

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

North Korea Crisis, as the name suggests, is a regional security crisis caused by Democratic People's Republic of Korea's series of nuclear and missile tests in East Asia and nearby regions. The first missile test was the launch of Nodong – 1 missile which occurred in 1993 over the Sea of Japan¹. Despite condemnation from the international community, it did not stop there as North Korea continued its clandestine nuclear missile development program until recently, in 2017. The most recent test was September 15th missile test over Hokkaido, Japan.

The United States of America, since the start of this crisis, has been involved in almost every peace negotiation for the denuclearization of North Korea. However, the US's intervention goes all the way back to the Cold War (1947 – 1991), when there was a struggle for power between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republic².

A. Background

After the defeat of the Empire of Japan in World War II, Korean Peninsula was divided into two regions: North being under the control of the USSR, and South under the US. The two regions in 1947 formed two independent states, being the Democratic Republic of Korea in the North with communism ideology, and the Republic of Korea in the South

¹ David E. Sanger, *Missile is Tested by North Koreans* (New York: The New York Times, 1993) <http://www.nytimes.com/1993/06/13/world/missile-is-tested-by-north-koreans.html>.

² Dates and Events, *Cold War Timeline*, <http://www.datesandevents.org/events-timelines/03-cold-war-timeline.htm>. Joseph Stalin in 1946, had a hostile speech stating that communism and capitalism were incompatible. However, this cannot be considered the start since there was not yet any active signs of hostility between the US and USSR. The start is marked by the US's containment policy, purposed to contain the spread of communism.

with capitalism³. The two were divided with a borderline named 38th parallel line. In 1950, under the approval of Joseph Stalin of the USSR, Kim Il Sung, the leader of DPRK, launched an invasion against ROK as an attempt to unify the two Korea under communism ideology. The US did not stand still as they did not want to lose a noncommunist territory into the hands of the communist, and Harry S. Truman, the President of the US, along with fifteen allied nations under the United Nations Organization, launched a counter-invasion against the North. The war reached a stalemate for three years as the war was held in the 38th parallel line without any significant progress and the participation of Chinese Communist Forces in the war⁴. On July 27th, 1953, the warring parties signed an armistice, despite no permanent peace treaty ever signed until now.

After the war, DPRK became interested in developing nuclear power and technology, and under the support of the USSR, established the Atomic and Nuclear Physics Research Institute in April 1955, and followed by Yongbyon Nuclear Scientific Research Center in 1963 which started operating in 1965⁵. Despite this, the USSR had ever rejected DPRK's proposal for the development of weaponized nuclear, instead agreed to develop "peaceful use of nuclear energy"; the same thing goes with PR China⁶. In the 1970s, DPRK began to be

³ Keith D. McFarland, *The Korean War: An Annotated Bibliography* (Oxfordshire: Routledge, 2009)

⁴ The State of New Jersey, *In Commemoration of the Korean War: "Freedom is Not Free"*, http://www.nj.gov/military/korea/timeline_1950.html.

As the war was pushed to Yalu River, the border between People's Republic of China and DPRK, Chinese government felt threatened by the US and UN – allied forces' presence that they decided to support DPRK. In fact, PR China's presence was the one pushing the South back to the 38th parallel line.

⁵ International Atomic Energy Agency, *Research Reactor Details – IRT-DPRK*. <https://nucleus.iaea.org/Pages/Others/Unauthorised.aspx> (July 30th, 1996)

⁶ Lee Jae-Bong, *US Deployment of Nuclear Weapons in 1950s South Korea & North Korea's Nuclear Development: Toward Denuclearization of the*

more independent in continuing the nuclear program, as they started to refine the reactors inside Yongbyon. However, the 80s shows a little different step from DPRK as they began to operate facilities for uranium fabrication and conversion, thus continued by high – explosive detonation tests. This phenomenon could be a signal of DPRK beginning to weaponize their nuclear power as US officials revealed an intelligence document proving the presence of secret nuclear reactor being constructed near Yongbyon in 1985, causing the international community to press DPRK into signing Non – Proliferation Treaty (NPT)⁷.

In an attempt to “disarm” DPRK, in 1994, the US and DPRK signed the *Agreed Framework*. In the agreement, DPRK was demanded to freeze and ultimately dismantle their nuclear program, and in return, the US agreed to:

- finance and construct in the DPRK two light-water reactors (LWR) of the Korean Standard Nuclear Power Plant model and, in so doing;
- provide the DPRK with an alternative source of energy in the form of 500,000 metric tons of heavy fuel oil each year for heating and electricity production until the first of those reactors is completed.
- conduct its activities in a manner that meets or exceeds international standards of nuclear safety and environmental protection; and
- provide for the implementation of any other measures deemed necessary to accomplish the foregoing or otherwise to carry out the objective of the Agreed Framework⁸.

Korean Peninsula, <http://apjif.org/-Lee-Jae-Bong/3053/article.html>
(February 17th, 2009)

⁷ John Balton, *Nuclear Weapons Program*,
<https://www.globalsecurity.org/wmd/world/dprk/nuke.htm> (April 30th, 2015)

⁸ Korean Peninsula Energy Development Organization, *About Us: Our History*, http://www.kedo.org/au_history.asp.

In 1995, Korean Peninsula Energy Development Organization (KEDO) was established with the US, South Korea, and Japan being the founding members. In the following years, many countries joined KEDO, including New Zealand, Australia, Canada, Indonesia, Chile, Argentina, the European Union, Poland, Czech Republic, and Uzbekistan⁹.

However, in November 2002, DPRK unexpectedly withdrew from the NPT and continued to enrich uranium in their facilities and expelled International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) in December, and it later continued with resuming the operation of Yongbyon facility in January 2003. In response to this issue, KEDO's Executive Board decided to suspend the heavy fuel oil supply to DPRK. The year 2003 showed KEDO's Executive Board's intention to reconsider LWR construction in DPRK after the events. As the end of 2003 showed no significant progress and DPRK being unable to meet the conditions to continue the LWR project, KEDO decided to suspend the project for one year in November 2003, and later extended for another one year on December 1st, 2004. The next year showed KEDO's seriousness to terminate the LWR program as all workers related to the LWR program in Kumho, DPRK, were withdrawn from the area, and on May 31st, 2006, LWR program was officially terminated by KEDO's Executive Board¹⁰.

Despite so, the US kept doing diplomatic approaches. One of them is the Six-Party Talks, the discussion between six countries (the United States of America, Republic of Korea, State of Japan, People's Republic of China, Russian Federation, Democratic People's Republic of Korea) to discuss the termination of DPRK's nuclear program. They

⁹ Ibid.

The three founding members formed the Executive Board. Despite being focused in Korean Peninsula, additional states or international organizations agreeing with KEDO's Agreed Framework are acceptable to join and give support to KEDO, in form of funding, goods, or services.

¹⁰ Ibid.

began in August 2003 because of President George W. Bush's refusal to directly negotiate with DPRK as what was done in President Bill Clinton's administration. In the talks, President Bush demanded every single party involved in the negotiation to press DPRK to surrender their nuclear program¹¹.

Tension went up and down during the talks as both the US and DPRK viewed each other hostile, especially after President Bush's State of the Union speech stating that DPRK is a part of "axis of evil" in 2002 as a part of Global War on Terrorism (GWOT or WoT)¹². However, peace talks still ran peacefully as the US began to recognize DPRK as a sovereign state and convinced that they would not invade DPRK. The progress of the negotiations can be seen in the fourth round as DPRK admitted committing themselves to abandoning all nuclear weapons and other existing programs, returning to the NPT, and accepting IAEA inspectors. In return, the other five parties appreciated DPRK's step and expressed their willingness in providing DPRK with energy aid. However, the fifth round showed a deteriorating mutual trust as DPRK condemned the US's sanction on DPRK's trading entities, including Banco Delta Asia, boycotted Six-Party Talks, and later initiated its first nuclear test on October 9th, 2006¹³.

The sixth round shows a little decrease of tension as IAEA inspectors in 2007 confirmed the shutting down of Yongbyon facility and the provision of a list of DPRK's nuclear activities. In return, the five parties agreed to increase the aid by 1 million tons of heavy fuel oil or fuel oil equivalent and normalization of diplomatic relations. In 2008, DPRK rejected the US's proposal to inspect all facilities in DPRK's territory, but instead allowed the inspection of Yongbyon, and

¹¹ Leszek Buszynski, *Negotiating with North Korea: The Six-Party Talks and the Nuclear Issue* (New York: Routledge), p. 2

¹² Tae-Hwan Kwak, *North Korea's Second Nuclear Crisis and Northeast Asian Security* (New York: Routledge), p. 47

¹³ Xiaodon Liang, *The Six-Party Talks at a Glance*, <https://www.armscontrol.org/factsheets/6partytalks> (July 18th, 2017)

only agreed for facilities outside Yongbyon if the other four parties were in agreement. However, DPRK denied accepting to enable sample collection in Yongbyon, and another talk in December resulted in no new consensus. Seeing this less beneficial for them, DPRK withdrew from Six-Party Talks at that month and continued their nuclear and missile program with the launch of modified Taepo Dong – 2 three-stage rockets on April 5th, 2009, marking the failure of Six-Party Talks¹⁴.

B. Research Question

From the introduction above, the research question that can be proposed in this case will be “How did the United States of America respond towards the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea after the failure of Six-Party Talks?”.

C. Theoretical Framework

Strategy Concept (Foreign Policy Strategy’s Typology)

Based on John P. Lovell’s *Foreign Policy in Perspective*, a strategy is “Any predesigned set of moves or series of decisions, in a competitive situation where the outcome is not governed purely by chance”¹⁵. In creating particular foreign policy, especially in facing certain opponents, a state must be able to consider the situation and their purposed goals, realize their strength and their opponents’. With this, John P. Lovell created a typology to determine states’ actions towards their opponents by viewing the opponents’ strategy and states’ capability. This typology creates four dimensions of action: *confrontative, leadership, accommodative, and concordance*¹⁶.

¹⁴ Xiaodon Liang, Loc. Cit.

¹⁵ John P. Lovell, *Foreign Policy in Perspective*, (New York: Reinhart & Winston: 1970).

¹⁶ Ibid.

		State B		View on Opponents' Strategy	
				Threatening	Supporting
State's Strength	Strong	Confrontation		Leadership	
	Weak	Accommodation		Concordance ¹⁷	

Confrontation, in Oxford Dictionary, means a hostile or argumentative situation or meeting between opposing parties¹⁸, and this option is preferable when State A considers itself as a *strong* state, and State A considers State B to be *threatening* their identity and interests. *Confrontation* is also considered as the use of the state's *hard power* to put pressure towards opposing parties to abide by the dominant party's will, and the use of *hard power* is usually shown in forms of military, economic, or political strength. Some actions a state usually takes during a *confrontation* towards opposing parties are embargo (the stopping of material supply towards certain parties), boycott (unilateral action of one party towards certain parties), blockading (prevention of any supply transports of certain parties), and armed conflict (face – to – face battles equipped with military arsenals, being the least favorable option).

Leadership means the action of leading a group or organization¹⁹, and based on the table, this will be a favored option when State A considers themselves as a *strong* state and they view State B to be *supportive* towards State A's will. This condition is indicated by the use *soft power* (persuasion and bargaining) as the primary method instead of violent, *hard*

¹⁷ John P. Lovell, *Foreign Policy in Perspective* (Mochtar Mas' oed, Ilmu Hubungan Internasional: Disiplin dan Metodologi, LPP3ES, 1990).

¹⁸ English Oxford Living Dictionary, *Confrontation*, <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/confrontation>.

¹⁹ English Oxford Living Dictionary, *Leadership*, <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/leadership>.

power based, actions, despite both are usually combined in the process.

Accommodation is a convenient agreement purposed to adapt or adjust to someone or something²⁰ with the hope to reduce tension between parties, and this option is favored when State A happens to be in a *weak* state, and they face a *threatening* opposition. In *accommodation*, conflicting parties will have diplomatic talks with hope to prevent any *hard power* being used.

Concordance means “being of one mind”, which is later translated as an agreement or consistency²¹. Concordance option is favored when in a negotiation, State A views themselves as a *weak* state and they realize that State B is in *supporting* stand. In this condition, State A will prevent contradictive policies with State B being made to ensure the single-minded state of both states.

In North Korea Crisis, State A is the United States of America and State B is the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea. The US views themselves as a *strong* state with the military, economic, and political capability to face DPRK, and the US considers DPRK as a *threatening* opponent towards the US and their allies. Therefore, the US prefers using *confrontation* strategy as the option to face DPRK and their nuclear and missile program. Despite so, the US concerns DPRK’s imminent retaliation attacks towards ROK and Japan if the US chose to conduct preemptive strikes, so they prefer using *hard power* as a prevention with the expectation that it is not DPRK who will conduct preemptive attacks. To fulfill this plan, the US introduced the “Strategic Patience” foreign policy, that is to put pressure on DPRK through economic aid and sanctions and military actions.

President Barack Obama, after DPRK’s submarine-launched missile test on April 23rd, 2016, sent a warning

²⁰ English Oxford Living Dictionary, *Accommodation*, <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/accommodation>.

²¹ English Oxford Living Dictionary, *Concordance*, <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/concordance>.

statement to DPRK's leader Kim Jong-Un that the US obviously can destroy DPRK with the US's arsenal for Kim Jong-Un's action being considered as "erratic" and "irresponsible"²². The following US President, Donald Trump, also repeatedly exchanged insults with Kim Jong-Un personally during his early period of presidency. One of them happening in September 2017, in which President Donald Trump called Premier Kim Jong-Un "Rocket Man" and Premier Kim Jong-Un called President Donald Trump "A Mentally Deranged Dotard"²³."

The first economic sanction from the US in this period came after the sinking of ROK's ship, the Cheonan, on July 21st, 2010, and was later followed by the expansion of sanctions imposed on DPRK's individuals and entities which some of them are involved with the nuclear and missile program on January 2nd, 2015. The US's policy is not limited to economic sanctions as after the sinking of Cheonan, the US and ROK conducted a joint naval military exercise in the Sea of Japan on July 25th, 2010, and a large-scale joint military exercise on February 28th, 2011²⁴. Along with Japan, the three states in 2014 signed a military agreement on sharing intelligence regarding DPRK's nuclear and missile program and conducted a trilateral naval military exercise in June - August 2016 on the Rim of Pacific (RIMPAC) 2016 in Hawaii which focused on the anti-missile operations using Aegis Combat System²⁵. It was later followed by the US Navy's plan

²² David Blair, "We could destroy you," Obama Warns "Erratic" North Korean Leader, <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2016/04/26/us-developing-missile-shield-to-guard-against-nuclear-attack-fro/> (April 26th, 2016)

²³ Kathy Novak, *What is Trump's policy on North Korea?*, <https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2018/01/trumps-policy-north-korea-180117104831379.html> (January 17th, 2018)

²⁴ Kesley Davenport, *Chronology of U.S.-North Korean Nuclear and Missile Diplomacy*, <https://www.armscontrol.org/factsheets/dprkchron>.

²⁵ Ankit Panda, *US, Japan, South Korea Plan Missile Defense Exercise on RIMPAC 2016 Sidelines*, <https://thediplomat.com/2016/05/us-japan-south->

to have a visit to Hong Kong on 2014, despite being rejected by the Chinese government at the year²⁶, and later accepted in October 2017²⁷.

The most prominent policy of the US in North Korea Crisis is the agreement with ROK government to install Terminal High–Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) battery in ROK on July 8th, 2016. This anti–ballistic missile defense system is specifically designed to intercept short–medium–range ballistic missile to ensure “South Korea’s security” in case of any offensive missile launch. Despite being agreed in 2016, the THAAD battery was not functional until May 2nd, 2017²⁸ during President Donald Trump’s administration.

D. Hypothesis

Responding to Democratic People’s Republic of Korea’s defense policy that threatened their interests and allies in Korean Peninsula, the United States of America chose to use *confrontation* strategy to face DPRK’s missile and nuclear program. Some of policies applied by the US to confront DPRK were economic sanction towards DPRK along with individuals and entities related to their nuclear and missile program, US–ROK–Japan joint military exercises and intelligence sharing, US–ROK THAAD Agreement, the US Navy visit to Hong Kong, and several threatening statements from the US’ presidents regarding recent tests.

[korea-plan-missile-defense-exercise-on-rimpac-2016-sidelines/](#), (May 17th, 2016).

²⁶ Michael S. Schmidt and Michael Forsythe, *China Blocks U.S. Navy Flotilla’s Visit to Hong Kong*,

<https://www.nytimes.com/2016/04/30/world/asia/china-blocks-us-navy-flotillas-visit-to-hong-kong.html> (April 29th, 2016).

²⁷ Raymond Yeung and Minnie Chan, *Thousands of US Navy officers arrive in Hong Kong for USS Ronald Reagan port of call*,

<http://www.scmp.com/news/hong-kong/community/article/2113729/thousands-us-navy-officers-arrive-hong-kong-uss-ronald> (October 3rd, 2017)

²⁸ Kesley Davenport, Op. Cit.

E. Purpose of Research

This paper is purposed for identifying policies made by the United States of America's government regarding North Korea Crisis towards the Democratic People's Republic of Korea's defense policy after Six-Party Talks was considered a failure to stop the country from further developing their nuclear and missile arsenal.

F. Methodology of Research

This paper will use the qualitative method as the method of research and library research as a primary method to gather data related to the case, in which the data will mostly come from news, books, and articles coming from whether electronic or physical sources. It will also use descriptive analysis technique as it will describe policies made by the United States' government regarding the issue.

G. Range of Research

The time focus which will be used in this paper is between 2009 and 2017, in which President Barack H. Obama took the Presidential office of the United States of America in 2009 and was later replaced by President Donald J. Trump in 2017. Meanwhile in DPRK, Kim Jong-Il passed away in 2011 and was replaced by his son, Kim Jong-Un. With new leaders having several differences on viewing the crisis compared to their predecessors, they could bring several turns of the event to any better or worse. This paper will also mainly focus on the US's perspective to help to focus on the US's policy in facing DPRK in the Crisis.

H. Outline

The outline of this paper will be as follows:

Chapter I: This chapter will consist of the background, research question, theoretical framework, hypothesis (early speculations as an answer to the research question), the purpose of research,

- data gathering methods, the range of research, and writing systematics;
- Chapter II: The beginning of explanation part, which will mainly discuss the US's policy towards DPRK since the Korean War until before the Six - Party Talks;
- Chapter III: This chapter will review the DPRK's defense policy after the Six-Party Talks, especially those related to their nuclear and missile program;
- Chapter IV: This chapter will discuss the policy of the US towards DPRK after the Six-Party Talks;
- Chapter V: This chapter will be the closing chapter, which will consist of the conclusion of this paper;
- References: This part will include every reference which becomes the base of this paper (citations, tables, etc.)