

Pro Brief Packet

Sample case _____ **2**

Arguments _____ *Error! Bookmark not defined.*

Anti-missile system is effective _____ **4**

THAAD works well _____ 4

THAAD can response to a wide range of threats _____ 4

THAAD can intercept short range missiles _____ 5

North Korea is planning for attack _____ **6**

Sanctions don't work _____ **7**

Negotiations don't work _____ **8**

Alternative anti-missile systems to THAAD _____ **11**

Goalkeeper _____ 11

SK/US relationships will be affected _____ **13**

US threatened to pull out troops _____ 13

Blocks _____ **14**

AT-CHN/SK relationship will be affected by THAAD _____ **14**

China can be replaced by other nations _____ 14

Sactions will hurt China's own interest _____ 14

Chinese sanctions can be stopped if US impose sanctions on China _____ 14

THAAD influense China's hegemony _____ 15

Cannot let China bully SK because that will set a precedent _____ 16

Disruptive effects on China _____ 17

AT-NK is not an immidiate threat _____ **18**

NK has issued many threats _____ 18

NK can do it at any time _____ 18

It needs to be stopped because its magnitude is very large _____ 19

NK has more nuclear weapons than once thought and is proliferating faster and faster _____ 19

NK is a threat _____ 19

Sample Case

We affirm, resolved: deployment of anti-missile systems is in South Korea's best interest.

My partner and I would like to define "South Korea's best interest" as the people's best interest, which is national security. We would also like to define anti-missile systems as systems which intercept a missile in flight.

Contention 1 - anti-missile systems work

Without the deployment of anti-missile systems, South Korea is under great threat. Tweed David wrote in 2017 that the Pentagon, in announcing the planned deployment last July, said the system would "contribute to a layered missile defense that will enhance the alliance's existing missile defense capabilities against North Korean missile threats." On Tuesday, July 11, the US military successfully tested its controversial THAAD missile system casting down an intermediate-range ballistic missile over the Pacific Ocean and demonstrating the improved capabilities of the warhead, according to news in 2017. This test is the 14th successful missile test, out of 14 tests, from which we can see that THAAD system can effectively defend against North Korea's missiles. Aegis is also an example of a system that works. According to the U.S. Navy, the computer-based command and decision element is the core of the AEGIS 'combat system. This interface makes the AEGIS combat system capable of simultaneous operations against multi-mission threats: anti-air, anti-surface and anti-submarine warfare.

Contention 2 - anti-missile systems are deterrence

Subpoint A: NK is a threat

According to BBC News, starting in 1994, North Korea has been using violent 'rhetoric, repeatedly saying that they are going to turn Seoul into a "sea of fire," as well as threatening a "merciless sacred war" in 2012. Professor John Delury argues that in past attacks, warnings were clear through North Korea 'rhetoric, and that "anytime a nation threatens pre'emptive nuclear war, there is a cause for concern. North Korea is no exception." This concern has also appeared in North Korea's increasing rate of proliferation and its larger estimated nuclear weapon count. As of the end of 2017, David Albright, a physicist at the Institute for Science and International Security, estimated that NK had 13-30 nukes, expanding its supply by 3-5 weapons a year. However, according to NBC News in 2017, North Korea has more nuclear weapons than once thought and is proliferating faster at one weapon a month. The Washington Examiner in 2017 presents that "risking war with the

unpredictable regime of Kim Jong Un is “unthinkable.” Therefore, South Korea needs to take action to prevent destruction.

Subpoint B: sanctions don't work

South Korea's best interest is to deploy anti-missile systems because diplomacy or sanctions do not stop North Korean nuclear proliferation. Sanctions have been intensely established since 2006. However, according to Arms Control last updated in March 2016, North Korea continues proliferation with sanctions from the UN security council. Additionally, according to a UN report, circumvention allows North Korea to facilitate an illegal trade with weapons.

Contention 3 - South Korea and United States relationships

Between 2009 and the end of 2016, relations between the two countries arguably reached their most robust state in decades. However, President Trump has threatened to pull troops from South Korea if they do not comply with deploying the rest of the THAAD system because of the possible casualties of U.S. troops without missile defense. This leads to two main concerns. First, South Korea benefits from the U.S. politically. According to the Congressional Research Service, South Korea currently houses over 28,500 U.S. troops and South Korea is under an agreement forcing their consent to deployment in an East Asian conflict. Since the early 1950s, the U.S. ROK Mutual Defense Treaty commits the United States to help South Korea defend itself. Second, the two countries' economies are joined by the Korea U.S. Free Trade Agreement. The U.S. is also South Korea's second largest trading partner. Foreign direct investment between both countries has also grown with the stock of South Korean FDI in the United States more than doubling, growing from \$19.9 billion in 2011 to \$40.1 billion in 2015. Without good relations with the U.S., South Korean economic and political strength will significantly decrease. This would lead to less economic power for the Korean people and less security with a worsened political position.

For all these reasons, we strongly urge a pro ballot.

Arguments

THAAD is effective

- **THAAD can protect against NK threats, especially in a regional area like SK. However, two of three of them are required to cover all of South Korea.**

Newman - 2017 - All about the US missile defense that'll protect south korea - and tick off china

<https://www.wired.com/2017/04/missile-defense-will-protect-south-korea-make-china-nervous/>

"THAADs are tailored to those medium-range threats that North Korea has in spades—North Korea regularly demonstrates that kind of capability," says Thomas Karako, the director of the Missile Defense Project at the Center for Strategic and International Studies. "THAADs are exactly the kind of thing that you would want for a regional area." The only downside? South Korea doesn't have enough of them. In fact, even when fully functional, the current South Korea THAAD "can't even cover Seoul, let alone catch Chinese missiles going to the US," says Bruce Bennett, a senior defense analyst at the RAND Corporation. **Because the THAAD has a relatively small interceptor range of around 125 miles, it would take two or three of them to cover all of South Korea. Still, the country having some protection against a potential North Korean strike beats having none.** Just not if you're China.

National interest- 2017

<http://nationalinterest.org/blog/the-buzz/thaad-101-the-ultimate-guide-the-missile-defense-system-19684>

THAAD has a unique capability to destroy threats in both the endo- and exo-atmosphere using proven hit-to-kill (kinetic energy) lethality. THAAD is effective against all types of ballistic-missile warheads, especially including Weapons of Mass Destruction (chemical, nuclear or biological) payloads. THAAD was specifically designed to counter mass raids with its high firepower (up to 72 Interceptors per battery), capable organic radar and powerful battle manager/fire control capability.

- **THAAD can respond to a wider range of threats**

ISDP- "THAAD in the Korean Peninsula" - Nov. 2016

<http://isdpr.eu/publication/korea-thaad/>

One of the main characteristics of THAAD is the ease of transportation which make it possible to quickly reposition THAAD. This gives THAAD greater flexibility to respond to changing threats.

Whilst alternative Ballistic Missile Defense System (BMDS), such as the Aegis BMD and Patriot/PAC-3, are also transportable, they have a more limited range.

When compared with alternative systems, THAAD can also intercept a wider range of threats. It can intercept both exo- and endo-atmospheric threats, while the Aegis BMD can only intercept exo-atmospheric threats and the Patriot-PAC-3, only endo-

atmospheric threats. In addition, THAAD is inter-operable with other BMDS, making it possible to have an integrated air and missile defense system. THAAD can also be used against weapons of mass destruction, i.e., chemical, nuclear and biological warheads.

- **THAAD can intercept short range missiles and has done it**

National interest- "The hard truth about THAAD, South Korea and China"- 2016

<http://nationalinterest.org/blog/the-buzz/the-hard-truth-about-thaad-south-korea-china-15295>

Let's start with THAAD's abilities. **Its manufacturer describes it as a "capability to defend against short and medium-ranged ballistic missiles."** And a quick look at the THAAD flight test results shows that the bulk of its testing has been against short-range targets. Here's a video of the November 2015 test in which THAAD intercepts both a short-range missile and a medium-range one. By contrast, it's largely unproven against longer-range threats such as intermediate-range ballistic missiles. In essence, then, THAAD is quite capable of intercepting short-range missiles: indeed, its mobile radar, the AN/TPY-2, can provide end-to-end coverage of short-range missile flights, enhancing the prospects for successful interception.

SK needs THAAD because NK is planning for attack

Korea JoongAng Daily-Kim Jong-un ordered a plan for a 7-day asymmetric war:officials-2015

<http://koreajoongangdaily.joins.com/news/article/Article.aspx?aid=2999392>

North Korea has a new war plan to complete a Southern invasion within a week using asymmetric capabilities including nuclear weapons, a high-profile defector and South Korean government officials told the JoongAng Ilbo.

The war plan was created less than a year after Kim Jong-un assumed power, a South Korean official told the JoongAng Ilbo quoting a defector who used to serve in a senior position in the North Korean military.

According to the official, Kim Jong-un hosted a top military-party meeting in Wonsan on Aug. 25, 2012, and approved the new war plan. The young ruler became the supreme commander of the North's Korean People's Army on Dec. 30, 2011, shortly after the death of his father, Kim Jong-il.

Sanctions won't work

BBC News- "Full Text: North Korea statement,"-October 17, 2006

<https://piie.com/publications/wp/wp08-12.pdf>

North Korean UN Ambassador Park Gil-yon called the resolution "gangster-like" and the Foreign Ministry released a statement reiterating that sanctions were an act of war and threatening "a merciless strike" against any implementer of the UN resolution.

Andrei Nikolaevich Lankov, Russian scholar of Asia and a specialist in Korean studies- "North Korea won't surrender its nuclear weapons – sanctions or no sanctions" The Guardian- January 2016

<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2016/jan/06/north-korea-nuclear-test-hydrogen-bomb-sanctions>

Even if sanctions were to inflict damage on the North Korean economy – which has exceptionally low dependence on foreign trade – the only victims will be common North Koreans, who will just suffer more. Sanctions and resolutions will not stop North Korean engineers from working hard to build bigger and better weapons, but seemingly there's nothing else that can be done.

Marcus Noland, executive vice president and director of studies of Peterson Institute for International Economics- "The (Non) Impact of UN Sanctions on North Korea"- December 2008

<https://piie.com/publications/wp/wp08-12.pdf>

Beginning with visual inspection and ending with the most sophisticated time-series models that can be implemented given the weakness of the data, no evidence has been found that economic sanctions by the UN Security Council have had any effect on either North Korea's trade in luxury goods with its largest trade partner, China, nor any indirect effect on North Korea's aggregate trade with its two principal partners.

Negotiations don't work

George Friedman- "U.S. geopolitical forecaster and strategist on international affairs" - U.S. Defense Secretary James Mattis-2017

<https://geopoliticalfutures.com/diplomacy-unlikely-solve-korean-crisis/>

The USS Nimitz left Bremerton, Washington, for the Western Pacific on June 1. It should arrive in a week, give or take a few days. In the meantime, the war of words continues, along with a war of nerves and a focus on mediation by China. **The United States is prepared to go to war in North Korea if it must, and preparations for this are underway, but it would prefer a diplomatic settlement.** The U.S. is now in the period, as we were before Operation Desert Storm in 1991 and Operation Iraqi Freedom in 2003, where a defiant enemy, in this case North Korea, is calculating its options. **The U.S. is not going to assume that a diplomatic solution can be reached, since a solution seems unlikely at this point.** It would look very much like a North Korean capitulation, and Pyongyang can't afford to capitulate. It is a time of relative quiet, but it probably won't stay that way. U.S. Defense Secretary James Mattis has made some telling statements on North Korea. In an interview on May 28 and a speech in Singapore on June 3, **Mattis made three points. First, a war in North Korea would be catastrophic, as it would involve enormous damage, likely to both sides. Second, the United States would not accept North Korea's developing an intercontinental ballistic missile that could reach the United States, and thus would act pre-emptively. Third, the United States is relying on China to persuade North Korea to stop developing the ICBM.** A Shift in Focus the United States has now focused not on the nuclear program but on the missile delivery system. **It is not demanding that North Korea abandon its nuclear program but is adamant on the ICBM.** It is unclear whether Mattis' comments mean that the United States will accept weapons that can strike others in the region such as Japan (as long as they can't strike the U.S.), but it appears to be enough of a shift that China can say to the North Koreans that the U.S. is showing flexibility. It is offering the North Koreans a solution that does not involve stepping back but merely agreeing not to look forward. This solution is dubious for both sides. The United States would need to verify that the North Koreans stopped developing their missiles. U.S. inspectors on the ground would be needed, since international inspectors in such circumstances have occasionally demonstrated poor eyesight. A missile program can be detected by satellites, but there are ways for North Korea to surprise the U.S. with suddenly deployed and armed missiles. And depending on China to monitor the situation would require more confidence in China than the U.S. possesses. Another problem for the U.S. is that this would leave North Korean nuclear capabilities intact for future exploitation and for potential sale to third parties. It would also leave regional powers, particularly Japan, vulnerable while protecting the United States, putting pressure on that relationship. **As for North Korea, it is facing this crisis because it lacks any way to deter the United States. The U.S. can attack North Korea at will. North Korea can't do the same to the U.S.** North Korea's primary goal is regime survival, and giving up the ICBM means abandoning that goal. Accepting American inspectors would require aggressive inspections and a political capitulation that could leave Kim Jong Un politically vulnerable at home. For the North Koreans, this deal would be less of a compromise than a capitulation. China's Role All of this raises the question of whether China is acting in good faith. By cooperating, China might gain economic

concessions from the United States, but it's unclear how long they would last. And China might actually welcome a United States obsessed with a North Korean ICBM aimed at the U.S., since this might divert U.S. focus in East Asia from China to North Korea permanently. Finally, while common sense would suggest that China has significant leverage with North Korea, that should not be overstated. Economically, North Korea is relatively self-sufficient. It has chosen poverty over dependence. The economic sanctions China can impose, such as blocking North Korean coal exports, have already been used in previous crises. The North Koreans, moreover, haven't trusted China since the Korean War, when China made no attempt to intervene until the U.S. threatened to cross the Yalu River into China. Absent that, the Chinese, having encouraged North Korea to invade the South, were willing to see North Korea fall. Using China as a negotiator might seem logical, but China has few chips to play and a history of betrayal. Mattis presented this issue in an interesting way in Singapore. On the one hand, he expressed confidence in China on North Korea. On the other hand, he ripped into Chinese policies in the South China Sea as violating international law. The message was that nothing China does in North Korea will make the U.S. concede the South China Sea, which was a relief to the audience in Singapore. But Mattis also conveyed the message to China and others that the U.S. is not confident in finding a diplomatic solution to this crisis. Sending Signals In the meantime, there were some odd developments that were obviously signals in the negotiations. An unnamed U.S. Navy official told Voice of America that the USS Carl Vinson was leaving waters around the Korean Peninsula. The source then reported that the Vinson and the USS Ronald Reagan began military exercises, operating side by side with aircraft overhead. It was meant to confuse and intimidate the North Koreans. We at GPF have focused on carrier deployments because they are the most visible sign of U.S. preparations for war. But in a potential conflict, they would play a somewhat limited role; the heavy lifting would be done by strategic bombers in Guam. As a reminder to the North Koreans, some of those bombers conducted a fairly large overflight south of the demilitarized zone on May 29. While the focus of U.S. demands has shifted to ICBMs, North Korea's nuclear program still presents a major threat to the region and could lead to diffusion of nuclear weapons and technology. Inspections are unlikely to work, since the U.S. will not trust international observers from the International Atomic Energy Agency. And the North Koreans will not accept American observers, which signals to the Americans that they intend to cheat. We remain in the same position as before, with the USS Nimitz scheduled to arrive in waters off the Korean Peninsula sometime this week. It seems unlikely to me that the Chinese will be able to produce a solution that satisfies both sides. In the meantime, North Korea is in the position that Saddam Hussein was in before both wars in Iraq. Giving in to the Americans could create a domestic political crisis and permanently weaken the regime. There is a possibility that the U.S. has no stomach for this war. There is also a possibility that North Korea could defeat the United States in Korea. Given the risks of capitulation, war may appear the more prudent move. The U.S. is hoping for a diplomatic solution but doesn't expect one. Mattis said war would have catastrophic consequences because he saw what happened to U.S. public opinion over Iraq after Donald Rumsfeld dismissed the concerns that the war might be much harder than he thought. For Mattis, predicting the worst and having it play out better than anticipated is preferable over the reverse. In short, it seems to me that we continue on the path to war. We are in a period where diplomacy is being given a chance but is not seen as a

particularly hopeful plan. And as Mattis made clear, the only alternative to a diplomatic solution remains war.

Alternative anti-missile systems to THAAD

- **Goalkeeper**

Thales- "Thales to overhaul Goalkeeper close-in weapon systems on S. Korean KDX-I destroyers." -Nov. 22, 2016.

<http://navaltoday.com/2016/11/22/thales-to-overhaul-goalkeeper-close-in-weapon-systems-on-s-korean-kdx-i-destroyers/>] DF

"Thales has joined forces with the South Korean defense contractor LiG Nex1 to overhaul Goalkeeper close-in weapon systems on board the KDX-I class vessels of the Republic of Korea Navy.

Thales noted that the overhaul would be carried out by Thales in close cooperation with DMI (the Naval Maintenance organization of the Netherlands Ministry of Defence) and LiGNex1.

Goalkeeper is a Dutch automatic weapon system designed and manufactured by Thales Nederland and used by a number of the world's navies.

The latest contract follows on from contracts between LiG Nex1 and Thales for the overhaul of the MW08 and STIR 2.4 radars onboard KDX-II Wang Geon.

According to the company, the current overhauls will be carried out in conjunction with LiG Nex1 in Korea and will include the construction of a dedicated workshop. LiG Nex1 and Thales are expecting to sign further overhaul contracts for the other vessels of the KDX-I class."

Tyler Rogoway- Jalopik- "The Seven Deadliest Naval Close-In Weapon Systems." - Apr. 27, 2014.

<http://foxtrotalpha.jalopnik.com/the-seven-deadliest-naval-close-in-weapon-systems-1568291678>

Now a "war-expert" at Time Magazine.

"Take the Phalanx's fire control concept and ditch its 20mm Vulcan cannon for the famed 30mm GAU-8 Avenger cannon, the same monster that is mounted in the A-10 Warthog, and you get one hardcore screen of fire surrounding your ship. **Goalkeeper, designed by Thales Defense, is the ultimate in high rate of fire, sea skimming missile pulverizing capability.** The Dirty Harry of the CIWS world if you will.

The Goalkeeper is truly one scary looking CIWS, with its large mounting structure needed to handle the massive thrust of its Avenger cannon when it spews solid tungsten sabot penetrators at 4,200 rounds per minute. **This fire breather offers almost double the range and much more destructive power than its little cousin the Phalanx, and it is also in the process or receiving upgrades that include a FLIR system so that it can chew apart fast boats and other doomed floating enemy objects with ease. The Goalkeeper system has been around for over 30 years and it is currently deployed with a number of operators including the Royal Navy, Belgian Navy and South Korean Navy."**

Thales- "NETHERLANDS MINISTRY OF DEFENCE AWARDS THALES GOALKEEPER MODIFICATION CONTRACT." - Nov. 29, 2012.

<https://www.thalesgroup.com/en/content/netherlands-ministry-defence-awards-thales-goalkeeper-modification-contract>] DF

“The operational modification will bring the system to the highest operational status again, capable of dealing with current and future threats. In addition, this contract solves various obsolescence issues. The enhanced surface target mode of Goalkeeper, in combination with a new frangible ammunition, provides Goalkeeper with the capability to act also as a highly effective defense weapon against surface targets including speed boats.

Goalkeeper’s prediction capabilities will be substantially increased through the use of new algorithms and state-of-the-art Electro-Optic tracking capabilities. This enables Goalkeeper to successfully engage the latest generation of missiles. Multi-Goalkeeper deployment capabilities will also be improved. Goalkeeper was developed in the 1980s; these modifications enable its deployment until 2025.

The first Goalkeeper will be modified in 2015 and will be performed by Thales. All other Goalkeepers will be modified by the Royal Netherlands Navy at the naval base in Den Helder.”

SK/US relationship will be affected

- **US will pull out troops**

Khang Vu- "The Ultimate Nightmare: U.S. Withdrawal from South Korea"- The National Interest- July 10, 2016

<http://nationalinterest.org/feature/the-ultimate-nightmare-us-withdrawal-south-korea-16904>

In a piece for the National Interest, Doug Bandow has argued that the United States should withdraw its troops from South Korea in order to save American lives and resources from being wasted on foreign soil as well as create incentives for Pyongyang to give up its nuclear weapons. Overall, Bandow's argument is worth paying close attention to; however, I strongly oppose his views on the role of the U.S. troop presence in maintaining peace on the Korean Peninsula as well as his proposal for dealing with the nuclear issue with Pyongyang. Leaving Korea at this moment is not a wise decision to make regarding recent developments in North Korea's nuclear capability. Bandow's argument rests on two major assumptions. First, he believes that Washington should not play the major role in the defense of prosperous and military advanced South Korea for doing so will exhaust America's already stretched military budget; in addition, keeping American troops as a tripwire in South Korea will potentially draw Washington into conflicts with nuclear-armed North Korea. Second, withdrawing American troops will break the current deadlock in negotiations with North Korea over the nuclear issues since Pyongyang will no longer face direct threats from the South, and as a result, it may give up its nuclear weapons.

Blocks

AT- CHN/SK relationship will be affected if deploy THAAD

- **China can be replaced by other nations**

Yonhap News- S. Korea to diversify source of foreign tourists- 2017

<http://english.yonhapnews.co.kr/national/2017/01/06/90/0302000000AEN20170106003000320F.html>

Also, the consular office of the Chinese Embassy notified Korean travel agencies of toughened rules that complicate the visa application process.

The latest moves raised speculation about Beijing's strong opposition as China believes THAAD will harm its strategic interests in the region.

Industry experts said that the Chinese government's action may hamper South Korea's goal to attract 8.3 million Chinese tourists this year.

In this regard, the Seoul government is moving to diversify the source of foreign tourists by launching aggressive marketing campaigns targeting Japan and Southeast Asian nations, the experts said.

Also, the government will customize travel packages priced over 3 million won (US\$2,700) for wealthy Chinese visitors who spend big in South Korea.

- **Sanctions will hurt China's own interest**

Yonhap- China cannot punish S. Korea over THAAD without hurting own interests: US expert-2016

http://www.koreatimes.co.kr/www/nation/2017/04/120_211542.html

Currently, most of the South Koreans are against the deployment of THAAD, and side with China.

The current South Korean president, Moon, has also been strongly opposed to the THAAD system. According to Snyder in 2016, "First, Chinese threats of punishment are likely to alienate rather than win over the South Korean public, while risking damage to a vibrant economic relationship that has brought China and South Korea together. Threats to cut off economic ties or discriminate against South Korean exports are inconsistent with China's World Trade Organization (WTO) obligations and will generate resentment among the South Korean public. China cannot hope to maintain friendly relations with its neighbors through economic threats or bullying."

- **Chinese sanctions can be stopped if U.S. imposes sanctions on China**

Matt Spetalnick and David Brunnstrom- "Exclusive: U.S. prepares new sanctions on Chinese firms over North Korea ties – officials"- July 13, 2017

<https://www.reuters.com/article/us-northkorea-usa-sanctions-exclusive-idUSKBN19Y28A>

Frustrated that China has not done more to rein in North Korea, the Trump administration could impose new sanctions on small Chinese banks and other firms doing business with Pyongyang within weeks, two senior U.S. officials said.

The U.S. measures would initially hit Chinese entities considered "low-hanging fruit," including smaller financial institutions and "shell" companies linked to North Korea's nuclear and missile programs, said one of the officials, while declining to name the targets. It would leave larger Chinese banks

untouched for now, the official said. The timing and scope of the U.S. action will depend heavily on how China responds to pressure for tougher steps against North Korea when U.S. and Chinese officials meet for a high-level economic dialogue in Washington on Wednesday, the administration sources told Reuters. President Donald Trump and his top aides have signaled growing impatience with China over North Korea, especially since it last week test-launched its first intercontinental ballistic missile, which experts say could put all of Alaska in range for the first time. U.S. officials have also warned that China could face U.S. trade and economic pressure - something Trump has held in abeyance since taking office in January - unless it does more to restrain its neighbor. The so-called secondary sanctions now being considered are a way for the United States to apply targeted economic pressure on companies in countries with ties to North Korea by denying them access to the U.S. market and financial system. Word of the sanctions plan comes as U.S. ambassador to the United Nations Nikki Haley seeks to overcome resistance from China and Russia to a U.N. Security Council resolution imposing stiffer international sanctions on Pyongyang. The targets now being weighed for sanctions would come from a list of firms numbering "substantially more than 10" that Trump shared with Chinese President Xi Jinping at a Florida summit in April and which U.S. experts have continued to compile for review, according to one of the officials.

- **THAAD influent China's hegemony**

Tweed, David- Explaining Thaad, and Why It So Bothers China: QuickTake Q&A. bloomberg.com, Bloomberg- 6 Mar. 2017, www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2017-03-06/explaining-thaad-and-why-it-so-bothers-china-quicktake-q-a. Accessed 10 July 2017

A U.S. missile defense system being deployed in South Korea is rubbing China the wrong way. The Terminal High Altitude Area Defense system, known as Thaad, is supposed to help South Korea protect itself from a North Korean military attack. But China sees Thaad as a threat that will break "the strategic equilibrium in the region." This debate is taking place in a volatile corner of the world. North Korea has threatened to obliterate South Korean cities in rains of fire, conducted dozens of ballistic missile tests and vowed to advance its well-documented nuclear weapons capabilities.

1. How does Thaad work?

The system, made by Lockheed Martin Corp., is designed to destroy short-and-medium-ranged ballistic missiles at high altitudes in their "terminal" phase, as they descend. It's different from conventional defense missiles, which are designed to get close to a target and self-detonate to damage or deflect the threat. According to Lockheed Martin, Thaad is more like hitting a bullet with a bullet: the missiles rely on infra-red seeker technology to locate and hit the target head on, completely destroying it, Lockheed says.

2. Could Thaad really save South Korea from an attack?

The Pentagon, in announcing the planned deployment last July, said the system would "contribute to a layered missile defense that will enhance the alliance's existing missile defense capabilities against North Korean missile threats." Some of China's military experts question Thaad's ability to take out North Korea's short-range missiles and artillery shells because the system is designed for high-altitude (the "ha" in Thaad) intercepts on either side of

the earth's atmosphere. However, independent test results collected by a Cornell University scholar show that the bulk of Thaad's testing has been against short-range targets, according to Rod Lyon, a fellow at the Australian Strategic Policy Institute in Canberra. Play Video Why a U.S. Missile Defense System Is Angering China A U.S. missile defense system being deployed in South Korea is upsetting China. Source: Bloomberg

3. Does it pose an offensive threat?

No. Thaad missiles don't carry warheads.

4. Could it knock down missiles launched by China at the U.S.?

Not really. China's longer range intercontinental ballistic missiles targeting the continental U.S. would still be in their ascent phase when they pass by Thaad installations in South Korea. The same would be true if North Korea acquires an operational ICBM.

5. So, what is China worried about?

It's concerned that Thaad's surveillance capabilities might be able to offer early tracking data to parts of the American ballistic missile defense system, eroding China's ability to target the U.S. in the event of war, Lyon said. The Global Times, a Communist Party-affiliated newspaper, accused Seoul of "tying itself to the U.S. chariot and turning into an arrogant pawn of Washington in the latter's military containment against China."

6. So Thaad could give the U.S. an advantage against China?

Perhaps. The U.S. already has a Thaad battery deployed in Guam, two radars in Japan, space assets, plus a range of ship-borne radars and larger land based radars in other parts of the Pacific, according to Lyon. Thaad would perhaps improve early tracking of some Chinese missiles but might not make interception of the missiles much easier.

7. How is China responding so far?

It's ordered travel agencies to stop selling tour packages to South Korea and taken steps against Lotte Group, one of South Korea's largest family-run conglomerates (or chaebol), which offered up the land that will host Thaad's missile battery. & Lotte Group's development in the Chinese market should come to an end," the Global Times wrote in an editorial after the decision. South Korea media has reported that Chinese hacks rendered some of Lotte's websites inoperable. South Korea responded by saying it would ensure Korean companies don't face unfair trade measures in China.

8. What does the U.S. say?

U.S. Secretary of State Rex Tillerson called China's recent steps "inappropriate." He said the U.S. will proceed with the Thaad deployment.

9. What do experts say?

Beijing has tried to woo South Korea away from the U.S. orbit, an effort that will have failed if Thaad gets deployed, says Zhang Baohui, director of the Center for Asian Pacific Studies at Lingnan University in Hong Kong. Robert Kelly, a political science associate professor at South Korea's Pusan National University, wrote that Beijing is essentially demanding that South Korea remain defenseless -- roofless -- in the face of a spiraling nuclear missile threat on its doorstep. That is an astonishing ultimatum: to effectively surrender South Korean national security over an existential threat to demands of a foreign power." TA

- **Cannot let China bully SK because that will set a precedent**

foreign affairs (council on foreign relations)- “The good, the THAAD, and the ugly”- 2017

<https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/united-states/2017-02-15/good-thaad-and-ugly>

Over the fall and winter, as South Korea descended into a political corruption scandal that eventually led to the impeachment of President Park Geun-hye, Beijing stepped up its economic coercion, appearing to take advantage of the domestic uncertainty in Seoul in a bid to undermine its security cooperation with Washington. Since then, Beijing has kept up the pressure. **If China succeeds—or even appears to succeed—in blocking THAAD, it could set a dangerous precedent, emboldening Chinese policymakers to expand their use of economic leverage as a coercive tool against China's other trading partners.** To counter this risk, the administration of U.S. President Donald Trump should continue to strengthen its cooperation with Seoul on North Korea and work toward THAAD’s deployment, while at the same time trying to reassure China that the missile defense system does not undermine China’s nuclear deterrent. It should also look for opportunities to raise the costs of Beijing’s coercive behavior.

- **Disruptive effects on China**

forbes – “Why China's Bullying of South Korea Will Have Unanticipated Costs For Both Parties”- 2017

<https://www.forbes.com/sites/douglasbulloch/2017/03/24/chinas-bullying-of-south-korea-may-have-unanticipated-costs/#a33ab2526913>

Such is the range of China's restrictions, affecting cosmetics, electric batteries for cars (though this could be simple protectionism), and TV soap operas, that a precise audit of the overall costs to South Korea is difficult. **Credit Suisse, however, estimated that China's travel restrictions alone could cost South Korea anywhere between 0.5% (if only affecting Chinese tour groups) to 1.2% of GDP. Beyond the affected sectors, some 25% of South Korea's exports go to China, so there is much at stake.**

Policies like these are also bound to have disruptive effects in China itself. Not only are Chinese consumers no longer able to source their favorite cosmetics, or watch their favourite TV shows (South Korean dramas are wildly popular in China) but basic economics indicates that the costs of protectionism always split two ways. Even this, though, is not the end of it for China.

AT-NK is not an immediate threat

- **NK has issued many threats**

BBC News- "The North consistently warned that military exercises being conducted in the area would spark a retaliation." - 15 September 2015

<http://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-17399847>

North Korea has frequently employed bellicose rhetoric towards its perceived enemies.

In 1994 South Koreans stocked up on essentials in panic after a threat by a North Korean negotiator to turn Seoul into "a sea of fire" - one which has been repeated several times since.

After US President George W Bush labelled it part of the "axis of evil" in 2002, Pyongyang said it would "mercilessly wipe out the aggressors".

In June 2012 the army warned that artillery was aimed at seven South Korean media groups and threatened a "merciless sacred war".

There is also a pattern of escalating threats whenever South Korea gets a new leader, with misogynist rhetoric directed at South Korea's first female President Park Geun-hye after she was elected in 2013.

While many observers dismiss the rhetoric as bluster, others warn of "the tyranny of low expectations" when it comes to understanding North Korea, because there have been a number of serious regional confrontations.

"If you follow North Korean media you constantly see bellicose language directed against the US and South Korea and occasionally Japan is thrown in there, and it's hard to know what to take seriously. But then when you look at occasions where something really did happen, such as the artillery attack on a South Korean island in 2010, you see there were very clear warnings," Professor John Delury at South Korea's Yonsei university told the BBC.

Mr Delury argues that misreading Pyongyang's intentions and misunderstanding its capabilities has kept the US and South Korea stuck in a North Korean quagmire.

In recent years, the North has warned of a pre-emptive nuclear attack on the US in response to the prospect of joint military exercises between South Korea and the US.

"Any time a nation threatens pre-emptive nuclear war, there is cause for concern. North Korea is no exception, with its... shift in rhetoric from accusing the US of imagining a North Korean ballistic missile threat, to vowing to use its ballistic missile capabilities to strike the continental US," says Andrea Berger, from the Royal United Services Institute in London.

- **NK can do it at any time**

Bruce Klingner- "South Korea Needs THAAD Missile Defense"-The Heritage Foundation- June 12, 2015.

<http://www.heritage.org/defense/report/south-korea-needs-thaad-missile-defense>

"Any time a nation threatens pre-emptive nuclear war, there is cause for concern. North Korea is no exception, with its... shift in rhetoric from accusing the US of imagining a North Korean ballistic missile threat, to vowing to use its ballistic missile

capabilities to strike the continental US," says Andrea Berger, from the Royal United Services Institute in London.

- **It needs to be stopped because its magnitude is so large.**

Brian- "US Strike on North Korea Could Put Seoul in Jeopardy."- VOA News. Apr. 26, 2017.

<https://www.voanews.com/a/us-strike-on-north-korea-could-put-seoul-in-jeopardy/3826065.html>

"It might involve artillery attacks on Seoul or elsewhere along the demilitarized zone [DMZ.] It might involve covert operations, but they have several levels of escalation to go before they get to nuclear or even chemical weapons," said John Schilling, a missile technology specialist with 38 North, a North Korea monitoring website run by Johns Hopkins University's School of Advanced International Studies (SAIS) in Washington.

North Korea has more than 21,000 artillery weapons, positioned mostly along the inter-Korean border, that could put in jeopardy the lives of 25 million people that live in and around Seoul, the South Korean capital located 56 kilometers south of the border.

An assessment of North Korean military capabilities by Strafor, an intelligence analysis organization in Texas, notes the North's artillery arsenal includes 300mm multiple rocket launcher systems that can "rain fire across" Seoul and beyond. "A single volley," a Strafor report said, "could deliver more than 350 metric tons of explosives across the South Korean capital, roughly the same amount of ordnance dropped by 11 B-52 bombers."

- **NK has more nuclear weapons than once thought and is proliferating faster and faster**
NBC News – "North Korea May Have More Nuclear Bomb Material Than Thought, Says Think Tank" - July 15, 2017

<http://www.nbcnews.com/news/world/north-korea-may-have-more-nuclear-bomb-material-thought-says-n783291>

Thermal images of North Korea's main nuclear site show Pyongyang may have reprocessed more plutonium than previously thought that can be used to enlarge its nuclear weapons stockpile, a U.S. think tank said on Friday.

The analysis by 38 North, a Washington-based North Korean monitoring project, was based on satellite images of the radiochemical laboratory at the Yongbyon nuclear plant from September until the end of June, amid rising international concerns over North Korea's nuclear and missile programs.

U.S. ambassador to the United Nations Nikki Haley has been seeking to overcome resistance from China and Russia to a U.N. Security Council resolution imposing stiffer international sanctions on Pyongyang.

Experts at 38 North estimated in April that North Korea could have as many as 20 nuclear bombs and could produce one more each month.

- **NK is a threat**

Washington examiner- "Winning a war against North Korea would come at 'great cost': Here's what it might look like"- 2017

<http://www.washingtonexaminer.com/winning-a-war-against-north-korea-would-come-at-great-cost-heres-what-it-might-look-like/article/2628595>

"To initiate military options takes you from a world of zero casualties to a world of tens of thousands in a best case, and quite possibly a million or more, especially if they use nuclear weapons," said Michael O'Hanlon, a senior foreign policy fellow at the Brookings Institution.

In other words, risking war with the unpredictable regime of Kim Jong Un is "unthinkable," except that for more than 60 years, an army of Pentagon planners has thought of little else.

Most of U.S. wargaming over the years has focused on the problem of repelling an invasion from the North.

The Pentagon's off-the-shelf war plan for the defense of South Korea, known as "OPLAN 5027" is updated regularly and includes a massive logistics scheme for quickly reinforcing the roughly 28,500 U.S. and 500,000 South Korea troops that would face off against North Korea's million-man army.

The risk calculus now is even more complicated, because North Korea has shown it can detonate a nuclear device underground and claims it can make a bomb small enough to fit atop a missile, a capability it has yet to demonstrate.