

CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION

A. Background

The relationship between the United States and Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) has been fluctuating for decades. Many motives become the aspects which make the relationship up and down and most of them related to the ideology of liberal and also human right violations issues. For example the cases of human right abuses which happened in DPRK under Kims regime. The issues of human right in DPRK several become the objective target of United States to spread the liberal concept of states to have freedom for its people because these issue has correlated each other. "In his Second Inaugural Address, President Bush stated, 'We are led, by events and common sense, to one conclusion: The survival of liberty in our land increasingly depends on the success of liberty in other lands.'" (Lefkowitz, 2008). However, the relationship between the United States and DPRK are worsening for the last decades and the issue wider into the security issue related to the nuclear weapon program of DPRK.

The offensive reaction of the United States towards DPRK parameter by uses a parameter of action in which use the military armament as the primary tool of diplomacy and also foreign policy in terms of forcing the state to follow the United States interest, or what actually suggested by the United States.

DPRK nuclear program started in 1985 when DPRK participate in the nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT) but still not agree with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). More than six years after DPRK signed the NPT, DPRK finally ratifies the safeguards agreement with IAEA in 1992. DPRK agree that the nuclear capacity only becomes a tool of defense and electricity in order to restore from its loss in the cold war when at that time DPRK allied with Soviet.

However, in 1993 IAEA claims that DPRK has been cheating on the agreement of IAEA and requesting for inspections, but one month later after the inspections, DPRK withdraw from the agreement. Since that time the United States several times asking for the neutralize the nuclear reactor which DPRK has and exchange it for the restabilization of diplomatic relationship and economic support from the United States such as in 1994 between the former president Jimmy Carter and Kim Jong-il in his early administration. The agreement was achieved by resulting the resolution called “Agreed Framework”.

The “Agreed Framework” resulting in that DPRK closed the nuclear site and in exchange for restabilization diplomatic relationship with the United States and economic support by exporting the light water reactor and fuel oil. However, this resolution once again failed and only last for less than 10 years. DPRK claimed that the failure of Agreed Framework was because the United States accused DPRK restarting the reactor in order to build a mass destruction weapon, but DPRK claimed that it was purposed for electricity reactor. After the failure of Agreed Framework in 2003, DPRK began restarting the nuclear reactor and tried to develop a nuclear weapon by collaborating with several states which also against the United States.

DPRK imports the plutonium powder and plutonium metal in order to become the main fuel of nuclear weapon. In 2003, DPRK built the plutonium facility with the help from Pakistan, following years the nuclear proliferation rings have built by additional clients of DPRK which are Libya and Iran. “One of the architects of DPRK’s nuclear program, in which Pyong-ho assures that \$3 million has been transferred to Pakistan’s army chief, and asks that Khan dispatch “the agreed documents, components, etc.” via a DPRK emissary” (Kalvapalle, 2017)

Under Barrack Obama administration, United States several times ask the international intervention in order to prevent armaments conflict by DPRK, one of the steps by conducting the Six-Party Talk which involved by Republic of Korea (ROK), Japan, Russia and China as the mediator. This task which produces to push DPRK once again to re-stabilize the situation by reflecting the principles of the Agreed Framework. Obama used this approach as a way to use diplomatic to approach DPRK. “Obama said the U.N. and members of the original “Six-Party Talks” would “vigorously implement” those resolutions and that there were “consequences” for DPRK’s actions” (Hamblin, 2017)

The administration shifting from Barrack Obama and Donald Trump make a big difference in the United States foreign policy. The doctrine of Donald Trump in his administration about the “America First” effect on how the United States conducted the foreign policy especially in the relationship with Europe and Asia. Donald Trump seems more focus to uphold the interest of United States and pull back the contribution of United States in global defense program but at the same time, he secures the United States interest in allies states by controlling the policy. By starting to decrease and take the United States troops in Europe and stabilizing relationship with Russia, and also manage security enforcement with the alliance in Asia such as Japan and Republic Of Korea. Under Trump administration the security sector of trump targeting Asia to be the base of military development of United States. “The administration will uphold Asian security guarantees at the same time as more strictly scrutinizing the US interests at stake” (Townshend, 2017).

Since Kim Jong Un hailed as the successor and replacement of his father regime Kim Jong-il which ended in 2011 after his death, Kim Jong Un becomes the leader of DPRK leader which has a commitment to pursue the development of nuclear weapons program and the advance of DPRK missile program. Under his regime, Jong Un focusing

on the advance of military system and the nuclear prolificacy as the main foreign policy as a tool gaining power in the international community. "Superiority in military technology is no longer monopolized by imperialists," he said, adding: "We have to make every effort to reinforce the people's armed forces." (Profile: North Korean leader Kim Jong-un, 2017). Under his regime, the foreign policy of DPRK seems to become the attention of global society because of controversial and instability of Jong Un leadership. The leadership of Jong Un may have been getting many critics from global society as the policy tends to create security threat from other states from his nuclear weapon policy.

Since the campaign period of Donald Trump before he was inaugurated as the president replacing Barack Obama, Trump already stated many contradictory statements about DPRK and its policy related to nuclear weapon prolificacy and Pyongyang defense policy to use the nuclear missile into the central objective of defense mechanism policy. With his fewer experiences in the security sector, Donald Trump shows his contradict response to each announcement which Pyongyang release related to the DPRK defense mechanism. "DPRK just stated that it is in the final stages of developing a nuclear weapon capable of reaching parts of the U.S. It won't happen!" (Trump, 2017). It remains unclear of how Donald Trump will execute his bias statement become true action. However, in his first period of administration, the DPRK weapon development become the central objectives of United States to reduce the challenges in Northeast Asia by DPRK.

In September 2017 DPRK launched the biggest nuclear test in DPRK history as claimed in a form of the hydrogen bomb. This nuclear test resulting in an earthquake at the scale 6.3 magnitude which comes from Kilju County as the center of the magnitude.

“The device, which DPRK described as a hydrogen bomb capable of being placed on a ballistic missile, was the most powerful it has tested to date. Original estimates had put its yield in the 100-kiloton range, but updated seismic data analyzed by experts this week put it closer to a whopping 250 kilotons, or nearly 17 times more powerful than the bomb that flattened Hiroshima” (Lee, 2017)

Regarding this nuclear weapon program, United Nation conducting resolution as a form of condemning of the nuclear weapon. “The United Nations Security Council has adopted eight major sanctions resolutions on DPRK in response to the country’s nuclear and missile activities since 2006 and All eight resolutions were unanimously adopted by the Security Council and all but Resolution 2087 (January 2013) contain references to acting under Chapter VII, Article 41 of the United Nations Charter” (Davenport, 2017)

B. Research Question

From the information above regarding the background of conflict, then the question emerged as How Donald Trump administration response on DPRK nuclear weapon program?

C. Research Purpose

The purpose of this research intentionally to explain how the United States of America response the DPRK nuclear weapon program. This research beneficial in order to explain how United States actions in order to counter DPRK nuclear weapon program.

D. Theoretical Framework

1. Offensive Realism Theory

Offensive realism is a theory which occurs from the branch of neo-realism by John Mearsheimer. This theory stated that the core of international structure forces states to pursuing and push each other to compete in order to gain power in the global community. This theory began with the highlighting the great power will maximize their relative power. the states will have the temptation to pursue the hegemony in order to become the greatest power in the conditional region.

“Offensive realists, on the other hand, believe that status quo powers are rarely found in world politics because the international system creates powerful incentives for states to look for opportunities to gain power at the expense of rivals and to take advantage of those situations when the benefits outweigh the costs. A state’s ultimate goal is to be the hegemon in the system” (Snyder, 2001)

A states who already achieve the hegemony tend to not feels enough with its hegemony power, but it will seek for the competitor in order to become the platform to pursue power at least until there are two great power in global community and at the same time, the states will maintain the balance of power in order to become the attention and this power will become the source to defending against each other. States that do achieve hegemony are still not satisfied; they will seek to prevent the rise of “peer competitors”—other hegemons—in nearby regions that are accessible by land.

“In an international system filled with such uncertainty regarding states’ intentions, the nature of states’ military capabilities and other states’ assistance in a struggle against hostile states” (Steinsson, 2014). Mearsheimer argues that the best way for powerful states to survive in the international system is to maximize their power and pursue the hegemony.

It is not possible for the great power to open up the alliance line in order to achieve the power to counter the challenges. Which mean, the opportunity defends against the competitor will open when the line of ally with the potential alliance. It will not only defend but seek for a chance to be an aggressor directly to the competitor. Diplomatically, the great power states will seek for the potential alliance in the international system in order as the media to observe and seek chances

“Mearsheimer suggests that great powers might want to balance “internally” while buck-passing externally, employing an arms buildup both to deter the aggressor from attacking and to hedge against the possibility of becoming the target of attack. Diplomatically, a buck-passer might want to maintain good relations with the potential aggressor, in the hope that this would divert the latter’s belligerent attention to the intended “buck-catcher.” (Snyder, 2001)

“As states are wary of incurring the costs of challenging strong states by allying with weaker states, they will buck-pass (meaning that they let other states balance the threatening power) until their own security is in grave danger” (Steinsson, 2014). The offensive realist believes that the political alliance will occur when the great power tends to use the cooperation as a form of aggression meanwhile the

great power collecting the power in order to gain maximum power in the international system.

The logic of offensive realism which describe about the importance of hegemony power for great states in order to survive, and the seeking for “alliance” in order to become a tool of aggression meanwhile the states gaining power maximized, describes the nature of states in international system work when there is an absence of world government. The behavior of states who struggling of power reflects on how states vigorously spending national income in order to accelerate the power of armaments and military capabilities. The logic great states will seek for a competitor while at the same time asking for a partner in order to become satellites states was shown on the behavior of the United States and DPRK.

The decision to seeking for the competitor reflects on the process and consideration of the United States on how it establishes the foreign policy, especially to counter the military power of DPRK. The great power of United States considers DPRK as the “competitor” of power in military sector and choose to increase its military capability in order to use it as the tool to oppose the DPRK nuclear warhead development. as the states which categorize as the great power in the military sector, United States is trying to pursue the hegemony with improving its power whether in the military and political area in the International system.

Proposing the case of DPRK nuclear program issue also become the United States steps to gain

power in the political sector by influencing United Nation as the legitimate institution in the international system to seek the alliances as the potential aggressor states and use them to obtain opportunities to diminish the competitor. The appropriate states which become the target of “alliances” will be the member of United Nation Security Council since the members held big influences and political power in United Nations. The implication is when the United States identify as the United Nation Security Council member who has a *veto* inside of the council, the United States using its influence in order to use the united nations as the starter tools to become the aggressor for countering DPRK.

E. Hypothesis

Based on the circumstances that occurred and the theoretical framework pictured, this thesis seems that there are 2 hypotheses:

Donald Trump administration response on DPRK nuclear program by:

1. Accelerating its military capabilities including deployment and intervention, also military budget
2. Pursue political power to counter DPRK nuclear weapon program by approaching United Nations members especially the members of United Nation Security Council.

F. Methodology Tools

This research was done using qualitative research method by collecting information from reliable sources such as book, articles, and journals those are analyzed using the theoretical framework mentioned in the previous part. The internet-based source also have an important role in order to

provide data such as charts, pictures, articles, and reports in order to obtain the update information.

G. Scope of Research

This research scope is limited to explain the progress of United States foreign policy into the development of DPRK nuclear weapon program under the Donald Trump administration starts from his early administration until March 2018. To conduct this research analysis toward this case, the important of recent cases are needed as the consideration in the decision-making process. This research will be more focus during the early Donald Trump administration until the newest update cases. However, the historical record of the progress will be explained.

H. System of Writing

Chapter I is the introduction of the research, which consists of background, the purpose of research, theoretical framework, hypothesis, research method and system of writing.

Chapter II is about the historical background on how nuclear weapon program started to become the main issue on the relationship between the United States and DPRK.

Chapter III is about the shifting of Barack Obama administration into Donald Trump This chapter also includes several events which become the important events on how the United States and DPRK relationship.

Chapter IV is the reaction of United States towards DPRK nuclear weapon program. This chapter includes explanation United States reaction to military motion and diplomatic approaches.

Chapter V is the conclusion. There will be the result of the analysis.