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### 1NC: Economic Engagement – Must be a Quid Pro Quo

1. Interpretation -- Economic engagement requires a quid pro quo – in order to be topical the affirmative must offer something to a target and receive something back in exchange. A gift is not engagement.

Haas and O'Sullivan, former senior aid to President George Bush, and Brookings Foreign Policy Studies Program fellow, 2000.

(Richard N., Meghan L., , Honey and Vinegar: Incentives, Sanctions, and Foreign Policy, http://brookings.nap.edu/books/0815733550/html/203.html#pagetop, 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 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** **U**nited **S**tates **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**.

B. Violation – the affirmative plan increases financial investment in Venezuela oil production infrastructure as a one-time gift or payment. That is not an exchange or engagement.

C. Standards –

1. Ground – requiring a quid pro quo is key to disadvantage links, case arguments, and kritiks based on attaching strings rather than just giving something to the target nation – their interpretation explodes the topic, destroying negative predictability.
2. Education- debating quid pro quos allows plans with more nuance than just increasing US contact or interaction- it better reflects the proposals in the literature

#### D. T is a voter for fairness and education, it is critical to preserve the integrity of debate.

### Economic Engagement – Must be a Quid Pro Quo

#### [ ] Engagement requires quid pro quo- a demand for change in the target country in exchange for incentives

Haas and O'Sullivan, former senior aid to President George Bush, and Brookings Foreign Policy Studies Program fellow, 2000.

(Richard N., Meghan L., , Honey and Vinegar: Incentives, Sanctions, and Foreign Policy, http://brookings.nap.edu/books/0815733550/html/203.html#pagetop, 1-2)

The strategy of engagement, or the use of incentives alongside other foreign policy tools to persuade governments to change one or more aspects of their behavior, has received relatively little scrutiny.

### Economic Engagement – Must be a Quid Pro Quo

#### [ ] Economic engagement is a subset of conditional engagement and implies a tit-for-tat exchange

Shinn 96 [James Shinn, C.V. Starr Senior Fellow for Asia at the CFR in New York City and director of the council’s multi-year Asia Project, worked on economic affairs in the East Asia Bureau of the US Dept of State, “Weaving the Net: Conditional Engagement with China,” pp. 9 and 11, google books]

In sum, conditional engagement consists of a set of objectives, a strategy for attaining those objectives, and tactics (specific policies) for implementing that strategy.

* The objectives of conditional engagement are the ten principles, which were selected to preserve American vital interests in Asia while accommodating China’s emergence as a major power.
* The overall strategy of conditional engagement follows two parallel lines: economic engagement, to promote the integration of China into the global trading and financial systems; and security engagement, to encourage compliance with the ten principles by diplomatic and military means when economic incentives do not suffice, in order to hedge against the risk of the emergence of a belligerent China.
* The tactics of economic engagement should promote China’s economic integration through negotiations on trade liberalization, institution building, and educational exchanges. While a carrots-and-sticks approach may be appropriate within the economic arena, the use of trade sanction to achieve short-term political goals is discouraged.
* The tactics of security engagement should reduce the risks posed by China’s rapid military expansion, its lack of transparency, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and transnational problems such as crime and illegal migration, by engaging in arms control negotiations, multilateral efforts, and a loosely-structured defensive military arrangement in Asia.8

[To footnotes]

8. Conditional engagement’s recommended tactics of tit-for-tat responses are equivalent to using carrots and sticks in response to foreign policy actions by China. Economic engagement calls for what is described as symmetric tit-for-tat and security engagement for asymmetric tit-for-tat. A symmetric response is one that counters a move by China in the same place, time, and manner; an asymmetric response might occur in another place at another time, and perhaps in another manner. A symmetric tit-for-tat would be for Washington to counter a Chinese tariff of 10 percent on imports for the United States with a tariff of 10 percent on imports from China. An asymmetric tit-for-tat would be for the United States to counter a Chines shipment of missiles to Iran with an American shipment of F-16s to Vietnam (John Lewis Gaddis, Strategies of Containment: A critical Appraisal of Postwar American National Security Policy. New York: Oxford University Press, (1982). This is also cited in Fareed Zakaria, “The Reagan Strategy of Containment,” Political Science Quarterly 105, no. 3 (1990), pp. 383-88).

### 1NC: Lifting Embargo is not Economic Engagement

#### A. Interpretation -- Economic engagement must be tangible- excludes lifting the embargo

Haass, 2000 – Brookings Foreign Policy Studies director

[Richard, and Meghan O'Sullivan, "Introduction" in Honey and Vinegar, ed. by Haass and O'Sullivan, google books]

Architects of engagement strategies have a wide variety of incentives from which to choose. 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, whether they be trade embargoes, investment bans, or high tariffs that have impeded economic relations between the United States and the target country. In addition, facilitated entry into the global economic arena and the institutions that govem it rank among the most potent incentives in today's global market."

#### And Increase means to make greater in number.

Dictionary.com Unabridged

[Based on the Random House Dictionary, Random House, Inc. 2010., "Increase," http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/increase]

in·crease   [v. in-krees; n. in-krees] Show IPA verb, -creased, -creas·ing, noun

–verb (used with object)

1.to make greater, as in number, size, strength, or quality; augment; add to: to increase taxes.

#### B Violation – the aff just removes the embargo – it doesn’t net increase economic engagement.

#### C. Standards -

#### Limits – the justify having affirmatives that do anything to effect the economy of other countries but do not force any engagement. This would make it difficult for the negative to prepare.

#### Effects T is an Independent Voter –the aff gets advantages off of removing the embargo, NOT increasing engagement, proves the resolution insufficient.

#### D. T is a voter for fairness and education, it is critical to preserve the integrity of debate.

### 1NC: Small Farmer Assistance is not a substantial increase

#### A. Interpretation—“Substantial” means requires specification to a large degree—prefer common interpretations to legal definitions

Arkush 2

(David, JD Candidate – Harvard University, “Preserving "Catalyst" Attorneys' Fees Under the Freedom of Information Act in the Wake of Buckhannon Board and Care Home v. West Virginia Department of Health and Human Resources”, Harvard Civil Rights-Civil Liberties Law Review, Winter, 37 Harv. C.R.-C.L. L. Rev. 131)

Plaintiffs should argue that the term "substantially prevail" is not a term of art because if considered a term of art, resort to Black's 7th produces a definition of "prevail" that could be interpreted adversely to plaintiffs. [99](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=1421887dc00d6c0b78bddb20857a69fa&docnum=16&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVzW-zSkAz&_md5=3f3ffe65eadff46b38ea49c40cb1037e&focBudTerms=definition%20of%20the%20term%21%20substantial%21%20or%20definition%20of%20the%20word%20substantial%21&focBudSel=all#n99) It is commonly accepted that words that are not legal terms of art should be accorded their ordinary, not their legal, meaning, [100](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=1421887dc00d6c0b78bddb20857a69fa&docnum=16&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVzW-zSkAz&_md5=3f3ffe65eadff46b38ea49c40cb1037e&focBudTerms=definition%20of%20the%20term%21%20substantial%21%20or%20definition%20of%20the%20word%20substantial%21&focBudSel=all#n100) and ordinary-usage dictionaries provide FOIA fee claimants with helpful arguments. The Supreme Court has already found favorable, temporally relevant definitions of the word "substantially" in ordinary dictionaries: "Substantially" suggests "considerable" or "specified to a large degree." See Webster's Third New International Dictionary 2280 (1976) (defining "substantially" as "in a substantial manner" and "substantial" as "considerable in amount, value, or worth" and "being that specified to a large degree or in the main"); see also 17 Oxford English Dictionary 66-67 (2d ed. 1989) ("substantial": "relating to or proceeding from the essence of a thing; essential"; "of ample or considerable amount, quantity or dimensions"). [101](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=1421887dc00d6c0b78bddb20857a69fa&docnum=16&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVzW-zSkAz&_md5=3f3ffe65eadff46b38ea49c40cb1037e&focBudTerms=definition%20of%20the%20term%21%20substantial%21%20or%20definition%20of%20the%20word%20substantial%21&focBudSel=all#n101)

#### B. Violation— plan must provide a substantial amount of increased aid to Mexico. They only provide aid to small farmers which would not be very much.

**You can base what substantial from the baseline of total US Mexico goods and services, which totaled $500 billion.**

**Office of the United States Trade Representative, ’13** (Executive Office of the President, 2013, <http://www.ustr.gov/countries-regions/americas/mexico>, accessed 7/16/13, JF)

U.S. goods and services trade with Mexico totaled $500 billion in 2011 (latest data available for goods and services trade). Exports totaled $224 billion;Imports totaled $277 billion**.** The U.S. goods and services trade deficit with Mexico was $53 billion in 2011.

#### C. Standards –

####  Limits—plan explodes the topic twofold by ignoring customary definition and taking action without worth, opens the floodgates for affirmatives with 1 person magnitudes and forces negatives into generic arguments with non-specific links

#### D. T is a voter for fairness and education, it is critical to preserve the integrity of debate.

### 1NC: Development Assistance is not Economic Engagement (1/2)

#### A. Interpretation - Economic engagement is the exchange of goods, services, capital and labor- not policy oriented

Rose, UC Berkeley Haas School of Business Administration, 2008

[Andrew, and Mark Spiegel, "Non-Economic Engagement and International Exchange: The Case of Environmental Treaties," April 2008, [www.nber.org/papers/w13988.pdf?new\_window=1](http://www.nber.org/papers/w13988.pdf?new_window=1)]

Non-Economic Engagement and International Exchange: The Case of Environmental Treaties We examine the role of non-economic partnerships in promoting international economic exchange. Since far-sighted countries are more willing to join costly international partnerships such as environmental treaties, environmental engagement tends to encourage international lending. Countries with such non-economic partnerships also find it easier to engage in economic exchanges since they face the possibility that debt default might also spill over to hinder their non-economic relationships. We present a theoretical model of these ideas, and then verify their empirical importance using a bilateral cross-section of data on international cross-holdings of assets and environmental treaties. Our results support the notion that international environmental cooperation facilitates economic exchange. Countries, like people, interact with each other on a number of different dimensions. Some interactions are strictly economic; for instance, countries engage in international trade of goods, services, capital, and labor. But many are not economic, at least not in any narrow sense. For instance, the United States seeks to promote human rights and democracy, deter nuclear proliferation, stop the spread of narcotics, and so forth. Accordingly America, like other countries, participates in a number of international institutions to further its foreign policy objectives; it has joined security alliances like NATO, and international organizations such as the International Atomic Energy Agency. In this paper, we concentrate on the interesting and understudied case of international environmental arrangements (IEAs). We ask whether participation in such non-economic partnerships tends to enhance international economic relations. The answer, in both theory and practice, is positive.

### 1NC: Development Assistance is not Economic Engagement (2/2)

**B. Violation – the plan is development assistance to small farmers in Mexico. Experts say that development assistant and economic engagement are two distinct policies.**

**Balducci 10** (Giuseppe, Phd @ University of Warwick, Department of Politics and International Studies, September 2010, “The EU’s promotion of human rights in China: a consistent and coordinated constructive engagement?,” <http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/3895/1/WRAP_THESIS_Balducci_2010.pdf>)

Chapter 3 has shown that the EU’s strategy **of constructive engagement was** mostly **based on economic engagement**, dialogue **and development assistance**. Chapter 3 has, in addition, shown that the strategy of constructive **engagement** privileged an approach that **sidelined sanctioning policies**. The abandonment of sanctioning policies, which were formulated at CFSP level, has shown the necessity to concentrate on the EC and the member states’ levels of governance. Similarly, **since two out of the three main policies of constructive engagement of China, i.e. economic engagement and development assistance,** came under the EC’s competence, a focus on these two **has been shown to be appropriate**. Chapter 3 has then shown that in the definition of the EU’s constructive engagement, Germany, France and the UK were not only the most influential member states but they were also representative of the other EU member states’ approaches towards human rights in China.

#### C. Standards –

#### Limits—plan explodes the topic twofold by ignoring customary definition and taking action without worth, opens the floodgates for affirmatives with 1 person magnitudes and forces negatives into generic arguments with non-specific links

#### D. T is a voter for fairness and education, it is critical to preserve the integrity of debate.

### 1NC: Point of Entry is not Economic Engagement

#### Interpretation—Toward indicates the object of action

OED ‘13

[Oxford English Dictonary <http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/204005?rskey=JVzAhI&result=2#eid>]

Toward, prep¶ Of motion (or action figured as motion): In the direction of; so as to approach (but not necessarily reach: thus differing from to prep. 1). †b. pred. after to be: On the way to. Obs. †c. With implication of reaching; to. Obs.¶ 2. a. Of position: In the direction of; on the side next to; turned or directed to, facing. †b. Beside, near; about, in attendance upon; in the possession of; with. Obs.¶ 3. In the direction of (in fig. senses). a. gen.: esp. with words expressing tendency or aim, and followed by an abstract noun expressing state, condition, etc. b. With a noun or pronoun denoting the object of action or feeling: To; against.¶ †c. With regard to, in reference to, respecting, concerning, about. Also as toward (cf. as to at as adv. and conj. Phrases 3a). Obs.¶ d. In comparison with: = to prep. 18. Now dial.¶ 4. Of time: So as to approach; at the approach of, nearly as late or as far on as, shortly before, near.¶ †a. Of condition or quality: Verging upon, near; somewhat like, nearly, as if; toward blackness, somewhat or nearly black. Obs.¶ b. Of quantity: Nearly as much as, nearly.¶ 6.a. In prospect of; in the imminence of; (as predicate) in preparation for. Obs. or arch.¶ †b. Coming upon, ‘in store for’; usually of evil: ready to fall upon, threatening. Obs.¶ 7. In the way of contribution to; as a help to; for the purpose of making up, promoting, assisting, or the like; for.¶ 8. For to…-ward, separated by the n. or pron., as in to us-ward, to God-ward, see -ward suffix, and cf. to prep. 2e.

#### B. Violation— improving border efficiency does not increase economic engagement with Mexico as the object of the attention

#### C. Standards –

#### 1. Predictable research—affirmatives that do not directly engage resolution member countries shift the focus of the discussion away from policy implementation inside member countries to domestic implementation, destroying core topic specific education

#### 2. Explodes the topic—justifies any aff which retrofits one entry point into the United States, adding many new affirmatives to the topic with no increase in unique education gained, ultimately killing depth of topic specific education on other affirmatives

#### D. T is a voter for fairness and education, it is critical to preserve the integrity of debate.

### United States federal government

#### [ ] United States federal government has 3 branches

US Legal 2013

United States Federal Government Law and Legal Definition. <http://definitions.uslegal.com/u/united-states-federal-government/>. Retrieved: July 1, 2013

The United States Federal Government is established by the US Constitution. The Federal Government shares sovereignty over the United Sates with the individual governments of the States of US. The Federal government has three branches: i) the legislature, which is the US Congress, ii) Executive, comprised of the President and Vice president of the US and iii) Judiciary. The US Constitution prescribes a system of separation of powers and ‘checks and balances’ for the smooth functioning of all the three branches of the Federal Government. The US Constitution limits the powers of the Federal Government to the powers assigned to it; all powers not expressly assigned to the Federal Government are reserved to the States or to the people.

**[ ] "Federal Government" means the national government, not the states or localities**

**Black’s Law 99** (Dictionary, Seventh Edition, p.703)

A national government that exercises some degree of control over smaller political units that have surrendered some degree of power in exchange for the right to participate in national political matters

### Should

#### **[ ] “Should” expresses an obligation**

Merriam-Webster 13

Online Dictionary, “Should,” Accessed: July 2, <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/should>

SHOULD: past of shall

1—used in auxiliary function to express condition <if he should leave his father, his father would die — Genesis 44:22(Revised Standard Version)>

2—used in auxiliary function to express obligation, propriety, or expediency <'tis commanded I should do so — Shakespeare> <this is as it should be — H. L. Savage> <you should brush your teeth after each meal>

3—used in auxiliary function to express futurity from a point of view in the past <realized that she should have to do most of her farm work before sunrise — Ellen Glasgow>

4—used in auxiliary function to express what is probable or expected <with an early start, they should be here by noon>

5—used in auxiliary function to express a request in a polite manner or to soften direct statement <I should suggest that a guide…is the first essential — L. D. Reddick>

#### [ ] Should indicates duty

Oxford Dictionary ‘13

“Should,” Accessed: July 2, http://oxforddictionaries.com/us/definition/american\_english/should

Definition of should verb (3rd sing. should) 1used to indicate obligation, duty, or correctness, typically when criticizing someone’s actions: he should have been careful I think we should trust our people more you shouldn’t have gone indicating a desirable or expected state: by now students should be able to read with a large degree of independence used to give or ask advice or suggestions:you should go back to bed what should I wear? (I should) used to give advice: I should hold out if I were you

### Substantially

#### [ ] "Substantial" means actually of real worth, importance, and considerable value

West's Encyclopedia of American Law 2008

[Edition 2. Copyright 2008 The Gale Group, Inc. ]

Of real worth and importance; of considerable value; valuable. Belonging to substance; actually existing; real; not seeming or imaginary; not illusive; solid; true; veritable.

#### [ ] Substantially is without material qualification

Black’s Law 1991

(Dictionary, p. 1024)

Substantially - means essentially; without material qualification

#### [ ] Substantially means the main; most important

Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary, 2009

["Substantially," http://dictionary.cambridge.org/define.asp?key=79480&dict=CALD, mss]

substantial (GENERAL) Show phonetics

adjective [before noun] FORMAL

relating to the main or most important things being considered:

The committee were in substantial agreement (= agreed about most of the things discussed).

### Substantial Increase – percentages

#### [ ] Substantial is 2%

Word and Phrases 1960

 'Substantial" means "of real worth and importance; of considerable value; valuable." Bequest to charitable institution, making 1/48 of expenditures in state, held exempt from taxation; such expenditures constituting "substantial" part of its activities. Tax Commission of Ohio v. American Humane Education Soc., 181 N.E. 557, 42 Ohio App.

#### [ ] Substantially increase is 30%

Damich, US Court of Federal Claims judge, 2001

[Edward J., UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT, 265 F.3d 1371; 2001 U.S. App. LEXIS 20590; 60 U.S.P.Q.2D (BNA) 1272, l/n, accessed 8-1-10, mss]

The term "to increase substantially" in claim 1 of the '705 patent refers to the claimed increase achieved by the invention in the relative productivity of the catalyst used in the Fischer-Tropsch process. The specification defines "substantially increased" catalyst activity or productivity as an increase of at least about 30%, more preferably an increase of about 50%, and still more preferably an increase of about 75%. '705 patent, col. 1, ll. 59-63. Based on that language from the specification, the trial court found, and the parties agree, that the term "to increase substantially" requires an increase of at least about 30% in the relative productivity of the catalyst. Notwithstanding that numerical boundary, the trial court found the phrase "to increase substantially" to be indefinite because the court concluded that there were two possible ways to calculate the increase in productivity, the subtraction method and the division method, and the patent did not make clear which of those ways was used in the claim.

#### [ ] Substantially means greater than 50%

Statement of Considerations,5

[<http://www.gc.energy.gov/documents/WA_05_048_INTERNATIONAL_BUSINESS_MACHINES_Waiver_of_the_Gove.pdf>]

The Subcontractor agrees to conduct research and development activities under this Subcontract principally in U.S.-based facilities. "Principally" is defined as greater than a ninety (90%) percent level of effort. Subcontractor also agrees that for a period of one (1) year following Subcontract completion, subsequent research and development by the Subcontractor for the purpose of commercializing technologies arising from the intellectual property developed under this Subcontract shall be performed substantially in U.S.-based facilities. "Substantially" is defined as greater than fifty (50%) percent level of effort. The Subcontractor further agrees that any processes and services, or improvements thereof, which shall arise from the intellectual property developed under this Subcontract when implemented outside the U.S., shall not result in a reduction of the Subcontractor's research workforce in the United States. Finally, it is understood between the DOE and the Subcontractor that any subsequent follow-on subcontracts and/or future phases of work under the Government's ASCI Program will be subject to a separate U.S. Competitiveness determination.

### Increase – (1/2)

####  [ ] Increase is to make greater

Dictionary.com Unabridged, 2010

[Based on the Random House Dictionary, Random House, Inc. 2010., "Increase," http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/increase, accessed 8-1-10, mss]

in·crease   [v. in-krees; n. in-krees] Show IPA verb, -creased, -creas·ing, noun

–verb (used with object)

1.to make greater, as in number, size, strength, or quality; augment; add to: to increase taxes.

#### [ ] “Increase” requires the Aff to make a pre-existing program greater—new policies are not an “increase”

Buckley, Attorney, 2006

(Jeremiah, Amicus Curiae Brief, Safeco Ins. Co. of America et al v. Charles Burr et al, http://supreme.lp.findlaw.com/supreme\_court/briefs/06-84/06-84.mer.ami.mica.pdf)

First, the court said that the ordinary meaning of the word “increase” is “to make something greater,” which it believed should not “be limited to cases in which a company raises the rate that an individual has previously been charged.” 435 F.3d at 1091. Yet the definition offered by the Ninth Circuit compels the opposite conclusion. Because “increase” means “to make something greater,” there must necessarily have been an existing premium, to which Edo’s actual premium may be compared, to determine whether an “increase” occurred. Congress could have provided that “ad-verse action” in the insurance context means charging an amount greater than the optimal premium, but instead chose to define adverse action in terms of an “increase.” That def-initional choice must be respected, not ignored. See Colautti v. Franklin, 439 U.S. 379, 392-93 n.10 (1979) (“[a] defin-ition which declares what a term ‘means’ . . . excludes any meaning that is not stated”). Next, the Ninth Circuit reasoned that because the Insurance Prong includes the words “existing or applied for,” Congress intended that an “increase in any charge” for insurance must “apply to all insurance transactions – from an initial policy of insurance to a renewal of a long-held policy.” 435 F.3d at 1091. This interpretation reads the words “exist-ing or applied for” in isolation. Other types of adverse action described in the Insurance Prong apply only to situations where a consumer had an existing policy of insurance, such as a “cancellation,” “reduction,” or “change” in insurance. Each of these forms of adverse action presupposes an already-existing policy, and under usual canons of statutory construction the term “increase” also should be construed to apply to increases of an already-existing policy. See Hibbs v. Winn, 542 U.S. 88, 101 (2004) (“a phrase gathers meaning from the words around it”) (citation omitted).

### Increase – (2/2)

####  [ ] Increase is making an already program greater, and excludes creation

Buckley 2006

(Jeremiah, Attorney, Amicus Curiae Brief, Safeco Ins. Co. of America et al v. Charles Burr et al, <http://supreme.lp.findlaw.com/supreme_court/briefs/06-84/06-84.mer.ami.mica.pdf>)

First, the court said that the ordinary meaning of the word “increase” is “to make something greater,” which it believed should not “be limited to cases in which a company raises the rate that an individual has previously been charged.” 435 F.3d at 1091. Yet the definition offered by the Ninth Circuit compels the opposite conclusion. Because “increase” means “to make something greater,” there must necessarily have been an existing premium, to which Edo’s actual premium may be compared, to determine whether an “increase” occurred. Congress could have provided that “ad-verse action” in the insurance context means charging an amount greater than the optimal premium, but instead chose to define adverse action in terms of an “increase.” That def-initional choice must be respected, not ignored. See Colautti v. Franklin, 439 U.S. 379, 392-93 n.10 (1979) (“[a] defin-ition which declares what a term ‘means’ . . . excludes any meaning that is not stated”). Next, the Ninth Circuit reasoned that because the Insurance Prong includes the words “existing or applied for,” Congress intended that an “increase in any charge” for insurance must “apply to all insurance transactions – from an initial policy of insurance to a renewal of a long-held policy.” 435 F.3d at 1091. This interpretation reads the words “exist-ing or applied for” in isolation. Other types of adverse action described in the Insurance Prong apply only to situations where a consumer had an existing policy of insurance, such as a “cancellation,” “reduction,” or “change” in insurance. Each of these forms of adverse action presupposes an already-existing policy, and under usual canons of statutory construction the term “increase” also should be construed to apply to increases of an already-existing policy. See Hibbs v. Winn, 542 U.S. 88, 101 (2004) (“a phrase gathers meaning from the words around it”) (citation omitted).

### Its

**[ ] “Its” refers to the United States Federal Government and is possessive**

**Updegrave, senior editor of Money Magazine, 1991**

(W.C., for 17 years, “Explanation of ZIP Code Address Purpose”, 8-19, <http://www.supremelaw.org/ref/zipcode/updegrav.htm>)

More specifically, looking at the map on page 11 of the National ZIP Code Directory, e.g. at a local post office, one will see that the first digit of a ZIP Code defines an area that includes more than one State. The first sentence of the explanatory paragraph begins: "A ZIP Code is a numerical code that identifies areas within the United States and its territories for purposes of ..." [cf. 26 CFR 1.1-1(c)]. **Note the singular possessive pronoun "its", not "their", therefore carrying the implication that it relates to the "United States" as a corporation domiciled in the District of Columbia (in the singular sense), not in the sense of being the 50 States of the Union (in the plural sense).** The map shows all the States of the Union, but it also shows D.C., Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, making the explanatory statement literally

#### [ ] Possessive pronouns show ownership

Using English 2013

[<http://www.usingenglish.com/glossary/possessive-pronoun.html>]

Mine, yours, his, hers, its, ours, theirs are the possessive [pronouns](http://www.usingenglish.com/glossary/pronoun.html) used to substitute a [noun](http://www.usingenglish.com/glossary/noun.html) and to show possession or ownership. EG. This is your disk and that's mine. (Mine substitutes the word disk and shows that it belongs to me.)

### Economic Engagement – Narrow Definitions

#### [ ] Economic engagement is the exchange of goods, services, capital and labor- not policy oriented

Rose, UC Berkeley Haas School of Business Administration, 2008

[Andrew, and Mark Spiegel, "Non-Economic Engagement and International Exchange: The Case of Environmental Treaties," April 2008, [www.nber.org/papers/w13988.pdf?new\_window=1](http://www.nber.org/papers/w13988.pdf?new_window=1)]

Non-Economic Engagement and International Exchange: The Case of Environmental Treaties We examine the role of non-economic partnerships in promoting international economic exchange. Since far-sighted countries are more willing to join costly international partnerships such as environmental treaties, environmental engagement tends to encourage international lending. Countries with such non-economic partnerships also find it easier to engage in economic exchanges since they face the possibility that debt default might also spill over to hinder their non-economic relationships. We present a theoretical model of these ideas, and then verify their empirical importance using a bilateral cross-section of data on international cross-holdings of assets and environmental treaties. Our results support the notion that international environmental cooperation facilitates economic exchange. Countries, like people, interact with each other on a number of different dimensions. Some interactions are strictly economic; for instance, countries engage in international trade of goods, services, capital, and labor. But many are not economic, at least not in any narrow sense. For instance, the United States seeks to promote human rights and democracy, deter nuclear proliferation, stop the spread of narcotics, and so forth. Accordingly America, like other countries, participates in a number of international institutions to further its foreign policy objectives; it has joined security alliances like NATO, and international organizations such as the International Atomic Energy Agency. In this paper, we concentrate on the interesting and understudied case of international environmental arrangements (IEAs). We ask whether participation in such non-economic partnerships tends to enhance international economic relations. The answer, in both theory and practice, is positive.

#### [ ] Negative and positive conditions together constitute economic engagement

Forcese, Associate, Hughes, Hubbard & Reed, LLP, 2002,

Greg BA, McGill; MA, Carleton; LL.B., Ottawa; LL.M., Yale; Member of the Bars of New York, Ontario and the District of Columbia., Washington, Yale Human Rights & Development Law Journal, “Globalizing Decency: Responsible Engagement in an Era of Economic Integration,” p. 42, this evidence was obtained at <http://bauscharddebate.com/2013/03/defining-economic-engagement/>)

At the margins, “conditionalities” inducing adherence to codes of conduct and sanctions blur together. For instance, while selective purchasing need not constitute a boycott, the Burma and South Africa procurement regimes discussed above are clearly designed to curtail economic engagement with unpalatable regimes. Measures insisting on divestment cross a subtle boundary, going beyond the “mitigation” goal of the second prong of responsible engagement. They clearly constitute sanctions, the propriety of which must be scrutinized with an eye to the various concerns about sanctions, their effectiveness and secondary effects.

### Economic Engagement – not a removal of sanctions

#### [ ] Removing sanctions is a form of appeasement

Stern 2006

(Martin, University of Maryland Graduate, Debunking detente, 11/27/06, http://www.diamondbackonline.com/article\_56223e79-7009-56a3-8afe-5d08bfff6e08.html)

Appeasement is defined as "granting concessions to potential enemies to maintain peace." Giving Iran international legitimacy and removing sanctions would have maintained peace with a potential enemy without changing the undemocratic practices of the enemy. If this isn't appeasement, I don't know how better to define the word.

#### [ ] Engagement and appeasement are distinct

Resnick, Assistant Professor and coordinator of the United States Programme at RSIS, 2001

(Evan, , “Defining Engagement,” Journal of International Affairs, 0022197X, Spring2001, Vol. 54, Issue 2, <http://web.ebscohost.com.turing.library.northwestern.edu/ehost/detail?sid=1b56e6b4-ade2-4052-9114-7d107fdbd019%40sessionmgr12&vid=2&hid=24&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWhvc3QtbGl2ZQ%3d%3d#db=mth&AN=4437301>)

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.(n34) 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.

### Economic Engagement – is a removal of sanctions

#### [ ] US economic engagement includes sanctions

Babson 2011

(Bradley Babson, March 11 2011, “Rethinking economic Engagement with North Korea, <http://38north.org/2011/03/rethinking-economic-engagement-with-north-korea/>, Accessed July 16, 2013, JD)

Unfortunately, U.S., South Korean, and Chinese economic engagement policies with North Korea have been guided by very different national interests and objectives. Taken together they produce conflicting dynamics that distort incentives for managed change in the economic system. Giveaways, sanctions, and commerce are all in this mix, with results that are not satisfying for any of the countries involved and are no doubt confusing for the North Koreans.

#### [ ] Engagement includes positive and negative incentives

Baker et al 2006

(James Baker, Chief of Staff for Reagan and former Secretary of State, co chair of study group, “The Iraq Study Group Report, December, 2006 http://media.usip.org/reports/iraq\_study\_group\_report.pdf)

Given the ability of Iran and Syria to influence events within Iraq and their interest in avoiding chaos in Iraq, the United States should try to engage them constructively. In seeking to influence the behavior of both countries, the United States has disincentives and incentives available. Iran should stem the flow of arms and training to Iraq, respect Iraq’s sovereignty and territorial integrity, and use its influence over Iraqi Shia groups to encourage national reconciliation. The issue of Iran’s nuclear programs should continue to be dealt with by the five permanent members of the United Nations Security Council plus Germany. Syria should control its border with Iraq to stem the flow of funding, insurgents, and terrorists in and out of Iraq.

#### [ ] The distinction between positive and negative incentives is blurred

Forcese 2002

(Greg Forcese, BA, McGill; MA, Carleton; LL.B., Ottawa; LL.M., Yale; Member of the Bars of New York, Ontario and the District of Columbia. Associate, Hughes, Hubbard & Reed, LLP, Washington, Yale Human Rights & Development Law Journal, 2002,   “Globalizing Decency: Responsible Engagement in an Era of Economic Integration,” <http://www.law.yale.edu/academics/vol5.htm>)

At the margins, “conditionalities” inducing adherence to codes of conduct and sanctions blur together. For instance, while selective purchasing need not constitute a boycott, the Burma and South Africa procurement regimes discussed above are clearly designed to curtail economic engagement with unpalatable regimes. Measures insisting on divestment cross a subtle boundary, going beyond the “mitigation” goal of the second prong of responsible engagement. They clearly constitute sanctions, the propriety of which must be scrutinized with an eye to the various concerns about sanctions, their effectiveness and secondary effects.

### Economic Engagement – not Development Assistance

[ ] **Engagement is distinct from Development Assistance**

**Balducci 2010** (Giuseppe, Phd @ University of Warwick, Department of Politics and International Studies, September 2010, “The EU’s promotion of human rights in China: a consistent and coordinated constructive engagement?,” <http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/3895/1/WRAP_THESIS_Balducci_2010.pdf>)

In order to make this study manageable and meaningful for generalisation, this thesis employs a conceptualisation of consistency which refers to the ability of the EC to devise economic and development policies consistent with one another and with the EU’s objective to promote human rights in China. As the EU’s strategy of **constructive engagement** of China on human rights **was principally based on economic engagement** and **development assistance**, a concentration **on** these **two sectors** appears wholly justifiable. The appropriateness of concentrating on the European Community is also supported by the fact that, within the EU’s architecture, the EC has been primarily

[ ] **Economic Engagement and Development Assistance are distinct policies**

**Balducci 2010**

(Giuseppe, Phd @ University of Warwick, Department of Politics and International Studies, September 2010, “The EU’s promotion of human rights in China: a consistent and coordinated constructive engagement?,” <http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/3895/1/WRAP_THESIS_Balducci_2010.pdf>)

Chapter 3 has shown that the EU’s strategy **of constructive engagement was** mostly **based on economic engagement**, dialogue **and development assistance**. Chapter 3 has, in addition, shown that the strategy of constructive **engagement** privileged an approach that **sidelined sanctioning policies**. The abandonment of sanctioning policies, which were formulated at CFSP level, has shown the necessity to concentrate on the EC and the member states’ levels of governance. Similarly, **since two out of the three main policies of constructive engagement of China, i.e. economic engagement and development assistance,** came under the EC’s competence, a focus on these two **has been shown to be appropriate**. Chapter 3 has then shown that in the definition of the EU’s constructive engagement, Germany, France and the UK were not only the most influential member states but they were also representative of the other EU member states’ approaches towards human rights in China.

### Economic Engagement - Must Build Relations

[ ] **Economic engagement must promote interdependence – means one-shot actions aren’t topical**

**Celik 2011**

[Arda Can, M.A in political science & international relations at Uppsala Univ. Sweden, “Economic sanctions and engagement policies,” <http://www.grin.com/en/e-book/175204/economic-sanctions-and-engagement-policies>]

**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’’¶ **Although**, much of **the literature focuses on the effectiveness of economic sanctions, economic engagement strategies have rapidly gained momentum and** gathers more and more **attention**(Kahler&Kastner,2006). Kirshner(2002) states that handful of studies examine the Hirchmanesque effects of economic relations and engagement policies therefore engagement policies are newly emerging alternative strategies against the economic sanctions. This literature is a composition of liberal and realist approaches. Liberals underline that Effectiveness of engagement policies are valid and ascending. On the other hand, Realists criticise the potential of engagement policies and does not give credits to the arguments of engagement strategies.¶ Liberal Approach ¶ Literature of liberal school points out that economic engagement policies are significantly effective tools for sender and target countries. The effectiveness leans on mutual economic and political benefits for both parties.(Garzke et al,2001). **Ecenomic engagement operates with trade mechanisms where sender and target country establish intensified trade thus increase the economic interaction** over time. This strategy decreases the potential hostilities and provides mutual gains. Paulson Jr (2008) states that **this mechanism is highly different from carrots (inducements). Carrots work quid pro quo in short terms and for narrow goals. Economic engagement intends to develop the target country and wants her to be aware of the long term benefits of shared economic goals**. Sender does not want to contain nor prevent the target country with different policies. Conversely; sender works deliberately to improve the target countries’ Gdp, trade potential, export-import ratios and national income. Sender acts in purpose to reach important goals.

### Economic Engagement must be conditional

#### [ ] Economic engagement requires a quid pro quo.

Haas and O'Sullivan 2000.

[Richard N., former senior aid to President George bush, and Meghan L., Brookings Foreign Policy Studies Program fellow, *Honey and Vinegar: Incentives, Sanctions, and Foreign Policy*, http://brookings.nap.edu/books/0815733550/html/203.html#pagetop, 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 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** **U**nited **S**tates **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 U**nited **S**tates **has important disagreements**.

### Economic Engagement must be unconditional

#### [ ] Economic engagement is distinct from offering a quid pro quo

Celik 2011

[Arda Can, M.A in political science and international relations at Uppsala Univ. Sweden, “Economic sanctions and engagement policies,” http://www.grin.com/en/e-book/175204/economic-sanctions-and-engagement-policies]

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’’¶ Although, much of the literature focuses on the effectiveness of economic sanctions, economic engagement strategies have rapidly gained momentum and gathers more and more attention(Kahler&Kastner,2006). Kirshner(2002) states that handful of studies examine the Hirchmanesque effects of economic relations and engagement policies therefore engagement policies are newly emerging alternative strategies against the economic sanctions. This literature is a composition of liberal and realist approaches. Liberals underline that Effectiveness of engagement policies are valid and ascending. On the other hand, Realists criticise the potential of engagement policies and does not give credits to the arguments of engagement strategies.¶

### Economic Engagement can be conditional or unconditional

#### [ ] Economic engagement provides economic incentives to shape behavior – it can be conditional or unconditional

Haass, Director of Foreign Policy Studies at the Brookings Institution, 2000

[Richard N. Haass, VP and, PhD from Oxford University, and Meghan L. O’Sullivan, Fellow with the Foreign Policy Studies program at Brookings, PhD in Politics from Oxford University, “Terms of Engagement: Alternatives to Punitive Policies,” Survival, vol. 42, no. 2, Summer 2000, http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/articles/2000/6/summer%20haass/2000survival.pdf]

¶ 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.3 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.

### Economic Engagement includes Trade (1/2)

#### [ ] Economic engagement includes trade and aid

Milner and Tingley 2011

(Helen V. Milner and Dustin H. Tingley. Princeton International Organization 65, Winter 2011, pp 37–68 Who Supports Global Economic Engagement? The Sources of Preferences in American Foreign Economic Policy

http://www.princeton.edu/~hmilner/forthcoming%20papers/MilnerTingley%20%282011%29%20Who%20Supports%20Global%20Economic%20Engagement.pdf

Political economy factors, foreign policy concerns, and ideology help account for legislative voting on aid and trade, but they do so in different ways. Why? Interestingly, the same political economy factors operate in the two areas. Legislators seem to respond to the economic endowments of their constituents. As Stolper-Samuelson models predict, districts heavily endowed with high-skill workers gain from freer trade and more aid, and their legislator’s voting choices reflect this. Surprisingly, this is just as true for aid as for trade. Even though aid is a smaller part of the U.S. economy than trade, aid is often seen as an important means of economic engagement with the world economy. Legislators hence respond to the political economy pressures of their constituents similarly. This suggests that political economy factors might help shape a broad internationalist policy orientation across multiple policy areas.

#### [ ] Economic engagement includes improving trade ties

Hill 2010

(Matthew Hill, Intern, Global Issues Program at the Lowy Institute for International Policy, Between the U.S. and China: A Kiwi Perspective September 14, 2010 <http://cogitasia.wordpress.com/2010/09/14/between-the-u-s-and-china-a-kiwi-perspective/#more-544>)

As part of this process, New Zealand has extended engagement with Asia, particularly with China. New Zealand is at the vanguard of economic engagement with the PRC, characterized by the ‘four firsts’ of approving China’s ascension to the WTO, granting it ‘market economy’ status, and commencing and completing free trade negotiations with Beijing. Economic ties have boomed, to 12% of New Zealand’s trade in 2009, with China now Wellington’s second largest trading partner. Non-economic engagement, while more tentative, has also grown in areas of education, environmental protection, and socio-cultural ties.

### Economic Engagement includes Trade (2/2)

####  [ ] Economic engagement includes trade, grants and loans, and investment

GAO 2013

(United States Government Accountability Office, Trends in U.S. and Chinese Economic Engagement, February 2013 <http://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-13-199>)

Since 2001, China has rapidly increased its economic engagement with sub-Saharan African countries. The United States has increased aid to sub-Saharan Africa and in 2010 provided more than a quarter of all U.S. international economic assistance to the region. According to some observers, China’s foreign assistance and investments in Africa have been driven in part by the desire for natural resources and stronger diplomatic relations. Some U.S. officials and other stakeholders also have questioned whether China’s activities affect U.S. interests in the region.

GAO was asked to review the nature of the United States’ and China’s engagement in sub-Saharan Africa. This report examines (1) goals and policies in sub-Saharan Africa; (2) trade, grants and loans, and investment activities in the region; and (3) engagement in three case-study countries—Angola, Ghana, and Kenya. GAO obtained information from, among others, 11 U.S. agencies, U.S. firms, and host-government officials. GAO was not able to meet with Chinese officials. GAO did not include U.S. and Chinese security engagement in the scope of this study

#### [ ] Economic engagement includes trade, investment, and assistance

GAO 2013

(United States Government Accountability Office, Trends in U.S. and Chinese Economic Engagement, February 2013 <http://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-13-199>)

China’s economic ties with sub-Saharan Africa, including its rapidly rising trade and investment in the region, have drawn global attention. While U.S. trade with the region has also increased, the United States has generally focused on providing development and humanitarian assistance to African countries, directing more than a quarter of its foreign economic assistance to the region in 2010. Since 2001, China has substantially increased its economic engagement with sub-Saharan African countries, with strong growth in both imports and exports. According to some observers, China’s foreign assistance and investments throughout Africa since that time have been driven in part by the Chinese government’s desire to obtain a share in Africa’s natural resources as well as by its interest in establishing diplomatic relations with countries in the region. Various U.S. officials and members of the U.S. business community have questioned whether China’s role in the region is affecting U.S. interests and opportunities for U.S. firms in sub-Saharan Africa.

### Toward

**[ ] Toward means in a process that will produce a specific result**

**MacMillan No Date**

(MacMillan dictionary, toward, <http://www.macmillandictionary.com/us/dictionary/american/toward>)

**used for showing how a process is developing in a way that will produce a particular result**

**[ ] It also means helping to pay for something – not the total cost**

**MacMillan No Date**

(MacMillan dictionary, toward, <http://www.macmillandictionary.com/us/dictionary/american/toward>)

**in order to help to pay for something**

**I would be happy to contribute a little toward the cost** of the gas.

**[ ] Toward means in the direction of**

**Michigan Supreme Court 1914**

[Michigan Reports: Cases Decided in the Supreme Court of Michigan, Volume 180, Google Books]

Under 3 Comp. Laws, § 11510 (5 How. Stat. [2d Ed.] § 14559), providing that “any person who shall discharge without injury to any other person, any firearm, while intentionally, without malice, aimed at or toward any person, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor,” etc., acts carelessly done, without design to do mischief, are punishable.¶ 2. Same—“Toward”—Construction of Statute.¶ It is sufficient, in a prosecution for violating the statute, to show that the accused was making use of a rifle pointed in the direction of a passenger on a car and discharged the weapon in that direction, without striking any one. **The word “toward” means in a course or line leading in the direction of.**

#### [ ] Toward means regarding

Random House **201**0

(Random House Kernerman Webster's College Dictionary, © 2010 K Dictionaries Ltd. Copyright 2005, 1997, 1991 by Random House, Inc. All rights reserved. http://www.thefreedictionary.com/toward)

to•ward (prep. tɔrd, toʊrd, twɔrd, twoʊrd; adj. tɔrd, toʊrd)¶ prep. Also, to•wards′.¶ 1. in the direction of: to walk toward the river.¶ 2. with a view to obtaining or having; for: They're saving money toward a new house.¶ 3. in the area or vicinity of; near.¶ 4. turned to; facing.¶ 5. shortly before; close to: toward midnight.¶ 6. as a help or contribution to: to give money toward a person's expenses.¶ 7. with respect to; as regards.

### Cuba

**[ ] Refers to the republic of Cuba**

**Collins English Dictionary 2003**

[Collins English Dictionary – Complete and Unabridged, http://www.thefreedictionary.com/Cuba]

Cuba [ˈkjuːbə]¶ n¶ (Placename) **a republic and the largest island in the Caribbean, at the entrance to the Gulf of Mexico**: became a Spanish colony after its discovery by Columbus in 1492; gained independence after the Spanish-American War of 1898 but remained subject to US influence until declared a people's republic under Castro in 1960; subject of an international crisis in 1962, when the US blockaded the island in order to compel the Soviet Union to dismantle its nuclear missile base. Sugar comprises about 80 per cent of total exports; the economy has been devastated by loss of trade following the collapse of the Soviet Union and by the continuing US trade embargo. Language: Spanish. Religion: nonreligious majority. Currency: peso. **Capital: Havana**. Pop.: 11 190 000 (2001 est.). Area: 110 922 sq. km (42 827 sq. miles)

**[ ] Refers to the territory of the Cuban state**

**China-Cuba Double Taxation Prevention Treaty 2001** http://www.chinatax.gov.cn/n6669073/n6669103/n11809672.files/n8688298.pdf

b) **the term “Cuba” means the national territory comprising the Island of Cuba, Isla Juventud, the other islands and adjacent keys, the internal waters and the territorial sea in the limits defined by its internal law and the airspace which extends over them, including the continental shelf and the exclusive economic zone adjacent to the territorial sea, over which the Cuban state exercises its sovereignty rights** and jurisdiction by virtue of its internal law and in accordance with international law;

### Mexico

**[ ] Refers to the United Mexican States**

**Collins English Dictionary 2003**

[Collins English Dictionary – Complete and Unabridged, http://www.thefreedictionary.com/Mexico]

Mexico [ˈmɛksɪˌkəʊ]¶ n¶ 1. (Placename) **a republic in North America, on the Gulf of Mexico and the Pacific**: early Mexican history includes the Maya, Toltec, and Aztec civilizations; conquered by the Spanish between 1519 and 1525 and achieved independence in 1821; lost Texas to the US in 1836 and California and New Mexico in 1848. It is generally mountainous with three ranges of the Sierra Madre (east, west, and south) and a large central plateau. Official language: Spanish. Religion: Roman Catholic majority. Currency: peso. **Capital: Mexico City**. Pop.: 99 969 000 (2001 est.). Area: 1 967 183 sq. km (761 530 sq. miles) **Official name United Mexican States** Spanish name Méjico

#### [ ] Refers to the territory of the United Mexican States

**Mexico-Russia Income Tax Treaty 2004**

 www.nalog.ru/html/docs/in/mex/mex\_in.doc‎

**the term "Mexico" means the territory of the United Mexican States** in the terms expressed in its Political Constitution, **including its exclusive economic zone and continental shelf** where the United Mexican States exercises its sovereign rights and jurisdiction in conformity with the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, of 1982;

### Venezuela

**[ ] Refers to the Republic of Venezuela**

**US Tax Convention with Venezuela 2000**

http://www.irs.gov/pub/irs-trty/venezu.pdf

1. For the purposes of this Convention, unless the context otherwise requires: **a) the term “Venezuela” means the Republic of Venezuela**;

**[ ] Refers to the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela**

**Collins English Dictionary 2003**

[Collins English Dictionary – Complete and Unabridged, http://www.thefreedictionary.com/Venezuela]

Venezuela [ˌvɛnɪˈzweɪlə]¶ n¶ 1. (Placename) **a republic in South America, on the Caribbean**: colonized by the Spanish in the 16th century; independence from Spain declared in 1811 and won in 1819 after a war led by Simón Bolívar. It contains Lake Maracaibo and the northernmost chains of the Andes in the northwest, the Orinoco basin in the central part, and the Guiana Highlands in the south. Exports: petroleum, iron ore, and coffee. Official language: Spanish. Religion: Roman Catholic majority. Currency: bolívar. **Capital: Caracas**. Pop.: 24 632 000 (2001 est.). Area: 912 050 sq. km (352 142 sq. miles) **Official name Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela**

**[ ] Refers to the territory of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela**

**Venezuela-UAE Double Taxation Prevention Treaty 2010** http://www.mof.gov.ae/En/AboutMinistry/Departments/Documents/%D8%A5%D8%AA%D9%81%D8%A7%D9%82%D9%8A%D8%A7%D8%AA%20%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%A5%D8%B2%D8%AF%D9%88%D8%A7%D8%AC%20%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%B6%D8%B1%D9%8A%D8%A8%D9%8A/Venezuela%20%28ENG%29%20DTA.pdf

a) **the term "Venezuela" means** in its geographical sense, **the territory of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, including its land territory, islands, lakes and rivers, internal waters and waters** included within the straight base lines adopted by the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, **its territorial sea and the air space over these areas, as well as the exclusive economic zone and the continental shelf beyond the exclusive economic zone, over which the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela exercises** in accordance with its legislation and international law, **sovereign rights or jurisdiction;**

### Or

#### [ ] Exclusive - “Or” means one or the other

**Quirk, Professor of Linguistics – University of Durham, 1993**

(Randolph, , and Sidney Greenbaum, “A University Grammar of English”, http://grammar.ccc.commnet.edu/grammar/conjunctions.htm)

**OR** **To suggest that** **only one** **possibility can be realized, excluding one or the other**: "You can study hard for this exam or you can fail." To suggest the inclusive combination of alternatives: "We can broil chicken on the grill tonight, or we can just eat leftovers. To suggest a refinement of the first clause: "Smith College is the premier all-women's college in the country, or so it seems to most Smith College alumnae." To suggest a restatement or "correction" of the first part of the sentence: "There are no rattlesnakes in this canyon, or so our guide tells us." To suggest a negative condition: "The New Hampshire state motto is the rather grim "Live free or die." To suggest a negative alternative without the use of an imperative (see use of and [above](http://grammar.ccc.commnet.edu/grammar/conjunctions.htm#above)): "They must approve his political style or they wouldn't keep electing him mayor."

#### [ ] Not Exclusive - **The word “or” is only exclusive if the two options are already mutually exclusive**

Smith, former member of the Philosophy Dept at Cambridge, 2013

[Dr Peter Smith, , “ Disjunction: Why did the inclusive “OR” become the convention?” http://math.stackexchange.com/questions/366122/disjunction-why-did-the-inclusive-or-become-the-convention]

**Velleman could be read as saying that** (i) in English, "**or" has two meanings** when used as a propositional connective, **one corresponding the familiar inclusive disjunction** of formal logic, **the other expressing exclusive disjunction**, but (ii) there's a special convention that in mathematical English, "or" is used only in the first way. Hence the OP's question -- why the special convention in maths?¶ **But (i) is arguably just wrong**. Although it is not infrequently said that "or" is semantically ambiguous, a much smoother theory seems to be that **"or" is in fact semantically unambiguous, meaning inclusive disjunction, and on those occasions where we hear/read a message "A or B" as also conveying "but not both", the additional implicature is either pragmatic (not semantic) or invokes prior knowledge that A excludes B**.¶ Note for example that **in the sort of cases typically invoked to supposedly illustrate the uses of exclusive "or", it would** -- on the semantic story -- **be a contradiction to add "or both" whereas it normally seems** like a **coherent** cancelling of a pragmatic (typically Gricean) implicature. Note again that 'either ... or' in English seems to have a uniform semantic negation, 'neither ... nor ...' (which couldn't be the negation if 'or' is exclusive). And so it goes.