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**File Overview**

This file contains a negative topicality argument. Topicality is the idea that the affirmative case must fall within the confines of the broader resolution, which is:

*Resolved: The United States federal government should substantially increase its economic and/or diplomatic engagement with the People's Republic of China.*

This topicality argument says that engagement must include positive incentives for China to change their behavior. It is not enough simply for the United States to talk to China; rather, they should negotiate with them, giving something and getting something in return. This is called a quid pro quo. The negative should argue that the affirmative case (whether it be TPP, Space, or Dialogue) is not engagement because it does not set any conditions or provide any incentives.

Topicality violations typically include four components: an interpretation, where the negative defines the word in question; a violation, where they explain how the affirmative team’s plan is outside the bounds of their definitions; standards, which are where the negative explains why their definition is preferable to other definitions of the same word; and voters, which explain why topicality is an issue the judge should vote on. The 1NC in this file is set up in this structure.

## 1NC Engagement is Quid Pro Quo T (1/1)

#### A. Interpretation:

#### Engagement requires positive incentives, not merely interacting

Haass 2k (Richard & Meghan O’Sullivan, Brookings Institution Foreign Policy Studies Program, Honey and Vinegar: Incentives, Sanctions, and Foreign Policy, p. 1-2)

The term *engagement* was popularized amid the controversial policy of constructive engagement pursued by the United States toward South Africa during the first term of the Reagan administration. However, the term itself remains a source of confusion. To the Chinese, the word appears to mean simply the conduct of normal relations. In German, no comparable translation exists. Even to native English speakers, the concept behind the word is unclear. Except in the few instances in which the United States has sought to isolate a regime or country, America arguably "engages" states and actors all the time in one capacity or another simply by interacting with them. This book, however, employs the term engagement in a much more specific way, one that involves much more than a policy of nonisolation. In our usage, engagement refers to a foreign policy strategy that depends to a significant degree on positive incentives to achieve its objectives. Certainly, engagement does not preclude the simultaneous use of other foreign policy instruments such as sanctions or military force. In practice, there is often considerable overlap of strategies, particularly when the termination or lifting of sanctions is used as a positive inducement. Yet the distinguishing feature of engagement strategies is their reliance on the extension or provision of incentives to shape the behavior of countries with which the United States has important disagreements.

#### That means the plan must be a quid-pro-quo

De LaHunt 6 (Assistant Director for Environmental Health & Safety Services in Colorado College's Facilities Services department, John, “Perverse and unintended” Journal of Chemical Health and Safety, July-August, Science direct)

Incentives work on a quid pro quo basis – this for that. If you change your behavior, I’ll give you a reward. One could say that coercion is an incentive program – do as I say and I’ll let you live. However, I define an incentive as getting something you didn’t have before in exchange for new behavior, so that pretty much puts coercion in its own box, one separate from incentives. But fundamental problems plague the incentive approach. Like coercion, incentives are poor motivators in the long run, for at least two reasons – unintended consequences and perverse incentives.

#### B. Violation: The plan does not operate on a quid-pro-quo basis.

### 1NC Engagement is Quid Pro Quo T (2/2)

#### C. Standards:

#### Limits – Allowing diplomatic action without requiring diplomatic conditionality includes talking to China about literally anything, from the Olympics to internet memes. There’s zero conceptual limit on the diplomatic area of the topic if the aff is not required to make a demand of China. This explodes the negative research burden and makes it impossible for us to be prepared.

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

One serious flaw in scholarly conceptualizations of engagement is the tendency to view engagement as simply a synonym for appeasement, a policy approach that has fallen into disrepute since the late 1930s. In their book, Force and Statecraft, Gordon Craig and Alexander George make the following case: "constructive engagement...is essentially a policy of appeasement, though the term itself cannot be used."(n11) Similarly, in a recently published article, Randall Schweller and William Wohlforth refer to engagement as "simply a new, 'more acceptable' term for an old policy that used to be called appeasement."(n12) Another scholar, Victor Cha, does try to differentiate appeasement from engagement, though he does so in a manner that nevertheless renders the two policies indistinguishable. Cha claims that engagement occurs when "non-coercive and non-punitive" means are employed by a strong country toward a weak country, while appeasement is the use of the very same means by a weak country against a strong country. This suggests that only the strong can engage and only the weak can appease, though the actual means deployed are virtually identical in both cases. A second problem associated with various scholarly treatments of engagement is the tendency to define the concept too broadly to be of much help to the analyst. For instance, Cha's definition of engagement as any policy whose means are "non-coercive and non-punitive" is so vague that essentially any positive sanction could be considered engagement. The definition put forth by Alastair lain Johnston and Robert Ross in their edited volume, Engaging China, is equally nebulous. According to Johnston and Ross, engagement constitutes "the use of non-coercive methods to ameliorate the non-status quo elements of a rising power's behavior."(n14) Likewise, in his work, Rogue States and US Foreign Policy, Robert Litwak defines engagement as "positive sanctions." Moreover, in their edited volume, Honey and Vinegar: Incentives, Sanctions, and Foreign Policy, Richard Haass and Meghan O'Sullivan define engagement as "a foreign policy strategy that depends to a significant degree on positive incentives to achieve its objectives."(n16) As policymakers possess a highly differentiated typology of alternative options in the realm of negative sanctions from which to choose--including covert action, deterrence, coercive diplomacy, containment, limited war and total war--it is only reasonable to expect that they should have a similar menu of options in the realm of positive sanctions than simply engagement. Equating engagement with positive sanctions risks lumping together a variety of discrete actions that could be analyzed by distinguishing among them and comparing them as separate policies.

#### Ground – They make it very difficult to be negative. There’s no uniqueness to unconditional dialogue. We talk to China now, which makes it difficult to run a disadvantage. The aff could be bidirectional, including positive or negative discussions. And, open-ended discussions can focus on process instead of outcomes, meaning the neg has no outcome that they can attack.

#### D. Topicality is a voting issue for fairness, education, and jurisdiction.

## Definition Extensions

#### Engagement requires positive inducements to behavioral change

Ikenberry 12 (G. John, Professor of Politics and International Affairs at Princeton University, Review of “The Logic of Positive Engagement”, Foreign Affairs, January / February, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/136888/miroslav-nincic/the-logic-of-positive-engagement-cornell-studies-in-security-aff)

When the United States seeks to change the behavior of rival or adversarial states, what are the available tools and strategies? In this provocative study, Nincic observes that American foreign-policy makers tend to resort to “negative pressures,” such as the use of force, coercive diplomacy, and economic sanctions. Less appreciated and less understood, Nincic argues, are the tools and strategies of “engagement,” policies that use positive inducements to alter the incentives and orientations of other states. Nincic is surely correct: policymakers know more about the use of sticks than carrots. The book seeks to explain the bias in American foreign policy toward threats and punishments and argues that it is a legacy of the Cold War, which taught politicians to worry about charges of appeasement. Nincic also sees biases in the American security-studies community, where, he claims, realist understandings of the world shift attention away from nonmilitary tools of influence. The book’s most useful contribution is to spell out how strategies of engagement and positive inducements can work, using the United States’ experiences with Cuba, Iran, Libya, North Korea, and Syria as case studies.

#### Engagement is distinct from appeasement

Mastanduno 3 (Michael, Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Nelson A. Rockefeller Professor of Government, B.A., Economics and Political Science, and Ph.D., Political Science, Princeton University, “The Strategy of Economic Engagement: Theory and Practice,” Economic Interdependence and International Conflict: New Perspectives on an Enduring Debate)

Our knowledge of the workings of economic engagement is still at a fairly preliminary stage. What we do know thus far leads, at best, to an assessment of cautious optimism. A recent series of case studies suggests that economic engagement can be effective as in instrument of statecraft. States have managed in certain situations to use economic relations to influence the foreign policies even of potential adversaries. Economic engagement is not **simply** synonymous with economic appeasement. Yet we must also appreciate the difficult conditions that must be met for economic-engagement strategist to succeed. Success requires the precise manipulation of domestic political forces in the target state. It requires some ability to control the effects of interdependence. It requires that domestic politics and foreign policy of a target state be linked in predictable and desirable ways. And the success of this strategy requires the effective management of domestic political constraints in the sanctioning state. These conditions, outlined subsequently, are difficult to meet individually and all the more so cumulatively.

### Contrast With Negative Inducements Evidence

#### Economic engagement is in contrast to negative inducements

Mastanduno 3 (Michael, Government Professor at Dartmouth, The Strategy of Economic Engagement: Theory and Practice, in Edward D. Mansfield and Brian M. Pollins, eds, Economic Interdependence and International Conflict: New Perspectives on an Enduring Debate, p. 184-5)

Much of the attention in political science to the question of interdependence and conflict focuses at the systemic level, on arguments and evidence linking the expansion of economic exchange among states on the one hand to the exacerbation of international conflict or the facilitation of international cooperation on the other. The approach taken in this chapter focuses instead at the state level, on the expansion of economic interdependence as a tool of state craft. Under what circumstances does the cultivation of economic ties, that is, the fostering of economic interdependence as a conscious state strategy, lead to important and predicable changes in the foreign policy behavior of a target state? Students of economic statecraft refer to this strategy variously as economic engagement, economic inducement, economic diplomacy, positive sanctions, positive economic linkage, or the use of economic “carrots” instead of sticks. Critics of the strategy call it economic appeasement.

#### Promising rewards is “engagement”; threatening punishment isn’t

Borer 4 (Douglas A., Professor of Defense Analysis at the Naval Postgraduate School, “Problems of Economic Statecraft: Rethinking Engagement”, http://www.au.af.mil/au/awc/awcgate/army-usawc/strategy2004/12borer.pdf)

The policy of engagement refers to the use of non-coercive means, or positive incentives, by one state to alter the elements of another state’s behavior. As such, some scholars have categorized engagement as a form of appeasement.21 However, I concur with the view articulated by Randall Schweller that, while engagement can be classified in generic terms as a form of appeasement, an important qualitative difference exists between the two: “Engagement is more than appeasement,” he says: It encompasses any attempt to socialize the dissatisfied power into acceptance of the established order. In practice engagement may be distinguished from other policies not so much by its goals but by its means: it relies on the promise of rewards rather than the threat of punishment to influence the target’s behavior. . . . The policy succeeds if such concessions convert the revolutionary state into a status quo power with a stake in the stability of the system. . . . Engagement is most likely to succeed when the established powers are strong enough to mix concessions with credible threats, to use sticks as well as carrots. . . . Otherwise, concessions will signal weakness that emboldens the aggressor to demand more.22

### Dialogue =/= Engagement Evidence

#### Dialogue alone isn’t “engagement” --- topical plans must also provide tangible economic incentives

Buszynski 9 (Dr. Leszek, Visiting Fellow at the Strategic and Defence Studies Centre, Professor of International Relations in the Graduate School of International Relations at the International University of Japan, Engagement with North Korea: A Viable Alternative, Ed. Kim, p. 100-101)

Engagement can have different meanings for the actors concerned and has often been used as an antonym to isolation and containment without clear definition of the obligations for the parties concerned. Engagement should not be confused with dialogue, which is compatible with isolation, and according to which economic and political interaction would be reduced to the minimum. Cold war dialogue between the United States and the Soviet Union was intended to resolve particular issues, such as the stability of the strategic nuclear balance, but otherwise was not intended to change either one of the parties. Engagement, however, involves not only regular dialogue but incentives for the target state to change its policies or behavior in desired ways. Those incentives might include the promise of extensive economic aid and investment, humanitarian assistance to alleviate famine and disease, as well as assurances of the target state's security, which might be incorporated in a nonaggression pact or a treaty. The critical issue is how an engagement policy would be related to a target state's nuclear program. Engagement may entail the offering of incentives for the target state to accept international monitoring of its nuclear program, or to surrender it entirely. In this sense engagement may come in three forms: The first is conditional engagement, in which the incentives would follow after the target state has agreed to and accepted international monitoring, or has agreed to dismantle its nuclear program; the second is staged engagement, when the benefits would he offered in phases in response to the dismantling of the nuclear program, which would follow a previously agreed schedule; the third is unconditional engagement, when the target state would receive the benefits first, and then as a product of a general improvement in relations would later surrender its nuclear program.

#### Diplomatic discussions alone are not sufficient for engagement

Alterman 9 (Jon B., Director of the Middle East Program at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, “Defining Engagement”, July / August, http://csis.org/files/publication/0709\_MENC.pdf)

For much of last month, dramatic images out of Tehran displaced a brewing debate over “engaging Iran.” Similar debates over engaging Hamas and Hezbollah fell by the wayside, too, and the debate over engaging Syria seemed to have been decided in the affirmative, with the announcement that the United States would return an ambassador to Damascus for the first time in more than four years. Just as the isolation of adversaries lay at the heart of the Bush administration’s strategy in the Middle East, properly calibrating engagement lies at the heart of the Obama administration’s strategy. For advocates, engagement with real or potential adversaries is an elixir that softens hostility and builds common interests. For opponents, it is a sign of surrender to dark forces of violence and hatred. Yet, for all of the passion that the issue of engagement excites, no one seems to want to define it. Each side would rather talk about the effects of engagement than the nature of engagement itself. Part of the problem is a matter of definition. Refusing to have any official contact with a group or country does not constitute engagement. But what then? Engagement must mean more than merely holding diplomatic discussions, but how much more? How should issues be sequenced? Should symbolic statements be demanded at the beginning as a sign of positive intentions, or held to the end as part of a final declaration? Even staunch advocates of engagement differ on these key issues.

### Dialogue =/= Engagement Evidence

#### Engagement requires more than talks; must include pressure

Crocker 9 (Chester, 9/13, a professor of strategic studies at the Walsh School of Foreign Service at Georgetown University, was an assistant secretary of state for African affairs from 1981 to 1989, “Terms of Engagement”, http://www.nytimes.com/2009/09/14/opinion/14crocker.html?\_r=0)

Let’s get a few things straight. Engagement in statecraft is not about sweet talk. Nor is it based on the illusion that our problems with rogue regimes can be solved if only we would talk to them. Engagement is not normalization, and its goal is not improved relations. It is not akin to détente, working for rapprochement, or appeasement. So how do you define an engagement strategy? It does require direct talks. There is simply no better way to convey authoritative statements of position or to hear responses. But establishing talks is just a first step. The goal of engagement is to change the other country’s perception of its own interests and realistic options and, hence, to modify its policies and its behavior. Diplomatic engagement is proven to work — in the right circumstances. American diplomats have used it to change the calculations and behavior of regimes as varied as the Soviet Union, South Africa, Angola, Mozambique, Cuba, China, Libya and, intermittently, Syria. There is no cookie-cutter formula for making it work, however. In southern Africa in the 1980s, we directed our focus toward stemming violence between white-ruled South Africa and its black-ruled neighbors. This strategy put a priority on regional conflict management in order to stop cross-border attacks and create better conditions for internal political change. The United States also engaged with the Cubans in an effort aimed at achieving independence for Namibia (from South Africa) and at the removal of Cuban troops from Angola. In Mozambique, engagement meant building a constructive relationship with the United States, restraining South African interference in Mozambique’s internal conflicts and weaning the country from its Soviet alignment. More recently, the Bush administration’s strategy for engagement with Libya ultimately led to the re-establishment of diplomatic relations and the elimination of that country’s programs to develop weapons of mass destruction. While the details differ, each case of engagement has common elements. Engagement is a process, not a destination. It involves exerting pressure, by raising questions and hypothetical possibilities, and by probing the other country’s assumptions and thinking. Above all, it involves testing how far the other country might be willing to go. Properly understood, the diplomacy of engagement means raising questions that the other country may wish to avoid or be politically unable to answer. It places the ball in the other country’s court.

### Dialogue =/= Engagement Evidence

#### Diplomatic engagement requires mutual concessions

Takeyh 9 (Ray, Senior Fellow for Middle Eastern Studies, Council on Foreign Relations, “The Essence of Diplomatic Engagement”, http://www.cfr.org/diplomacy-and-statecraft/essence-diplomatic-engagement/p20362)

It is Obama's declared engagement policy that has raised the ire of critics and led them to once more take refuge in the spurious yet incendiary charge of appeasement. Columnist Charles Krauthammer recently exclaimed, "When France chides you for appeasement, you know you're scraping bottom." Acknowledgement of America's misjudgments is derided as an unseemly apologia while diplomacy is denigrated as a misguided exercise in self-delusion. After all, North Korea continues to test its nuclear weapons and missiles, Cuba spurns America's offers of a greater opening, and the Iranian mullahs contrive conspiracy theories about how George Soros and the CIA are instigating a velvet revolution in their country. Tough-minded conservatives are urging a course correction and a resolute approach to the gallery of rogues that the president pledges to embrace. Such views miscast the essence of diplomatic engagement. Diplomacy is likely to be a painstaking process and it may not work with every targeted nation. However, the purpose of such a policy is not to transform adversaries into allies, but to seek adjustments in their behavior and ambitions. North Korea, Cuba, Syria, and Iran would be offered a path toward realizing their essential national interests should they conform to global conventions on issues such as terrorism and proliferation. Should these regimes fail to grasp the opportunities before them, then Washington has a better chance of assembling a durable international coalition to isolate and pressure them. One of the problems with a unilateralist Bush administration that prided itself on disparaging diplomatic outreach was that it often made America the issue and gave many states an excuse for passivity. The Obama administration's expansive diplomatic vision has deprived fence-sitters of such justifications. An administration that has reached out to North Korea, communicated its sincere desire for better ties to Iran, and dispatched high-level emissaries to Syria cannot be accused of diplomatic indifference. The administration's approach has already yielded results in one of the most intractable global problems: Iran's nuclear imbroglio. The Bush team's years of harsh rhetoric and threats of military retribution failed to adjust Iran's nuclear ambitions in any tangible manner. A country that had no measurable nuclear infrastructure before Bush's inaugural made tremendous strides during his tenure. Unable to gain Iranian capitulation or international cooperation, the Bush administration was left plaintively witnessing Iran's accelerating nuclear time clock. In a dramatic twist of events, the Obama administration's offer of direct diplomacy has altered the landscape and yielded an unprecedented international consensus that has put the recalcitrant theocracy on the defensive. Iran's mounting nuclear infractions and its enveloping isolation caused it to recalibrate its position and open its latest nuclear facility to inspection and potentially ship out its stock of low-enriched uranium for processing in Russia. Deprived of such fuel, Iran would not have the necessary resources to quickly assemble a bomb. In a short amount of time, the administration has succeeded in putting important barriers to Iran's nuclear weapons aspirations. The United States will persistently confront crises that require the totality of its national power. The tumultuous Bush years have demonstrated the limitations of military force. Diplomatic interaction requires mutual concessions and acceptance of less than ideal outcomes. Moreover, as the United States charts its course, there is nothing wrong with acknowledging past errors. Instead of clinging to its self-proclaimed exceptionalism, America would be wise to take into account the judgment of other nations that are increasingly central to its economy and security.

## Impact Extensions

### Dialogue Impacts

#### Allowing the dialogue concept of diplomatic engagement makes the term all-inclusive, ending limits

Hayden 13 (Craig, Assistant Professor, International Communication Program, American University, ““Engagement” is More Convenient than Helpful: Dissecting a Public Diplomacy Term”, http://uscpublicdiplomacy.org/blog/%E2%80%9Cengagement%E2%80%9D-more-convenient-helpful-dissecting-public-diplomacy-term)

If “engagement” is something that unfolds over time, and involves a number of intervening moments that cumulate into something like influence – it doesn’t fit neatly into existing measurement models that test specific theories of persuasion, attitude change, or whatever the “user” wants out of engagement. But just because measurement is hard doesn’t mean we shouldn’t think clearly about how acts serve the strategic ends of public diplomacy. Wallin offers one route to evaluation – whether or not an act, an event, or the content of a message involved with a public diplomacy program was “engaging.” This is actually a testable proposition. For example, the Elaboration Likelihood Model offers a dual-process concept of persuasion, by examining “central” and “peripheral” routes to persuasion. The key term is “elaboration” or the “systemic thinking about” a topic or issue. How audiences to public diplomacy attend to a topic or key argument is something that can be measured. Yet understandably, public diplomacy policy-makers and practitioners are not often versed in theories of influence. I don’t think that’s a huge problem. What is a bigger problem is that the term “engagement” conceals two visions for influence that are somewhat conflated. Engagement apparently can mean both acts of persuasion and acts of relation-building. If policy-makers and critics are concerned about making sure public diplomacy is guided by strategic purpose – that it serves some policy-end in a way that makes it open to post hoc evaluation – then we need a firmer definition of engagement. Current ambiguity highlights a more pervasive tension in the strategic mandate for public diplomacy. Persuasion and relation-building are often at cross-purposes, yet there is a tacit understanding that the purpose of public diplomacy is ultimately to shape the attitudes, dispositions, and indeed behaviors of target publics. For a good survey of the arguments about persuasion and the broader family of influence concepts that operate within public diplomacy, see Ali Fisher’s "Looking for the Man in the Mirror" essay. Suffice to say, engagement as a public diplomacy term provides both an open-ended license for definition and a shifting warrant for making claims about influence. I think this tension is readily apparent in efforts to use social media for public diplomacy. Case in point – how does the use of Facebook or Twitter constitute engagement? Does the larger base of people who “Like” an embassy page indicate a successful campaign of engagement? Or, does it reflect a productive use of advertising techniques to recruit “likes,” while not necessarily providing the implied more meaningful connections that social networks can sustain? When an ambassador uses Twitter, does this constitute a robust effort to sustain dialogue with publics, or, does it represent a kind of performance that humanizes the chief of mission? I’m not suggesting one is better than the other. What I am saying is that there a few clear parameters for what constitutes “engagement.” In my research on U.S. digital public diplomacy, I have heard a lot of critiques about what is being done from a practical standpoint, but not so much on the bigger question of “why.” What does this mean for practitioners? For starters, it makes it harder to design the kind of formative research needed to plan an effective public diplomacy program that takes into account both the contextual factors and the strategic needs that the program will serve. The conceptual ambiguity also makes it difficult to pin down how and when a program can be deemed effective in post hoc evaluation. While I readily acknowledge that measurement and evaluation imperatives can ultimately distort the practice of public diplomacy or even conceal the less democratic forms of communication involved in public diplomacy outreach, I think it’s also important to acknowledge that the ambiguity of a term like “engagement” makes it potentially about everything – all the touch-points, communications, and connections that are involved in public diplomacy. I don’t think this helps practitioners, policy-makers, or commentators. Instead, it perpetuates jargon, and elides more persistent questions about both the purpose and the operative theories that underscore efforts to reach foreign publics.

### Dialogue Impacts

#### Their interpretation includes 1000’s of public diplomacy efforts – Every message is an “engagement”

Wallin 13 (Matthew, fellow @ American Security Project, “Engagement: What does it Mean for Public Diplomacy?”, http://www.americansecurityproject.org/engagement-what-does-it-mean-for-public-diplomacy/)

Exploring the sudden shift to “engagement” as a preferred term by these circles, Dr. Nick Cull wrote in 2009: The term engagement has much to commend it. It is not the term public diplomacy. It is already used in slightly different ways in the worlds of marketing and the military and can therefore be assumed to fall reassuringly on the ears of both those constituencies. It has already gained currency among NGOs and other practitioners of international communication. But missing from the discourse about engagement and its attractiveness as a term is a substantial discussion of exactly what it means. Since “engagement” is used so commonly without explanations of what it actually entails, it appears to have become little more than a buzzword developed to encompass various activities that are otherwise difficult to succinctly describe. Let’s look at a few examples of how the term engagement has been used. When presenting statistics about social media activities undertaken by the State Department’s Center for Strategic Counterterrorism Communications, Ambassador Alberto Fernandez described the number of “engagements” the CSCC’s digital outreach team had made that year as in the thousands**.** Explaining what an engagement is, Fernandez stated that engagements “consist of written text posted to online forums, Facebook, or the comments sections of media Web sites.” So does each post the CSCC makes in a forum count as an “engagement?” Does each post on Facebook count as an engagement? If so, this appears to set a low bar for what is considered engagement.

### Engagement Impacts

#### Their interpretation is the broad version of engagement – Narrow engagement requires incentives

Martin 11 (Curtis, Pf of Poli Sci @ Merrimack College, “Gauging Engagement: Obama’s “Open Hand” to North Korea and Iran”, http://citation.allacademic.com//meta/p\_mla\_apa\_research\_citation/4/9/9/5/8/pages499587/p499587-1.php)

There is no commonly agreed definition of “engagement”, and indeed the term is a source of considerable confusion as it has been applied to U.S. foreign policy. 6 For the sake of discussion, we will be considering engagement in two senses that are of special relevance to the Obama experience: what we will call “broad engagement” and “narrow engagement.” Broad engagement will refer to extensive and active involvement in the world--economically, diplomatically and militarily-- the kind of engagement the United States has pursued vigorously since World War II through membership in multilateral political and economic organizations, military alliances, frequent involvement in military conflicts abroad, and participation in global finance and trade. Historically, it is the opposite of the isolationism that dominated the U.S. discourse on foreign affairs in the country’s first century and that returned with a vengeance following World War I. Narrow engagement, however, will refer to the practice of “strategic interaction designed to elicit cooperation from an opposing state.” It will refer to “the extension or provision of incentives to shape the behavior of countries with which the United States has important disagreements.” The Obama administration has employed both broad and narrow engagement as complementary strategies--with broad engagement seen as an essential condition for the successful pursuit of narrow engagement with adversaries. Though it will consider the administration’s practice of broad engagement, this paper will principally concern its efforts at narrow engagement with Iran and the DPRK

#### Definitional precision is critical to effective policy-making; ad hoc definitions undermine crucial research skills

Resnick 1 (Evan, Ph.D. Candidate in Political Science at Columbia University, holds an M.Phil. in Political Science and an M.A. in Political Science from Columbia University, 2001 (“Defining engagement,” *Journal of International Affairs*, Volume 54, Issue 2, Spring, Available Online to Subscribing Institutions via ABI/INFORM Complete)

In matters of national security, establishing a clear definition of terms is a precondition for effective policymaking. Decisionmakers who invoke critical terms in an erratic, ad hoc fashion risk alienating their constituencies. They also risk exacerbating misperceptions and hostility among those the policies target. Scholars who commit the same error undercut their ability to conduct valuable empirical research. Hence, if scholars and policymakers fail rigorously to define "engagement," they undermine the ability to build an effective foreign policy.

### Engagement Impacts

#### Broad definitions of engagement are bad – Coherence is critical to good debates on engagement

Resnick 1 (Evan, Ph.D. Candidate in Political Science at Columbia University, holds an M.Phil. in Political Science and an M.A. in Political Science from Columbia University, 2001 (“Defining engagement,” *Journal of International Affairs*, Volume 54, Issue 2, Spring, Available Online to Subscribing Institutions via ABI/INFORM Complete)

While the term "engagement" enjoys great consistency and clarity of meaning in the discourse of romantic love, it enjoys neither in the discourse of statecraft. Currently, practitioners and scholars of American foreign policy are vigorously debating the merits of engagement as a strategy for modifying the behavior of unsavory regimes. The quality of this debate, however, is diminished by the persistent inability of the US foreign policy establishment to advance a coherent and analytically rigorous conceptualization of engagement. In this essay, I begin with a brief survey of the conceptual fog that surrounds engagement and then attempt to give a more refined definition. I will use this definition as the basis for drawing a sharp distinction between engagement and alternative policy approaches, especially appeasement, isolation and containment. In the contemporary lexicon of United States foreign policy, few terms have been as frequently or as confusingly invoked as that of engagement.1 A growing consensus extols the virtues of engagement as the most promising policy for managing the threats posed to the US by foreign adversaries. In recent years, engagement constituted the Clinton administration's declared approach in the conduct of bilateral relations with such countries as China, Russia, North Korea and Vietnam. Robert Suettinger, a onetime member of the Clinton administration's National Security Council, remarked that the word engagement has "been overused and poorly defined by a variety of policymakers and speechwriters" and has "become shopworn to the point that there is little agreement on what it actually means."2 The Clinton foreign policy team attributed five distinct meanings to engagement:3 1) A broad-based grand strategic orientation: In this sense, engagement is considered synonymous with American internationalism and global leadership. For example, in a 1993 speech, National Security Advisor Anthony Lake observed that American public opinion was divided into two rival camps: "On the one side is protectionism and limited foreign engagement; on the other is active American engagement abroad on behalf of democracy and expanded trade."4 2) A specific approach to managing bilateral relations with a target state through the unconditional provision of continuous concessions to that state: During the 1992 presidential campaign, candidate Bill Clinton criticized the Bush administration's "ill-advised and failed" policy of "constructive engagement" toward China as one that "coddled the dictators and pleaded for progress, but refused to impose penalties for intransigence."5 3) A bilateral policy characterized by the conditional provision of concessions to a target state: The Clinton administration announced in May 1993 that the future extension of Most Favored Nation trading status to China would be conditional on improvements in the Chinese government's domestic human rights record.6 Likewise, in the Agreed Framework signed by the US and North Korea in October 1994, the US agreed to provide North Korea with heavy oil, new light-water nuclear reactors and eventual diplomatic and economic normalization in exchange for a freeze in the North's nuclear weapons program.7 4) A bilateral policy characterized by the broadening of contacts in areas of mutual interest with a target state: Key to this notion of engagement is the idea that areas of dialogue and fruitful cooperation should be broadened and not be held hostage through linkage to areas of continuing disagreement and friction. The Clinton administration inaugurated such a policy toward China in May 1994 by declaring that it would not tie the annual MFN decision to the Chinese government's human rights record.8 Similarly, the administration's foreign policy toward the Russian Federation has largely been one of engagement and described as an effort to "build areas of agreement and ... develop policies to manage our differences."9 5) A bilateral policy characterized by the provision of technical assistance to facilitate economic and political liberalization in a target state: In its 1999 national security report, the White House proclaimed that its "strategy of engagement with each of the NIS [Newly Independent States]" consisted of "working with grassroots organizations, independent media, and emerging entrepreneurs" to "improve electoral processes and help strengthen civil society," and to help the governments of the NIS to "build the laws, institutions and skills needed for a market democracy, to fight crime and corruption [and] to advance human rights and the rule of law."10 Unfortunately, scholars have not fared better than policymakers in the effort to conceptualize engagement because they often make at least one of the following critical errors: (1) treating engagement as a synonym for appeasement; (2) defining engagement so expansively that it essentially constitutes any policy relying on positive sanctions; (3) defining engagement in an unnecessarily restrictive manner.