

2011-2012 Foreign Assistance to India Controversy Paper Proposal

Jarrold Atchison, Ph.D.\*

Ken Bailey

Mikaela Malsin

Patrick McCleary

Ian Miller

Richard Min

Tom Pacheco

\*Authors in Alphabetical Order

## Table of Contents

I. Executive Summary.....	3
II. Reasons the Debate Community Should Debate Foreign Assistance to India.....	5
III. Current Foreign Assistance Levels to India.....	8
IV. Potential Affirmatives	
a. Disease/Health.....	10
b. Economic Reform/Infrastructure.....	11
c. Military Assistance.....	13
d. Agriculture Assistance.....	17
e. Energy Assistance.....	18
f. Laundry List.....	20
IV. Potential Negative Ground	
a. Usual Suspects.....	21
b. Critical Literature.....	21
c. Indian Domestic Politics.....	21
d. International Agent Counterplans.....	22
e. China Disads.....	23
f. Pakistan Disads.....	26
V. Potential Resolutions.....	28
VI. Foreign Assistance Definitions .....	31
VII. Republic of India Definition.....	34

## Executive Summary

As of April 4, 2011, there were ten other controversy papers in process for the 2011-2012 debate season. Although this wide array of options is fantastic for the debate community, we understand the pragmatic demands that come with sorting through this high number of quality controversy papers. Towards that end, we have streamlined this controversy paper to make it easier to digest. This executive summary is designed to outline the nuts and bolts of the controversy. The subsequent sections provide more depth and evidence.

**We propose that the 2011-2012 debate resolution examine United States foreign assistance to the Republic of India.**

### Status of the Controversy

Mikaela Malsin's section of the controversy paper demonstrates that the Obama administration has reduced foreign assistance to India. There is a substantial debate in the literature over Obama's overall commitment to India. Some argue that the Bush administration era of strong relations between India and the United States have come to an end as Obama has moved towards a more regional security approach that includes more concessions to Pakistan to help with the war on terror. Others argue that India's incredible economic prosperity has reduced the need for international assistance so the cuts are more pragmatic than symbolic. Either way, this is a controversy area that comes close to preserving negative uniqueness in the way that Dr. Ryan Galloway discussed in last year's controversy discussion. There is little risk that we will see substantial increases in foreign assistance to India in the short term.

### Why Foreign Assistance?

A cursory glance at past topics shows that the debate community has utilized security assistance, development assistance, and foreign assistance in the topic construction process. We

chose foreign assistance because it was the broadest category. It is a legally defined category that is broad but predictable. Given that we are only engaging one nation it was important to us to enable the debate community to engage a full range of options (development, military, and economic assistance). If it was a list topic that included more than one nation then we might have opted to narrow the range of assistance. For instance, the last time that assistance to India was debated (1992-1993) the topic included eight nations and was narrowed to its “development and assistance policies.” The sample solvency advocates section of this controversy paper support using the broader foreign assistance category.

### Is the controversy too big?

We do not think so but we understand that some people may have that reaction. India is one of the most important nations in the world yet it has lots of problems. In our experience, foreign assistance topics from the past highlight that the key questions to determining the size of these types of topics are:

- 1- Are there solvency advocates for increasing foreign assistance programs?
- 2- Are there reasons that the foreign assistance should come from the United States?

We have a section below dedicated to presenting solvency advocates. In our experience, advantages tend to determine whether or not the aid is best suited to come from the United States or other nations.

If, however, the controversy is chosen and the topic committee decides that the area is too broad then it is *possible* for the topic committee to present a slate of resolutions that include some narrower parts of foreign assistance. As we discuss in the proposed topic section, we trust the committee to balance the basic intent of the paper with the broader demands for creating a slate of good topics.

## Reasons the Debate Community Should Debate Foreign Assistance to India

### **1. It is time for a foreign policy topic.**

Since the Middle East + Afghanistan topic, we have debated agriculture, nuclear weapons, and immigration. All three of these topics have had the advantage of basically being domestic topics that have clear foreign policy implications. As a result, we have had good overlap with literature bases and good debates that involve other nations. For instance, India was an important part of the immigration topic. We believe, however, that a more exclusive foreign policy topic invites a different set of arguments and literature bases. India is a great example because last year we ended up debating about a very specific set of people, problems, and issues related to India. For the most part, we focused on high skilled labor circulation with little discussion of the immense social, economic, and political inequalities that India is struggling with today. Foreign policy topics invite different questions which we hope will produce a more sustained debate over the unique status of India today.

### **2. India is an important nation with lots of problems.**

Most of us have seen the staggering statistics related to the rapid economic growth that India has experienced in recent years. Our limited research, however, suggests that the benefits of that economic growth are not nearly as universal as many people may believe. Despite the massive economic upheaval, India is struggling with tons of issues that can be directly addressed through foreign assistance:

- Political and Bureaucratic Corruption – India is ranked as “highly corrupt” by Transparency International; more than 15% of Indians reported firsthand experience with bribes or influence peddling in public office (Transparency International, [http://www.transparency.org/policy\\_research/surveys\\_indices/cpi/2010/results](http://www.transparency.org/policy_research/surveys_indices/cpi/2010/results))
- Significant GHG Emissions – India contributes 5% of global GHG emissions (Center for the Advanced Study of India at the University of Pennsylvania, <http://casi.ssc.upenn.edu/iit/rao>);

India is also the world's fourth largest energy consumer (Congressional Research Service, <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RL33529.pdf>)

- Carrying Capacity Under Stress – India has 2% of the world's surface area and 4% of the world's fresh water, but 17% of its population, which is growing too fast for the resources available (Congressional Research Service, <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RL33529.pdf>)
- Poor Agricultural Practices – 30% of India's gross agricultural output is lost every year due to soil degradation, poor land management and counterproductive irrigation strategies (“Environmental Issues in India,” <http://www.all-about-india.com/Environmental-issues-in-India.html>)
- Social Inequality – Caste-based discrimination is widespread and causes violence; women suffer from lack of civil liberties and ownership rights, and from frequent domestic abuse (Social Institutions & Gender Index, <http://genderindex.org/country/india>)
- Threat of Terrorist Attacks – India is home to both militant Hindu nationalist groups interested in launching attacks inside the country, and an indigenous Islamist terrorist threat from groups such as the Indian Mujahideen (Congressional Research Service, <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RL33529.pdf>)
- Human Trafficking – India is “a source, destination, and transit country for men, women and children subjected to trafficking in person, specifically forced labor and commercial sexual exploitation” (U.S. State Department, <http://www.state.gov/g/tip/rls/tiprpt/2010/142760.htm>)
- Widespread Poverty – India has the world's largest concentration of people living in poverty, with more than 700 million earning less than \$2 per day (USAID, <http://www.usaid.gov/locations/asia/countries/india/>)
- HIV/AIDS – India has the world's third largest population suffering from HIV/AIDS (UNICEF, [http://www.unicef.org/india/hiv\\_aids\\_156.htm](http://www.unicef.org/india/hiv_aids_156.htm))
- Poorly Trained Military – despite fielding an enormous military and increasing its defense budget, the military is trained for conventional interstate wars that are unlikely to occur and lacks counterterrorism training (Congressional Research Service, <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RL33529.pdf>)
- Female Infanticide and Feticide – up to 10 million Indian females are “missing” due to sex-selective abortions and infanticide over the past 20 years; about 500,000 females are “lost” annually (Congressional Research Service, <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RL33529.pdf>)
- Poor Intellectual Property Protection – India is on the U.S. special 301 “Priority Watch List” for 2010 for failing to provide sufficient IPR protection or enforcement; piracy and counterfeiting, including the counterfeiting of pharmaceuticals, is widespread (Congressional Research Service, <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RL33529.pdf>)

**3. Foreign Assistance is timely and controversial.**

Budget slashing and protectionist arguments have once again forced the American people into asking the fundamental question, what, if any, obligation do we have to rest of the world? India represents a great case study for these overarching questions because most Americans presume that it is a country that can pay for its own solutions. What we have learned from our foreign assistance topics of the past, however, is that there are times when experience, expertise, and training can make big difference in helping resolve problems. Some of India's struggles have less to do with the need for money and more to do with struggling to identify long term solutions to the impact of globalization on their people.

## Current Foreign Assistance to India By Mikaela Malsin

During his November 2010 visit to India, President Barack Obama expressed a vision of strengthened U.S.-India ties and of a far-reaching partnership in which the two powers would work together on various global issues. Although Obama has publicly embraced India as a key ally, the relationship between the two countries has thus far seemed qualitatively different under Obama's leadership from its special status during the Bush administration. According to one Indian commentator, "Indo-US relations have lost some of the élan that they had acquired under Bush." In fact, according to prominent analyst Ashley J. Tellis, "For all the structural factors that favor closer ties—and the good intentions of the leadership in Washington and New Delhi to realize them—U.S.-Indian relations today are widely perceived as stagnant." This perception appears on both sides. There are several important factors at play in the deteriorating relationship, but one general theme arises from our current foreign assistance priorities.

Between 1947 and 2010, the U.S. gave more than \$15.7 billion total in direct aid, mainly in the form of economic grants, loans, and food aid. However, in 2007, the State Department announced a 35% reduction such assistance; the cuts mainly came from development assistance and food aid – a consequence of India's rapid economic expansion and rise to donor status. More generally, the decreasing emphasis on India as a nation in need of assistance comes about in response to the state's recent economic growth. As Tellis notes, "The lack of U.S. attention to India... is ironically a function of India's success. Or, to put it another way: For an administration that may be best described as 'Problems 'R Us,' India is not a problem that rises to the level of many of its neighbors." This shift in attitude toward India has been mirrored internationally. In particular, the United Kingdom opted in March of 2011 to freeze its aid to India at its current levels, largely on the basis that India's economic status obviates the need for aid. International

organizations and private donors are also cutting back, citing the “growing middle class” and other markers of economic success as their reasons.

**Table I. Direct U.S. Assistance to India, FY2001-FY2011**  
(in millions of dollars)

Program or Account	FY2001-2004	FY2005	FY2006	FY2007	FY2008	FY2009	FY2010 (est.)	FY2011 (req.)
CSH/GHCS	161.5	53.2	52.8	53.4	66.0	76.0	87.2	100.7
DA	115.0	24.9	19.7	15.7	16.6	11.0	31.3	34.0
ESF	37.4	14.9	5.0	4.9	—	—	—	—
IMET	3.9	1.5	1.3	1.5	1.3	1.4	1.2	1.4
NADR	3.5	4.2	2.7	1.1	1.7	1.7	3.2	5.2
PEPFAR	20.4	26.6	29.6	29.9	29.8	30.5	27.0	<sup>b</sup>
Subtotal	360.6	125.3	111.1	106.5	115.4	120.6	149.9	141.3
Food Aid <sup>a</sup>	81.2	26.1	30.7	31.0	13.5	13.5	4.0	4.0
Total	441.4	151.4	141.8	137.5	128.9	134.1	153.9	145.3

**Sources:** U.S. Departments of State and Agriculture; U.S. Agency for International Development. FY2010 figures are estimates; FY2011 amounts are requested. Columns may not add up due to rounding.

**Abbreviations:**

CSH: Child Survival and Health (Global Health and Child Survival, or GHCS, from FY2010)

DA: Development Assistance

ESF: Economic Support Fund

IMET: International Military Education and Training

NADR: Nonproliferation, Anti-Terrorism, Demining, and Related (mainly export control assistance, but includes anti-terrorism assistance for FY2007)

PEPFAR: President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief

a. P.L. 480 Title II (grants), Section 416(b) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended (surplus donations), and Food for Progress. Food aid totals do not include freight costs.

b. Country sub-allocations for PEPFAR are released late in the fiscal year.

Source: Congressional Research Service, “India-U.S. Relations,” October 27, 2010, p. 59.  
<http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RL33529.pdf>.

A topic requiring the affirmative to substantially increase foreign assistance to India would force the affirmative to defend a reversal of the current trend towards reducing assistance to India. Unlike the immigration and nuclear weapons topics which risked legislative change in the direction of the resolution, this topic does not appear to have much risk of sacrificing negative uniqueness.

**Potential Affirmative Areas Based on Solvency Advocates**  
**By Ken Bailey, Ian Miller, and Richard Min**

*Disease/Health Affirmatives*

**Increasing foreign assistance for HIV/AIDS treatment causes increased domestic support for India's efforts, send a signal of strength, and encourage less reliance on foreign assistance**

**Mitra 04**

[Primit Mitra, "India at the Crossroads: Battling the HIV/AIDS Pandemic", The Washington Quarterly, Autumn 2004, [http://www.twq.com/04autumn/docs/04autumn\\_mitra.pdf](http://www.twq.com/04autumn/docs/04autumn_mitra.pdf)]

Foreign assistance can also play an important role. In June 2004, the U.S. government selected Vietnam to receive funds as the 15th "focus country" under Bush's emergency plan—the only non-African or non-Caribbean country thus far. PEPFAR currently directs funding to 12 African nations— Botswana, Ethiopia, Côte d'Ivoire, Kenya, Mozambique, Namibia, Nigeria, Rwanda, South Africa, Tanzania, Uganda, and Zambia—as well as Haiti and Guyana in the Caribbean to combat HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria through bilateral programs. Choosing India as a focus country or at least increasing support for its HIV/AIDS program would reinforce India's efforts, signal that it was on the right track, and encourage Indians to take on more of the financial burden. In addition, professional relationships among Indian and U.S. scientists, NGOs, and government officials should be strengthened so that India can benefit from the scientific expertise and experience of U.S. NGOs.

**In addition to advantages accrued from preventing the actual disease, Affirmatives in these areas are likely to find advantages intrinsic to the leadership role the U.S. would take utilizing its foreign assistance. Many scholars see India as a key litmus test for governmental effectiveness in prevention and health treatment:**

**Sridhar 10**

[Devi Sridhar, Director of the Global Health Governance Project, "THE BIG QUESTION: Solving the Health Crises", World Policy Institute, 7-21-2010]

A preventable disease like malaria, eradicated in high-income countries, still causes one million deaths in developing nations. As India adds more millionaires to the world than any other nation, 40 percent of its children are undernourished. There are fundamental inequalities in global health. Ultimately it is up to governments to ensure a healthy population: safe water and sanitation, adequate food, education and health care services, and a conflict-free environment. Within governments, ministries of health are tasked with illness prevention and treatment; but often the most important determinants of overall health lie outside their purview. In Kenya, for instance, preventing malnutrition requires coordination and cooperation from the ministries of agriculture, water and irrigation, cooperative development, and finance. Since each individual ministry isn't primarily concerned with malnutrition, they have little incentive to allocate their limited financial and human resources for this goal. The public health and sanitation ministry is then left scrambling to treat the diseases their administrative cohorts could have stopped.

**In turn, this allows actions like Affirmatives under this topic area to exert global health leadership, providing new internal links to potential advantages. An example of such a card is given below.**

**Meier 10**

[Benjamin Mason Meier, Assistant Professor of Global Health Policy at the University of North Carolina, "THE BIG QUESTION: Solving the Health Crises", World Policy Institute, 7-21-2010]

While the WHO once coordinated initiatives to develop national health systems, the decline of its authority has shifted global policy from overarching goals to detailed medical care. The United States has stepped into this leadership vacuum, employing bilateral foreign assistance for disease prevention and health promotion in the most disadvantaged regions of the world. By moving beyond supplying individual medicines for select high-profile diseases—as was the case with the previous administration's ambitious HIV treatment agenda—the Obama administration's Global Health Initiative seeks to resurrect and sustain national health systems. The program has clear targets and principles to enable individual countries to meet their own national health needs. It presents an opportunity to break free from the limitations of medical intervention by developing the health system from

within. American leadership is necessary to meet foreign challenges, to secure human rights and to guide international efforts for the public's health. As the United States develops its first comprehensive strategy on health and foreign policy, this unprecedented support for stronger national health systems can answer the world's call for better global health governance.

### *Infrastructure Assistance*

#### **Increasing foreign assistance towards infrastructure, educational, agriculture, or energy sectors of India's economy is key to gaining influence to direct budgetary concerns and India's economic decisions**

##### **Mulford 07**

[David C. Mulford, Ambassador in the U.S. Embassy in India, "Fiscal Year 2007 Performance Report", United States Department of State, 11-16-2007]

As I have mentioned before, I am extremely concerned about the steep foreign assistance budget cuts for India. The FY 2008 CBJ level of \$81 million and the FY 2009 OMB request of \$84 million reflect significant cuts from our FY 2007 level of \$103 million. Worse still is the disproportion of the cuts, which effectively eliminates resources for critical programs to improve agriculture, education, energy security, and human rights. While India continues to benefit from high economic growth rates, one-third of the world's poor live in India and India is actively interested in demonstration projects that show the way forward than ever before. This is not the time to cut off programs; it is imperative that we stay engaged in all the above areas and not just ongoing health interventions. This is important for both strategic and humanitarian reasons. As you know, India is an important strategic ally that is critical to long-term regional stability and prosperity. As the largest democracy in the world with one of the largest markets, it is an anchor of support for the war on terrorism and rebuilding Afghanistan. Without addressing the needs and rising expectations of the 700 million Indians living on less than two dollars a day, however, prospects for India's own future stability could be threatened. India needs to continue growing and adopting new ideas to solve its huge infrastructure, educational, agricultural and energy challenges. At present India lacks the legitimacy to fully influence its neighbors as a regional power in promoting U.S. strategic interests. While the country boasts of high economic growth rates, in reality two-thirds of the Indian population is left out of the benefits of this growth. This is creating strong political divisions that can increasingly hurt U.S. strategic interests. Most recently, we are seeing this in the stalled civil nuclear negotiations. Those not benefiting from India's growth are ripe for recruitment into destabilizing anti-social movements. Already large tracts of Indian territory are effectively outside government control, dominated by a rapidly growing Maoist insurgency that claimed over 700 lives last year. India's Muslim population – the second largest in the world – is also not benefiting from India's growth. Indian Muslims are disproportionately likely to be unemployed, illiterate and poor. It is in the U.S. national interest to support India's efforts to emerge as a major democratic power and help it to maintain its fragile political and social cohesiveness. To do this, we need to remain engaged in India's efforts to broaden its economic growth so that all Indians can participate and benefit. USAID needs to stay engaged in India beyond the health sector not only for strategic reasons, but for humanitarian concerns as well. Based on World Bank figures, India has more poor people than Africa, Latin America, the Middle East, Central Asia and Europe combined. Close to half of all children are malnourished and 70% are anemic. Less than one-third of all Indians have completed the tenth grade. Not one city in India has fully reliable water or electricity service. India is the fifth largest (and the second fastest growing) emitter of greenhouse gas emissions. Forty percent of married women suffer from spousal violence. Clearly there is no way that the Millennium Development Goals can be met globally without India making significant progress in addressing these daunting challenges. Our assistance has been making a difference in all of these areas with limited resources. Our programs have successfully demonstrated that seed funding and technical know-how can be used to tremendous effect in a number of critical sectors. Innovative models are taken to scale by the Indian government, using their own resources, to have a broad, sustainable impact that goes far beyond the USG's initial financial contribution. This leveraging, which multiplies by four every dollar invested by the USG, gives us a seat at a number of policy tables to help India direct its growing budgetary resources to high impact interventions that create jobs, expand services and strengthen governance.

**The potential Affirmatives under this area have the potential for several evolutions. One potential evolution would be to simply choose one the areas listed from Mulford (infrastructure, education, agriculture, or energy) and craft various Affs based around one of those areas. For example, Affs that choose to improve food based foreign assistance would have a strong basis, for, as indicated by Mellor, this seems to be a major problem with foreign assistance to India currently (and indeed most low-income countries):**

**Mellor 09**

[John W. Mellor, former Director-General of the International Food Policy Research Institute, “U.S. Foreign Assistance Reform: Food Security and Poverty Reduction”, Bread for the World Institute, Briefing Paper, 2009]

U.S. foreign aid in general, and USAID programs in particular, have lost focus in four key areas: 1. A shift away from projects and programs aimed at national impact to small, self-contained projects that are much less ambitious in scope. 2. A shift away from efforts to build national institutions, particularly the public institutions that are essential to self-sustaining progress towards a country’s development objectives. 3. An underestimation of the role of technical expertise in development efforts today. 4. The de-emphasis of broad-based economic growth in favor of social sector interventions—including the virtual elimination of support for agriculture. For low-income countries, the key to achieving any other development objective is long-term, self-sustaining growth that includes rapid reductions in food insecurity and poverty. This paper focuses on assistance to these countries. The importance of agriculture stems from the reality that, in low-income countries, anywhere from 60 to 90 percent of the population lives in rural areas and is dependent on agriculture—directly or indirectly—for nearly all income.

**In addition to the obvious advantages from poverty reduction and famine alleviation, other advantage areas also exist. For example, the economic instability that is resulting from India’s poverty gap has many scholars concerned with the country’s internal stability, as the following piece of evidence indicates.**

**Qu 10**

[Xiong Qu, Editor, CCTV, <http://english.cntv.cn/program/bizasia/20100702/101398.shtml>, July 7, 2010]

India is also facing a widening income gap. Economists say the only way to tackle the mammoth problem, is with inclusive development. That’s been on the government’s agenda for 5 years, but without result. For our special series on income, our India correspondent Shweta Bajaj brings us this report. For a nation to be large in size brings strengths but also it has its share of weaknesses. India is not different. Far flung areas, large population and difficult terrain makes matters even more complex. India is one national bearing the brunt of all this. Scattered development and industrialization means income gaps that are not only massive but also widening. That’s India’s reality. Despite its two third of population living below poverty line, the nation is expanding rapidly. This only indicates the opportunity being missed. Unlike other nations, more than 70 percent of India’s growth comes from domestic consumer spending. And that means tapping potential of by bridging income gaps is essential for the nation. Even more so now. Though India’s economic growth created wealth for many in Indian cities, it’s given rise to a new consumer class, waiting to spend their salaries in swanky malls. But this has only created inequality which has led to resentment. Naxal attacks and unrest is a common sight today in under developed parts of India. And this internal security situation has only made matters worse.

*Military Assistance*

**We open this section with a piece of evidence describing the importance of military assistance to the overall U.S.-India relationship:**

**Bishoyi 11**

[Saroj Bishoyi, “Defence Diplomacy in US-India Strategic Relationship”, Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses, January 13, 2011, [http://www.idsa.in/system/files/jds\\_5\\_1\\_sbishoyi.pdf](http://www.idsa.in/system/files/jds_5_1_sbishoyi.pdf)]

Defence diplomacy plays vital role in achieving specific foreign and security policy objectives of nations. It helps build trust and confidence between nations and also facilitates cooperation at political and economic level. This is evident from the growing US-India strategic relationship. Since the end of the Cold War and the collapse of the Soviet Union, the US-India relations have improved considerably. Defence diplomacy has helped significantly in building trust and confidence between the two nations. After the end of the Cold War, while the US decided to maintain “cooperative engagement” with militaries of the friendly countries. India also need of the emerging international security environment which demanded close cooperation with the United States, especially, in the area of defence and security. India had begun to rethink its foreign policy priorities, which in a way facilitated a modest level of cooperation with the United States. Moreover, lessening of differences on many global as well as bilateral issues prompted the military in both the countries to utilise the opportunity to develop closer relations. 1 India has also moved away from its traditional emphasis on the “power of the argument” towards the “argument of power”.

*Area 1 Dual-Use Technology Transfers*

**Concerns regarding dual-use technology transfers have been at the forefront of issues relating foreign assistance to India ever since the civilian nuclear deal was completed. However, despite the progress made by the deal and other technology transfers, it remains a key issue, and stumbling blocks remain for Affs to resolve. A card summarizing this position is provided below.**

**Bishoyi 11**

[Saroj Bishoyi, “Defence Diplomacy in US-India Strategic Relationship”, Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses, January 13, 2011, [http://www.idsa.in/system/files/jds\\_5\\_1\\_sbishoyi.pdf](http://www.idsa.in/system/files/jds_5_1_sbishoyi.pdf)]

India regards technology transfer as the “acid test” of US commitment and a “touchstone” for forging a long and stable US-India strategic relationship. India has been looking for advanced technologies for its defence modernisation and especially for its domestic economic development purposes. However, the US-India cooperation in the area of dual-use technology has over time stumbled over various issues including leakage of technology transfer or over the issue of maintaining exclusive control over the area where dual-use technology was to be used. This was because of US export control policies and its support to various international regimes of technology controls, i.e. Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG)

*Area 2 Joint Research and Development*

**Another potential area under military assistance is joint research and development. To distinguish this area from “Dual-Use”, the types of assistance provided under this area would be in the cooperative development of new technology and weapons, rather than the passive “buyer/seller” approach that exists under technology transfers.**

**Bishoyi 11**

[Saroj Bishoyi, “Defence Diplomacy in US-India Strategic Relationship”, Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses, January 13, 2011, [http://www.idsa.in/system/files/jds\\_5\\_1\\_sbishoyi.pdf](http://www.idsa.in/system/files/jds_5_1_sbishoyi.pdf)]

In the field of research and development, the dual use technology issue always remained the “litmus test” by which healthy relations could be measured. So the recent removal of Indian organisations like ISRO and DRDO from US Entity Lists will facilitate possible cooperation between the two countries in this sector. India expects that the US defence industry will be able to transfer some latest technologies and help it establish the muchneeded military-industrial complex. It wants to move away from a buyer-seller relationship towards transfer of technology and joint development, joint production and joint marketing of latest weapons and technology. India is seeking to build its own indigenous defence industry, and is looking for the best technologies to use in its defence sector. The recent reform in India’s defence research, development, planning, procurements, defence finance and foreign direct investments (FDI) and off-setting is a clear indicator of what Indian defence policy makers want in the field of defence modernisation and industrialisation. Reports indicate that 15 per cent of Indian military equipment is state-of-the-art, 35 per cent mature, and 50 per cent obsolete. India currently procures approximately 70 per cent of its equipment from abroad, but aims to reverse this balance to manufacture 70 per cent or more of its defence equipment at home. 23 Defence minister, A.K. Antony while releasing India’s first Defence Production Policy (DPP) in New Delhi in January 2011 said that “the policy aims to achieve maximum synergy among the armed forces, DPSUs, OFBs, Indian industry and research and development institutions.” 24 This is a major opportunity to build an industrial infrastructure that will be able to quantitatively, technologically, and qualitatively support the requirements of India’s armed forces in terms of weapons systems, platforms, upgradation and overhaul. It is also a great opportunity for long term defence cooperation and strategic partnership between the U.S. and Indian research, development, and manufacturing establishments.

*Area 3 Joint-Military Exercises*

**The advantage ground here would be new and diverse from previous military related advantages. For example, rather than Affs simply defending generic internal links to hege, good evidence exists in the literature base for the very specific operations and tactics learned from joint U.S.-India exercises being key to U.S. military strategy. In addition, it benefits Indian military tremendously, and provides it a means of deterrent in the region. A piece of evidence summarizing this position is provided below.**

**Bishoyi 11**

[Saroj Bishoyi, “Defence Diplomacy in US-India Strategic Relationship”, Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses, January 13, 2011, [http://www.idsa.in/system/files/jds\\_5\\_1\\_sbishoyi.pdf](http://www.idsa.in/system/files/jds_5_1_sbishoyi.pdf)]

The US-India military exchanges have reached an all time high considering the number of joint military exercises held in recent times. While the US and Indian armies planned to undertake nine joint exercises in India in 2010, the air forces and the navies of both the nations are also planning similar programmes for the year 2010-11. 25 India conducts the maximum number of joint military exercises with the US, and their growing strategic partnership is taking these operations to highly advanced level. In the last decade, India and the US have held over 60 exercises. While India is keen to gain the practical experience of learning through military war games, the US is also interested in learning from the Indian expertise in various fields as improvised explosive devices (IED) detection, counter-insurgency and mountain and jungle warfare skills.

*Area 4 Counterterrorism*

**Given the proximity of India to several counterterrorism hotspots and operations, any military assistance section of the topic could find a case for including it in the debates. Most foreign assistance efforts to India's military have included at least some counterterrorism initiative or operation, opening up debates as to how current initiatives could be improved or what new ones could be taken. A piece of evidence summarizing this position is provided below.**

**Bishoyi 11**

[Saroj Bishoyi, "Defence Diplomacy in US-India Strategic Relationship", Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses, January 13, 2011, [http://www.idsa.in/system/files/jds\\_5\\_1\\_sbishoyi.pdf](http://www.idsa.in/system/files/jds_5_1_sbishoyi.pdf)]

Another crucial area of cooperation between the two countries includes enhanced military cooperation on counterterrorism. The United States and India have institutionalised their co-operation to combat international terrorism through a joint working Group (JWG) on counter terrorism. The first meeting of the JWG was held on February 7-8, 2000 in Washington, where the two sides unequivocally condemned all acts, methods, and practices of terrorism as criminal and unjustifiable, whatever political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious, or any other reasons that may be invoked to justify them. Inter-agency teams from the two countries agreed on a range of measures to enhance cooperation between the two countries to combat international terrorism. The two sides also agreed The exercise is designed to promote cooperation between the two militaries to promote interoperability through the combined military decision-making process, through battle tracking and manoeuvring forces, and exchange of tactics, techniques and procedures. This joint working group is also a part of the wide ranging architecture of institutional dialogue established by the two sides during the visit of President Bill Clinton to India in March 2000. While much of the groundwork for strengthening institutional cooperation in counterterrorism had already been done before the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks in the United States, these strikes led to two important new initiatives. The first was the establishment of the US-India cyber security forum, which held its first meeting in New Delhi in April 2002, and the second in Washington, D.C. in November 2004. Whereas the JWG consists exclusively of governmental experts in various aspects of counterterrorism with no involvement of non-governmental experts, the cyber security forum brings together both government and industry representatives from each country to identify areas for collaboration such as combating cyber-crime, cyber security research and development, information incident management and response.

*Area 5 Military Education and Training*

**Finally, perhaps the largest example of U.S. foreign military assistance, there exists Affs that could alter or increase military education initiatives with India. Again, a wording of the resolution that aims to include or exclude specific areas would have to be carefully worded, as this area overlaps with joint military exercises to some extent. A piece of evidence providing potential Affs is given below.**

**Bishoyi 11**

[Saroj Bishoyi, "Defence Diplomacy in US-India Strategic Relationship", Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses, January 13, 2011, [http://www.idsa.in/system/files/jds\\_5\\_1\\_sbishoyi.pdf](http://www.idsa.in/system/files/jds_5_1_sbishoyi.pdf)]

A key element of the US engagement process through defence diplomacy is the enlarged International Military Education and Training (IMET) programme. The IMET programme is an instrument of US national security and foreign policy and a key component of US security assistance that provides training on a grant basis to students from allied and friendly nations. The United States IMET assistance to India has gone up from \$0.5 million in 2001 to \$1.364 million in 2009. Below is the account levels for IMET for fiscal years 2006-2011, including 2006-2009 (actual - funding actually provided in fiscal years 2006-2009, including supplemental funding), 2010 (estimate funding allocations for the 2010 fiscal year) and 2011 (requested-funding requested under the president's fiscal year 2011 budget)

*Area 6 Maritime Cooperation***The US should expand maritime cooperation**

**Mohan '10** (Maritime cooperation U.S.-India Initiative Series India, the United States and the Global Commons By C. Raja Mohan October 2010)

Although India and the United States already enjoy significant maritime cooperation, framing the issues in terms of the Asian and global maritime commons would provide a new basis for deepening cooperation. As vulnerable maritime commons in the Asian littoral come under threat from China's expansive territorial claims and exclusionary interpretations of its exclusive economic zones (EEZs), the need for greater Indo-U.S. naval and maritime cooperation in the Indian Ocean and Western Pacific has grown urgent. Strengthening India's naval capabilities in the South China Sea and the Persian Gulf is also in the interest of the United States. Although the range of weapons systems that Delhi has begun to acquire from Washington has expanded in recent years, the two sides still need to focus on boosting India's maritime power projection capabilities as part of a new framework for Indo-U.S. burden-sharing in the Asian and global maritime commons. Washington should consider transferring special platforms such as carriers and nuclear-powered submarines, or at least the skills associated with their use, to India. It should also consider assisting India in the development of expeditionary forces and their rapid deployment. Beyond naval military cooperation, U.S. political and diplomatic support will help reinforce India's own fledgling naval diplomacy in the Western Indian Ocean, the Persian Gulf, South China Sea and the South Pacific. For their part, Delhi's political classes and the foreign policy establishment should join the Indian Navy in articulating India's political commitment to keeping open the Asian maritime commons. They should also support multilateral endeavors such as the Proliferation Security Initiative, define the principles for participation in coalition operations, remove obstacles to stronger security cooperation with the United States, come out explicitly in favor of freedom of navigation and modify their positions on expanding territorial sovereignty over the oceans.

**Expanding maritime cooperation with India is important to regional security and SLOCs**

**Mohan '10** (Maritime cooperation U.S.-India Initiative Series India, the United States and the Global Commons By C. Raja Mohan October 2010)

Geography places India astride commercial routes and energy lifelines passing from the Indian Ocean to Southeast Asia. In military terms, the Indian Navy (IN) is one of the largest maritime forces in the region. India has played a crucial role in increasing maritime bonding by initiating numerous confidence building measures (CBMs). It conducts regular naval exercises with IOR and Southeast Asian navies, and in 2004 held its second joint exercise with the Chinese People's Liberation Army Navy (PLAN). 21 The exercise provided an opportunity for the two Asian giants not only to assess one another, but also to extend a hand of rapprochement in the face of existing circumstances that cause the Chinese to feel encircled by the United States. It also enabled the Chinese to become more appreciative of Indian sensitivities regarding Chinese attempts to gain a foothold in the Indian Ocean, a move that had made many of the littorals wary and apprehensive. In addition, the IN has made flag-showing visits to important ports in the IOR an annual feature. Naval training establishments in India under the Southern Naval Command at Kochi regularly accept naval personnel from Southeast Asian and IOR countries for training, a feature that must continue if Indians are to build stronger and more influential relationships with friendly navies around the region. In addition to the surveillance of its vast maritime zones, the Indian Navy, in association with its Coast Guard, is specifically involved in surveillance of the Palk Straits, the Gulf of Mannar, the coasts of Maharashtra and Gujarat, and other island territories. Its goal is to curb the influx of refugees and Tamil terrorists, and to prevent poaching, gun running, etc. India has been spearheading a multilateral naval exercise, designated MILAN, since the mid 1990s. MILAN involves a series of exercises, includes participation from the Bay of Bengal rim states, and is conducted every year off the Andaman and Nicobar Islands. The MILAN series was institutionalized with the objective of achieving interoperability with ASEAN navies, allaying fears about the Indian Navy's growing influence in the Andaman Sea, and promoting goodwill between India and ASEAN countries. MILAN 2003, held in February, further highlighted India's commitment to this end. The exercise now includes navies from Myanmar (Burma), Singapore, Indonesia, Vietnam, Thailand, Malaysia and Australia. 22 In addition, bilateral and multilateral exercises involving search-and-rescue drills, exchanges of information, anti-submarine warfare, advanced mine countermeasures and antiterror tactics have been held between regional navies from time to time. Bilateral goodwill visits with ASEAN countries, China, Japan and the United States are a regular feature and include extensive cooperation on the training of personnel, hydrography, etc. Singapore is prepared to share intelligence with India as part of a comprehensive anti-terrorism agreement. 23 Unfortunately no such institutionalized set-up exists for the IOR navies, although there is extensive sharing of operational expertise and intelligence regarding transnational crime (except piracy, which is covered by the pirate reporting centres). The silver lining to the above has been in the MALBAR series of exercises that the U.S. Navy and the IN have revived. The exercise, held in December 2002, involved ships from Sri Lanka, the Maldives and Mauritius as well. The latest and sixth exercise in the series was held in 2003. 24 It is obvious from the above that smaller regional navies have a lot to gain from interaction with the Indian Navy, based on its experience in dealing with transnational crime and terrorism. In fact, joint efforts by the Indian Navy, and other capable IOR and Southeast Asian navies, could lead to SLOC patrols to help ensure the free flow of traffic through SLOCs and choke points. Malaysia and Indonesia, however, vehemently opposed recent Indian offers to provide SLOC protection in the Malacca region in partnership with the U.S. Navy - regarding the entire prospect as an affront to their sovereignty. Other smaller nations also viewed the issue with milder apprehension. This episode has revealed an important lesson for participant states: while the success of any transnational security enforcement agency will require multilateral cooperation, working out the modalities of such cooperation may prove difficult due to acute national sensitivities toward the preservation of state sovereignty. The United States maintains a considerable and continuous naval presence in the politically volatile Gulf region, mainly for its strategic interest in seeing that energy lifelines are not unduly threatened. It may be prudent to include the powerful U.S. Navy in any arrangement that seeks to ensure maritime order in the region. This would not only lower the vulnerability threshold of the SLOCs and the choke points, but also ensure that they remain stable and free from threat of closure.

*Agriculture Assistance***US assistance solves Indian agriculture**

Mellor '9 (John W., former Director-General of the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI), Chief Economist at USAID and Professor, Cornell University, November, "U.S. Foreign Assistance Reform: Food Security and Poverty Reduction", [www.bread.org/institute/papers/briefing-paper-8.pdf](http://www.bread.org/institute/papers/briefing-paper-8.pdf))

A highly productive partnership between USAID, and the Rockefeller and Ford Foundations during the 1950s and 60s gave India a premier agricultural educational and research system. USAID allocated large sums to develop agricultural universities. These universities then provided the staff for the rapidly growing public institutions with which Rockefeller collaborated—collaboration which resulted in high-yielding corn, wheat and sorghum varieties. Significantly, the Foundation never hired Indian researchers on its staff. Instead, it worked with them in their national institutions, offering incentives in the form of scholarships and field allowances. The result was a national research and educational capacity that continued after the foreign aid left. Ford Foundation did similar work developing the extension system, using USAID-financed personnel at the agricultural universities. Rockefeller research results went out through those extension systems.

**Indian hi-yield agriculture is great**

**Paarlberg '10** (Robert, is B.F. Johnson professor of political science at Wellesley College, an associate at Harvard University's Weatherhead Center for International Affairs, and author of *Food Politics: What Everyone Needs to Know*, JUNE, "Attention Whole Foods Shoppers",

[http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2010/04/26/attention\\_whole\\_foods\\_shoppers?page=0,3&hidecomments=yes](http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2010/04/26/attention_whole_foods_shoppers?page=0,3&hidecomments=yes))

In Europe and the United States, a new line of thinking has emerged in elite circles that opposes bringing improved seeds and fertilizers to traditional farmers and opposes linking those farmers more closely to international markets. Influential food writers, advocates, and celebrity restaurant owners are repeating the mantra that "sustainable food" in the future must be organic, local, and slow. But guess what: Rural Africa already has such a system, and it doesn't work. Few smallholder farmers in Africa use any synthetic chemicals, so their food is de facto organic. High transportation costs force them to purchase and sell almost all of their food locally. And food preparation is painfully slow. The result is nothing to celebrate: average income levels of only \$1 a day and a one-in-three chance of being malnourished. If we are going to get serious about solving global hunger, we need to de-romanticize our view of preindustrial food and farming. And that means learning to appreciate the modern, science-intensive, and highly capitalized agricultural system we've developed in the West. Without it, our food would be more expensive and less safe. In other words, a lot like the hunger-plagued rest of the world. Thirty years ago, had someone asserted in a prominent journal or newspaper that the Green Revolution was a failure, he or she would have been quickly dismissed. Today the charge is surprisingly common. Celebrity author and eco-activist Vandana Shiva claims the Green Revolution has brought nothing to India except "indebted and discontented farmers." A 2002 meeting in Rome of 500 prominent international NGOs, including Friends of the Earth and Greenpeace, even blamed the Green Revolution for the rise in world hunger. Let's set the record straight. The development and introduction of high-yielding wheat and rice seeds into poor countries, led by American scientist Norman Borlaug and others in the 1960s and 70s, paid huge dividends. In Asia these new seeds lifted tens of millions of small farmers out of desperate poverty and finally ended the threat of periodic famine. India, for instance, doubled its wheat production between 1964 and 1970 and was able to terminate all dependence on international food aid by 1975. As for indebted and discontented farmers, India's rural poverty rate fell from 60 percent to just 27 percent today. Dismissing these great achievements as a "myth" (the official view of Food First, a California-based organization that campaigns globally against agricultural modernization) is just silly.

*Energy Assistance***Expanding solar energy assistance is crucial to solar energy commercialization and market leadership**

**Reddy '11** (The Greening of U.S.-Indian Relations: Authors Jacob Scherr Anjali Jaiswal Shravya Reddy NRDC Issue Paper I January 2011)

India is endowed with a vast potential for solar power generation, receiving nearly 5,000 kWh of solar radiation annually (4-7 kWh per square meter per day).<sup>7</sup> The Indian government has announced plans to add 20 Gigawatts (GW) of installed capacity by the year 2022, making India the single most attractive market for long-term investment in solar technologies.<sup>8</sup> The United States is also growing rapidly as a market for solar power, slated to overtake Germany as the largest solar market in the world, and could grow eightfold to \$8 billion by 2015.<sup>9</sup> Both countries' economies can mutually benefit from cooperation in solar technology research, development, and

commercialization. The U.S.-India solar energy MOU (Appendix D) has been signed by the Solar Energy Centre, operating under MNRE, and the National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL), operating under DOE. The main joint activity is solar mapping for India, which has recently been completed.<sup>10</sup> The data availability for this mapping has been a challenge. Even though the solar mapping produced is insufficient for developers to make specific solar siting decisions, it is adequate to identify certain areas as priority areas and establish a ground monitoring station. The station enables data collection to determine solar siting. The solar energy MOU also includes building a pilot concentrated solar power (CSP) plant, identifying optimal sites for large-scale solar, and creating solar project design and finance tools for the private sector. For solar project design and finance, DOE is working with MNRE and industry associations like CII to create specialized software for solar site development and holding workshops to teach developers how to use software tools to "prospect" for potential solar development sites. Each side is responsible for funding its own activities and has already earmarked and released its own operating expenses. Both U.S. and Indian officials are pleased with current progress under the solar energy MOU. As part of the solar energy MOU, DOE and the national laboratories (including Lawrence Berkeley and Brookhaven) are also engaged in a number of cooperative solar activities with India. These include the following: 1) exchanging best practices and technical assistance between the Solar America Cities program and India's Solar Cities program; 2) creating and holding workshops for Indian financial institutions to increase their comfort level with solar technologies, providing training on financial due diligence for solar projects, providing the financial institutions with the fundamentals needed to assess viability of project proposals, and potentially building industry capacity by creating an Indian equivalent of the U.S. Renewable Energy Finance Forum; 3) increasing R&D cooperation through a consortia model, where the United States will fund a consortia of U.S. industry, labs, and universities, and India will fund a similar consortia from its side; and 4) providing technical assistance to an appropriate Indian entity to establish and maintain a database of policies and incentives for renewable energy and energy efficiency, similar to the Database of State Incentives for Renewable Energy (DSIRE) model in the United States, and partnering with the Solar Energy Center (SEC) in India to test for failure mechanisms and degradation rates of photovoltaic modules recovered from storage in SEC's outdoor testing facility.<sup>11, 12</sup>

Key Highlights for Solar Energy Collaboration: Issues of scale Given the initial stage of activities under the solar energy MOU, India is interested in even more ambitious collaborative projects. However, an impediment to larger-scale collaboration is the relatively low level of technical assistance funds allocated to U.S. agencies to work with India. Specifically, because NREL has to spend its own money to participate in the MOU and does not receive additional Federal funding for this purpose, it has minimal incentive to undertake large-scale activities. Indian officials suggested that it would be much more productive for the Indian government to simply spend a larger amount of its own funds and hire NREL as consultants, as that would empower the Indian side to frame the scope and scale of the collaboration according to their own level of need and interest, beyond the constraints of the MOU.

**Biofuels assistance is critical to solve global warming and gain market leadership**

**Reddy '11** (The Greening of U.S.-Indian Relations: Authors Jacob Scherr Anjali Jaiswal Shravya Reddy NRDC Issue Paper I January 2011)

MOU for Cooperation in the Development of Biofuels India and the United States have high potential for biofuels research and development. In India, technological breakthroughs with biofuels could help provide energy to non-grid-connected areas and also reduce the reliance on conventional fuels in its ever-expanding automobile sector.<sup>17</sup> In the United States, the world's second-largest automobile market and the world's highest per-capita consumer of energy, a shift towards economically and environmentally viable biofuels could fundamentally alter its greenhouse gas emissions profile. Biofuels are increasingly being viewed by scientists in both countries as a promising pathway to mitigate climate change, and collaborative research and development in this field could help both countries lead the global market in the ongoing low-carbon energy race.

**United States assists India with Climate Change**

VOA News 9

(Voice of America, "US, India Hope for Cooperation on Global Trade, Climate Change", Sept 19, 2009, <http://www.voanews.com/english/news/a-13-2009-09-19-voa28-68794072.html>)

"Whereas even a few years ago, when such cooperation was almost unimaginable, today the United States and India have an increasingly positive dialogue on nuclear non-proliferation, climate change and global trade," said Assistant Secretary of State Robert Blake. Climate change and global trade are two issues on which India and the United States have had serious differences in the past. Last month India called trade ministers to a meeting in New Delhi about the stalled global trade dialogue, and they agreed that an agreement must be complete by 2010. India's ambassador to Washington, Meera Shankar, says India had a genuine concern. "There are important concerns which the Indian companies have about the growing protectionist trends within the U.S. and the use of non-tariff barriers, including various standards to keep out goods from the developing countries," she said. "So I think this is a two-way process. India is also trying to work with the U.S. on how to deal with proposed limits on "greenhouse gas" emissions, one of the major barriers to a new world climate-change treaty coming up at international talks in Copenhagen this December. The U.S. wants India and others to agree to strict limits on carbon-dioxide emissions, but India refuses to accept terms that would endanger its rapid economic growth. India has to grow its energy basket [supply] anywhere between five to seven times in the next 20 years," she added. "In such a scenario an absolute reduction in emissions may become very challenging, and perhaps almost impossible." U.S. diplomat Blake says the goal is not to limit India's growth, but to help it develop. The U.S., he says, wants to work with India on clean energy technology and help make it a world leader in sustainable development. Through USAID assistance, clean coal technology projects and practices in Indian coal-fired power plants have reduced carbon emissions by over 90 million tons over the past eight years," he added. Because of progress like this, Blake says he is hopeful that the strategic partnership between India and the United States will remove barriers to global accords on trade and climate change.

*Laundry List*

**USAID '9** (“U.S. FOREIGN ASSISTANCE PERFORMANCE PUBLICATION Fiscal Year 2009”, [http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf\\_docs/PDACR050.pdf](http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PDACR050.pdf))

The United States-India relationship is undergoing rapid transformation with a profound, positive impact on the security, stability, and prosperity of the world in the 21st century. Both countries are undertaking an ambitious and multi-faceted strategic partnership, forged by common interests and guided by shared values. In FY 2009, the U.S. foreign assistance program made significant achievements toward achieving sustainable growth and reducing poverty in India.

In health, the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) technical assistance supported the Government of India (GOI)'s commitment to reach the Millennium Development Goals by improving policies, implementing program approaches, and allocating resources that boost maternal, newborn, and child health and the nutritional status of its population. In FY 2009, all targets for tuberculosis (TB) were achieved, making a significant contribution to the GOI's success in reaching global TB targets. More than 7.3 million children received Vitamin A doses, 4.6 million were treated for diarrhea, and 17.8 million given DPT3 immunizations (a vaccine for diphtheria, pertussis, and tetanus). Reproductive health activities influenced GOI public policy and budget decisions, and leveraged \$7.5 million in public-private sector resources. As a result of USAID's efforts, 48 new health policies and guidelines have been created, and high quality health services are more accessible.

In FY 2009, the education program partnered with private sector entities and Indian state governments to scale up successful education modules, benefiting 36.5 million children and 731,076 teachers and administrators in 11 states. More than 85,000 students received a formal education through USAID-funded minority education programs. The United States Government's flagship technology program reported 19 percent learning gains among students impacted by project interventions. From an employability-training program for disadvantaged youth, 76 percent of graduates (35,671 total) were placed in jobs that paid higher-than-average salaries for that position.

USAID programs helped 304,730 people access running water and 22,405 people increase their access to improved sanitation facilities. The program increased source revenue by more than \$622.4 million cumulatively in 11 municipalities, and assisted nine municipalities to invest more than \$93.8 million in critical water and sanitation projects, a 54 percent increase over 2008 levels. Programs benefiting over 170,000 agriculture and dairy farmers provided training and advisory services, which increased access to markets and resulted in an average 25 percent increase in household income among beneficiaries.

In energy, the U.S. assistance provided critical inputs for India's utilities to respond to increasing demand for energy, while efficiently managing its distribution. An innovative market-transforming pilot demonstrated 46 percent energy savings and is being presented to policy-makers, regulators, and other key decision-makers. On the environmental front, clean energy efforts resulted in a 95,000 metric-ton-reduction of carbon dioxide emissions in FY 2009.

Under the Rule of Law and Human Rights program, more than 150,000 women received legal information, advice, or support through 43 partner organizations at the national and district levels, and more than 800,000 people participated in program events broadening knowledge of and promoting dialogue on women's rights. With USAID support, a coalition of over 700 organizations representing the needs and concerns of women in India at the national level lobbied successfully to include the implementation and enforcement of the Domestic Violence Act, anti-female feticide legislation, and gender-just public budgeting. To improve disaster response preparedness, United States and Indian public and private institutions are working together to share best practices and build institutional capacity. Program activities were especially focused on institutionalizing the Incident Command System. In FY 2009, 412 officials and engineers were trained (putting the cumulative total trained at 1,019,527) to be better prepared for and take more effective action when a disaster occurs.

In sum, USAID has made significant progress toward achieving sustainable growth and reducing poverty by decreasing child and maternal mortality; addressing the rise of infectious diseases; and improving agricultural productivity to promote food security. U.S. foreign assistance enhances India's military professionalism, counterterrorism efforts, export control, and border security. U.S. programs in health, agriculture, water and sanitation, education, and energy efficiency contribute not only to alleviating poverty, but also to supporting responsible growth for a productive India's future.

## Potential Negative Ground

### *The Usual Suspects*

We did not feel the need to cut cards on most of the usual suspects: Domestic Politics, Foreign Assistance Tradeoff Disads, Security K, etc...but we did want to give a feel for the more specific literature bases that are available.

### *Critical Literature*

We did not dive into the critical literature on foreign assistance, but suffice it to say that many scholars object to the notion that anyone needs United States foreign assistance and that it can be given freely and without pernicious conditions. We believe that there is an even richer critical literature over the transformations that India is struggling with as it adopts globalization at the expense of its people and environment. Inevitably, most foreign assistance will be designed to help India address these symptoms giving the negative ample room to investigate how the affirmative interacts with one of the worlds' oldest and most important non-Western societies that has lived with colonization and liberation for quite some time.

### *Indian Domestic Politics*

This is the other area that we did not have a chance to cut cards for. The caselist from last year and on some other topics show different variations of this argument. Last year, Michigan State University's Jessica Hockensmith & Kaavya Ramesh had several interesting Indian politics advantages that show the strong potential for researching in this area for great negative disads.

*International Counterplans by Patrick McCleary*

International agents or other countries are definitely a huge potential area of negative ground. There are several different actors who could administer foreign aid, including the UK, the EU, Germany, the Netherlands, and Canada, to name a few.

**Depending on the potential specifics of the targets of foreign aid, there are different actors that already target their assistance to certain sectors of India.**

Asian Development Bank '11

("Country Assistance Plans – India: Donor Activities and Aid Coordination," last updated 2011,

<http://www.adb.org/documents/caps/IND/0500.asp>, accessed 4-23-11) PM

The United Kingdom, through its Department for International Development (DFID), has a large aid program to India, focusing on poverty reduction inter alia through support for social sector initiatives. The program also seeks to support sustainable economic growth through support for economic reforms, particularly in fiscal policy and the power sector. DFID is concentrating its assistance to selected states, including Madhya Pradesh, Andhra Pradesh, and West Bengal, and is collaborating and coordinating activities with ADB in the areas of mutual interest such as support for power sector reforms, urban water supply and sanitation and slum improvement. ADB's efforts to strengthen the poverty focus of its portfolio and the supporting TA program provide further cooperation opportunities. The United States Agency for International Development (USAID) has focused its program inter alia on population stabilization; provision of health care, including HIV/AIDS control; environmental protection and pollution control, particularly in urban areas; and support for energy conservation and demand side management. USAID also provides extensive food aid. The Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) has been active in support for state power sector reforms. In its preparatory work for power sector reforms in Kerala, the ADB is already drawing upon work being prepared by CIDA-financed consultants. The ADB and CIDA are also closely collaborating on power sector reforms in Madhya Pradesh. The priorities of Germany's assistance are the infrastructure (power) and social sectors, including water supply, urban waste management, housing, and health. The Netherlands is providing assistance mainly for social sector interventions, as well as in support of local governance and effective decentralization. One of its focal states is Kerala. The European Union (EU) provides assistance under two broad categories: development assistance and economic cooperation. The former is directed towards improving the quality of life of the poorest and is providing grants for rural development, as well as primary education and health. EU's economic cooperation program mainly comprises technical assistance and training support.

The above card may also give some reasons why the US would be key because of how it targets its foreign aid. There are specific sectors, such as preventing Indian overpopulation, environmental destruction, and AIDS-related problems. These could be potential advantages or add-ons that aren't resolved by the CP.

## **The UK and EU just announced big foreign aid increases – this is also true for India**

**Palmer, British National Party, ‘11**

**(Stephen, “EU Countries Increase Foreign Aid to £47 Billion Despite Economic Turmoil,” 4-8-11,**

**<http://www.bnp.org.uk/news/eu-countries-increase-foreign-aid-%C2%A347-billion-despite-economic-turmoil>, accessed 4-23-11) PM**

Despite Europe’s dire financial condition, the EU has proudly announced its member states’ highest ever aid contribution to foreign countries, totalling £47 billion for 2010. The sum spent by the EU’s 27 member states increased by £4 billion compared with 2009 and accounted for more than half of the global amount of aid. Unsurprisingly, the United Kingdom was one of the largest donors, giving £8.4 billion away in foreign aid last year, an amount that is set to increase year on year despite huge cuts to domestic services. The UK was among just eight member states who met last year’s target of donating 0.56% of their Gross National Income (GNI). The others were Belgium, Denmark, Finland, Ireland, Luxembourg, the Netherlands and Sweden. However, ten countries, including Italy and Greece, spent less on aid than in 2009. Portugal, which is now seeking a £3-billion bailout from other EU countries, also rather foolishly increased its contribution, from 0.23% to 0.29%. Despite the huge amount given away, EU commissioners still bemoaned states for not meeting their targets. According to Commissioner for Development Andris Piebalgs, “a substantial collective effort is still needed in order to achieve the goal of 0.7% [of GNI] by 2015”. Tellingly, Piebalgs also complained that aid budgets “still represent less than 1% of national GNI” and “must be increased”, revealing that the 0.7% target is only an initial step. The UK’s foreign aid budget is set to rise to £8.7bn this year, becoming £9.1bn in 2012, £12bn in 2013, and £12.6bn by 2014. The 2013 figure will account for 0.7 per cent of the UK’s (GNI), the United Nations “target” set for all EU members to achieve by 2015. Based on these figures, the UK will hold the dubious distinction of becoming the first country to hit the UN goal. According to Chancellor George Osborne, giving away yet more of taxpayers’ money to foreign countries when frontline public services are slashed at home will allow Britons to “hold their heads up high” and “honour their promise”. Last year, the biggest beneficiary of UK foreign aid was India, a country with the fourth-largest economy in the world and its own space programme, which got £295 million of UK aid. Other top recipients include Ethiopia, Bangladesh, Sudan, Tanzania, Afghanistan, Nigeria, the Democratic Republic of Congo, and, of course, Pakistan, which will now receive a staggering £650m in foreign aid. The Department for International Development (DFID) is the only British ministry not suffering cuts of up to 50 per cent. Instead, a new quango has been set up to “monitor” its spending, further increasing its drain on the taxpayer.

*China Disad by Tom Pacheco*

**There are several potential directions to this DA. Based off preliminary research, status quo relations between India and China are ok and growing. Their relationship bilaterally is based off geopolitical and economic interests.**

**Rajan, Chennai Center for China Studies director, 6-15-10**

**[D.S., “India-China Relations: An Indian Perspective”**

**<http://www.southasiaanalysis.org/%5Cpapers39%5Cpaper3861.html>, accessed 4-23-11, TP]**

Broadly speaking, India-China ties at government levels remain stable at this juncture; New Delhi and Beijing have established a ‘strategic and cooperative partnership for peace and prosperity’ and signed a document on ‘shared vision for the 21st century’, signifying that the Sino-Indian ties have gone beyond the bilateral context and acquired a global character. Accordingly, India and China are cooperating on international issues related to the diversification of global energy mix, climate change, arms control and disarmament, non-traditional security threats, counter-terrorism, WTO, WMD, human rights and South-South Co-operation. Bilaterally, the two sides now aim at building ‘a relationship of friendship and trust, based on equality, in which each is sensitive to the concerns and aspirations of the other’. They are not viewing each other as a security threat and are by and large satisfactorily implementing confidence building measures in the disputed border, besides carrying out joint military exercises. Special Representatives of India and China have so far held thirteen rounds of border talks, though with no tangible results. Most important is that with an attitude of promoting ties looking beyond the unsolved and ‘complex’ border dispute, India and China are speeding up their trade and economic contacts. Bilateral trade is fast gathering momentum, with the volume to the tune of US\$ 40 billion now and projections for US\$ 60 billion by 2010. China has emerged as India’s largest trading partner, replacing the US, in April 2008-February 2009 period.

**Although relations are stable now, there are various sticking points, the most problematic being boundary issues. Other things like Tibet, Pakistan-Sino relations, China defense modernization, shipping lane domination, and East Asian integration affect their relationship as well. Yet, China fears ties between India and the US.**

**Rajan, Chennai Center for China Studies director, 6-15-10**

[D.S., “India-China Relations: An Indian Perspective”

<http://www.southasiaanalysis.org/%5Cpapers39%5Cpaper3861.html>, accessed 4-23-11, TP]

India-US Relations Chinese critical positions on the India-US relations are also a matter of India's concern. The Chinese have welcomed the India-US Strategic Dialogue and are themselves promoting ties with the US. Still, China seems to nurture fears about US-India collusion against it. Its official media description of India's policy as one 'befriending the far and attacking the near' is unmistakably an indirect, but strong criticism of the developing strategic relations between India and the US.

**There are differing interpretations about the border issue- some say India and China are nearing the point of a border war, yet the leaders of both countries suggest that is media hype. China and India work on a variety of issues together, but a common phrase being used in the literature is “befriending the far and attacking the near,” implying China perceives India's relationship with the US as a threat. Affs that work with India on issues important to the India and China's relations would boost friction between India and China.**

**McLaughlin, The Washington Diplomat, 2009**

[Seth, November, “As Barbs Fly Over Border Dispute, Ties Between China, India Deteriorate”

[http://www.washdiplomat.com/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=6127:-as-barbs-fly-over-border-dispute-ties-between-china-india-deteriorate-&catid=983:november-2009&Itemid=250](http://www.washdiplomat.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=6127:-as-barbs-fly-over-border-dispute-ties-between-china-india-deteriorate-&catid=983:november-2009&Itemid=250), accessed 4-23-11, TP]

China's People's Daily stirred the pot again last month by accusing India of being “obsessed” with “hegemony,” and following a policy of “befriend the far and attack the near.” It also accused the United States of “tipping the balance between China and India, seeking to woo India away from Russia and China and, in the meantime, feeding India's ambition to match China force for force by its ever burgeoning arms sales to India.” “India, which vows to be superpower, needs to have its eyes on relations with neighbors and abandon the recklessness and arrogance as the world is undergoing earthshaking changes,” the paper charged. And it gave a thinly veiled warning that while the two sides “will never pose a mortal foe to each other,” the “fabricated stories” and “fanciful” reports in the India media — including the claim that China aims to breakup multiethnic India into 20 or 30 fragments — could create an atmosphere where “an accidental slip or go-off at the border would erode into a war.” The tit-for-tat recriminations by both Chinese and Indian media have overshadowed the more conciliatory tone of some leaders on both sides as they try to cooperate on issues such as climate change and the global economic downturn. Chinese Premier Wen Jiabao said he wanted to meet Indian Prime Minister Singh on the sidelines of the ASEAN (Association of Southeast Asian Nations) summit in late October, and earlier, Indian Foreign Minister Krishna himself played down the border tensions, telling reporters “this has been one of the most peaceful boundaries that we have had.”

**It becomes a question of how China perceives India's rise- China is suspicious of the US intentions with their relationship with India. A second way to construct the disad would be boosting US-India relations hurts US-Sino relations.**

**Sharma, The Diplomatic Courier, 1-10-11**

[Rajeev, "How Will China Respond to a Rising India" <http://oilprice.com/Geo-Politics/Asia/How-Will-China-Respond-to-a-Rising-India.html>, accessed 4-23-11, TP]

Two events in the last decade or so have impacted Sino-Indian relations hugely: India's second set of nuclear tests in May 1998 and the July 2005 India-U.S. decision to go ahead with a game-changer civilian nuclear energy cooperation agreement. The first because a leaked letter of then Indian Prime Minister Atal Bihari Vajpayee to then U.S. President Bill Clinton explaining reasons for the nuclear tests made it clear that India had taken the step mainly because of China. The second because China saw Washington's intent to sign the 123 agreement with India as a counter balance to China and getting India into the nuclear club through the back door. The deepening Indo-U.S. ties prompted a rethink in China's India policy, evidenced in China's hyper active behind-the-scenes lobbying against an India-specific waiver at the Nuclear Supplier's Group in 2008. India got the NSG waiver though China did not want it, primarily because the U.S. lobbied very hard for it. A country that does not support India's entry in a small cartel like NSG can hardly be expected to back its claim for permanent membership at the United Nations Security Council. China knows that it is not impossible especially when the other P4 members—particularly the U.S.—have come out with strong and unequivocal support for India's case. Since its reluctant support to India at the NSG in 2008, China has been accusing India of "befriending the far, attacking the near". China can be held guilty of the same. For years China has been wooing it's far abroad in Africa, Latin America, Europe, and the Middle East, while ignoring it's near abroad; not just India, but also Vietnam, South Korea, Thailand, Singapore, the Philippines, and Japan have issues with China. India's resurgence may or may not be a threat to China depending on how the Chinese respond to a rising India. One way is to categorize India as an enemy and take diplomatic and military steps to deal with it accordingly. The other way is that of peaceful co-existence and mutual respect. Singh has said that there is enough space in the world to accommodate both India and China.

**The status quo also demonstrates that the US values Beijing over New Delhi, and therefore doesn't intervene when China puts pressure on India. US-India relations could stop Chinese pressuring of India, or China could become more emboldened because they know the US won't do anything about it.**

**Chellaney, Center for Policy research strategic studies professor, 2009**

[Brahma, 10-28-09, "U.S. spurs China-India tensions" <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2009/oct/28/us-spurs-china-india-tensions//print/>, accessed 4-23-11, TP]

The more-muscular Chinese stance clearly is tied to the new U.S.-India strategic partnership, symbolized by the nuclear deal and deepening military cooperation. As President George W. Bush declared in his valedictory speech, "We opened a new historic and strategic partnership with India." The Obama administration, although committed to promoting that strategic partnership, has been reluctant to take New Delhi's side in any of its disputes with Beijing. This has emboldened China to up the ante against India, with the Chinese Foreign Ministry employing language like "we demand" in a recent statement that labeled the Indian prime minister's visit to Arunachal Pradesh a "disturbance." The Communist Party's official newspaper, the People's Daily, after asking India to consider the costs of "a potential confrontation with China," ran another denunciatory editorial recently on New Delhi's "recklessness and arrogance." New Delhi has hit back by permitting the Dalai Lama to tour Arunachal Pradesh and announcing an end to the practice of Chinese companies bringing thousands of workers from China to work on projects in India. And in a public riposte to Beijing's raising of objections to multilateral funding of any project in Arunachal, India has asked China to cease its infrastructure and military projects in another disputed region - Pakistan-held Kashmir. The present pattern of border provocations, new force deployments and mutual recriminations is redolent of the situation that prevailed 47 years ago, when China - taking advantage of the advent of the Cuban missile crisis, which brought the world to the brink of a nuclear Armageddon - routed the unprepared Indian military in a surprise two-front aggression. Today, amid rising tensions, the danger of border skirmishes, if not a limited war, looks real. Such tensions have been rising since 2006. Until 2005, China was eschewing anti-India rhetoric and pursuing a policy of active engagement with India even as it continued to expand its strategic space in southern Asia, to New Delhi's detriment. In fact, when Chinese Premier Wen Jiabao visited India in April 2005, the two countries unveiled six broad principles to help settle their festering border dispute. But after the Indo-U.S. defense-framework accord and nuclear deal were unveiled in quick succession in subsequent months, the mood in Beijing changed perceptibly. That gave rise to a pattern that now has become commonplace: Chinese newspapers, individual bloggers, security think tanks and even officially blessed Web sites ratcheted up an "India threat" scenario. A U.S.-India military alliance has always been a strategic nightmare for the Chinese, and the ballyhooed Indo-U.S. global strategic partnership triggered alarm bells in Beijing. The partnership, though, falls short of a formal military alliance. Still, the high-pitched Indian and American rhetoric that the new partnership represented a tectonic shift in geopolitical alignments apparently made Chinese policymakers believe India was being groomed as a new Japan or Australia to America - a perception reinforced by subsequent arrangements and Indian orders for U.S. arms worth \$3.5 billion in just the past year. Clearly, New Delhi failed to foresee that its rush to forge close strategic bonds with Washington could provoke greater Chinese pressure and that in such a situation, the United States actually would offer little comfort. Consequently, India finds itself in a spot.

Continues....

For one thing, Beijing calculatedly has sought to pressure India on multiple fronts - military, diplomatic and multilateral. For another, the United States - far from coming to India's support - has shied away from even cautioning Beijing against any attempt to forcibly change the territorial status quo. Indeed, on a host of issues - from the Dalai Lama to the Arunachal dispute - Washington has chosen not to antagonize Beijing. That, in effect, has left India on its own. The spectacle of the president of the most powerful country in the world seeking to curry favor with a rights-abusing China by shunning the Dalai Lama during the Tibetan leader's Washington visit cannot but embolden the Chinese leadership to step up pressure on India, the seat of the Tibetan government in exile. Mr. Obama also has signaled that America's strategic relationship with India will not be at the expense of the fast-growing U.S. ties with Beijing. The Obama team, after reviewing the Bush-era arrangements, intends to abjure elements in its ties with New Delhi that could rile China, including any joint military drill in Arunachal or a 2007-style naval exercise involving the United States, India, Australia, Japan and Singapore. Even trilateral U.S. naval maneuvers with India and Japan are being abandoned so as not to raise China's hackles. As his secretary of state did in February, Mr. Obama is undertaking an Asia tour that begins in Japan and ends in China - the high spot - while skipping India. In fact, Washington is quietly charting a course of tacit neutrality on the Arunachal dispute. Yet Beijing remains suspicious of the likely trajectory of U.S.-India strategic ties, including pre-1962-style CIA meddling in Tibet. This distrust found expression in the People's Daily editorial that accused New Delhi of pursuing a foreign policy of "befriending the far and attacking the near." Left to fend for itself, New Delhi has decided to steer clear of any confrontation with Beijing. As the prime minister of the Tibetan government in exile, Samdhong Rinpoche, has put it: "For the past few months, China has adopted an aggressive attitude and is indulging in many provocative activities, which are being tolerated by Indian government in a very passive manner." Still, even as it seeks to tamp down tensions with Beijing, New Delhi cannot rule out the use of force by China at a time when hard-liners there seem to believe that a swift, 1962-style military victory can help fashion a Beijing-oriented Asia. Having declared that America's "most important bilateral relationship in the world" is with Beijing, the Obama team must caution China against crossing well-defined red lines or going against its self-touted gospel of China's "peaceful rise."

**There is definitely a debate to be had about the effects of US engagement with India and how other parts of Asia perceive and react to that engagement. Other literature that would be worthwhile to explore includes:**

**Chellaney, Center for Policy research strategic studies professor, 2010**

[Brahma, "Asian Juggernaut: The Rise of China, India and Japan" googlebooks, accessed 4-23-11, TP]

**Other authors such as Joseph Nye, Venu Rajamony, Zhang Guihong, and K. Alan Kronstadt write extensively on issues of encirclement, US-India relations, and China.**

*Pakistan Disad by Tom Pacheco*

**US-Pakistan relations are fragile and out of convenience. The US deems the partnership necessary for the war on terror and gives billions of dollars in aid to Pakistan. Recently, relations plunged as a result of a CIA mishap; yet, it only speaks to larger flaws in relations. Kugelman, Woodrow Wilson International Center for scholars South Asia program associate, 3-1-11**

[Michael, "The U.S.-Pakistan relationship in disarray"]

[http://afpak.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2011/03/01/the\\_us\\_pakistan\\_relationship\\_in\\_disarray](http://afpak.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2011/03/01/the_us_pakistan_relationship_in_disarray), accessed 4-24-11, TP]

Yet it would be a mistake to assume the U.S.-Pakistan relationship was plunged into crisis only after Davis pulled the trigger, and that it will remain so only as long as he languishes in his jail cell. In reality, the Davis affair represents just the latest chapter in a lengthening narrative -- one of an unraveling partnership that some fear could rupture completely. The ongoing U.S.-Pakistan struggles are often attributed to a mere trust gap, easily surmountable if each side convinces the other of its good intentions. Unfortunately, mutual suspicions are too historically ingrained simply to be wished away with soothing words. Islamabad stewes over what it perceives as America's repeated betrayals, if not outright abandonment, of Pakistan -- from Washington's failure to help prevent the partition of Pakistan during a bloody civil war in 1971, to its reduced engagement with Islamabad following the Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan in the late 1980s. Washington, meanwhile, steams about the billions of dollars of its aid that have been diverted or simply disappeared, along with the persistent evidence that elements of the Pakistani government and security forces still support key insurgent groups operating in Afghanistan, such as the Haqqani network. With relations held hostage to mutual suspicion, equivocations and prevarications are part and parcel of the partnership.

**Although relations seem to be collapsing, both countries are attempting to continue working together. The status quo is shaky.**

**Kugelman, Woodrow Wilson International Center for scholars South Asia program associate, 3-1-11**

[Michael, "The U.S.-Pakistan relationship in disarray"]

[http://afpak.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2011/03/01/the\\_us\\_pakistan\\_relationship\\_in\\_disarray](http://afpak.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2011/03/01/the_us_pakistan_relationship_in_disarray), accessed 4-24-11, TP]

Officials on both sides continue to pull out the requisite stops to maintain a happy face. Even as Pakistanis seethed with anger about the Davis episode, both capitals began signaling their desire to absorb the latest blow to the relationship and move on. Several weeks ago Sen. John Kerry (D-MA) was dispatched to Pakistan to "reaffirm" the U.S. partnership, while high-level military officials recently met in Oman to mend fences. Such diplomacy, however, obscures the deep divide that drives the two reluctant allies apart. Yet around the time of the Oman meeting, the Associated Press revealed that Pakistan's Inter-Services Intelligence had contemplated severing its relationship with the CIA. Such a split, between arguably the two most critical entities in Pakistan-U.S. relations, would sound the death knell for any prospect of a meaningful relationship. For the immediate future, the best-case scenario is that U.S.-Pakistan relations will simply continue to muddle along. With too many fundamental differences to consummate a healthy, sustainable relationship, yet with too much at stake for both sides to sever ties, a very shaky status quo may well persevere.

**There is a zero-sum nature in relations with India and Pakistan- history pits them against each other. South Asia policy is such a priority because of the complexity of balancing relations with the two countries and US strategic interests.**

**Rothkopf, Carnegie Endowment for international peace visiting scholar, 10-19-10**

[David, "Making love to a cactus: U.S.-Pakistan relations at a dangerous moment"]

[http://rothkopf.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2010/10/19/making\\_love\\_to\\_a\\_cactus\\_us\\_pakistan\\_relation\\_s\\_at\\_a\\_dangerous\\_moment](http://rothkopf.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2010/10/19/making_love_to_a_cactus_us_pakistan_relation_s_at_a_dangerous_moment), accessed 4-24-11, TP]

Next, there will be a tension because of another factor. Next month, President Obama will be going to India. Historically, due to India's Cold War ties to the U.S.S.R., the United States embraced Pakistan for strategic reasons. But for even more compelling historical reasons -- from roots in the British Empire to the embrace of democracy to a host of cultural affinities -- India, not Pakistan, is the United States's natural ally in South Asia. India is also a rising major power and an important counterweight to China. Since the late Clinton years, the United States has been turning ever closer to New Delhi and that is a trend the Obama visit will and should continue. Given India and Pakistan's history of conflict -- accentuated again by the Mumbai-attack focus of the Guardian report -- the United States is about to wrap its gnarliest diplomatic relationship in a fabric of even greater complexities. It is what the United States must do, to be sure. The Obama administration has in fact, thus far handled all this with considerable dexterity (no small feat considering the factors involved and the fact that this is the first time in history that South Asia policy has topped the list of U.S. foreign policy priorities). But one cannot help but wonder if -- given the underlying forces at play -- the biggest challenges we face lie in the future.

**There is deep literature in regard to the importance of US relations with Pakistan. Potential plans could embolden India to encircle Pakistan, or scenarios could involve Pakistan backlash. C. Christine Fair is among many political scientists who writes and researches the issue. How affs would affect Pakistan are important and should be discussed, particularly as the US timetable for withdrawal comes into effect.**

## Potential Resolutions By Jarrod Atchison

This is always the most interesting, dangerous, and difficult part of a controversy paper. One view of this process is that controversy papers are supposed to center on the controversy and give the topic committee as much flexibility as possible regarding potential resolutions. The advantage of this perspective is that controversy papers rarely involve the rigor, review, and research that the topic committee process involves so it makes sense to give more flexibility to the more rigorous process. The disadvantage of this perspective is that the community might vote for a controversy because of a particular vision of the topic and then the topic committee changes the vision and produces a slate of resolutions that do not reflect the original vision people voted for in the first place.

An alternate view of this process is that controversy papers define the parameters of the available resolutions and as a result, the topic committee should refrain from deviating too far from the controversy paper. After last year's topic committee meeting, several people expressed frustration over the exclusion of comprehensive immigration reform from the slate of resolutions. Part of the exclusion stemmed from the controversy paper's argument that comprehensive immigration reform did not fit our current practices. Although few of these critics addressed the justifications for the exclusion in the controversy paper, the sentiment was clear: controversy papers should not restrict *quality* research, rigor, and resolutions.

In an ideal world, the controversy paper is so awesome that the topic committee does not have to do much in the way of inventing the slate of resolutions. The reality, however, is that the topic committee's job is to strike a careful balance between these two perspectives and to work to identify a slate of resolutions that provide the community meaningful choices among a set of good resolutions. The process is difficult, thankless, and controversial.

To help the topic committee, authors of controversy papers have adopted the practice of proposing some resolutions in an effort to show the community how the controversy may manifest itself in a slate of resolutions. Interestingly enough, no matter how many qualifiers are added to the proposed resolutions (“Seriously, this is just a rough draft”) the community gravitates toward this section of the controversy paper and it normally produces the greatest discussion. With the two views of the process in mind and with the qualifier—seriously, this is just a rough draft; we identify our philosophy of this controversy and a slate of proposed resolutions.

The resolution for the 1990-1991 season was, “RESOLVED: "That the United States should substantially change its trade policy toward one or more of the following: China, Hong Kong, Japan, South Korea, Taiwan." Most 2N’s today would cringe at that resolution—bidirectional, lots of countries, and little specificity of what constitutes a trade policy. At the opposite end of the spectrum we have the 2003-2004 behemoth list topic:

Resolved: that the United States Federal Government should enact one or more of the following: Withdrawal of its World Trade Organization complaint against the European Union’s restrictions on genetically modified foods; A substantial increase in its government-to-government economic and/or conflict prevention assistance to Turkey and/or Greece; Full withdrawal from the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; Removal of its barriers to and encouragement of substantial European Union and/or North Atlantic Treaty Organization participation in peacekeeping in Iraq and reconstruction in Iraq; Removal of its tactical nuclear weapons from Europe; Harmonization of its intellectual property law with the European Union in the area of human DNA sequences; Rescission of all or nearly all agriculture subsidy increases in the 2002 Farm Bill.

We hope to propose a set of resolutions that is somewhere between these two and reflects our belief that the mechanism should be a bit broader because the target is only one nation.

*Simple and Elegant:* The United States Federal Government should substantially increase its foreign assistance to the Republic of India.

*List:* The United States Federal Government should substantially increase its Child Survival and Health assistance, Development Assistance, Economic Support Fund assistance, International Military Education and Training assistance, and/or Nonproliferation, Anti-Terrorism, Demining, and Related assistance to the Republic of India.

*Narrower (non-military):* The United States Federal Government should substantially increase its Child Survival and Health assistance, Development Assistance, and/or Economic Support Fund assistance to the Republic of India.

There are lots of different permutations and even smaller versions of these resolutions available. We are hesitant to suggest going much narrower because fear and uncertainty tends to result in the community choosing one of the smallest options available. We do not, however, want to restrict the topic committee and fully recognize their rigor and research is more likely to produce an appropriate slate of resolutions.

## Foreign Assistance Definitions By Ian Miller

### **Foreign assistance is defined by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961**

**McCormick '8** (OECD/DAC and U.S. aid statistics: Requirements, Relationships, Frameworks, Processes, and Assessments William McCormick, USAID/ODP/BMD Video-conference with WB-Moscow Wednesday, May 28, 2008 6:30 a.m. Washington time)

The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, is the primary legislative framework for the definition of foreign assistance and related collection and reporting of aid statistics to Congress, international bodies, and the public.

### **The Foreign Assistance Act definition is the most accurate definition and is used by the government to create the Greenbook**

**Congressional Research Service '9** (Foreign Aid Reform: Agency Coordination Marian Leonardo Lawson Analyst in Foreign Assistance Susan B. Epstein Specialist in Foreign Policy August 7, 2009 Congressional Research Service 7-5700 www.crs.gov R40756)

The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (FAA), Section 634, defines foreign assistance as “any tangible or intangible item provided by the United States Government to a foreign country or international organization under this or any other Act, including but not limited to any training, service, or technical advice, any item of real, personal or mixed property, and agricultural commodity” and clarifies that this “includes, but is not limited to, foreign assistance provided by means of gift, loan, sale, credit, or guarantee.” This definition is used by USAID in preparing the “Greenbook,” the database of annual U.S. foreign assistance obligations. This definition also aligns closely, though not exactly, with the “foreign operations” activities funded through annual State-Foreign Operations Appropriations legislation. Many aid experts, however, feel that this definition is misleading because it includes funding for things such as the Export-Import Bank, the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, and certain agricultural commodity programs that are primarily intended to benefit U.S. commercial interests. Another common and much narrower definition used by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) to track Official Development Assistance (ODA) is “Grants or loans to developing countries which are undertaken by the official sector with promotion of economic development and welfare as the main objective and at concessional financial terms (having a grant element of at least 25 per cent). In addition to financial flows, technical co-operation is included in aid. Grants, loans and credits for military purposes are excluded.” The U.S. and most other donor countries use this definition when reporting annual aid activities to the OECD. However, critics of this definition claim that, by excluding military assistance in particular, ODA greatly under-represents U.S. foreign assistance activities. ODA also excludes aid to developed countries, such as Russia, Israel, and Ireland. The period and stage of reporting may also shape assistance statistics. For example, ODA is reported by calendar year (starting January 1) while the Greenbook figures are reported by fiscal year (starting October 1). Similarly, many sources report aid data based on the level appropriated, which may vary considerably from Greenbook data, which reports aid when it is obligated, and ODA, which focuses on the point of disbursement. For this report, CRS uses data from the USAID Foreign Assistance Database based on the FAA definition of foreign assistance and disbursements by fiscal year, unless otherwise noted. Readers are advised that both aid levels and the agencies involved in aid activities would be different if based on ODA or other definitions of foreign aid.

### **Foreign assistance is clearly defined by the Greenbook**

**Kersey '5** (Kersey, Jessica, "Blinded by Fear, Blindsided by Reality: U.S. Foreign Assistance and Perceptions of National Security" (2005). Senior Thesis Projects, 2003-2006. [http://trace.tennessee.edu/utk\\_interstp3/64](http://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_interstp3/64)

Important Definitions What, exactly, are foreign assistance and national security? Before it is possible to prove the United States' foreign aid policy has been motivated by security threats and has led to increased instability in recipient countries, it is necessary to clarify a few key terms which will continue to be important throughout this paper. The first of these is foreign assistance. Due to the emphasis on the United States' foreign assistance policy in this paper, the definition and categories used to describe foreign assistance are derived from the U.S. Overseas Loans and Grants or Greenbook, a publication created by the United States Agency for International Development's Center for Development Information and Evaluation to serve as a comprehensive report of all U.S. foreign assistance distributed to the rest of the world since 1945. This publication will not only provide the definitions and categories aid will Kersey 4 be divided into within this paper, but also the figures detailing the amount of U.S. aid distributed to the world and, more specifically, to Afghanistan and Nicaragua from 1947 to 2000. The "Reporting Concepts" section of the Greenbook separates foreign assistance into three overarching categories - economic assistance, military assistance, and nonconcessional support - which are further separated by more specific funding categories that fall under these comprehensive headings. Of the three categories, economic and military assistance will figure most prominently in this paper. According to the Greenbook, economic assistance is equivalent to Official Development Assistance (ODA) or "grants or loans to [developing] countries and territories which are (a) undertaken by the official sector; (b) with promotion of economic development and welfare as the main objective; (c) at concessional financial terms [if a loan, having a Grant Element (q.v.) of at least 25 per cent]" (OECD 2005). The economic assistance category includes funds distributed by USAID and its predecessor organizations, Food Aid, and other economic assistance and is also divided based on the program this funding is slated to aid. Though the main focus of sections of this paper devoted to the effects of the United States' economic assistance policy will be bilateral aid from the United States that fits the standard ODA definition, it is important to note that economic assistance provided to or withheld from Afghanistan and Nicaragua by other countries or lending institutions due to U.S. influence will also be mentioned. In addition to discussing economic assistance as foreign aid, this paper will also discuss military assistance. Though military assistance is less often considered in papers discussing the impact of foreign aid, it is important that this type of assistance be included in a paper discussing the link between the United States' foreign assistance policy, security and stability as military assistance is often motivated by security concerns and has a crucial impact on the stability of recipient countries. By virtue of the 5 smaller amounts of U.S. assistance that qualify as military assistance, the Greenbook's treatment of this category is much less complex than the economic assistance category. Under the military assistance heading only two subcategories - loans and grants - exist. Though military assistance is, like economic assistance, further separated by the program funding is intended to aid, a clear definition for exactly what physically constitutes military assistance in the United States is absent from the Greenbook. However, it is clear that military assistance is classified as such because these loans and grants are comprised of money the United States intends recipient countries to use for military equipment and training. In addition to the official military assistance recorded in the U.S. Overseas Loans and Grants, the sections of this paper devoted to the impact of U.S. military assistance policy on Afghanistan and Nicaragua will also include references to and descriptions of covert aid given by the United States to resistance groups within these countries. Though this is not official bilateral aid, it is included as military assistance for three reasons: it is funding intended for the upkeep of military forces and actions; it is a strong indicator of the motivations of the United States' foreign aid policy; and it has a powerful impact on recipient countries.

## **Foreign assistance to India includes health, education, agricultural, environmental, human rights, and disaster preparedness assistance**

**US Department of State '09** (UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF STATE INDIA U.S. FOREIGN ASSISTANCE PERFORMANCE PUBLICATION Fiscal Year 2009 FY 2009 FOREIGN ASSISTANCE GOALS INDIA U.S. FOREIGN ASSISTANCE PERFORMANCE PUBLICATION FY 2009 2

The United States-India relationship is undergoing rapid transformation with a profound, positive impact on the security, stability, and prosperity of the world in the 21st century. Both countries are undertaking an ambitious and multi-faceted strategic partnership, forged by common interests and guided by shared values. In FY 2009, the U.S. foreign assistance program made significant achievements toward achieving sustainable growth and reducing poverty in India. In health, the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) technical assistance supported the Government of India (GOI)'s commitment to reach the Millennium Development Goals by improving policies, implementing program approaches, and allocating resources that boost maternal, newborn, and child health and the nutritional status of its population. In FY 2009, all targets for tuberculosis (TB) were achieved, making a significant contribution to the GOI's success in reaching global TB targets. More than 7.3 million children received Vitamin A doses, 4.6 million were treated for diarrhea, and 17.8 million given DPT3 immunizations (a vaccine for diphtheria, pertussis, and tetanus). Reproductive health activities influenced GOI public policy and budget decisions, and leveraged \$7.5 million in public-private sector resources. As a result of USAID's efforts, 48 new health policies and guidelines have been created, and high quality health services are more accessible. In FY 2009, the education program partnered with private sector entities and Indian state governments to scale up successful education modules, benefiting 36.5 million children and 731,076 teachers and administrators in 11 states. More than 85,000 students received a formal education through USAID-funded minority education programs. The United States Government's flagship technology program reported 19 percent learning gains among students impacted by project interventions. From an employability-training program for disadvantaged youth, 76 percent of graduates (35,671 total) were placed in jobs that paid higher-than-average salaries for that position. USAID programs helped 304,730 people access running water and 22,405 people increase their access to improved sanitation facilities. The program increased source revenue by more than \$622.4 million cumulatively in 11 municipalities, and assisted nine municipalities to invest more than \$93.8 million in critical water and sanitation projects, a 54 percent increase over 2008 levels. Programs benefiting over 170,000 agriculture and dairy farmers provided training and advisory services, which increased access to markets and resulted in an average 25 percent increase in household income among beneficiaries. In energy, the U.S. assistance provided critical inputs for India's utilities to respond to increasing demand for energy, while efficiently managing its distribution. An innovative market-transforming pilot demonstrated 46 percent energy savings and is being presented to policy-makers, regulators, and other key decision-makers. On the environmental front, clean energy efforts resulted in a 95,000 metric-ton-reduction of carbon dioxide emissions in FY 2009. Under the Rule of Law and Human Rights program, more than 150,000 women received legal information, advice, or support through 43 partner organizations at the national and district levels, and more than 800,000 people participated in program events broadening knowledge of and promoting dialogue on women's rights. With USAID support, a coalition of over 700 organizations representing the needs and concerns of women in India at the national level lobbied successfully to include the implementation and enforcement of the Domestic Violence Act, anti-female feticide legislation, and gender-just public budgeting. To improve disaster response preparedness, United States and Indian public and private institutions are working together to share best practices and build institutional capacity. Program activities were especially focused on institutionalizing the Incident Command System. In FY 2009, 412 officials and engineers were trained (putting the cumulative total trained at 1,019,527) to be better prepared for and take more effective action when a disaster occurs. In sum, USAID has made significant progress toward achieving sustainable growth and reducing poverty by decreasing child and maternal mortality; addressing the rise of infectious diseases; and improving agricultural productivity to promote food security. U.S. foreign assistance enhances India's military professionalism, counterterrorism efforts, export control, and border security. U.S. programs in health, agriculture, water and sanitation, education, and energy efficiency contribute not only to alleviating poverty, but also to supporting responsible growth for a productive India's future.

## Republic of India Definition By Ken Bailey

### **The “Republic of India” is a union of 28 states and 7 Union territories within Southern Asia Official Portal of the Indian Government 05**

[“States and Union Territories”, [http://www.india.gov.in/knowindia/state\\_uts.php](http://www.india.gov.in/knowindia/state_uts.php), 2005]

India, a union of states, is a Sovereign, Secular, Democratic Republic with a Parliamentary system of Government. The President is the constitutional head of Executive of the Union. In the states, the Governor, as the representative of the President, is the head of Executive. The system of government in states closely resembles that of the Union. There are 28 states and 7 Union territories in the country. Union Territories are administered by the President through an Administrator appointed by him/her. From the largest to the smallest, each State/UT of India has a unique demography, history and culture, dress, festivals, language etc. This section introduces you to the various States/UTs in the Country and urges you to explore their magnificent uniqueness...

States: Andhra Pradesh, Arunachal Pradesh, Assam Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Goa, Gujarat, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Jammu and Kashmir, Jharkhand, Karnataka, Kerala Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Manipur, Meghalaya, Mizoram, Nagaland, Orissa, Punjab, Rajasthan, Sikkim, Tamil Nadu, Tripura, Uttarakhand, Uttar Pradesh, West Bengal,

Union Territories: Andaman and Nicobar Islands, Chandigarh, The Government of NCT of Delhi, Dadra and Nagar Haveli, Daman and Diu, Lakshadweep, Puducherry

While clear definitions like the one presented above exist, one potential area of contestable topicality for Affirmatives and Negatives is that of disputed territories. For example, while the above definition lists Kashmir as part of the “Republic of India”, the status of the area is currently under dispute by Pakistan. Thus, while India may consider Kashmir (or any other disputed territory) part of itself, other countries and/or the world community may not recognize it as such.