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**File Overview**

This file contains the affirmative answers to T-QPQ. The affirmative should argue that their affirmative is indeed an example of engagement, both with specific evidence about their case and with a counter-definition. They also should provide counter-standards for why their definition is preferable, and explain why topicality shouldn’t be a voting issue (i.e. “reasonability” – if the affirmative case is reasonably close to the topic, a judge shouldn’t penalize the team with a full rejection). Affirmatives can choose the best counter-definitions of engagement based on their case; there are multiple options available in the file.

### We Meet – Dialogue

#### Our dialogue is the backbone of diplomatic engagement

**Berridge & James 2001** (G.R., Professor of International Politics at the University of Leicester; Alan, Emeritus Professor of International Relations at Keele University, A Dictionary of Diplomacy, p. 62-63)

diplomacy. (1) The conduct of relations between \*sovereign states through the medium of officials based at home or abroad, the latter being either members of their state’s \*diplomatic service or \*temporary diplomats. Thus diplomacy includes the stationing of representatives at \*international organizations. But the backbone of diplomacy has, for five centuries, been the dispatch of \*diplomatic missions to foreign states, and it is still very much the norm. As states are notional rather than flesh-and-blood persons, they cannot communicate in the manner of individuals, but must do so through representative human persons. In principle, this can be done by such individuals speaking to each -other at a distance through electronic devices. But there are large practical objections to their use as the sole or even the prime method of interstate communication. Diplomacy is therefore the principal means by which states communicate with each other, enabling them to have regular and complex relations. It is the communications system of the \*international society. The label ‘diplomacy’ was first given to this system by Edmund Burke in 1796. See also channels of communication. (2) The use of tact in dealing with people. Diplomacy in this sense is a skill which is hugely important in the conduct of diplomacy. But there is a large distinction between an apt way of executing a task, and the underlying function of that task. (3) Any attempt to promote international \*negotiations, whether concerning inter- or intra-state conflicts; hence \*track two diplomacy’. (4) Foreign policy. The use of the word ‘diplomacy’ as a synonym for foreign policy, which is especially common in the United States, can obscure the important distinction between policy and the (non-violent) means by which it is executed.

### We Meet – TPP

#### TPP is economic engagement

Russel 4/19 (Daniel, Assistant Secretary, Bureau of East Asian and Pacific Affairs, “FY 2017 Budget Priorities for East Asia: Engagement, Integration, and Democracy”, http://www.state.gov/p/eap/rls/rm/2016/04/255968.htm)

The arithmetic is simple. U.S. tariffs average 1.4 percent – some of the lowest in the world. For the other TPP countries with which we don’t already have trade agreements, their average tariff rate can be more than double that, with tariffs significantly higher for some specific products that we export. When these tariffs move to zero, in tandem with commitments to address other non-tariff barriers, American business is the big winner. TPP is the centerpiece of our economic engagement with the Asia-Pacific, which aims at creating a system that is open, free, transparent, and fair, creates new opportunities for growth at home and in the region, and reinforces our strategic presence abroad. Our engagement helps to build more stable societies by encouraging governments to strengthen rule of law. It supports our trade and investment goals by promoting laws and institutions that secure property rights, enforce contracts, and fight corruption. It empowers citizens to hold their governments accountable on issues such as protecting the environment and product safety, which is also important to the health and wellbeing of our own people. It aligns American leadership with the aspirations of ordinary people in the region, and with values that they admire, thus distinguishing us from other great powers past and present.

#### TPP is diplomatic engagement

Solis 13 (Mireya, Sr. Fellow @ Brookings Inst., “Endgame: Challenges for the United States in finalizing the TPP Negotiations”, http://www2.jiia.or.jp/en/pdf/publication/2013-06\_004-kokusaimondai.pdf)

Indeed, the TPP is part of a larger strategy of regional diplomatic engagement pursued by the Obama administration. These efforts were evident in the decision to sign the Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in July 2009, to negotiate the TPP in December 2009, to join the East Asia Summit in October 2010, and in the announcement of a rebalancing towards Asia in the fall of 2011.2 Then State Secretary Clinton summarized the goals of the economic agenda in the U.S. “forward deployed” strategy: to harness Asia’s economic dynamism and to partake in the construction of the region’s economic architecture (Clinton, 2011). Undoubtedly, the TPP is the centerpiece of the effort to achieve high level economic liberalization in Asia-Pacific.

### We Meet – Space

**Collaboration over scientific ventures is central to diplomatic engagement**

**Masters, Zondi, Van Wyke, Landsberg 15** (Associate Professor, Department of Political Sciences, [University of South Africa, Pretoria](https://scholar.google.com/citations?view_op=view_org&hl=en&org=10976511949285581406), Siphamandla Zondi is the Executive Director of the Institute for Global Dialogue (IGD,  She has written columns for the [Toronto Star](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Toronto_Star), [The Globe and Mail](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Globe_and_Mail), and [Chatelaine](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Chatelaine_%28magazine%29) magazine,[[2]](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Michele_Landsberg#cite_note-2) and is one of the first journalists in Canada to address sexual harassment in the workplace, racial discrimination in education and employment opportunities, and lack of gender equality in divorce and custodial legal proceedings, “South Africa Foreign Policy vol.2, 2015)

It is broadly **defined as the use of scientific collaborations among na-tions to address common problems and to build constructive international partnerships**. Ever since **the role of science in diplomatic relations was realized, various definitions of science diplomacy have been formulated**. Yakushiji' **refers to S&T diplomacy as a way to advance scientific coop-eration and as a vehicle for achieving scientific ends through the foreign policy objectives of countries.** The field of S&T diplomacy is broadly con-sidered to be a niche area that has benefits in the international arena**. It has become an umbrella term to describe a number of formal and informal technical, research-based, academic or engineering exchanges between countries. These collaborations are in appreciation of the fact that as far as the problems of the world go, no single country is capable of solving global challenges on its own**. Whether it is to fight the threat of terrorism, 111W Aids, the scourge of Ebola or environmental challenges like climate change. **international scientific collaboration has become central to diplomatic en-gagement between countries**. Unlike mainstream diplomacy (that seeks to advance international rela-tions**), science diplomacy is rather fluid and is classified as 'soft power' diplomac**y." **It is a particular diplomatic nich**e **that countries establish and promote to strengthen bilateral engagement** on Sett Science diplomacy Is **not just another term that denotes any form of international cooperation**; it is the use of science to engage partner countries in exchanging solutions to shared global problems.

**Space cooperation is diplomatic engagement**

Frank A. **ROSE**, Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Arms Control, Verification and Compliance, **16** [“The Role of Diplomacy in Keeping Outer Space Safe, Secure, and Sustainable,” 32nd Space Symposium, Colorado Springs, CO, April 14, 2016, http://www.state.gov/t/avc/rls/255834.htm]

Our **diplomatic efforts include specific engagements in both bilateral and multilateral fora**, in bilateral space security dialogues, and in the various United Nations organizational entities and regional fora. We are committed to using these efforts to prevent conflict from extending into space. **Bilateral Diplomatic Engagement We have made it a focal point of our diplomatic efforts to discuss space security issues with a range of countries** – friends, allies, partners, and those who are interested in greater cooperation. **The State Department has established over 15 formal space security dialogues with a number of partners**, including: the United Kingdom, France, Germany, the Republic of Korea, Japan, India, South Africa and the UAE. We use these dialogues to discuss the challenges to the space environment, multilateral diplomatic initiatives, and opportunities for practical, bilateral cooperation. **In addition to our formal space security dialogues with many governments, we have expanded our space security discussions with a range of other partners**, such as Turkey, Chile, Indonesia, Singapore, and Vietnam. Additionally, we are expanding our space security-related conversations in the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) countries. In many cases, our candid discussions have given the U.S. a better appreciation for our partners’ perspectives, and helped identify areas for cooperation and coordination. In addition, **these diplomatic engagements have resulted in increased interest in bilateral and multilateral space cooperation in areas interest in bilateral and multilateral space, including**: **Space situational awareness**; **Orbital debris mitigation; and The use of space for maritime domain awareness**. I believe that most of these nations have a similar view of a space environment that is safe, secure, and sustainable. Needless to say, there are sometimes significant disagreements about how we get to that end-state.

### Definition: Engagement is Not QPQ

#### Counter-interpretation: Engagement is direct contact, not conditions or appeasement – our definition avoids over-limiting & establishes coherent policy boundaries

Resnick 1 (Evan, Ph.D. Candidate in Political Science at Columbia University, “Defining Engagement”, Journal of International Affairs, 54(2), 551-566, ebsco)

The third trap that has ensnared numerous scholars is the tendency to needlessly circumscribe the parameters of engagement. This results from attempts to: define engagement as ends rather than means; stipulate the types of states that can engage or be engaged; restrict the types of behaviors that comprise engagement; and limit the types of behaviors that can be modified through engagement. Each of these restrictions hampers the task of evaluating the utility of engagement relative to other policies objectively accurately. Some scholars have excessively narrowed the definition of engagement by defining it according to the ends sought rather than the means employed. For example, Schweller and Wohlforth assert that if any distinction can be drawn between engagement and appeasement, "it is that the goal of engagement is not simply tension-reduction and the avoidance of war but also an attempt to socialize [a] dissatisfied power into acceptance of the established order."(n17) Such ends-based definitions hinder the study of engagement in two ways. First, because the act of policymaking consists of selecting from a variety of alternative means in the pursuit of a given end(s), it stands to reason that policy instruments are more effectively conceptualized in terms of means rather than ends. When defined as different means, policies can be more easily compared with one another across a whole spectrum of discrete ends, in order to gauge more accurately the circumstances under which each policy is relatively more or less effective. Second, scholars who define engagement as the end of peaceful socialization inevitably create a bias for future empirical research on engagement outcomes. This is because it is difficult to imagine a more ambitious foreign policy objective than the peaceable transformation of a revisionist state that rejects the dominant norms and practices of the international system into a status-quo state that embodies those same norms and practices. The equation of engagement with socialization alone forecloses the possibility that engagement could be employed to accomplish more modest goals such as tension-reduction. Therefore, all else being equal, scholars using this loaded definition will be predisposed to conclude from examination only of the hardest cases of attempted socialization that the policy is ineffective. Considering engagement as a set of means would enable analysts to more fairly assess the effectiveness of engagement relative to other policies in achieving an array of ends. Scholars have also inappropriately narrowed the scope of engagement by unnecessarily limiting the types of states that can pursue engagement or the types of target states that can be engaged. Cha's conceptualization posits that only powerful states can engage and that only weak ones can be engaged. This forecloses alternative examples of weak states' initiating engagement and strong states' being engaged. As a result, Cha's interpretation risks biasing subsequent empirical studies of engagement, as one would typically expect powerful states to engage more successfully than weak states, and for weak states to be engaged more successfully than strong states. On the other side of the coin, Johnston and Ross define engagement as the effort to ameliorate the revisionist elements of "a rising major power's behavior." This conceptualization is equally biased; rising great powers are probably the hardest types of states to socialize as opposed to declining great powers or smaller regional powers.(n20) Scholars have limited the concept of engagement in a third way by unnecessarily restricting the scope of the policy. In their evaluation of post-Cold War US engagement of China, Paul Papayoanou and Scott Kastner define engagement as the attempt to integrate a target country into the international order through promoting "increased trade and financial transactions."(n21) However, limiting engagement policy to the increasing of economic interdependence leaves out many other issue areas that were an integral part of the Clinton administration's China policy, including those in the diplomatic, military and cultural arenas. Similarly, the US engagement of North Korea, as epitomized by the 1994 Agreed Framework pact, promises eventual normalization of economic relations and the gradual normalization of diplomatic relations.(n22) Equating engagement with economic contacts alone risks neglecting the importance and potential effectiveness of contacts in noneconomic issue areas. Finally, some scholars risk gleaning only a partial and distorted insight into engagement by restrictively evaluating its effectiveness in achieving only some of its professed objectives. Papayoanou and Kastner deny that they seek merely to examine the "security implications" of the US engagement of China, though in a footnote, they admit that "[m]uch of the debate [over US policy toward the PRC] centers around the effects of engagement versus containment on human rights in China."(n23) This approach violates a cardinal tenet of statecraft analysis: the need to acknowledge multiple objectives in virtually all attempts to exercise inter-state influence.(n24) Absent a comprehensive survey of the multiplicity of goals involved in any such attempt, it would be naive to accept any verdict rendered concerning its overall merits. In order to establish a more effective framework for dealing with unsavory regimes, I propose that we define engagement as the attempt to influence the political behavior of a target state through the comprehensive establishment and enhancement of contacts with that state across multiple issue-areas (i.e. diplomatic, military, economic, cultural). The following is a brief list of the specific forms that such contacts might include: DIPLOMATIC CONTACTS Extension of diplomatic recognition; normalization of diplomatic relations Promotion of target-state membership in international institutions and regimes Summit meetings and other visits by the head of state and other senior government officials of sender state to target state and vice-versa MILITARY CONTACTS Visits of senior military officials of the sender state to the target state and vice-versa Arms transfers Military aid and cooperation Military exchange and training programs Confidence and security-building measures Intelligence sharing ECONOMIC CONTACTS Trade agreements and promotion Foreign economic and humanitarian aid in the form of loans and/or grants CULTURAL CONTACTS Cultural treaties Inauguration of travel and tourism links Sport, artistic and academic exchanges(n25)

### Definition: Engagement is Not QPQ

#### QPQ’s are not engagement

Smith 5 (Karen E, Senior Lecturer in International Relations, London School of Economics, “Engagement and conditionality: incompatible or mutually reinforcing?,” May 2005, Global Europe: New Terms of Engagement, <http://scholar.googleusercontent.com/scholar?q=cache:8-3RqE0TzFMJ:scholar.google.com/+engagement+positive+incentives+bilateral&hl=en&as_sdt=0,14>)

First, a few definitions. ‘Engagement’ is a foreign policy strategy of building close ties with the government and/or civil society and/or business community of another state. The intention of this strategy is to undermine illiberal political and economic practices, and socialise government and other domestic actors into more liberal ways. Most cases of engagement entail primarily building economic links, and encouraging trade and investment in particular. Some observers have variously labeled this strategy one of interdependence, or of ‘oxygen’: economic activity leads to positive political consequences.19‘Conditionality’, in contrast, is the linking, by a state or international organisation, of perceived benefits to another state(such as aid or trade concessions) to the fulfilment of economic and/or political conditions. ‘Positive conditionality’ entails promising benefits to a state if it fulfils the conditions; ‘negative conditionality’ involves reducing, suspending, or terminating those benefits if the state violates the conditions (in other words, applying sanctions, or a strategy of ‘asphyxiation’).20 To put it simply, engagement implies ties, but with no strings attached; conditionality attaches the strings. In another way of looking at it, engagement is more of a bottom-up strategy to induce change in another country, conditionality more of a top-down strategy

#### Economic engagement excludes conditions

Çelik 11 (Arda Can, Graduate Student in the Department of Peace and Conflict Research at Uppsala University (Sweden), 2011 (*Economic Sanctions and Engagement Policies*, Published by GRIN Verlag, ISBN 9783640962907, p. 11)

Economic engagement policies are strategic integration behaviour which involves with the target state. Engagement policies differ from other tools in Economic Diplomacy. They target to deepen the economic relations to create economic intersection, interconnectness, and mutual dependence and finally seeks economic interdependence. This interdependence serves the sender state to change the political behaviour of target state. However they cannot be counted as carrots or inducement tools, they focus on long term strategic goals and they are not restricted with short term policy changes. (Kahler&Kastner, 2006) They can be unconditional and focus on creating greater economic benefits for both parties. Economic engagement targets to seek deeper economic linkages via promoting institutionalized mutual trade thus mentioned interdependence creates two major concepts. Firstly it builds strong trade partnership to avoid possible militarized and non militarized conflicts. Secondly it gives a leeway to perceive the international political atmosphere from the same and harmonized perspective. Kahler and Kastner define the engagement policies as follows “It is a policy of deliberate expanding economic ties with and adversary in order to change the behaviour of target state and improve bilateral relations’’. (p523-abstact). It is an intentional economic strategy that expects bigger benefits such as long term economic gains and more importantly; political gains. The main idea behind the engagement motivation is stated by Rosecrance (1977) in a way that ‘’the direct and positive linkage of interests of states where a change in the position of one state affects the position of others in the same direction.’’

### Definition: Diplomatic Engagement is Not QPQ

#### Their incentive approach doesn’t work for diplomatic engagement

Neumann 9 (Ronald, president of the American Academy of Diplomacy and a former U.S. ambassador to Algeria, Bahrain, and Afghanistan, “Assessing Engagement: Strategy, Tactics, and Content”, http://www.washingtoninstitute.org/policy-analysis/view/assessing-engagement-strategy-tactics-and-content)

In general, engagement is just one tool among many in the diplomat's arsenal. The choice of which particular tool to use in a given situation should be guided not by ideology, but rather by the underlying policy objective. Yet the United States too often views diplomatic relations in more simplistic terms: as a reward for a country's good behavior, and as something to take away if a country is misbehaving. This creates a double challenge for policymakers -- it endangers Washington's ability to inform and influence while raising the political cost of reengagement once relations have been cut off. Moreover, by requiring target countries to meet preconditions for reengagement, the United States is essentially demanding concessions before negotiations even begin. Conspicuously, there are no examples in the past two decades of diplomatic history where isolation has led to a breakthrough in the Middle East. Engagement need not be viewed as surrender, however. Other diplomatic tools, including pressure, can be judiciously combined with engagement to secure U.S. policy objectives. The notion that one must choose between negotiations and the use of force is therefore a false dichotomy. Remaining engaged even at the most difficult moments can give Washington options and information it might not otherwise have.

#### Diplomatic engagement is direct, person to person contact through routine government channels; it’s more than “mere talk” & doesn’t allow for any old message we send to China

Thielmann & Seel 12 (Greg & Benjamin, fellows @ The Arms Control Association, “Diplomatic Engagement: The Path to Avoiding War and Resolving the Nuclear Crisis”, https://www.armscontrol.org/files/Iran\_Nuclear\_Brief\_Diplomatic\_Engagement20120104.pdf)

It is therefore necessary to re-examine the contribution diplomacy can make, regardless of the characteristics of Iran’s current government. In dealing with a difficult interlocutor such as Tehran, diplomats can provide two vital functions: Gaining knowledge about one’s negotiating partner. By contributing to knowledge of the personalities involved and the societal and governmental context of the issue positions, diplomats can identify and exploit opportunities that might otherwise be missed. As James Dobbins, the lead U.S. negotiator at the 2001 Bonn conference on Afghanistan, said with regard to Iran at a 2009 Arms Control Association panel discussion, “[Engagement] may or may not lead to agreement, but it will always lead to better information, and better information will lead to better policy.” The Iranian political context is exceedingly complicated. The government often sends mixed signals in offering or responding to Regular personal interaction is faster, more nimble, and more targeted than relying exclusively on diplomatic correspondence, third party intermediaries, and occasional high-level encounters. Frequent direct contact is more likely to build relationships of trust and avoid misunderstandings. The Bonn Conference on Afghanistan in late 2001 showed that the United States and Iran could work together constructively in common cause, suggesting that diplomatic dysfunction is not built into the DNA of the two sides (see box, p. 7).

### Definition: Diplomatic Engagement is Not QPQ

#### Diplomatic engagement is reassurance – The plan meets

Hannah 9 (10/18, John, senior fellow at The Washington Institute, “Assessing Engagement: Strategy, Tactics, and Content”, http://www.washingtoninstitute.org/policy-analysis/view/assessing-engagement-strategy-tactics-and-content)

Thus far, the Obama administration has placed diplomatic engagement at the forefront of America's relations with its adversaries. This strategy is aimed at convincing these adversaries that a genuine alternative path is available to them, assuming they are willing to change their behavior on matters of critical concern to Washington. As the president has repeatedly stated, this path can lead to new relations with the United States based on mutual respect and mutual interests. The Obama administration's strategic shift was heavily influenced by its negative assessment of Bush-era policies. According to this critique, Washington's approach had been too confrontational, antagonizing adversaries and allies alike while failing to achieve U.S. objectives. Whether accurate or not, this widespread narrative had a significant effect on the Obama administration's conception and pursuit of engagement. With respect to Iran, the shift has meant offering an open hand rather than a closed fist. Instead of threatening isolation, punitive actions, and possible military attack, the administration has repeatedly sought to reassure the Islamic Republic of America's benign intentions and desire to engage in direct negotiations as soon as possible. At the same time, high-level U.S. officials have publicly cast doubt on the viability of a military option, objecting to potential Israeli military action in particular.

**Diplomatic engagement is the establishment of norms and cooperation.**

Mallory **STEWART**, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Arms Control, Verification and Compliance, **15** [“Formulation, Coordination, and Implementation of Promoting Space Security and Sustainability,” 2015 Space Resiliency Summit, Mary M. Gates Learning Center, Alexandria, VA, December 9, 2015, http://www.state.gov/t/avc/rls/2015/250567.htm]

**Protecting the national security** of the United States and its allies **by preventing conflict from extending into space and avoiding or deterring purposeful interference with our space systems is a major goal of our diplomatic engagements**. This goal is described in the 2010 U.S. National Space Policy which makes clear that it is not in anyone’s interest for armed conflict to extend into space. The 2010 Policy also states that purposeful interference with space systems, including supporting infrastructure, will be considered an infringement of a nation’s rights.

**There are two main diplomatic approaches to achieving this goal: (1) we are strengthening space cooperation and information sharing with allies and partners to enhance collective space situational awareness and maximize the interoperability and redundancy of our space assets, and (2) we are encouraging the development of “best practices” and norms of responsible behavior in the space faring community to enhance resiliency through the prevention of** mishaps, misperceptions, and the chances of **miscalculation**.

### Definition: Economic Engagement Can Be Either

#### Economic engagement can be unconditional

Kahler 4 (Miles, Graduate School of International Relations and Pacific Studies at the University of California, San Diego, and Scott L. Kastner Department of Government and Politics University of Maryland, “Strategic Uses of Economic Interdependence: Engagement Policies in South Korea, Singapore, and Taiwan”, November, http://www.bsos.umd.edu/gvpt/kastner/KahlerKastner.doc)

Economic engagement—a policy of deliberately expanding economic ties with an adversary in order to change the behavior of the target state and effect an improvement in bilateral political relations—is the subject of growing, but still limited, interest in the international relations literature. The bulk of the work on economic statecraft continues to focus on coercive policies such as economic sanctions. The emphasis on negative forms of economic statecraft is not without justification: the use of economic sanctions is widespread and well-documented, and several quantitative studies have shown that adversarial relations between countries tend to correspond to reduced, rather than enhanced, levels of trade (Gowa 1994; Pollins 1989). At the same time, however, relatively little is known about how widespread strategies of economic engagement actually are: scholars disagree on this point, in part because no database cataloging instances of positive economic statecraft exists (Mastanduno 2003). Furthermore, beginning with the classic work of Hirschman (1945), most studies in this regard have focused on policies adopted by great powers. But engagement policies adopted by South Korea and the other two states examined in this study, Singapore and Taiwan, demonstrate that engagement is not a strategy limited to the domain of great power politics; instead, it may be more widespread than previously recognized. We begin by developing a theoretical framework through which to examine strategies of economic engagement. Drawing from the existing literature, our framework distinguishes between different forms of economic engagement, and outlines the factors likely to facilitate or undermine the implementation of these different strategies. With this framework as a guide, we then examine the strategic use of economic interdependence—focusing in particular on economic engagement—in three East Asian States: South Korea, Singapore, and Taiwan. We use these case studies to draw conclusions about the underlying factors that facilitate the use of a strategy of economic engagement, that determine the particular type of engagement strategy used, and that help to predict the likelihood of success. Because our conclusions are primarily derived inductively from a small number of cases, we are cautious in making claims of generalizability. Nonetheless, it is our hope that the narratives we provide and the conclusions that we draw from them will help to spur further research into this interesting yet under-studied subject. ECONOMIC ENGAGMENT: STRATEGIES AND EXPECTATIONS Scholars have usefully distinguished between two types of economic engagement: conditional policies that require an explicit quid-pro-quo on the part of the target country, and policies that are unconditional. Conditional policies, sometimes called “linkage” or economic “carrots,” are the inverse of economic sanctions. Instead of threatening a target country with a sanction absent a change in policy, conditional engagement policies promise increased economic flows in exchange for policy change. Drezner’s (1999/2000) analysis of conditional economic inducements yields a set of highly plausible expectations concerning when conditional strategies are likely to be employed, and when they are likely to succeed. Specifically, he suggests that reasons exist to believe, a priori, that policies of conditional engagement will be less prevalent than economic sanctions. First, economic coercion is costly if it fails (sanctions are only carried out if the target country fails to change policy), while conditional engagement is costly if it succeeds (economic payoffs are delivered only if the target country does change policy). Second, states may be reluctant to offer economic inducements with adversaries with whom they expect long-term conflict, as this may undermine their resolve in the eyes of their opponent while also making the opponent stronger. Third, the potential for market failure in an anarchic international setting looms large: both the initiating and the target states must be capable of making a credible commitment to uphold their end of the bargain. These factors lead Drezner to hypothesize that the use of economic carrots is most likely to occur and succeed between democracies (because democracies are better able to make credible commitments than non-democracies), within the context of international regimes (because such regimes reduce the transactions costs of market exchange), and, among adversaries, only after coercive threats are first used. Unconditional engagement strategies are more passive in that they do not include a specific quid-pro-quo. Rather, countries deploy economic links with an adversary in the hopes that economic interdependence itself will, over time, effect change in the target’s foreign policy behavior and yield a reduced threat of military conflict at the bilateral level. How increased commercial and/or financial integration at the bilateral level might yield an improved bilateral political environment is not obvious. While most empirical studies on the subject find that increased economic ties tend to be associated with a reduced likelihood of military violence, no consensus exists regarding how such effects are realized. At a minimum, two causal pathways exist that state leaders might seek to exploit by pursuing a policy of unconditional engagement: economic interdependence can act as a constraint on the foreign policy behavior of the target state, and economic interdependence can act as a transforming agent that helps to reshape the goals of the target state. Perhaps the most widely accepted theoretical link between economic integration and a reduced danger of military violence centers on the constraints imposed on state behavior by increasing economic exchange. Once established, a disruption in economic relations between countries would be costly on two levels. First, firms might lose assets that could not readily be redeployed elsewhere. For example, direct investments cannot easily be moved, and may be lost (i.e. seized or destroyed) if war breaks out. Second, firms engaged in bilateral economic exchange would be forced to search for next-best alternatives, which could impose significant costs on an economy as a whole if bilateral commercial ties are extensive. In short, economic interdependence makes war more costly, meaning that states will be less likely to initiate armed conflict against countries with which they are integrated economically. Constraining effects of economic interdependence may also arise more indirectly: as economic integration between two countries increases, an increasing number of economic actors within those two countries benefit directly from bilateral economic ties, who in turn are likely to support—and lobby for—stable bilateral political relations. Economic integration, in other words, creates vested interests in peace (Hirschman 1945; Russett and Oneal 2001; Levy 2003). These interests are likely to become more influential as economic ties grow (Rogowski 1989), suggesting that leaders will pay increasing domestic political costs for implementing policies that destabilize bilateral political relations. Domestic political institutions might act as important intervening variables here. For example, these effects may be most likely to take effect in democracies, which provide actors who benefit from trade clear paths through which to influence the political process (Papayoanou 1999; Gelpi and Grieco 2003; Russett and Oneal 2001). Democracies, of course, likely vary in the influence they give to commercial interests, as do authoritarian polities (e.g. Papayoanou and Kastner 1999/2000). Recently, scholars have questioned whether the increased costs of military conflict associated with economic interdependence necessarily act as a constraint on state leaders. Indeed, without further assumptions, the effects appear indeterminate: while economic interdependence increases the costs of conflict for the target state, it also increases those costs for the engaging state. <<card continues>>

### Definition: Economic Engagement Can Be Either

<<card continues>> On the one hand, increased costs for the target might make it less willing to provoke conflict, but on the other hand, the increased costs for the engaging state may paradoxically embolden the target state, believing it could get away with more before provoking a strong response (Morrow 1999, 2003; Gartzke 2003; Gartzke et al. 2001). This critique suggests that for an unconditional engagement policy exploiting the constraining effects of economic interdependence to work, leaders in the target state must value the benefits afforded by economic integration more than leaders in the initiating state (on this point, see also Abdelal and Kirshner 1999/2000). Such asymmetry is most likely to arise when the target state’s economy depends more heavily on bilateral economic exchange than the sending state (Hirschman 1945), and when domestic political institutions in the target state give the benefactors of bilateral exchange considerable political influence (Papayoanou and Kastner 1999/2000). The second mechanism through which economic interdependence might effect improved political relations centers on elite transformation that reshapes state strategies. This transformation can be defined as both an elevation at the national level of goals of economic welfare (and a concurrent devaluation of the old values of military status and territorial acquisition) and a systemic transformation of values away from the military orientation of the Westphalian order. Such arguments have a long heritage, including both Joseph Schumpeter's analysis of imperialism as an atavism that would be superseded by more pacific bourgeois values, and interwar idealists, who sometimes based their arguments on the material transformations underway in the international system. How economic interdependence creates transformed (and more pacific) elites is less clear. Learning may take place at the individual level—the cases of Mikhail Gorbachev and Deng Xiaoping come to mind—but such learning must often take place before policy encourages increased interdependence. Processes of creating shared values and identity and economic influences on broader social learning are more difficult to trace. A different and perhaps more plausible transformational route follows from the vested interests argument outlined above. What appears to be social learning is in effect coalitional change: internationalist elites committed to economic openness and international stability supplant or marginalize nationalist elites wedded to the threat or use of military force. Whether a society is a pluralist democracy or not, interests tied to the international economy become a critical part of the selectorate to whom political elites must respond. Etel Solingen (1998) outlines such a model of transformation in regional orders when strong internationalist coalitions committed to economic liberalization create zones of stable peace. The barriers to a successful unconditional engagement strategy that aims to achieve elite transformation in the target state would appear substantial. Strategies in this vein are likely to encounter substantial resistance in the target state: most elites probably don’t want to be “transformed,” and they certainly don’t want to be replaced. Faced with likely resistance, initiating states pursuing this strategy must be prepared to open economic links unilaterally (i.e. without the cooperation of the target), hoping that the prospect of bilateral economic ties will generate a latent coalition of groups desiring a peaceful environment in which they could take advantage of those ties, and that eventually a political entrepreneur will mobilize this latent coalition in an effort to challenge the existing order. Because transformational strategies may require long time horizons and may also incur repeated disappointments, they are perhaps most likely to be successful when a broad and stable consensus—one able to withstand changes in governing party—exists within the country initiating such a strategy (see, for example, Davis 1999). In summary, we have distinguished between three types of economic engagement: conditional engagement (linkage); unconditional engagement seeking to utilize the constraining effects of economic interdependence; and unconditional engagement seeking to utilize the transforming effects of economic interdependence. We have also outlined a number of expectations, mostly drawn from the existing literature, regarding the conditions likely to facilitate the use of these various strategies. In the remainder of this essay we examine the engagement policies of South Korea, Singapore and Taiwan, and we use these cases to draw conclusions concerning the conditions facilitating the strategic use of economic interdependence.

#### Economic engagement does not require conditionality

Haass 2k (Richard N., Vice President and Director of Foreign Policy Studies at the Brookings Institution, and Meghan L. O’Sullivan, Fellow with the Foreign Policy Studies Program at the Brookings Institution, “Terms of Engagement: Alternatives to Punitive Policies”, Survival, 42(2), Summer, p. 2-3)

Many different types of engagement strategies exist, depending on who is engaged, the kind of incentives employed and the sorts of objectives pursued. Engagement may be conditional when it entails a negotiated series of exchanges, such as where the US extends positive inducements for changes undertaken by the target country. Or engagement may be unconditional if it offers modifications in US policy towards a country without the explicit expectation that a reciprocal act will follow. Generally, conditional engagement is geared towards a government; unconditional engagement works with a country’s civil society or private sector in the hopes of promoting forces that will eventually facilitate cooperation. Architects of engagement strategies can choose from a wide variety of incentives. Economic engagement might offer tangible incentives such as export credits, investment insurance or promotion, access to technology, loans and economic aid. Other equally useful economic incentives involve the removal of penalties such as trade embargoes, investment bans or high tariffs, which have impeded economic relations between the United States and the target country. Facilitated entry into the economic global arena and the institutions that govern it rank among the most potent incentives in today’s global market. Similarly, political engagement can involve the lure of diplomatic recognition, access to regional or international institutions, the scheduling of summits between leaders – or the termination of these benefits. Military engagement could involve the extension of international military educational training in order both to strengthen respect for civilian authority and human rights among a country’s armed forces and, more feasibly, to establish relationships between Americans and young foreign military officers. While these areas of engagement are likely to involve working with state institutions, cultural or civil-society engagement entails building people-to-people contacts. Funding nongovernmental organisations, facilitating the flow of remittances and promoting the exchange of students, tourists and other non-governmental people between countries are just some of the possible incentives used in the form of engagement.

### Definition: Economic Engagement Can Be Either

#### Either is topical

Haass 2k (Richard N., Vice President and Director of Foreign Policy Studies at the Brookings Institution, and Meghan L. O’Sullivan, Fellow with the Foreign Policy Studies Program at the Brookings Institution, “Engaging Problem Countries”, Brookings Policy Brief, No. 61, June, <http://dspace.cigilibrary.org/jspui/bitstream/123456789/18245/1/Engaging%20Problem%20Countries.pdf>?1)

Engagement as a policy is not merely the antithesis of isolation. Rather, it involves the use of economic, political, or cultural incentives to influence problem countries to alter their behavior in one or more realms. Such a strategy can take a variety of forms. *Conditional* engagement is a government-to-government affair in which the United States offers inducements to a target regime in exchange for specified changes in behavior. This was the approach favored in 1994 when the United States and North Korea entered into a framework agreement under which Pyongyang pledged to curtail its nuclear weapons development in exchange for shipments of fuel, construction of a new generation of nuclear power-generating reactors, and a degree of diplomatic normalization. In contrast, *unconditional* engagement is less contractual, with incentives being extended without the explicit expectation that a reciprocal act will follow. Unconditional engagement makes the most sense in promoting civil society in hopes of creating an environment more conducive to reform.

### Resnick Definition Best

#### Our interpretation focuses on interaction – That’s the fairest limit, avoids too narrow concepts

Resnick 1 (Evan, Ph.D. Candidate in Political Science at Columbia University, “Defining Engagement”, Journal of International Affairs, 54(2), 551-566, ebsco)

Engagement is an iterated process in which the sender and target state develop a relationship of increasing interdependence, culminating in the endpoint of "normalized relations" characterized by a high level of interactions across multiple domains. Engagement is a quintessential exchange relationship: the target state wants the prestige and material resources that would accrue to it from increased contacts with the sender state, while the sender state seeks to modify the domestic and/or foreign policy behavior of the target state. This deductive logic could adopt a number of different forms or strategies when deployed in practice.(n26) For instance, individual contacts can be established by the sender state at either a low or a high level of conditionality. Additionally, the sender state can achieve its objectives using engagement through any one of the following causal processes: by directly modifying the behavior of the target regime; by manipulating or reinforcing the target states' domestic balance of political power between competing factions that advocate divergent policies; or by shifting preferences at the grassroots level in the hope that this will precipitate political change from below within the target state. This definition implies that three necessary conditions must hold for engagement to constitute an effective foreign policy instrument. First, the overall magnitude of contacts between the sender and target states must initially be low. If two states are already bound by dense contacts in multiple domains (i.e., are already in a highly interdependent relationship), engagement loses its impact as an effective policy tool. Hence, one could not reasonably invoke the possibility of the US engaging Canada or Japan in order to effect a change in either country's political behavior. Second, the material or prestige needs of the target state must be significant, as engagement derives its power from the promise that it can fulfill those needs. The greater the needs of the target state, the more amenable to engagement it is likely to be. For example, North Korea's receptivity to engagement by the US dramatically increased in the wake of the demise of its chief patron, the Soviet Union, and the near-total collapse of its national economy.(n28) Third, the target state must perceive the engager and the international order it represents as a potential source of the material or prestige resources it desires. This means that autarkic, revolutionary and unlimited regimes which eschew the norms and institutions of the prevailing order, such as Stalin's Soviet Union or Hitler's Germany, will not be seduced by the potential benefits of engagement. This reformulated conceptualization avoids the pitfalls of prevailing scholarly conceptions of engagement. It considers the policy as a set of means rather than ends, does not delimit the types of states that can either engage or be engaged, explicitly encompasses contacts in multiple issue-areas, allows for the existence of multiple objectives in any given instance of engagement and, as will be shown below, permits the elucidation of multiple types of positive sanctions.

#### Our interpretation is distinct from appeasement

Resnick 1 (Evan, Ph.D. Candidate in Political Science at Columbia University, “Defining Engagement”, Journal of International Affairs, 54(2), 551-566, ebsco)

In contrast to many prevailing conceptions of engagement, the one proposed in this essay allows a substantive distinction to be drawn between engagement and appeasement. The standard definition of appeasement--which derives from the language of classical European diplomacy, namely "a policy of attempting to reduce tension between two states by the methodical removal of the principal causes of conflict between them"--is venerable but nevertheless inadequate. It does not provide much guidance to the contemporary policymaker or policy analyst, because it conceives of a foreign policy approach in terms of the ends sought while never making clear the precise means involved. The principal causes of conflict between two states can be removed in a number of ways. A more refined definition of appeasement that not only remains loyal to the traditional connotations but also establishes a firm conceptual distinction from engagement might be: the attempt to influence the political behavior of a target state by ceding territory and/or a geopolitical sphere of influence to that state. Indeed, the two best-known cases of appeasement, Great Britain's appeasement of the United States at the turn of the 20th century and of Nazi Germany in the 1930s, reveals that much of this appeasement adopted precisely these guises. The key elements of the British appeasement of the US-acceptance of the Monroe Doctrine-permission for the US to build and fortify a Central American canal, and acquiescence to American claims on the border between Alaska and the Yukon--consisted of explicit acknowledgement of American territorial authority. Meanwhile, the appeasement of the Third Reich by Great Britain was characterized by acquiescence to: Germany's military reoccupation of the Rhineland (1936); annexation of Austria (1938); acquisition of the Sudetenland from Czechoslovakia as decided at the Munich Conference; and absorption of the remainder of Czechoslovakia (1939). A more contemporary example of appeasement is the land for peace exchange that represents the centerpiece of the on-again off-again diplomatic negotiations between the Israeli government and the Palestinian Authority. Thus, a rigid conceptual distinction can be drawn between engagement and appeasement. Whereas both policies are positive sanctions--insofar as they add to the power and prestige of the target state--engagement does so in a less direct and less militarized fashion than appeasement. In addition, engagement differs from appeasement by establishing an increasingly interdependent relationship between the sender and the target state. At any juncture, the sender state can, in theory, abrogate such a relationship at some (ideally prohibitive) cost to the target state. Appeasement, on the other hand, does not involve the establishment of contacts or interdependence between the appeaser and the appeased. Territory and/or a sphere of influence are merely transferred by one party to the other either unconditionally or in exchange for certain concessions on the part of the target state.

### Government Definitions Best

#### Official government definitions of engagement support our interpretation – Theirs is cherrypicked; government is the best brightline

Kane 8 (Major Brian, US Marine Corps, M.A. Defense Technical Inst., “Comprehensive Engagement: A Winning Strategy”, http://www.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/a504901.pdf)

Engagement strategies are not new. Since the end of the Cold War, engagement strategy has been called “comprehensive containment, conditional containment, conditional engagement, limited engagement, quid pro quo engagement, congagement, unconditional engagement, and comprehensive engagement.” As a result, engagement strategy represents a “conceptual fog” in today’s environment. However, the Clinton Administration attempted to dissipate this fog with the first post-Cold War, multi-faceted definition proposed in its NSS, which stated that engagement strategy is: (1) a broad based grand strategic orientation; (2) a specific approach to managing bilateral relations with a target state through the unconditional provision of continuous concessions to that state; (3) a bilateral policy characterized by the conditional provision of concessions to a state; (4) a bilateral policy characterized by the broadening of contacts in areas of mutual interest with a target state; and (5) a bilateral policy characterized by the provision of technical assistance to facilitate economic and political liberalization in a target state.10 This definition of engagement has been the most successful historically.

### AT: Limits

#### Even if diplomatic engagement is unlimited, diplomatic processes check

Lee & Hocking 11 (Donna, Pf @ U of Bradford, UK, & Brian, “Diplomacy”, published in Bertrand Bardie, Dirk-Berg Schlosser & Leonardo Morlino (eds.) International Encyclopaedia of Political Science, https://kar.kent.ac.uk/38123/3/IPSA%20Encyp%20Diplomacy%2028%20April.pdf)

As the above discussion of the theories of diplomacy indicates, those who study diplomacy remain divided over whether it is essentially a state-based set of political processes or whether it is a set of networked-based political processes. Those who maintain that diplomacy is primarily the pursuit of the foreign policy interests of the state in the international system of states, argue that diplomacy is confined to a quite narrow set of bilateral and multilateral processes of communication, representation and mediation focused on the foreign ministry and its overseas missions. Diplomatic processes continue to exhibit some regularity so that functions, institutions, codes, conventions and cultures of diplomacy are marked by continuity and marginal change, and that diplomatic rules and norms will continue to hold in the future. The obvious casualty in this approach is any in-depth analysis of change in diplomatic structures and processes. By contrast, those who conceptualise diplomacy outside state-centric frameworks tend to emphasise continual change in the conduct and context of diplomacy. The principle objective of network-based approaches is to highlight and analyse the challenges posed to diplomacy by contemporary changes in the international system. Scholars turn to issues of globalisation and regionalisation to emphasise the increasingly complex social, economic and political context of diplomacy (at domestic, regional and international levels). For these scholars, change and transformation in diplomatic process and structures is the central concern of analysis and in this frame diplomacy is seen to have both formal and informal structures. Diplomatic processes are network-based and draw in a range of public and private actors, there is an absence of agreed rules and norms of diplomatic engagement such that new codes and conventions are emerging or in need of development. In short, diplomacy both in terms of the varying processes through which it is effected and the machinery through which it is conducted, are closely linked phenomena which are the subject of differing interpretations. We now examine how these have developed in response to changes in both domestic and international environments.

### Reasonability

#### Defer to reasonability – The smallest limit isn’t the best limit. Debate needs adequate ground for an entire year of contests, making it different from the real world scholarly concerns. They validate arbitrary exclusions that shift the goal posts

Drifte 3 (Reinhard Drifte, Professor and Chair of Japanese Studies and Director at the Newcastle East Asia Center at the University of Newcastle, 2003 (“Introduction,” *Japan's Security Relations with China Since 1989: From Balancing to Bandwagoning?*, Published by Routledge, ISBN 1134406673, p. 5-6)

The misunderstanding of the policy of engagement gives rise to considerable confusion because it obfuscates the Realist elements of engagement, i.e. the role of force to effect balancing and hedging. In order to propose remedies to perceived deficiencies of engagement, qualifying adjectives to 'engagement', or even the coinage of new words, have been proposed which make an appropriate understanding of engagement policy even more difficult. Definitions range from unconditional engagement, conditional engagement, comprehensive or constructive engagement, robust engagement, congagement, coercive engagement, to constrainment.8 The resulting definatory maze cannot fail to make the pursuit of engagement difficult at a national level, let alone in tandem with another country. In fact engagement relies as much on Realist foundations, with their deterrence and balance-of-power elements, as on Liberal foundations, which stress the positive forces of increasing international economic interdependence and integration, the spreading of international norms, the establishment of rules and institutions to regulate and enable peaceful cooperation between nations. The power-balancing and deterrence elements in engagement policy follow the Realist teaching that war can be avoided if there is a stable power balance, but that the shift of power relations (which China drives forward through its economic and military strengthening) is particularly dangerous for the maintenance of peace. The systemic issues for hegemonic stability are how to maintain such stability and how to accommodate change. Realists will point out that multipolar systems like those in Asia are less stable than unipolar systems. The situation in Asia has been depicted as a five-power balance-of-power system, as 'ripe for rivalry', and as heading for instability.9 The following definition of engagement by Alastair Iain Johnston and Robert S. Ross probably describes best the dualistic character of this policy: 'The use of non-coercive methods to ameliorate the non-status-quo elements of a rising power's behaviour. The goal is to ensure that this growing power is used in ways that are consistent with peaceful change in regional and global order'. The authors explicitly state that amelioration of the rising power's behaviour does not seek to limit, constrain or delay the newcomer's power, nor to prevent the development of influence commensurate with its greater power.10 They attach four conditions that will make a policy of engagement effective: 1. the new rising power has only limited revisionist aims and there are no irreconcilable conflicts of interest with the established powers; 2. the established powers are strong enough to mix concessions with credible threats, i.e. a sticks and carrots policy; 3. engagement is a complement and not an alternative to balancing; 4. the established powers must live by the same principles they demand of the new rising power11 When we look carefully at this statement it becomes clear that, for the rising power, 'coercive means' must still be considered in its calculation of the [end page 5] established powers despite their goal of the non-use of 'coercive methods'. Not only is this related to the established powers' Realist objectives (i.e. balancing and hedging) vis-a-vis conceivable intentions of a rising power, but it is also, in the first instance, due to the simple fact that all the established powers, including Japan, maintain considerable military forces and are involved in military alliances to cater for a whole range of challenges to their security. The crucial issue for a correct understanding of Japan's engagement policy (and this would apply to the engagement policy of any other country) is to clarify the emphasis and the robustness with which some rather than other goals associated with engagement are pursued, as well as the mix of policy tools used; one needs to consider issues such as no unilateral use of offensive military force, peaceful resolution of territorial disputes, respect for national sovereignty, transparency of military forces, cooperative solutions for transnational problems or respect for basic human rights.12

### Reasonability

#### Even Haass agrees we meet – Their interpretation is obviously arbitrary

Haas 2k (Richard, Vice President and Director of Foreign Policy Studies at the Brookings Institution, & Meghan O’Sullivan, “Terms of Engagement: Alternatives to Punitive Policies”, <http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/> research/files/articles/2000/6/summer%20haass/2000survival.pdf)

Architects of engagement strategies can choose from a wide variety of incentives. Economic engagement might offer tangible incentives such as export credits, investment insurance or promotion, access to technology, loans and economic aid. Other equally useful economic incentives involve the removal of penalties such as trade embargoes, investment bans or high tariffs, which have impeded economic relations between the United States and the target country. Facilitated entry into the economic global arena and the institutions that govern it rank among the most potent incentives in today’s global market. Similarly, political engagement can involve the lure of diplomatic recognition, access to regional or international institutions, the scheduling of summits between leaders – or the termination of these benefits. Military engagement could involve the extension of international military educational training in order both to strengthen respect for civilian authority and human rights among a country’s armed forces and, more feasibly, to establish relationships between Americans and young foreign military officers. While these areas of engagement are likely to involve working with state institutions, cultural or civil-society engagement entails building people-to-people contacts. Funding nongovernmental organisations, facilitating the flow of remittances and promoting the exchange of students, tourists and other non-governmental people between countries are just some of the possible incentives used in the form of engagement.

#### Precision impossible—neg definitions undermine conceptual clarity.

Capie & Evans 7 (David H., Research Fellow and Co-Director of the Armed Groups Project in the Centre for International Relations at the University of British Columbia, and Paul M., Professor at the Institute of Asian Research and Liu Institute for Global Issues at the University of British Columbia, 2007 (“Engagement,” *The Asia-Pacific Security Lexicon*, Published by the Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, ISBN 9812307230, p. 115-116)

According to the Oxford Concise Dictionary, the noun engagement and the verb to engage have several different meanings. Among these, to engage can mean "to employ busily", "to hold a person's attention", "to bind by a promise (usually a marriage)", or to "come into battle with an enemy". The noun engagement can mean "the act or state of engaging or being engaged", an "appointment with another person", "a betrothal", "an encounter between hostile forces", or "a moral commitment". The gerund engaging means to be "attractive or charming". In the literature on security in the Asia-Pacific, engagement most commonly refers to policies regarding the People's Republic of China. However, the term has been used in many different ways leading to a great deal of confusion and uncertainty. A Business Week headline summed up the confusion: "Does 'engagement' mean fight or marry?"1 Although one of the most important and ubiquitous terms in the Asia-Pacific security discourse, engagement is generally under-theorized. Most of the literature on the term is either descriptive or prescriptive. There is little agreement about the meaning of engagement and considerable inconsistency in its use. The New York Times noted that "there are many definitions of engagement" and described it as a "moving target". This indeterminacy has prompted a host of scholars and officials to offer their own modified interpretations of engagement, for example deep engagement or conditional engagement. These, in turn, have arguably made for less, rather than greater conceptual clarity.