

Constructive

See R2 Peach OS.

Rebuttal

Pascal-Emmanuel **Gobry**, January 11, 20**15**, "America's biggest foreign policy problem: No one trusts America anymore", theweek, <https://theweek.com/articles/445904/americas-biggest-foreign-policy-problem-no-trusts-america-anymore> //nw

Today, the United States cannot be trusted. This is not a new problem. If you were to **look at the history of America's conflicts since the end of World War II**, the main lesson would be: "Don't trust America." What do the following groups have in common? **Koreans above the 38th parallel in 1953; South Vietnamese in 1975; anti-Taliban Afghans in 1989; Iraqi Kurds in 1991; Somalis in 1993.** Here's the commonality: **They all put their trust in the United States of America, and they got screwed as a result.** States are, in Nietzsche's words, the coldest of all cold monsters. But not all states are as untrustworthy as the United States. Imperial Britain was ruthless. But it was rationally ruthless. This is not the case for America. When **America intervenes in a country, forms local alliances, and then screws its allies** it is almost never because of cold-hearted calculation. Most of the time, it is because of frightened improvisation. All the cases I have laid out involve **America pulling out of a half-finished conflict, primarily for domestic political reasons, rather than reasons of national interest.** Please understand my point: In each of these particular cases, you can debate the case for or against what America did, and in some, or even many, America might have even done the right thing. But you are still left with the problem that groups of non-Americans trust the American state at their own peril. And it really is a big problem for U.S. foreign policy. If you lead an important faction in a country where America intervenes, why should you help the Americans, since the record so clearly shows they will drop you when the going gets tough? This leads to a self-fulfilling prophecy: Because America is not seen as trustworthy, local stakeholders don't support America; because local stakeholders don't support America, the going gets tough; because the going gets tough, America gets going. This is pretty much what happened to the U.S. in Afghanistan. That self-fulfilling prophecy leads to a never-ending, vicious cycle.

That puts them in a double-bind – either 1) allies will proliferate in both worlds, because they'd never trust the U.S., or 2) allies will never proliferate because they aren't doing so rn.

Countries understand the U.S. is scaling back solely to reduce tensions.

Doug **Bandow**, 08-29-20**24**, "What Price Are Americans Prepared to Pay for Defending Taiwan?", Cato Institute, <https://www.cato.org/commentary/what-price-are-americans-prepared-pay-defending-taiwan> // RB

Other arguments for war are similarly unpersuasive. Would failing to defend Taiwan ruin U.S. credibility, especially with Washington's Asian allies? **Japan, the Philippines, and South Korea all have defense treaties with the U.S.**, the purpose of which is **to provide a formal legal guarantee.** **The U.S. formally ended its Taiwan treaty in agreeing to mutual recognition with the PRC.** **Washington has no obligation to go to war for Taipei, which America's** treaty **allies** surely **understand.**

Regional organizations fill-in.

Wawan **Rahmadi**, 05-15-20**24**, "Conflict Escalation in the South China Sea: Measuring the Direction of Indonesia's Maritime Policy", Modern Diplomacy,
<https://moderndiplomacy.eu/2024/05/15/conflict-escalation-in-the-south-china-sea-measuring-the-direction-of-indonesias-maritime-policy/>

Bilateral Relations as a Conflict Reducer **Conflicts in the South China Sea region are feared to have an impact on bilateral and regional relations between Indonesia and China.** Therefore, both China and Indonesia are trying to defuse the dispute over the Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) dispute in the Natuna Waters. This is done to maintain stability and good relations between the two countries and as a step to enhance international cooperation through cooperative and persuasive maritime diplomacy, in accordance with Indonesia's Vision as the World Maritime Axis. Source: (Databoks 2023) **Co-operative relations in almost all sectors mean that the two countries will seek peaceful means rather than conflict in order to maintain a mutually beneficial relationship.** According to the author, a **diplomatic approach will benefit both parties more than militarisation.** **Therefore, it is very important to close the space for intervention in the form of military support,** joint exercises and political declarations from other parties (outside the region) that can complicate regional dynamics. **Demilitarization of the South China Sea issue will increase trust and cooperation among regional countries and thus contribute positively to resolving territorial and maritime disputes.** The use of the Navy should only be seen as an instrument of diplomacy, not as a force of war, in the context of the South China Sea dispute. This should be based on the application of international law governing territorial waters. **The importance of sustained diplomatic efforts and the development of an inclusive and comprehensive maritime security strategy will be more effective in upholding Indonesia's sovereignty in the South China Sea.**

It's the best approach – countries in the region are better-equipped to solve their own issues.

Velasco 13 Juliana Velasco; "Regional Organizations And The Durability Of Peace"; University of Central Florida; August 2013;
<https://stars.library.ucf.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3701&context=etd>; // JL– grao recut (recut 10.31.24 lcp)

The most significant outcome is that when accounting for all other variables, **regional organizations are 6.728 times more likely to craft an agreement that is not broken for at least 5 years.** The return of significance on regional organizations with the addition of the other variables not only reinforces hypothesis. It also reinforces the theory in general. Eight separate regressions were run in order to combine 3rd party type and each of the remaining variables. Of those, significant results for a third party were present when controlling for region and outstanding issues. When controlling for region, **regional organizations are almost three times more likely to produce a peace agreement** that last five years and when controlling for outstanding issues, almost 3.5 times more likely. Of the twenty two regressions which combined two non-repeatable variables with 3rd party type, seven returned significant results for regional organizations, ranging from peace agreements 2.998 times to 4.799 times more likely to last five years. Overall, the results show that regional organizations do make a substantial difference in the success of peace agreements in keeping the peace

Taiwan is too lucrative to pass up – investors won't go anywhere.

Business Standard World News, 11-08-20**24**, "Taiwanese happy with domestic capital despite China woes: Cathay executive", Reuters,
https://www.business-standard.com/world-news/taiwanese-happy-with-domestic-capital-despite-china-woes-cathay-executive-124110500352_1.html // TT

He said a major factor in their reasoning was the importance of **Taiwanese companies like contract chip manufacturer TSMC in the booming artificial intelligence industry, making investment opportunities on the island too lucrative to pass up.** "I think now is a time of precarious balance. **Clients would rather remain in place than move. Taiwan stocks have been pretty immune to (cross-strait) tensions,** mainly **because Taiwan has built unique technological industries that no other countries would be able to replicate** and build up any time soon," he said.

Rest were analytics.