#### 1. Interpretation: Economic engagement requires direct engagement with the state institutions -- not individuals.

Haass and O'Sullivan, 2000 (Richard and Meghan, VP/Director of Foreign Policy Studies + Senior Fellow in the Foreign Policy Studies Program @ Brookings, "Terms of Engagement: Alternatives to Punitive Policies," Survival, p. 2-3 (maybe merge with prior card…)

Architects of engagement strategies can choose from a wide variety of¶ incentives. Economic

AND

just some of the possible incentives used in the form of¶ engagement.

#### 2. Violation --- the Aff isn’t engagement with the government of a topic country.

#### 3. Voting Issue ---

#### a) Predictable Limits --- allowing engagement to non-governmental agencies it creates thousands of potential affs which engage with non-state actors -- kills the negs ability to have case specific strategies --- that’s crucial to advocacy skills.

#### b) Adverse Ground --- forcing the aff to be gov 2 gov ensures clash over the controversy of how to engage, and its effects.

#### c) Precision --- err negative the most qualified evidence concludes that there is a distinction between engagement with the government and individual actors.