The resolution:

Resolved: the United States federal government should substantially increase its economic engagement with Cuba.

My partner and I begin with our definitions:

Resolved means to reduce through mental analysis

Random House Unabridged Dictionary 2006

(http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/resolved)

**Resolve**: 1.To come to a definite or earnest decision about; determine (to do something): I have resolved that I shall live to the full. 2.to separate into constituent or elementary parts; break up; cause or disintegrate (usually fol. by into). 3.to reduce or convert by, or as by, breaking up or disintegration (usually fol. by to or into). 4.to convert or transform by any process (often used reflexively). 5.**to reduce by mental analysis** (often fol. by into).

The term resolved is an independent clause before a colon. What follows the colon is the focus of what to reduce through mental analysis.

Peck 2007 (Frances, University of Ottawa Writing Center, "The Colon", http://www.writingcentre.uottawa.ca/hypergrammar/colon.html)

The colon focuses the reader's attention on what is to follow, and as a result, you should use it to introduce a list, a summation, or an idea that somehow completes the introductory idea. You may use the colon in this way, however, only after an independent clause: He visited three cities during his stay in the Maritimes: Halifax, Saint John and Moncton. Their lobbying efforts were ultimately useless: the bill was soundly defeated. My mother gave me one good piece of advice: to avoid wasting time and energy worrying about things I cannot change.

The United States federal government is an amalgam of fallible individuals where no one is really in charge.

Claude, ‘88

[Inis, Professor of Government and Foreign Affairs, University of Virginia, States and the Global System, pages 18-20]

This view of the state as an institutional monolith is fostered by the notion of sovereignty, which calls up the image of the monarch, presiding over his kingdom.  Sovereignty emphasizes the singularity of the state, its monopoly of authority, its unity of command and its capacity to speak with one voice.  Thus, France wills, Iran demands, China intends, New Zealand promises and the Soviet Union insists.  One all too easily conjures up the picture of a single-minded and purposeful state that decides exactly what it wants to achieve, adopts coherent policies intelligently adapted to its objectives, knows what it is doing, does what it intends and always has its act together. This view of the state is reinforced by political scientists’ emphasis upon the concept of policy and upon the thesis that governments derive policy from calculations of national interest.  We thus take it for granted that states act internationally in accordance with rationally conceived and consciously constructed schemes of action, and we implicitly refuse to consider the possibility that alternatives to policy-directed behaviour may have importance–alternatives such as random, reactive, instinctual, habitual and conformist behaviour.  Our rationalistic assumption that states do what they have planned to do tends to inhibit the discovery that states sometimes do what they feel compelled to do, or what they have the opportunity to do, or what they have usually done, or what other states are doing, or whatever the line of least resistance would seem to suggest. **Academic preoccupation with the making of policy is accompanied by academic neglect of the execution of policy.  We seem to assume that once the state has** calculated its interest and **contrived a policy** to further that interest, **the carrying out of policy is the virtually automatic result** of the routine functioning of the bureaucratic mechanism of the state.  I am inclined to call this the Genesis theory of public administration, taking as my text the passage: ‘And God said, Let there be light: and there was light’.  I suspect that, in the realm of government, policy execution rarely follows so promptly and inexorably from policy statement.  Alternatively, one may dub it the Pooh-Bah/Ko-Ko theory, honouring those denizens of William S. Gilbert’s Japan who took the position that when the Mikado ordered that something e done it was as good as done and might as well be declared to have been done. In the real world, that which a state decides to do is not as good as done; it may, in fact, never be done.  And what states do, they may never have decided to do.  **Governments are not automatic machines, grinding out decisions and converting decisions into actions.  They are agglomerations of human beings**, like the rest of us **inclined to be fallible**, lazy, forgetful, indecisive, resistant to discipline and authority, and likely to fail to get the word or to heed it.  As in other large organizations, **left and right governmental hands are frequently ignorant of each other’s activities**, official spokesmen contradict each other, ministries work at cross purposes, and the creaking machinery of government often gives the impression that no one is really in charge.  I hope that no one will attribute my jaundiced view of government merely to the fact that I am an American–one, that is, whose personal experience is limited to a governmental system that is notoriously complex, disjointed, erratic, cumbersome and unpredictable.  The United States does not, I suspect, have the least effective government or the most bumbling and incompetent bureaucracy in all the world.  Here and there, now and then, governments do, of course perform prodigious feats of organization and administration: an extraordinary war effort, a flight to the moon, a successful hostage-rescue operation.  More often, states have to make do with governments that are not notably clear about their purposes or coordinated and disciplined in their operations. This means that,in international relations, states are sometimes less dangerous, and sometimes less reliable, than one might think.  Neither their threats nor their promises are to be taken with absolute seriousness.  **Above all**, it means that we **students of international politics must be cautious in attributing purposefulness and responsibility to governments**.  To say the that the United States was informed about an event is not to establish that the president acted in the light of that knowledge; he may never have heard about it.  To say that a Soviet pilot shot down an airliner is not to prove that the Kremlin has adopted the policy of destroying all intruders into Soviet airspace; one wants to know how and by whom the decision to fire was made.  To observe that the representative of Zimbabwe voted in favour of a particular resolution in the United Nations General Assembly is not necessarily to discover the nature of Zimbabwe’s policy on the affected matter; Zimbabwe may have no policy on that matter, and it may be that no one in the national capital has ever heard of the issue.  We can hardly dispense with the convenient notion that Pakistan claims, Cuba promises, and Italy insists, and we cannot well abandon the formal position that governments speak for and act on behalf of their states, but **it is essential that we bear constantly in mind the reality that governments are never fully in charge and never achieve the unity, purposefulness and discipline that theory attributes to them**–and that they sometimes claim.

The term “Should” implies an inpraesenti ruling couched in a present indicative which means topical affirmatives must act immediately. We have already begun.

Summer 94 **(Justice, Oklahoma Supreme Court, “Kelsey v. Dollarsaver Food Warehouse of Durant”,** [**http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn14**](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn14)**)**

**The legal question to be resolved** by the court **is whether the word "should**"13 in the May 18 order **connotes futurity or may be deemed a ruling in praesenti**.14 **The answer to this query is not to be divined from rules of grammar**;15 **it** **must be governed by** the age-old practice culture of **legal professionals** and its immemorial language usage. To determine if the omission (from the critical May 18 entry) of the turgid phrase, "and the same hereby is", (1) makes it an in futuro ruling - i.e., an expression of what the judge will or would do at a later stage - or (2) constitutes an in in praesenti resolution of a disputed law issue, the trial judge's intent must be garnered from the four corners of the entire record.16 Nisi prius orders should be so construed as to give effect to every words and every part of the text, with a view to carrying out the evident intent of the judge's direction.17 The order's language ought not to be considered abstractly. **The actual meaning** intended by the document's signatory **should be derived from the context in which the phrase to be interpreted is used**.18 When applied to the May 18 memorial, these told canons impel my conclusion that **the judge doubtless intended his ruling as an in praesenti resolution** of Dollarsaver's quest for judgment n.o.v. Approval of all counsel plainly appears on the face of the critical May 18 entry which is [885 P.2d 1358] signed by the judge.19 True minutes20 of a court neither call for nor bear the approval of the parties' counsel nor the judge's signature. To reject out of hand the view that in this context "should" is impliedly followed by the customary, "and the same hereby is", makes the court once again revert to medieval notions of ritualistic formalism now so thoroughly condemned in national jurisprudence and long abandoned by the statutory policy of this State. IV CONCLUSION Nisi prius judgments and orders should be construed in a manner which gives effect and meaning to the complete substance of the memorial. When a judge-signed direction is capable of two interpretations, one of which would make it a valid part of the record proper and the other would render it a meaningless exercise in futility, the adoption of the former interpretation is this court's due. A rule - that on direct appeal views as fatal to the order's efficacy the mere omission from the journal entry of a long and customarily implied phrase, i.e., "and the same hereby is" - is soon likely to drift into the body of principles which govern the facial validity of judgments. This development would make judicial acts acutely vulnerable to collateral attack for the most trivial of reasons and tend to undermine the stability of titles or other adjudicated rights. It is obvious the trial judge intended his May 18 memorial to be an in praesenti order overruling Dollarsaver's motion for judgment n.o.v. It is hence that memorial, and not the later June 2 entry, which triggered appeal time in this case. Because the petition. in error was not filed within 30 days of May 18, the appeal is untimely. I would hence sustain the appellee's motion to dismiss.21 Footnotes: 1 The pertinent terms of the memorial of May 18, 1993 are: IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF BRYAN COUNTY, STATE OF OKLAHOMA COURT MINUTE 5/18/93 No. C-91-223 After having heard and considered arguments of counsel in support of and in opposition to the motions of the Defendant for judgment N.O.V. and a new trial, the Court finds that the motions should be overruled. Approved as to form: /s/ Ken Rainbolt /s/ Austin R. Deaton, Jr. /s/ Don Michael Haggerty /s/ Rocky L. Powers Judge 2 The turgid phrase - "should be and the same hereby is" - is a tautological absurdity. This is so because "**should**" **is synonymous with ought or must and is in itself sufficient to effect an inpraesenti ruling** - **one that** **is couched in "a present indicative synonymous with ought."** See infra note 15. 3 Carter v. Carter, Okl., 783 P.2d 969, 970 (1989); Horizons, Inc. v. Keo Leasing Co., Okl., 681 P.2d 757, 759 (1984); Amarex, Inc. v. Baker, Okl., 655 P.2d 1040, 1043 (1983); Knell v. Burnes, Okl., 645 P.2d 471, 473 (1982); Prock v. District Court of Pittsburgh County, Okl., 630 P.2d 772, 775 (1981); Harry v. Hertzler, 185 Okl. 151, 90 P.2d 656, 659 (1939); Ginn v. Knight, 106 Okl. 4, 232 P. 936, 937 (1925). 4 "Recordable" means that by force of 12 O.S. 1991 § 24 an instrument meeting that section's criteria must be entered on or "recorded" in the court's journal. The clerk may "enter" only that which is "on file." The pertinent terms of 12 O.S. 1991 § 24 are: "Upon the journal record required to be kept by the clerk of the district court in civil cases . . . shall be entered copies of the following instruments on file: 1. All items of process by which the court acquired jurisdiction of the person of each defendant in the case; and 2. All instruments filed in the case that bear the signature of the and judge and specify clearly the relief granted or order made." [Emphasis added.] 5 See 12 O.S. 1991 § 1116 which states in pertinent part: "Every direction of a court or judge made or entered in writing, and not included in a judgment is an order." [Emphasis added.] 6 The pertinent terms of 12 O.S. 1993 § 696.3 , effective October 1, 1993, are: "A. Judgments, decrees and appealable orders that are filed with the clerk of the court shall contain: 1. A caption setting forth the name of the court, the names and designation of the parties, the file number of the case and the title of the instrument; 2. A statement of the disposition of the action, proceeding, or motion, including a statement of the relief awarded to a party or parties and the liabilities and obligations imposed on the other party or parties; 3. The signature and title of the court; . . ." 7 The court holds that the May 18 memorial's recital that "the Court finds that the motions should be overruled" is a "finding" and not a ruling. In its pure form, a finding is generally not effective as an order or judgment. See, e.g., Tillman v. Tillman, 199 Okl. 130, 184 P.2d 784 (1947), cited in the court's opinion. 8 When ruling upon a motion for judgment n.o.v. the court must take into account all the evidence favorable to the party against whom the motion is directed and disregard all conflicting evidence favorable to the movant. If the court should conclude the motion is sustainable, it must hold, as a matter of law, that there is an entire absence of proof tending to show a right to recover. See Austin v. Wilkerson, Inc., Okl., 519 P.2d 899, 903 (1974). 9 See Bullard v. Grisham Const. Co., Okl., 660 P.2d 1045, 1047 (1983), where this court reviewed a trial judge's "findings of fact", perceived as a basis for his ruling on a motion for judgment n.o.v. (in the face of a defendant's reliance on plaintiff's contributory negligence). These judicial findings were held impermissible as an invasion of the providence of the jury and proscribed by OKLA. CONST. ART, 23, § 6 . Id. at 1048. 10 Everyday courthouse parlance does not always distinguish between a judge's "finding", which denotes nisi prius resolution of fact issues, and "ruling" or "conclusion of law". The latter resolves disputed issues of law. In practice usage members of the bench and bar often confuse what the judge "finds" with what that official "concludes", i.e., resolves as a legal matter. 11 See Fowler v. Thomsen, 68 Neb. 578, 94 N.W. 810, 811-12 (1903), where the court determined a ruling that "[1] find from the bill of particulars that there is due the plaintiff the sum of . . ." was a judgment and not a finding. In reaching its conclusion the court reasoned that "[e]ffect must be given to the entire in the docket according to the manifest intention of the justice in making them." Id., 94 N.W. at 811. 12 When the language of a judgment is susceptible of two interpretations, that which makes it correct and valid is preferred to one that would render it erroneous. Hale v. Independent Powder Co., 46 Okl. 135, 148 P. 715, 716 (1915); Sharp v. McColm, 79 Kan. 772, 101 P. 659, 662 (1909); Clay v. Hildebrand, 34 Kan. 694, 9 P. 466, 470 (1886); see also 1 A.C. FREEMAN LAW OF JUDGMENTS § 76 (5th ed. 1925). 13 "Should" not only is used as a "present indicative" synonymous with ought but also is the past tense of "shall" with various shades of meaning not always easy to analyze. See 57 C.J. Shall § 9, Judgments § 121 (1932). O. JESPERSEN, GROWTH AND STRUCTURE OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE (1984); St. Louis & S.F.R. Co. v. Brown, 45 Okl. 143, 144 P. 1075, 1080-81 (1914). For a more detailed explanation, see the Partridge quotation infra note 15. Certain contexts mandate a construction of the term "should" as more than merely indicating preference or desirability. Brown, supra at 1080-81 (jury instructions stating that jurors "should" reduce the amount of damages in proportion to the amount of contributory negligence of the plaintiff was held to imply an obligation and to be more than advisory); Carrigan v. California Horse Racing Board, 60 Wash. App. 79, 802 P.2d 813 (1990) (one of the Rules of Appellate Procedure requiring that a party "should devote a section of the brief to the request for the fee or expenses" was interpreted to mean that a party is under an obligation to include the requested segment); State v. Rack, 318 S.W.2d 211, 215 (Mo. 1958) ("should" would mean the same as "shall" or "must" when used in an instruction to the jury which tells the triers they "should disregard false testimony"). 14 In praesenti means literally "at the present time." BLACK'S LAW DICTIONARY 792 (6th Ed. 1990). In legal parlance the phrase denotes that which in law is presently or immediately effective, as opposed to something that will or would become effective in the future [in futurol]. See Van Wyck v. Knevals, 106 U.S. 360, 365, 1 S.Ct. 336, 337, 27 L.Ed. 201 (1882).

The term “Substantially” means 0%

1. The term substantially is subjective and has to be defined in specific context

Words and Phrases 2 (Volume 40A, p. 464)

Cal. 1956. “Substantial” is a relative term, its measure to be gauged by all the circumstances surrounding the matter in reference to which the expression has been used

1. In the context of the resolution a substantial increase is evaluated at 0.02

Words & Phrases 60

'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. 4.

1. That amount rounds down to 0%

Microsoft Support 2004 ("How To Implement Custom Rounding Procedures" http://support.microsoft.com/kb/196652)

Arithmetic Rounding

When rounding always down or up, the resulting number is not necessarily the closest to the original number. For example, if you round 1.9 down to 1, the difference is a lot larger than if you round it up to 2. It is easy to see that numbers from 1.6 to 2.4 should be rounded to 2.

However, what about 1.5, which is equidistant between 1 and 2? By convention, the half-way number is rounded up.

You can implement rounding half-way numbers in a symmetric fashion, such that -.5 is rounded down to -1, or in an asymmetric fashion, where -.5 is rounded up to 0.

The following functions provide symmetric arithmetic rounding:

The Excel Round() spreadsheet function.

The SQL Server Round() function can do symmetric arithmetic rounding.

The following function provide asymmetric arithmetic rounding:

The Round() method of the Java Math library.

Visual Basic for Applications does not have any function that does arithmetic rounding.

Banker's Rounding

When you add rounded values together, always rounding .5 in the same direction results in a bias that grows with the more numbers you add together. One way to minimize the bias is with banker's rounding.

Banker's rounding rounds .5 up sometimes and down sometimes. The convention is to round to the nearest even number, so that both 1.5 and 2.5 round to 2, and 3.5 and 4.5 both round to 4. Banker's rounding is symmetric.

The term “Increase” indicates becoming greater in quality

1. Increase indicates a form of becoming

Encarta 2006 – Encarta Online Dictionary. 2006. ("Increase" http://encarta.msn.com/encnet/features/dictionary/DictionaryResults.aspx?refid=1861620741)

in·crease [ in krss ]  
transitive and intransitive verb  (past and past participle in·creased, present participle in·creas·ing, 3rd person present singular in·creas·es)Definition: make or become larger or greater: to become, or make something become, larger in number, quantity, or degree  
noun  (plural in·creas·es)

1. Increases can only be compared to the immediately preceding object, we cannot evaluate becoming from a temporal distance because values are constantly in flux. Measurements must be immanent to each becoming.

Rogers 2005 Judge Rogers, June 24, 2005, US Court of Appeals for the DC Circuit, State of New York, et al., Petitioners v. US Environmental Protection Agency, 367 U.S. App. D.C. 3; 413 F.3d 3, 2005 U.S. App. LEXIS 12378, \*\*; 60 ERC (BNA) 1791, p. Lexis

[\*\*48] Statutory Interpretation. HN16Go to the description of this Headnote. While the CAA defines a "modification" as any physical or operational change that "increases" emissions, it is silent on how to calculate such "increases" in emissions. 42 U.S.C. § 7411(a)(4). According to government petitioners, the lack of a statutory definition does not render the term "increases" ambiguous, but merely compels the court to give the term its "ordinary meaning." See Engine Mfrs.Ass'nv.S.Coast AirQualityMgmt.Dist., 541 U.S. 246, 124 S. Ct. 1756, 1761, 158 L. Ed. 2d 529(2004); Bluewater Network, 370 F.3d at 13; Am. Fed'n of Gov't Employees v. Glickman, 342 U.S. App. D.C. 7, 215 F.3d 7, 10 [\*23] (D.C. Cir. 2000). Relying on two "real world" analogies, government petitioners contend that the ordinary meaning of "increases" requires the baseline to be calculated from a period immediately preceding the change. They maintain, for example, that in determining whether a high-pressure weather system "increases" the local temperature, the relevant baseline is the temperature immediately preceding the arrival of the weather system, not the temperature five or ten years ago. Similarly, [\*\*49] in determining whether a new engine "increases" the value of a car, the relevant baseline is the value of the car immediately preceding the replacement of the engine, not the value of the car five or ten years ago when the engine was in perfect condition.

1. A Prerequisite to any increase is a decrease in the Ego.

Downing 2012 (Linda, "We must decrease to increase"; http://highlandstoday.com/hi/list/columns-linda-downing/we-must-decrease-to-increase-459672#sthash.SF8a42ms.dpuf)

True increase means decrease, mainly in stuff and ego. This past Sunday's Wall Street Journal cried out like an Old Testament prophet: "Fiscal cliff ahead … a blanket of uncertainty." The first century's John the Baptist saw the answer: "He must increase, but I must decrease" (John 3:30). We can buy the size 3 lie by ignoring the tape measure, but that will never turn a lie into truth. God gets the last word on that. Finding truth requires the right starting point. That is the quest of this column. If we seek simple truth, we can find it together—side-by-side.

The phrase “Economic Engagement” implies symbolic exchange fueled by speculation

1. Economic engagement includes all economic policies, trade, and foreign direct investment with a second party

Department of State 2009 (Department of State Archive 2001 – 2009. “What is Total Economic Engagement?” http://2001-2009.state.gov/e/eeb/92986.htm)

Total Economic Engagement seeks to integrate and coordinate all U.S. economic instruments and programs into our regional and country strategies. The Bureau of Economic, Energy and Business Affairs’ (EEB) broad cross-section of economic disciplines, interagency contacts, and expertise in such areas as trade, finance, energy, development, transportation, and telecommunications help ensure this coordination. EEB is actively involved in the entire range of international economic issues affecting America’s security and well-being. Our priorities extend from securing reliable, sustainable energy supplies to increasing market access for U.S. goods and services. Protection of American interests, such as intellectual property rights, fair play in international business, and shutting down terrorist access to financial networks, is not only part of our work, it is the foundation on which our efforts rest. But promoting U.S. economic and security interests is not a short-term endeavor; dealing creatively with emerging markets and alleviating poverty are priorities that are even more important in the era of rapid globalization than they were in the wake of World War II. To quote Franklin D. Roosevelt: “True individual freedom cannot exist without economic security and independence. People who are hungry and out of a job are the stuff of which dictatorships are made.” Poverty and political unrest walk hand-in-hand, and too many countries’ economic situations offer little hope to their citizens. However, the economic landscape does not need to remain dormant. We believe, the crop of economic security, individual prosperity and political stability can be grown through total economic engagement. Total economic engagement looks beyond the current practice of using financial development assistance as the only ox at the plow. We know that developing countries own the keys to their own economic success. Just as democracy relies on the educated and active common man, so a healthy economy rests on the liberated individual. Ronald Reagan summed it up well: “We who live in free market societies believe that growth, prosperity and ultimately human fulfillment, are created from the bottom up, not the government down. “Only when the human spirit is allowed to invent and create, only when individuals are given a personal stake in deciding economic policies and benefiting from their success – Only then can societies remain economically alive, dynamic, progressive, and free.” Our goal, therefore, must be the creation of the right conditions for individual economic growth and success. We must cultivate conditions for private sector growth, investment and trade. This cannot be accomplished through Official Development Assistance (ODA) funds alone. Foreign assistance must support a developing country’s own effort to improve their economic climate. Total economic engagement is putting all of the players to the same plow. EEB is harnessing trade and economic policy formation, proper governance, and ODA activities together. The bureau also integrates the American individual. Working with U.S. citizen-partners participating in developing economies abroad is a key element of total economic engagement. An accurate accounting of a nation’s total engagement must include economic policies as well as, trade, remittances, and foreign direct investment. In these areas, the U.S. leads the world in total economic engagement with the developing world. The private donations of American citizens, military emergency aid and peacekeeping and government assistance provide the primary sources for development financing. In all of EEB’s endeavors with State regional bureaus, the White House, and other economic agencies (e.g., USTR, Treasury), we promote Total Economic Engagement as the standard for assessing our country and regional economic strategies because we have seen that this holistic economic strategy delivers tangible results.

1. Engagement is not a policy

POMED 10 POMED Wire (Project on Democracy in the Middle East) May 26, 2010 POMED Notes: “One Year After Cairo: Has U.S. Engagement Improved the Prospects for Reform in the Arab World?” http://pomed.org/blog/2010/05/pomed-notes-one-year-after-cairo-has-us-engagement-improved-the-prospects-for-reform-in-the-arab-world.html/

Wittes then responded to the panelists’ comments, and emphasized that “engagement is not a policy, it’s a tool, and we have a lot of tools in our toolbox – engagement is not an end in itself.” She also insisted that the president’s speech in Cairo was not about a series of specific initiatives or launching programs, but rather about outlining a framework of principles that will inform our approach in the region. More broadly, failure in one instance of engagement doesn’t discourage U.S. diplomats. “We’re constantly seeking how best to employ all the policies that we have” to pursue the sorts of changes that people on the ground desire. But she returned to the notion of “mutual responsibility” to underscore that the U.S. cannot achieve these things on its own, and the “best we can do is seek to build partnerships wherever we can.”

1. Engagement is a means

Joe Biden 97 Joseph Biden (then a Senator) THE CHINA SUMMIT: WHAT KIND OF ENGAGEMENT? (Senate - September 17, 1997) Congressional Record Page: S9437 http://www.fas.org/spp/starwars/congress/1997/970917-prc.htm

If containment fails to advance our interests, what about engagement? Engagement, a term frequently used to describe the Clinton administration's policy, is, by itself, virtually without substance. `Engagement' could run the gamut from normal diplomatic relations, to a zealous mercantilist approach that runs the risk of placing profits over principle. Or to paraphrase George Will in another context from years ago, he said, `Some of my friends love capitalism more than they hate communism.

Engagement is not a policy. It is a means to an end. It is the content of the engagement that matters.

We should not be passive in our relationship with China. We can influence what kind of great power China becomes.

Encouraging China's transition from a poor, isolated Communist state to a more prosperous, open, and democratic partner, however, will take more than a bland policy of engagement. It requires patience and purpose in the pursuit of clearly articulated U.S. interests.

1. Trade is the transfer of ownership of an object. In the modern economy this transfer is guided by exchange rates. However, look deeper and even so-called rational economic tools like supply and demand, interest rates, and speculation are destroying the system from the inside out.

Baudrillard 2009 (Jean, “The Transparency of Evil”, Pgs. 37-39 [NN])

Not the least of paradoxes, given this context, is to see the economy returning triumphantly to the agenda - though whether we can properly speak of 'economy' here is questionable. Certainly this glaring reality of today cannot have the meaning it had in the classical or Marxist accounts. Its motor is neither the infrastructure nor the superstructure of material production, but rather the destructuring of value, the destabilization of real markets and economies and the victory of an economy unencumbered by ideologies, by social science, by history - an economy freed from 'Economics' and given over to pure speculation; a virtual economy emancipated from real economies (not emancipated in reality, of course: we are talking about virtuality - but that is the point, too: today, power lies not in the real but in the virtual); and an economy which is viral, and which thus connects with all other viral processes. If the economic sphere has once more become an exemplary theatre of our present reality, it has done so as the locus of special effects, of unforeseeable events, of an irrational interplay of forces. Along with Marx, we too dreamt of the end of Political Economy - of the abolition of classes and the advent of a transparent social realm in accordance with the ineluctable logic of Capital. And then we dreamt of the end of the economy in terms of a disavowal of its basic tenets -a disavowal that threw out the Marxist critique into the bargain: on this view, primacy was accorded neither to the economic nor to the political- the economy was simply ushered out as a mere epiphenomenon, vanquished by its simulacrum of itself, and by a superior logic. Today we no longer even need to dream: Political Economy is coming to an end before our eyes, metamorphosing into a trans economics of speculation which merely plays at obeying the old logic (the law of value, the laws of the market, production, surplus-value, all the classical laws of capital) and there­ fore no longer has anything economic or political about it. A game and nothing but a game, with floating and arbitrary rules: a game of catastrophe. So Political Economy will indeed soon have come to an end - though not at all in the way we once envisaged: rather, through the exacerbation of its own logic to the point of self-parody. Speculation is not surplus-value, it is a sort of ecstasy of value, utterly detached from production and its real conditions: a pure, empty form, the purged form of value operating on nothing but its own revolving motion, its own orbital circulation. The self-destabilization of Political Economy is thus what puts paid, in monstrous and somehow ironic fashion, to all possible alternatives. What possible riposte could there be to such extravagance, which effectively co-opts the energy of poker, of potlatch, of the I accursed share', and in a way opens the door to Political Economy's aesthetic and delusional stage? This unexpected demise, this phase transition, this wild bull market, is fundamentally far more original than all our old political utopias.

The term “Its” means belonging to. Topical affs can only trade what belongs to them.

Oxford English Dictionary, 2013 http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/100354?redirectedFrom=its#eid

its, adj. and pron. Pronunciation: /ɪts/

A. adj. As genitive of the pronoun, now possessive adjective.

Of or belonging to it, or that thing (Latin ejus); also refl., Of or belonging to itself, its own (Latin suus).The reflexive is often more fully its own, for which in earlier times the own, it own, were used: see own adj. and pron.

B. pron. As possessive pronoun.

[Compare his pron.2] The absolute form of prec., used when no n. follows: Its one, its ones. rare.

We engage in trade with Cuba. We exchange control of objects. Our objects, and the only object we can own - ourselves and our lives. We simultaneously take control of our lives and concede them. This is economic exchange of nothing: zero exchange. In an exchange without content, form is crucial.

Fernando 2010(Jeremy, “*The Suicide Bomber; and her gift of death*” Pg. 125-126)

We might provisionally begin our glimpse into the phenomenon by considering the notion that suicide is the expression of a subject`s will towards death. One can even posit that since one is thrown into life, and that one has no control over the point in which one dies, suicide is the subject`s way of gaining some form of control-at least of telos of life itself. Of course the irony of the situation is, the very moment in which the subject gains a form of control over her/his life is also the very same moment in which her/his life is lost. This opens the question of whether one can think of suicide in terms of an economic exchange. E

ven though the opening gambit is that the subject exchanges life for control, the attempted control was over life itself: Hence, if life is lost within the very exchange that is taking place, is there even a transference that occurs; is there actually an exchange? Since both the losses-the life of the subject-and the gains-control over a no longer existent life-amount to an exchange of nothing-in the economic sense of zero exchange-this is strictly speaking an empty exchange. Hence, one needs to consider suicide as a ritualistic exchange, where one stakes one`s life in order to gain form of control: and here is where form is crucial, for surely there is no content in this emptiness, to this emptiness.

Giving up our lives does not remove us from circulation. Exchanging life for death is a market function to be included in our economic frame. Excluding the dead is an effacement of the self which props a culture of mourning and vampiric obsession with tragedy.

Butterfield 2002 [Bradley. University of Wisconsin, La Crosse M.A. and Ph.D. in Comparative Literature, University of Oregon. The Baudrillardian Symbolic, 9/11, and the War of Good and Evil. PMC 13.1 2002. Project Muse.]

Despite this transparent warning, in Symbolic Exchange and Death (1976) Baudrillard went on to sketch several examples of symbolic exchange in relation to death in today's political economy. The anagram in Saussure, the Witz in Freud, graffiti in New York, the Accident in the media are all treated by Baudrillard as symbolic events wherein death, denied and repressed, poses a challenge to life. From the standpoint of 9/11, his theory of death in primitive and modern cultures is most pertinent. Like Foucault, Baudrillard sees the history of Western culture in terms of a genealogy of discrimination and exclusion: At the very core of the "rationality" of our culture, however, is an exclusion that precedes every other, more radical than the exclusion of madmen, children or inferior races, an exclusion preceding all these and serving as their model: the exclusion of the dead and of death. (Symbolic 126) According to Baudrillard, the dead in primitive societies played integral roles in the lives of the living by serving as partners in symbolic exchange. A gift to the dead was believed to yield a return, and by exchanging with the dead through ritual sacrifices, celebrations and feasts, they managed to absorb the rupturing energy of death back into the group. But there is an irreversible evolution from savage societies to our own: little by little, the dead cease to exist. They are thrown out of the group's symbolic circulation. They are no longer beings with a full role to play, worthy partners in exchange....Today it is not normal to be dead, and this is new. . . . Death is a delinquency, and an incurable deviancy. (126) Modern Western cultures have largely ceased to exchange with the dead collectively, partly because we no longer believe in their continued existence, and partly because we no longer value that which cannot be accumulated or consumed. The dead have no value by our measurements. We give them nothing and expect nothing from them in return, and yet they remain with us, in our memories, obligating our recognition and response. How do we respond to the symbolic challenge of death and the dead, the challenge they pose to our conscious experience? This is the question of 9/11. The primitives, Baudrillard maintains, responded to this challenge collectively through symbolic exchanges with their dead and deities. Their belief in the sign's transparency, its symbolic singularity, can be seen in animistic practices such as voodoo, where the enemy's hair is thought to contain his or her spirit. If the dead are only humans of a different nature, and if the sign is what it stands for, then a symbolic sacrifice to a dead person is every bit as binding as a gift to a living person. The obligation to return is placed upon the dead, and they reciprocate by somehow honoring or benefiting the living. Most Christians believe in and employ this same mechanism when they pray to the resurrected Christ, but even they do not believe that their symbolic gestures are anything but metaphors. We no longer believe in the one to one correspondence of signifier and signified, and we know the loved one is not really contained in the lock of hair. Americans will doubtless commemorate the deaths of those killed on 9/11 as long as our nation exists, but we know that our gifts to the dead are only symbolic, which for us means imaginary. Baudrillard's postmodern-primitive symbolic, on the other hand, aimed to obliterate the difference in value between the imaginary and the real, the signifier and the signified, and to expose the metaphysical prejudice at the heart of all such valuations. His wager was that this would be done through aesthetic violence and not real violence, but having erased the difference between the two, there was never any guarantee that others wouldn't take such theoretical "violence" to its literal ends. Graffiti art, scarification and tattooing are just the benign counterparts of true terrorism, which takes ritual sacrifice and initiation to their extremes. Literalists and extremists, fundamentalists of all sorts, find their logic foretold in Baudrillard's references to the primitives. What the terrorists enacted on 9/11 was what Baudrillard would call a symbolic event of the first order, and they were undeniably primitive in their belief that God, the dead, and the living would somehow honor and benefit them in the afterlife. Unable to defeat the U.S. in economic or military terms, they employ the rule of prestation in symbolic exchange with the gift of their own deaths. But Americans are not "primitives"--we do not value death symbolically, but rather only as a subtraction from life. Capitalism's implicit promise, in every ad campaign and marketing strategy, is that to consume is to live. We score up life against death as gain against loss, as if through accumulation we achieve mastery over the qualitative presence of death that haunts life. Our official holidays honoring the dead serve no other function than to encourage consumption. When it comes to actually dealing with death and the dead, even in public, we do so in private. As Baudrillard points out, "This entails a considerable difference in enjoyment: we trade with our dead in a kind of melancholy, while the primitives live with their dead under the auspices of the ritual and the feast" (134-35). Because we devalue death and thereby the dead, we view them only as a dreaded caste of unfortunates, and not as continuing partners in exchange. Ultimately, however, it is not so much the dead but our own deaths, our negative doubles, that we insult by denying their value. When we posit death as the negation of life, we bifurcate our identities and begin a process of mourning over our own eventual deaths, a process which lasts our whole lives. The more we devalue our death-images, that is, the greater they become, until they haunt our every moment, as in Don DeLillo's darkest comedy, White Noise. This leads us, according to Baudrillard, to an obsession with death that can be felt in the media fascination with catastrophes like 9/11. Death "becomes the object of a perverse desire. Desire invests the very separation of life and death" (147). Political economy's inability to absorb the rupturing energy of death is thus compensated by the symbolic yield of the media catastrophe. In these events we experience an artificial death which fascinates us, bored as we are by the routine order of the system and the "natural" death it prescribes for us. Natural death represents an unnegotiable negation of life and the tedious certainty of an unwanted end. It therefore inspires insurrection, until "reason itself is pursued by the hope of a universal revolt against its own norms and privileges" (162). The terrorist spectacle is an example of such a revolt, in which death gains symbolic distinction and becomes more than simply "natural." We may not think we identify with the terrorists' superstitions about honor in the next life, but in events like 9/11, Baudrillard would suggest, we nevertheless identify despite ourselves with both with the terrorists and their victims: We are all hostages, and that's the secret of hostage-taking, and we are all dreaming, instead of dying stupidly working oneself to the ground, of receiving death and of giving death. Giving and receiving constitute one symbolic act (the symbolic act par excellence), which rids death of all the indifferent negativity it holds for us in the "natural" order of capital. (166)

Our final note:

Life is slavery if you cannot opt out.

We prefer not to opt in.

We give our lives to Cuba.

We are becoming objects.

In this unilateral giving, we are free from all power, including even our power over the self.

This is our most private moment, let us rest in peace and without query.

Lotringer 2007 (Sylvere, "Exterminating Angel"; Introduction to Forget Foucault)

By the time Baudrillard conceived this collapse, the general outlook of society had changed drastically. By the early 60s, workers were already becoming eager consumers. Surplus value no longer arose from hard labor; it was created through the commodity. Semiotic equivalence became more real than reality. As "communication" replaced production, workers were being "alienated" not at work, but at home in their daily lives. Class struggle no longer applied. It was the beginning of the assembly-life, social life colonized by the commodity. Baudrillard's thought enj oys a special status in French theory, providing a bridge between the high modernist thinkers of the 30s and 40s and post-structuralist thought, which sought to revise Marxian analysis in light of the increased abstraction of capitalism. While the Situationists sought to reclaim life through their detournements, Baudrillard turned to death as an ally. Re-reading Hegel through Nietzsche, he realized that debts always preceded exchange. A spared slave could never be free of the master's gift of his life. Foucault said the same thing in conclusion to his Will to Knowledge, the book Baudrillard was ostensibly 􀍞hallenging. Foucault reminded his readers that, in ancient cultures, the right to kill was a dissymmetrical one. In reality, it was "the right to take life or let live." And Baudrillard says: "Contrary to what we might imagine, power is never the power of putting someone to death, but exactly the opposite. " Power consists of "unilateral giving (of life in particular) " (5E, pp. 40, 42) . Foucault was talking about death's absolute form during periods when the sovereign could exercise the right to kill in order to ensure his own survival. In modern times, this symbolic right subsisted but, Foucault estimated, only in a "relative and limited" form. The mechanisms of power had dramatically changed. Instead of destroying life, the mechanisms of power managed it in all sorts of ways. As a result, to "let live" was substituted a power to "foster life, " thereby disqualifying death and the rituals that accompanied it. "Now it is over life, through its unfolding," Foucault wrote, "that power establishes its dominion; death is power's limit, the moment that escapes it; death becomes the most secret aspect of existence, the most "private."9 While Foucault went onto explore what "to seize hold of life" really meant in terms of the administration of bodies and lives, this point became pivotal in Baudrillard's thinking. But could these disciplined bodies, these lives newly modulated by a creative bio-power, still be called lives? Foucault briefly envisaged the possibility of a "resistance," but never elaborated on its possible nature or the conditions in which it could be exerted. One could argue that Foucault vindicated Baudrillard's thesis by default. Only life pushed to the limit, to moments that escaped the system of equivalence, could render power powerless. Giving one's life away-a counter-gift-was the only present that couldn't be reciprocated.

**The topic is dead. The affirmative team is dead. Debate is dead. The round is dead. This joke is dead.**

**Do not investigate these deaths.**

**Any attempt to find meaning in these deaths is pointless.**

Jeremy **Fernando** 20**10**(*“The Suicide Bomber; and her gift of death”* Pgs.:137-139)

**When someone is willing to give up their life, when someone is willing to give themselves as a gift of death, what defense is there any longer?** And more than that**, how can one even begin to deal with a phenomenon that not only escapes one’s comprehension, but that is beyond understanding itself**. **It is of no coincidence that the most feared figure of the Second World War was the Kamikaze pilot. For not only was the pilot willing to die**—in some way all soldiers who enter a war zone, either willingly or not, enter a complicity to death, accept in some way the possibility of their death—but more profoundly, **the Kamikaze pilot was indeed of a divine wind, of a divine nature, because he was already dead. Before each squadron was sent off, the Kamikaze pilots would gather for a last meal, a last cigarette, a last cup of sake and a bow to the Emperor.** By **the time the pilot** actually **climbs into his cockpit, he is already** a **dead** man: **his life and his death—has already been offered** during the ritual. The typical **Western analysis usually involves pointing out the fact that before flying, the pilots were pumped full of amphetamines in order to allow them to fly their planes directly into targets. However this misses the point as it assumes that it is only due to the drugged state that the pilots become suicide bombers, that it was the drugs that made them into suicide bombs. Even if they , had gained a measure of Dutch courage’ from the amphetamines, there is no denying that the pilots themselves were fully aware of their status** as the order of the Divine Wind the moment they began their training, the moment they become pilots. Hence, from that point onwards, their lives had already been offered as a sacrifice: if the amphetamines had anything to do with it, it was merely an instrument which aided their task; the sacrifice had long ago been made. And it is the ritual— of which there are echoes of a Last Supper; or a last meal of a condemned inmate-which allows the Kamikaze pilot to sever himself from the real order, to offer her/his self—as a stake. **And like any true stake, the Kamikaze pilot has no idea what the reciprocation is, what the effects of his sacrifice are: all that he knows is that he has offered himself: everything else he remains blind to, remains in the dark from. The attempt to** explain away, **ascribe, his actions to the effect of drugs**—another favorite **is social pressures**, or brainwashing by the Japanese military machine—or any other cause is **an attempt to re-inscribe the actions of the Kamikaze pilot back into a cause and effect analysis, to return it to the order of reason.** We are never quite as afraid when something opposes the order of reason: in fact by opposing it, the underlying assumptions are strengthened. And this is what the offering of drugs as a reason attempts to do: by claiming that the pilots are flying in a drugged state, **one is trying to establish that their actions are the result of an illusion, a change in mental state: in that way reality is preserved, and one can then ascribe this action- an action that is beyond explanation** itself- to another reason: more importantly, reason itself is preserved. **What frightens us the most is when there is no reason for action, when the action itself is beyond reason**, beyond explanation, beyond knowing: for in that way it always remains an enigma to us, **and we have no ability, no hope, of being able to discipline it**, of putting it under us, **of controlling it**. But before we go on thinking the figure of the suicide bomber, **we have to make a momentary diversion, and open another register of thinking, that of what is to be dead; and the question of, what is this very moment of death, the instant of death itself?**