

Jackie and I negate Resolved: Deployment of anti-missile systems is in South Korea's best interests.

Contention One is Provoking an Arms Race.

The deployment of anti-missile systems will only spark an arms race, as countries like China seek to develop nuclear capabilities that can overwhelm these systems.

[The Georgetown Security Studies Review](#) finds that

One such advancement that Beijing has responded to is the development of missile defense systems. Within China, scholars note that **the deployment of missile defense systems [such as THAAD] “will be “the most significant factor” in China’s future nuclear development.** This reaction stems from **[because of the] Chinese fear that such systems can undermine their military capabilities.**

[The South China Morning Post](#) confirms that

The People's Liberation Army Rocket Force **[China] has been developing its capability against [THAAD]** a US missile defence system. Most notably this **[which] includes a hypersonic missile[s] delivery vehicle, Wu-14, capable of carrying nuclear warheads and travelling at 10 times the speed of sound** to bypass US missile defence systems. China also test fired in January the Dongfeng-5C, **[and] an intercontinental ballistic missile [ICBM] capable of carrying 10 independently targetable nuclear warheads.**

Unfortunately, an arms race would only bring more instability to South Korea because it would increase the possibility of China firing in the face of perceived aggression.

[Hutchison of the University of Rhode Island](#) explains that

Specifically, they found that the presence of an arms race between strategic rivals increased the chance of a MID occurring from 16 to 35%, while **[with an arms race], the probability of war increases from 1 in 100 to 1 in 20 [which is a five-fold increase].** during arms race years.

Contention Two is Undermining Diplomacy

Negotiations have the highest chance of succeeding right now because of recent shifts in mindset by China and South Korea.

[Mount of the Atlantic](#) explains last week that

As **China** says **[has realized] tensions with North Korea are “now at a tipping point approaching a crisis” following its firing of a ballistic missile over Japan.**

And [Diamond](#) 2017 continues that

this incipient shift may provide the best possibility for the success of negotiations.

[Holodny 2017 furthers](#)

The new president [of South Korea Moon Jae-In] previously stated he **supports dialogue with North Korea in order to mollify** rising regional **tensions, as opposed to his predecessor's** [tough policies on North Korea].

However, by deploying THAAD, the Affirmative discourages diplomacy for two reasons.

First is through backlash from China.

[Snyder](#) 2016 finds that

Chinese foot-dragging on UN statements condemning a spate of **North Korean missile tests** in violation of UN Security Council Resolutions **was an instance of Chinese retaliation for** the decision to deploy **THAAD.**

Second, China is incentivized by THAAD to keep North Korea's nuclear program.

(note: the below two cards have been paraphrased to simplify technical language)

[The Associated Press](#) explains that the THAAD radar only has two modes: one that can spy on China, and one that can spy on North Korea. Currently, the radar is pointed at North Korea, and the US has no incentive to change this because doing so would render THAAD's missile interceptors useless.

However, [the Cato Institute](#) continues China is worried that without a nuclear North Korea, the radar will be reconfigured to spy on China.

This means that China wants the North Korean nuclear program in place in order to direct the radar's focus on North Korea, and not China.

This is why The [Atlantic](#) confirms that

China regards the U.S. response, not North Korean provocations, **[THAAD, not North Korea] as the primary threat to its security.**

Chinese cooperation is crucial to bringing North Korea to the negotiating table for two reasons

First, economic leverage

[Business Insider](#) finds that

90% of North Korea's trade is done with China, accounting for 90% of its oil and, in some years, 100% of its aviation fuel.

This is why, in past years, only Chinese cooperation has led to negotiations.

[Business Insider](#) continues that

After a provocative North Korean missile launch in 2003, China cut off its supply of oil to North Korea for three days. In no time, **the Kim regime caved to** international demands and sat down for the six-party **talks on nuclear disarmament.**

Second, diplomatic effectiveness.

[Bandow 2017](#) explains

As a result, most everyone's attention turns to China. **The PRC is the North's** most important friend and **only ally [which is why]** Chen Ping, deputy managing editor of China's Global Times, observed: "There are many ways in which North Korea is not an ordinary country for China."28 U.S. officials have been particularly insistent that China act to curb the North's nuclear ambitions, and perhaps much more. In April 2013 Secretary of State John Kerry declared: "There is no group of leaders on the face of the planet who have more capacity to make a difference in this than the Chinese, and everybody knows it, including, I believe, them."29 After the North's nuclear test earlier this year, Kerry proclaimed: "China had a particular approach that it wanted to make, that we agreed and respected to give them space to implement that. Today in my conversation with the Chinese I made it very clear that it has not worked and we cannot continue business as usual."30 In June 2016 a senior Treasury official traveling with Secretary Jack Lew argued that "**China has the ability to** both **create pressure and use that as a leverage** that is a very important part of global efforts **to** isolate North Korea and **get North Korea to change its policies."**

The impact is a de-escalation of tensions.

[The Guardian in 2017](#) explains that **The immediate goal of diplomacy is to lower tensions, cutting through** the chest-thumping public **[provocative] statements by talking face to face.**

De-escalation is crucial because it avoids costly conflict.

[Beauchamp 2017](#) quantifies that

There could be up to 2 million casualties in the first 24 hours of a conflict. [and] As bad as things are with North Korea right now, the situation will only get worse over time² North Korea's mastery of nuclear technology — meaning both missiles and nuclear devices themselves — is steadily improving.

Thus we negate.