

I. Introduction

We affirm, **“Resolved: Deployment of anti-missile systems is in South Korea’s best interest.”**

II. Framework & Definitions

A. Park (2011) explains that in order for South Korea to promote its democracy, freedom, and economy, it must prioritize regional security and stability.

B. We define South Korea’s best interest as “regional security and stability”

III. Arguments

A. *Contention 1: Preventing a First Strike*

1. On the Korean peninsula, tensions are escalating and time is running out. [Vox \(2017\)](#) finds that more recently, because of the confusing, aggressive rhetoric between North Korean and American leaders, as well as military demonstrations, and buildup by both sides, the probability of war is higher than ever. North Korea is getting ready to launch a first strike.

2. Smith of the National Defense University explains in 2015 that North Korea is uniquely aggressive because of its growing nuclear arsenal and geopolitical standing. Smith elaborates that the regime is *motivated to change the regional status quo to attempt to take regional power, and is willing to launch a first strike. This is critical because*

3. South Korean anti-missile systems stop North Korea from launching a first strike in two ways:

a) First, the addition of the THAAD radar to existing Anti Missile Systems substantially hurts North Korean first strike capabilities. [The National Interest elaborates in 2017](#) that for North Korea to launch a first strike, they would now have to use complex missile salvos, **making a first strike more costly and undesirable. This makes an effective first strike impossible without massive damage to their own government and limited resources.**

b) Second, layered anti-missile systems stabilize deterrence against rogue states. [Prof. Quackenbush of the University of Minnesota](#) finds empirically in 2006 that **when anti-missile systems are highly accurate, rogue nuclear states like North Korea are highly likely to back down from conflict because of retaliatory credibility. In other words, anti-missile systems force North**

**Korea to tone down aggression because anti-missile systems
prove that South Korea is serious about defending itself.**

IMPACTS:

The second impact is stopping war. [Vox \(2017\)](#) projects that war with North Korea would involve nuclear launches. Wellerstein of the Stevens Institute of Technology quantifies that North Korea's current nuclear warhead would cause at least **3.5 million instant casualties and 9.1 million people would be affected from radioactivity and infrastructure destruction when aimed at Seoul.**

B. Contention 2: Securing Alliances

1. North Korea's strategy has been to decouple alliances in the region to weaken regional retaliation. [Yale Professor Mira Hooper explains in 2017](#) that since North Korea's new nuclear warheads can reach the US mainland, it has raised the costs of American security commitments in the region.
2. Even worse, Prof. Hooper furthers that with these new developments, US security commitments and allied cooperation between Japan and South Korea are decreasing. This hinders efforts to deter and contain North Korea.
3. However, **anti-missile system deployment stops alliances from decoupling in two ways.**
 - a) First, anti-missile systems improve relations between Japan and South Korea.
 - (1) [The Washington Post \(2016\)](#) reports that the recent THAAD information sharing deal between Japan and South Korea marked a warming point in relations, allowing for more military cooperation and coordination which in turn allows for a better response to NK aggression.
 - (2) [Scott Snyder of the Center for Foreign Relations](#) furthers in 2017 that increased bilateral relations between Japan and South Korea is essential to providing assurance for control

of NK to both governments as the regional situation becomes volatile and more dangerous.

- b) Second, anti-missile system deployment Bolsters the US commitment to the region.

- (1) [Lee of the US-Korea Institute in 2017](#) writes that deployment is a critical litmus test of the US-South Korea alliance. By deploying, South Korea strengthens its ties with the United States, fills security gaps, and paves the way for more ground forces on the peninsula to Better protect itself from NK aggression.

IMPACTS:

The first impact is increasing South Korean influence. [Fmr. Georgetown Prof. Cronin explains in 2017](#) that South Korea's unique position as an equal middleman between China and the United States make it a viable leader to other countries in the region. By improving ties with the United States and Japan, South Korea can begin building stronger ties with countries in Northeast and Southeast Asia, to build a larger multilateral security structure, and enhance its own security.

The second impact is stopping the nuclear domino. Professor Hooper notes that when alliances are weak, South Korea will feel compelled to build up its nuclear capability to take on North Korea by itself. This is already happening; the Washington Post (2017) notes that South Korea's government is considering deployment of nuclear weapons, with a majority of the public support. To quantify, [Harvard Fellow Zackary Keck furthers in 2017](#) that South Korea can build 1000 nuclear warheads in the next 6 months. Next, [Mark Fitzpatrick of the IISS writes in 2017](#) that South Korean nuclearization will destabilize Northeast Asia further and drive North Korea to further develop its nuclear arsenal, causing a nuclear domino effect that will affect major players like Japan, China, Russia, and Taiwan. Thankfully, better alliance cooperation adds credibility by enhancing security and defense postures, which, as [Tony Stagarone notes in 2017](#), provides security reassurances that will keep South Korea from nuclearizing.

C. Contention 3: The EMP

1. On the Korean peninsula, tensions are escalating and time is running out. [Vox \(2017\)](#) finds that more recently, because of the confusing, aggressive rhetoric between North Korean and American leaders, as well as military demonstrations, and buildup by both sides, the probability of war is higher than ever.
2. [Graham of the US-Korea Institute explains in 2017](#) that as pressure increases, North Korea becomes highly motivated to retaliate against the West, in lower risk ways, primarily, an electromagnetic pulse attack. An EMP attack would take down the power grid and electrical systems in the region.
3. Hence, an EMP would be disastrous. North Korea can launch an EMP attack by detonating a small nuclear warhead above South Korea, or launching an EMP-ready satellite.
4. Thankfully, AMS systems can stop an EMP attack.
 - a) [Professor JJ Suh of the International Christian University writes in 2017](#) that the THAAD AMS can shoot down EMP nuclear missiles on their ascent.
 - b) [Wired \(2008\)](#) reports that the AEGIS AMS can shoot down military satellites and has already done so.

IMPACT:

The first impact is a nat'l power outage. [The Korea Times explains in 2011](#) that if an EMP attack was successful, 1.61 million households in Seoul and nearby areas would lose power. [Risk Assessment Expert Neil Hodge explains in 2017](#) that these blackouts would cause up to 164 billion dollars in losses for companies and paralyze major utilities and hospitals putting the lives of South Koreans at risk in very high numbers.

The second impact is stopping North Korean aggression. [Dr. Peter Pry of the Center for Security Policy finds in 2017](#) that a successful EMP would cripple and deny American and South Korean forces the critical communication, transportation, resources, and reinforcements needed to fend off a North Korean attack and give North Korea the advantage. Hence, AMS is essential to securing the allied advantage and stopping aggression.

D. Contention 4: Humanitarian Diplomacy

1. [The National Interest \(2015\)](#) explains that AMS deployment enhances defensive posturing of South Korea. Anti-missile systems manned by the US would protect South Korean lives as the situation on the peninsula becomes more hostile. This strengthens defensive postures and gestures on both sides of the conflict.
2. Defensive posturing in itself promotes humanitarian initiatives and development. [Ohlin \(2015\) of the US Naval War College](#) finds that when states build defensive capabilities to help other states, humanitarianism and its practices become reinforced on the international scale because outward aggression and offense become discouraged. Furthermore, direct American military intervention in itself becomes discouraged.
3. This is important because just last week, [Reuters reports](#) that South Korea approved a 8 million dollar aid humanitarian aid package to North Korea, in spite of hostilities. Furthermore, [Feffer of the US-Korea Institute writes two days ago](#) that by engaging North Korea through humanitarian aid, other options for international engagement open up too.
4. The first impact is stopping provocations. Professor [Aslam \(2010\)](#) of Former Christian College finds that American military interventions are 50% more probable to cause an increase in conflict and lead to future political instability and unrest for all countries involved.
5. The second impact is North Korean reform. [Willis \(2017\)](#) of the University of Leeds finds that North Korea is already giving way to UN human rights pressures and diplomacy. Pyongyang has already given in to ratifying other certain points, with Rights for People with Disabilities being the most recent example. These small concessions suggest that North Korea is on its way to broader, deeper reforms. Even moreso, as these small concessions take place, more opposition will spring up, leading to more political reform.

IV. CLOSING STATEMENT

A. Thus, we affirm.