

Framework- economy --- military budget ---- military ---- national security

Commented [1]: magnitude, scope, reversibility, probability, time frame, lives, quality of life

Warrant: need to have sustainable economy to fund the military, if we buy a bunch of AMS one day and deplete our resources, what about tomorrow?

Our impacts are also much more probable

THAAD works! I have (5) responses to the argument.

1. THAAD cannot stop missiles at low altitudes and entirely useless against artillery.

Emanuel Pasterich-HuffPost-The Unable Sadness Of THAAD-2016 // To start with, THAAD is an outdated technology whose ability to stop missiles is doubtful. To the degree that THAAD might work, it does so for missiles flying at high altitudes. North Korea does not need to send missiles at high altitudes to attack South Korea, if such an unlikely scenario unfolded. After all, if North Korea wanted to kill tens of thousands or more South Korean civilians, it does not need to use any missiles at all, but rather can use its substantial artillery units for which Seoul is fully within range. THAAD is entirely useless against artillery. Moreover, there are any number of strategies that render the missile defense system ineffective. As THAAD is aimed at missiles flying at a high altitude, most likely it will simply encourage the Chinese, who perceive the system as intended primarily to deter them, to build many more missiles. That will only bring on an arms race and greater insecurity.

2. THAAD has never been battle tested and North Korea can overwhelm the systems.

Robert E Kelly-The National Interest-Can THAAD Save South Korea?-2016 // Next, THAAD has never been battle-tested. No one really knows how effective it will be. But even if all ten THAAD anti-missile rockets were to destroy Northern inbound missiles, the North almost certainly has, or will soon have, many more, including dummies. Finally, THAAD is only a mild quantitative expansion of what South Korea already has. It is not a qualitative shift in regional air battle scenarios. In reality, THAAD just thickens South Korea's "roof" a little. It buys South Korea a few more years at best – a bit more time before North Korea builds so many missile, drones, dummies, and so on that it can overwhelm Southern air defense. THAAD does not obviate the North's nuclear weapons, much less China's. It just gives Seoul a little more breathing room to figure out what to do about Pyongyang's spiraling missile program.

3. THAAD is not effective in countering NK nuclear attacks.

YONHAP News Agency-THAAD not effective in countering N.K. nuclear attack haystacked in barrage of warheads - 2016 // Garth McLennan, who has closely followed American foreign and security policy, made the point in an article contributed to the website 38 North, forecasting that THAAD's deployment to South Korea would lead to the North stepping up its production of ballistic missiles. "THAAD would not, however, serve as an effective tool in countering a North Korean nuclear strike if such an attack were haystacked among a barrage of conventional warheads," he said. "The THAAD system is a powerful anti-missile tool ... but in this case, it would not serve as a bulletproof measure against a North Korean nuclear attack." The nuclear warheads would be the proverbial needles in the haystack of conventional munitions. Currently, such a defensive system does not exist, he said.

Korea Expose, missile defense expert and MIT professor Ted Postol - THAAD missile defense no work - 2017 // Postol also notes the THAAD system has not been proven to work. "The infrared seeker on THAAD interceptors is easily fooled by decoys," he said. "An enemy can launch several fake missiles along with the real one; they would shoot out in different directions to confuse the THAAD system, which would then have a hard

missiles from exploding on land. Because the distance between Pyongyang and Seoul is merely 194 kilometers, China has claimed that THAAD is not suited for protecting South Korea. Second, THAAD's radar can detect China's military actions and interfere with Chinese interests. Because THAAD has to detect missile action as soon as possible, it must constantly collect data from areas within a 1,000 kilometer range, which includes Chinese and Russian territory. THAAD deployment in South Korea seems unlikely to improve relations with North Korea since compromised relations with China, one of few countries with significant influence over North Korea, will likely further damage relations on the peninsula.

However, residents in Seongju county, where THAAD will be deployed, are strongly against THAAD because of the possible disintegration of chemical warheads and batteries that may emit radiation and contaminate the environment. In addition to the fear of radiation, anti-THAAD sentiment has strengthened in response to the government's secrecy surrounding THAAD deployment. South Korean civil organizations and political parties have criticized the US Department of Defense and President Park's government for the lack of information provided to citizens over the deployment, and for the government's declaration of the deployment without any open discussion. While the US Department of Defense sent officials to Seongju county to explain the process of deployment, it never held any press conference to officially announce the deployment site and reasons for the deployment. Given that THAAD deployment has been a major issue in South Korean politics, and that the government still chose to announce the deployment site without democratic input, many South Korean citizens think that their government may be withholding critical information.

Cannot intercept missiles with irregular trajectory

The continuous missile development by North Korea could be seen as tests for bypassing THAAD's abilities, as it is possible to launch more missiles than a missile defense can intercept. So far, only one THAAD battery is planned to be deployed which could be a critical weakness. THAAD's difficulty in intercepting missiles with irregular trajectories could also be used; in theory, North Korea's medium-range Rodong missiles would be able to bypass THAAD as they have an irregular trajectory.

Other AMS work

Goalkeeper Blocks

GOALKEEPER NOT ANTI-MISSILE SYSTEMS

Osborne 13 [Osborn, Kris @ DefenseTech, 8/13/13, Navy Overhauls Phalanx Ship Defense Weapon, <https://www.defensetech.org/2013/08/21/navy-overhauls-phalanx-ship-defense-weapon/>, A.G.]

The Phalanx, or **CIWS, is an area weapon engineered to use a high rate of fire and ammunition to blanket a given area, thus destroying or knocking threats out of the sky before they reach a ship.** The Phalanx CIWS, which can fire up to 4,500 rounds per minute, has been protecting ship platforms for decades.

The weapon is currently on Navy cruisers, destroyers, aircraft carriers and amphibious assault ships, among other vessels. The upgrades are designed to substantially increase capability and ensure that the system remains viable in the face of a fast-changing and increasingly complex threat environment, Navy officials said.

GOALKEEPER WON'T PROTECT BALLISTIC MISSILES

Wachsberger 04 [Christian Wachsberger, Michael Lucas and Alexander Krstic, @Australian government department of defense, june 2004, "Limitations of Guns as a Defence against Manoeuvring Air Weapons", <http://dSPACE.dsto.defence.gov.au/dSPACE/bitstream/1947/3526/1/DSTO-TN-0565.pdf>] A.G.

Thirty years later different technologies were needed to mount credible air defences against the jet bomber aircraft of the day. These aircraft could travel at stratospheric altitudes (e.g. B52 Stratofortress) or fly close to the ground using terrain following radar to guide them (e.g. F111 strike aircraft) and could deliver ordnance onto selective ground targets with significantly greater levels of precision. High-speed, strike aircraft would only be exposed to any line-of-sight ground-based weapon systems for short periods of time, however, improved tracking and engagement radars together with optical sighting systems enabled remotely controlled guns to remain effective.

Yet **another thirty years have passed and the technology that was designed for warfare in the seventies no longer remains suited to dealing with modern and emerging air weapon systems. Strategic and other critical assets will be subject to attack from a new range of air threats and these include:**

stealth aircraft, armed helicopters, highly accurate aircraft-launched weapons that emit low RF and IR signatures, offer long stand-off ranges (beyond 150 km), are capable of travelling at high speed (mach 5+) and can manoeuvre at high g forces, high-speed, **long-range cruise missiles**, armed unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs), **surface-launched missiles, ballistic artillery missiles**, precision-guided, long-range artillery shells, large numbers of low cost sub-munitions, **and highly coordinated attacks involving combinations of the aforementioned weapon systems.**

- No literature on cost

GOALKEEPER RANGE

navweaps[http://www.navweaps.com/Weapons/WNNeth_30mm_Goalkeeper.php, “30 mm (1.2”) Goalkeeper SGE-30”]A.G.

According to navy weapons .com, the goalkeeper ciws system has a maximum range of 3,300 (1.875 miles)

A.E.G.I.S. blocks

ROK already has Aegis

<http://thediplomat.com/2016/07/stopping-north-korean-missiles-an-alternative-to-thaad/>

Before long, North Korea will have effective long-range three-stage ballistic missiles armed with nuclear warheads. This is clearly a global security threat, for which a purely national response is inadequate: it requires a regional BMD coalition with multiple layers of collaboration across the Northeast Asia region, encompassing sensors, command and control systems, engagement functions and intercept scenarios. BMD relies on phased-array radar, notably the Aegis system developed by the United States. There are currently six nations operating Aegis-equipped ships, of which three – the U.S., Japan, and the Republic of Korea (ROK) – have recently conducted a trilateral ballistic missile information sharing and defense drill. BMD maritime patrol operations continue, with Australia expected to join in soon.

Aegis costs

CRS 17[O'Rourke, Donald, @crs, June 5, 2017, “Navy Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense (BMD) Program: Background and Issues for Congress”, <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/weapons/RL33745.pdf>]A.G.

Navy briefing slides dated February 27, 2012, provided by the Navy to CRS on March 9, 2012. The briefing slides state that the estimated up-front cost of \$92 million includes \$13.5 million for constructing a new weapon magazine, \$0.8 million for constructing a pier laydown area, \$3.4 million for constructing a warehouse, \$5.0 million for repairing an existing facility that is to be used as an administrative/operations space, and \$69.3 million for conducting maintenance work on the four ships in the United States prior to moving them to Rota. **The briefing states that the estimated recurring cost of \$100 million per year** includes costs for base operating support, annual PCS (personnel change of station) costs, a pay and allowances delta, annual mobile training team costs, ship maintenance work, the operation of a Ship Support

Activity, and higher fuel costs associated with a higher operating tempo that is maintained by ships that are homeported in foreign countries.

South Korea bought before

Aitoro 15[Jill R. Aitoro @ washington business journal, Jun 11, 2015, "South Korea looks to buy \$1.2B missile defense system",

https://www.bizjournals.com/washington/blog/fedbiz_daily/2015/06/south-korea-looks-to-buy-1-2b-missile-defense.html] A.G.

The State Department approved a \$1.91 billion possible foreign military sale to South Korea for three Aegis Combat Systems from Lockheed Martin Corp. (NYSE: LMT) that use computer and radar technology to track and guide weapons to destroy enemy targets. The buy, which is now in the hands of Congress for final approval, will include related equipment and services as well, some of which will be provided by the Raytheon Co.

South Korea will buy again

Yoon 16[Sukjoon Yoon @ the diplomat, July 18, 2016, "Stopping North Korean Missiles: An Alternative to THAAD", <http://thediplomat.com/2016/07/stopping-north-korean-missiles-an-alternative-to-thaad/>] A.G.

Currently the ROK navy has level 8 Aegis capabilities, but this could be updated to level 9 for the second KDX-III batch, which will also have a superior intercept capability using SM-3 missiles. This program will therefore be able to contribute cost-effectively to monitoring North Korean ballistic missile threats from the seas around the Korean Peninsula, providing space tracking and surveillance systems, forward-based midcourse X-band radar, early warning radar, etc.

US will still have influence

CRS 17[O'Rourke, Donald, @crs, June 5, 2017, "Navy Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense (BMD) Program: Background and Issues for Congress", <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/weapons/RL33745.pdf>] A.G.

A September 6, 2016, press report states:

A trio of planned South Korean guided missile destroyers will be built with the capability to intercept ballistic missile threats. USNI News has learned.

The addition of the capability will give the Republic of Korea (RoK) Navy a powerful organic BMD capability in addition to U.S. Army ground-based interceptors peppered throughout South Korea.

Under the plan, the three remaining ships in the Sejong the Great-class will be able to simultaneously intercept traditional air warfare threats while adding a ballistic missile defense capability through a series of hardware and software upgrades over the current

class of ship, several sources confirmed to USNI News.

The destroyers will be fitted with the U.S. Navy's Baseline 9 version of the Aegis Combat System that combines modern computing architecture to allow the ship's AN/SPY-1D(v) radar to detect and track aircraft, cruise missiles and ballistic missiles at the same time.

Subpar success rate

<https://www.mda.mil/global/documents/pdf/testrecord.pdf>

Missile defense agency - 2017

35 successful intercepts in 42 attempts against ballistic missile targets

Iron Dome Blocks

Iron dome purpose

raytheon[Raytheon, company that manufactures the iron dome system's product page, "Iron Dome Weapon System, Defense Against Rockets, Artillery and Mortars"

<http://www.raytheon.com/capabilities/products/irondome/>,]A.G.

The Iron Dome Weapon System works to detect, assess and intercept incoming rockets, artillery and mortars. The Tamir missile is Iron Dome's combat-proven interceptor that strikes down incoming threats launched from ranges of 4-70 km. The Iron Dome system is deployed today in Israel, providing day and night protection.

The only operational interceptor solution for countering rockets, artillery and mortars (CRAM) available for U.S. and coalition partners, the Iron Dome Weapon System and Tamir interceptor have achieved more than 1,500 successful intercepts.

An effective and affordable defense solution, the Iron Dome system can assess a threat based on its trajectory to determine the expected target area. If the attack poses danger to an occupied area, the Tamir missile intercepts it, while allowing off-target threats to detonate in unoccupied areas. This cost-effective approach minimizes unnecessary interceptor launches.

Built for terrorist protection

[Hruksa 14] Hurksa, Joel @Extremetech, 5/10/14, "The United States' missile defense system will never work — which is why we're spending more money on it",

<https://www.extremetech.com/extreme/182175-the-united-states-missile-defense-system-will-never-work-which-is-why-were-spending-more-money-on-it>

Iron Dome is an anti-missile system developed by Israel to defend against Grad and Qassam rockets fired by insurgents and terrorist groups. These rockets have a typical velocity of about 675 meters per second, or approximately 0.4 miles per second. An ICBM, in contrast, has a velocity of 2.5 miles per second in boost phase and a terminal-phase velocity of around 4.3 miles per second.

Iron Dome BAD

Iron dome has a 5% success rate along with lack of defense from icbms and ballistic missiles.

Dr. Clemens 2016 [Walter C, associate professor at the Harvard University Davis Center for Russian and Eurasian Studies and Professor Emeritus of Political Science at Boston University, North Korea and The World, University of Kentucky Press, 2016, d3]

As noted later, in chapter 20, President Barack Obama's Penatgon pushed Seoul in 2015 to buy and deploy its "THAAD" defense system to shield South Korea from short- and medium-range missile attack. Washington pointed vaunted successes of Israel's "Iron Dome," heavily subsidized by the United States. **Serious analysis showed, however, the dome to be quite leaky. It stopped at most 5 percent of missiles fired from Gaza- not the 85 to 95 percent claimed by Israel and the Pentagon. If defense against the short-range missile is problematic, how much more difficult to intercept an ICBM- especially if outfitted with multiple warheads? The Economist reported in 2014 that "not even the American military can distinguish sophisticated decoys from a warhead** (though it might manage to do so if confronted with relatively crude weapons designed by Iran or North Korea)." Some analysts hoped that antimissiles fired from drones could intercept enemy missiles during launch phase, but the problems in deploying such a system close to North Korea or Iran, not to speak of China or Russia, might well be insurmountable. A survey of expert opinion conducted by The Economist concluded: "Even with new technology, America's multi-billion- dollar effort to build a shield against long range ballistic missiles looked doomed."

Doug's master block

US Defense Department concluded systems as of 2014 were inadequate- means AEGIS is incapable of solving

Dr. Clemens 2016 [Walter C, associate professor at the Harvard University Davis Center for Russian and Eurasian Studies and Professor Emeritus of Political Science at Boston University, North Korea and The World, University of Kentucky Press, 2016, d3]

The United States proceeded to throw good money after bad. **A dozen years after the Bush team embraced missile defense, the US Defense Department conceded that the defense systems deployed in Alaska and California would not work.** The Pentagon announced in February 2014 that its next budget would include funds to overhaul Boeing Company's ground-based missile defense system and develop a replacement for an interceptor built by Raytheon after several recent test failures. "We've got to get more reliable systems," Frank Kendall, under-secretary of defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, told a conference sponsored by McAleese and Associates and Credit Suisse. Did the problems arise from a shortage of funding

in recent years? No, Kendall said. **They resulted more from decisions to rush deployment of technologies that had not been completely and thoroughly tested. "Just updating the things we've got is probably not going to be adequate. So we're going to have to go beyond that," he said-offering no details.**

AT-CH doesn't have large impact on SK econ

Shuli Ren-China's Sanctions Over THAAD Can Sink Korea's Economy-March, 2017

<http://www.barrons.com/articles/chinas-sanctions-over-thaad-can-sink-koreas-economy-1488773168>

And things could get worse. China has asked for a boycott of Lotte Group's products, but China's displeasure has so far only been directed at cosmetics, duty-free shops and Korean casinos. Will China launch sanctions against Korean smartphones and car makers too?

Credit Suisse economist Christiaan Tuntoono wrote:

In 2016, Chinese tourists to Korea represent a hefty 47% of total tourist arrivals and an estimated 64% of total tourism revenue. Besides tourism, Korea is also highly exposed to China on merchandise trade, with 25% of gross exports (18% on value-added basis) bounded for the country. Korean companies in automobile, electronics and media also have significant operations within the Chinese borders. We are concerned that the Korean economy and the highly exposed sectors may face greater pressures from China if the dispute is not reconciled in the near future.

AT: Don't know if China will increase with more THAAD

Ahn: professor of international trade law and policy at Seoul National University.

VOA - 2017 - <https://www.voanews.com/a/china-means-business-in-economic-challenge-over-thaad/3768596.html>

Some local analysts have suggested businesses begin scouting new markets, as THAAD poses a formidable barrier to resolving the trade dispute.

In the meantime, Ahn suggested Seoul use a mediation provision in its FTA with China. It's essentially a channel, he said, to discuss non-tariff issues when it's unclear if the problem is intentional.

But Ahn is not hopeful about resolution.

"I think the situation will become worse," he said.

He said it's likely THAAD will be fully deployed and China will eventually formalize its economic sanctions against South Korea.

Sanctions/diplomacy don't work

1. North Korea is willing to negotiate

National Post - 2017

Choi Sun-hee, the top North Korean diplomat who handles relations with the U.S., spoke briefly to reporters in Beijing en route to Pyongyang. She was travelling from Norway, where she led a delegation that held an informal meeting with former U.S. officials and scholars. Choi did not elaborate on what the North's conditions are, but her comments raise the possibility of North Korea and the U.S. returning to negotiations for the first time since 2008, when six-nation talks over Pyongyang's nuclear weapons program fell apart.

2. U.S. has the potential to sanction the Chinese

Exclusive: U.S. prepares new sanctions on Chinese firms over North Korea ties - officials - Matt Spetalnick and David Brunnstrom (Reuters) - 2017

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 Pyongyang 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. The administration has yet to see what it considers a sufficient response from China. "The president is losing patience with China," the official said, adding that there would be a "more aggressive approach to sanctioning Chinese entities ... in the not-too-distant future." China's embassy in Washington did not respond immediately to a request for comment. The White House declined comment.

3. Pyongyang could suspend its nuclear and missile activities in exchange for a halt in joint US/SK military drills

Guy Taylor, "THAAD missile shield to South Korea gives Donald Trump advantage over China on North Korea," *Washington Times*, 8 March 2017. JF <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2017/mar/8/thead-missile-shield-to-south-korea-gives-donald-t/>

"In an unusual and public proposal that analysts say exposed Beijing's growing alarm over the situation on the Korean Peninsula, Chinese Foreign Minister Wang Yi told reporters that **Pyongyang could suspend its nuclear and missile activities in exchange for a halt in joint U.S.-South Korean military drills that the North has long condemned as a rehearsal for an invasion.**

The Trump administration and South Korea quickly threw cold water on the proposal as the U.N. Security Council convened a closed-door session on [Pyongyang](#)'s ballistic missile tests — including a simultaneous launch Monday in which a missile crashed into waters just 190 miles off the coast of Japan. **The State Department said China's suggested trade-off was not a "viable deal,"** and U.S. Ambassador Nikki Haley said the regime of North Korean leader Kim Jong-un would first have to take 'some sort of positive action.'"

The biggest problem with the proposition is that the U.S. didn't view it as a fair trade, but all that could change if the U.S. were able to gain leverage in the area by deploying T.H.A.A.D.

Diplomacy would work

-There Is a Peaceful Way Out of the North Korea Crisis

<https://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2017/04/north-korea-trump-china/524349/>

As the old saying goes, however, in crisis there is both danger and opportunity. In his summit with the Chinese leader, President Trump clearly became aware of the complexity of the situation as seen by the Chinese regime: North Korea is not a mere client state of China, and a Chinese attempt to use its economic leverage (such as cutting off essential food and oil supplies) to pressure the Kim dictatorship could bring unpredictable consequences, including, the Chinese fear, a collapse of the North Korean regime that would send millions of North Korean refugees streaming across the border into China.

Yet the Chinese leadership is clearly deeply frustrated with North Korea's erratic and menacing behavior, which increasingly endangers China's vital interests in regional peace and stability. It is this incipient shift in China's thinking that presents the most promising opportunity for a breakthrough on the long-stalled diplomatic front. Whether through a resumption of the six-party talks or initiation of direct three-party negotiations involving China, the U.S., and North Korea (with the U.S. closely coordinating with Japan and South Korea), a diplomatic breakthrough must be pursued.

4. <http://www.pbs.org/newshour/rundown/north-south-korea-come-agreement/>

MARGARET SESSA-HAWKINS (PBS)-North and South Korea come to agreement- 2015

According to The Associated Press, South and North Korea have come to an agreement to defuse the stand-off at their border. Under the settlement, South Korea has agreed to stop broadcasting propaganda at the border, and North Korea has expressed regret over the wounding of two South Korean soldiers by a North Korean land mine.

The stand-off began earlier in August after a landmine blast maimed two South Korean troops. Following the blast, South Korea installed loud speakers broadcasting anti-North Korean propaganda at the border. North Korea then positioned troops at the border, and said they were prepared to attack if South Korea did not stop.

Talks between the two countries began shortly after the Saturday deadline. They were adjourned for a bit Sunday morning, but resumed in the afternoon. Talks ended officially early Tuesday morning in Korean time, with North Korea agreeing to a military de-escalation. Both sides also agreed to hold talks in Seoul or Pyongyang in the near future to improve their ties.

US will withdraw troops

1. Econ over national security argument; sanctions outweigh this impact

It's unlikely troops will be withdrawn because it causes economic loss for the U.S.

Pulling out troops would actually be cheaper for U.S.

A U.S. withdrawal would beyond all doubt create a vacuum of power on the Korean Peninsula, prompting North Korea to take on more provocative actions such as testing more missile and nuclear tests, attacking South Korean troops near the DMZ more often or shelling on the South's ships and islands near the Northern Limit Line. In return, South Korea may respond militarily to avoid losing face, and if initial deterrence fails, the two Koreas will be drawn into another Korean War, an adverse prospect for future U.S. administrations. The U.S. should not worry about being drawn into a conflict with North Korea because the presence of American troops has effectively thwarted North Korean attacks in the first place. In addition, keeping American troops on Korean soil is cheaper than sustaining the same number of troops in America, which helps shoulder some of the budget burden from American taxpayers. Maintaining the presence of American military in Korea is undeniably beneficial to both America and South Korea.

Deterrence theory

-AMS causes more proliferation

argument against korea will proliferate then everyone will proliferate

must prove every step of proliferation will occur

must prove sk will proliferate in general, why would they do that with US troops

so wouldn't that mean us will pull out? why will us pull out?

-NK is already deterred by US, how likely is a strike? So why do we need a deterrent?

SK/US relations

1. Chinese sanctions are highly effective and continue to increase.

<http://money.cnn.com/2017/03/03/news/economy/china-south-korea-thaad-tourism-trade-sanctions/index.html>

CNN Jethro Mullen - china south korea thaad tourism trade sanctions - 2017

China is also South Korea's biggest trading partner, accounting for about a quarter of its exports. "Korea is a lot more dependent on China than the other way around," said Krystal Tan of Capital Economics. "China is a much larger economy." Investors are clearly worried about the escalation in tension and the potential fallout on tourism. Shares in South Korean companies with big duty-free businesses plunged in Seoul on Friday. Hotel Shilla dropped 13% and Shinsegae fell 5%. We also have good evidence that China will continue to place other sanctions, by the fact that in recent months, Beijing has placed restrictions on South Korean cosmetics and even denied visas to two South Korean classical artists who were set to perform in China.

2. Woo-hyun 2017 (Shim Woo-hyun, Korea Herald, "Tourism industry to continue to suffer as THAAD issue remains unresolved", July 9, 2017,

<http://www.koreaherald.com/view.php?ud=20170709000210>

If the number of Chinese tourists decreases by half to reach 4 million this year, their spending in Korea is also estimated to plunge by almost 11 trillion won. The average spending of a Chinese tourist was 2.74 million won (\$2,373) in 2015, but this might too decline, industry sources anticipated. On the back of continued declines of Chinese tourism in Korea, the sales of the duty-free industry saw the most dramatic financial loss. Lotte Duty Free, Korea's largest duty-free operator, expected its sales to decrease by 20 percent, 350 billion won down from the same period last year.The overall duty-free industry also expects its sales to decrease 15 to 20 percent accounting for some 600 billion won. Lotte Mart also had to shut down 87 of its 99 outlets in China, due to the THAAD controversy. Of the 87 closed outlets, only 13 were voluntarily closed by the company, while the other 74 were closed by Chinese authorities citing safety violations. Korea's tourism deficit also expanded to hit a record high in May due mainly to a drop in incoming travelers, according to the Bank of Korea.

The tourism balance of payment, or net costs spent by Koreans on short-term overseas tours, reached \$1.18 billion in May. The number of outbound tourists also jumped 21 percent to 2 million in May from a year ago. The number of foreign visitors overall fell 34.5 percent to 978,000.

Econ loss caused unemployment

South Korea Unemployment Rate

1999-2017 | [Data](#) | [Chart](#) | [Calendar](#)

South Korea's seasonally adjusted unemployment rate rose to 3.8 percent in June 2017 from a four-month low of 3.6 percent in the previous month. The number of unemployed persons increased by 55 thousand from the previous month to 1.05 million and the number of employed rose by 14 thousand to 26.48 million people. The participation rate edged up to 62.9 percent from 62.8 percent in May. Unemployment Rate in South Korea averaged 3.64 percent from 1999 until 2017, reaching an all time high of 7.10 percent in June of 1999 and a record low of 2.90 percent in November of 2013.

Counters chinese hegemony

1. Trade sanctions

SK is a buffer zone

1. SK doesn't want to be a middle-man or be used for other relations

Not immediately needed

Furthermore, the deployment of AMS is not immediately needed. According to Alex Lockie in 2017 from Business Insider, “North Korea doesn’t attack Seoul, Tokyo, Guam, or any other place — because if they did, the US would absolutely destroy them.” Moreover, North Korea is estimated to have 13-30 nuclear weapons and creates 3-5 a year as of the end of 2016 by David Albright, physicist of the institute for Science and International Security. Therefore, since North Korea has a relatively low and slow rate of creating nuclear weapons, it is not in South Korea’s best interest to deploy AMS and it is better for it to focus on more immediate concerns, like economic issues. (sanctions, debt, unemployment, stagnant wages)

Other best interests

<https://www.nytimes.com/2017/05/12/world/asia/south-korea-economy-moon-jae-in.html>

Nytimes - motoko rich - 2017

“Unfortunately, because we ourselves do not see the future of Korea as so rosy, I do not want to bring up children in this unpromising society,” said Bang Seong-deok, a civil engineering doctoral student taking a break with a friend outside a classroom black on Wednesday. “I think that mentality is persistent among many of peers.”

Anger at the collusive ties between government and business was at the heart of the protests that led to the impeachment of Mr. Moon’s predecessor, Park Geun-hye. During the election campaign, Mr. Moon vowed to end that corruption but he also promised to address other factors that had fueled the revolt: skyrocketing household debt, high youth unemployment and stagnant wages, all of which are hobbling the economy.

US will pull out

Warrant: Rinna 2016 [Anthony Rinna. "America's Korea Mission Isn't Charity." Apr. 8, 2016. *The National Interest*. <http://nationalinterest.org/feature/americas-korea-mission-isnt-charity-15711>] DF

The Korean Peninsula sits in the middle of one of the most important nodes in the global economic system, where several of the world's most powerful economies—those of China, Japan and South Korea—converge. East Asia not only remains one of the most economically successful regions of the world, but regional economies are experiencing an unprecedented growth of [intraregional integration](#).

A large part of the United States' economic security depends on continued commercial health and stability in this part of the globe. The outbreak of armed conflict on the Korean Peninsula would likely wreak economic havoc on the region as a whole, with consequent economic repercussions for the United States.

Year-to-date trade figures for February 2016 from the U.S. Census Bureau [indicate](#) that China, Japan and South Korea are all among the top six U.S. foreign trading partners. As Kurt Campbell, Assistant Secretary for the State Department's Asia-Pacific bureau [stated](#) before the U.S. Congress in 2011, "America's success in the 21st century is tied to the success of the dynamic Asia-Pacific region." Managing the threat posed by instability on the Korean Peninsula to the United States' economic interests cannot be done only through a combination of diplomacy and nuclear deterrence. It also requires the continual presence of American conventional armed forces.

Americans and South Koreans share a common goal: maintaining stability on the Korean peninsula and containing the threat posed by North Korea and its militarism. Yet where Seoul and Washington diverge is the scope and underlying motivations behind this outward display of solidarity. For Seoul, the primary mission is the defense of a republic—indeed, this is the only entity to which South Koreans are ultimately responsible.

- also costs more for US since sk pays for a portion of US troops

US can replace CH

http://atlas.media.mit.edu/en/profile/country/kor/#Trade_Balance

25% vs 14%

The top export destinations of South Korea are [China\(\\$131B\)](#), [the United States \(\\$72.7B\)](#), [Vietnam \(\\$26.6B\)](#), [Hong Kong \(\\$26.3B\)](#) and [Japan \(\\$25.5B\)](#). The top import origins are [China \(\\$90.1B\)](#), [Japan \(\\$44.6B\)](#), [the United States \(\\$42.7B\)](#), [Germany \(\\$20.2B\)](#) and [Saudi Arabia\(\\$17.7B\)](#).

There is strong disapproval in SK

Xinhuanet - 2017 - Yoo Seungki

http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/2017-07/13/c_136441900.htm

One year has passed since people in Seongju, a county in South Korea's southeast region, launched their protest rally against the deployment of the U.S. Terminal High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) missile interception system.

On July 13, 2016, Seongju was designated as a site for the U.S. missile shield installation. Since then, residents have never missed one day of a candlelit rally, rain or shine and in a sweltering heat or a biting cold.