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The objective of this paper is to propose a new strategy in the United States’ foreign policy approach to dealing with North Korea. Past administrations employed strategies that fell short of accomplishing the goal of de-nuclearization on the Korean peninsula. In order to design a new approach I researched the two previous U.S. administrations attempts at dealing with North Korea. First, I examined the Bill Clinton administrations Agreed Framework, which took an approach of engagement with North Korea. The agreement was based on a theory of positive sanctions and rewards for dealing with an “enemy” government. Next, I analyzed the transition from the Clinton administration into the Bush administration, and how U.S. foreign policy took a drastic turn into a neo-conservative strategy. I then analyze the Bush administrations attempts to deal with North Korea, and the overall lack of strategy that was used in doing so. Finally, I analyze the best way to move forward, and provide an outline of a better method that should be used to conduct the 6-Party Talks. The method I selected was interest-based bargaining, and it relies on cooperation of all parties involved in the negotiations to reach an outcome based on equity. The goal is to satisfy all parties’ interests, not just your own. The results of my research have led me to rely on a strategy based on Liberal theories of International Relations, which focus on, cooperation with an enemy, and equal gains for all. I used this approach to design a negotiation scenario where all sides are able to contribute to supplying aid to North Korea, while in return receiving the security
of knowing North Korea is disabling their nuclear capabilities. Lastly, I evaluate the plan that I researched, and assess the viability of the plan’s actual ability to be implemented.
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INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this paper is to find a workable solution to the crisis that is currently ongoing in the Korean peninsula. The Korean peninsula has been divided since the end of World War II. Since that time both North and South Korea have had relatively separate existences in the world. Two repressive dictators that have been glorified under the state’s propaganda machine have ruled North Korea. The father Kim Il-Sung, and his son and current leader Kim Jong-Il have become legends, and the fables that describe their lives enable them to retain control over the minds of the people in that impoverished land.

This is important because North Korea is a country in desperate need of help. Charles Armstrong paints the picture most people see when they view North Korea. He states:

\[
\text{North Korea is little more than a horrifying totalitarian regime. Guilty of grievous crimes against its citizens, it is also portrayed as a belligerent rogue state bent on developing nuclear weapons to threaten its neighbors and even the United States. (Armstrong, 14).}
\]

While this may be how most of the world views North Korea, it doesn’t stray too far from the truth. The fact is that the citizens of the country are facing starvation, and lack the basic necessities to make it through life. It requires an international diplomatic effort of grand scale to de-nuclearize the DPRK, and provide the citizens with a better life and prosperous future. Cha and Kang present the other image of North Korea, and their idea of how future policy should be formed.

\[
\text{North Korea is not crazy, near collapse, nor about to start a war. But it is dangerous, not to mention dangerously misunderstood. Defusing the threat that North Korea poses to its neighbors and the world will require less bluster, more patience, and willingness on the part of the United States to probe and understand the true sources of the North’s conduct. (Cha & Kang, 20).}
\]
South Korea was also ruled by an autocratic military leadership, and really did not see its first democratically elected President until 1987. Different Presidents have used different policies when addressing the problems with their neighbors to the north. Currently President Lee Myung-Bak pursues more of a hardline stance when approaching the North Korean situation. (Mochizuki & O’Hanlon, 2003).

The purpose of this paper is to actually examine from the U.S. perspective, starting with President Bill Clinton, and running through the current Obama administration, ways to deal with North Korea. It offers a solution that focuses on three areas that are of vital concern for the future of North Korea. They are Securing Basic Human Needs, International Status and Recognition, and Security.

This paper argues that engagement policies are much more effective than policies that favor a hard-line approach to foreign policy. I also argue that ignoring the situation only creates more problems for those countries that neighbor North Korea, and that active engagement will lead to a better standard of living for the citizens of North Korea. While having a belligerent dictator in power at the present time may not be ideal, it is better to engage with the belligerent country than to try and force change through military efforts. The current situation that the United States faces in Iraq has proven the fact that state building through military intervention is costly and resource exhaustive.

The first chapter begins with analysis of the Agreed Framework, which was constructed under the Clinton administration. I analyze the effects of positive sanctions when dealing with North Korea. This agreement was made between the U.S., and North Korea, and I analyze why it did not succeed in the end. However, there are lessons learned from this agreement that I apply to my recommendation for how the Obama
administration should proceed when dealing with North Korea. I argue that the Agreed Framework failed to recognize the requirements for fulfilling the obligations of such an agreement, and thus it ultimately failed due to not being able to live up to its own ambitious desires. The Agreed Framework also collapsed due to a Republican controlled Congress that did not legislate the funding needed in order for the United States to fulfill its part of the agreement.

The second section of the first chapter transitions into the George W. Bush administration, and explains how the U.S. approach to dealing with North Korea drastically changed. The Bush administration took a much more confrontational, and ultimately neo-conservative approach, and didn’t use engagement as a policy tool when dealing with North Korea. However, Bush initiated the 6-Party Talks, which has become crucial in dealing with North Korea. These talks set up the framework for the proposed plan that I lay out in Chapter 5. The 6-Party Talks include North Korea, South Korea, China, Russia, Japan, and the United States.

In Chapter 2 I describe the theoretical approaches that lay behind the Clinton and Bush administrations foreign policy approach. I argue that the Clinton administration used a Liberal approach, and favored cooperation over competition. While the Bush administration had two ideologies. There were those who favored a Realist approach to foreign policy, and then those who were from the neo-conservative school. Ultimately the neo-conservative policy would be the direction that the administration moved. The ultimate goal of this chapter is to assess the most beneficial theoretical base from which to move forward when addressing how to negotiate with North Korea.
Chapter 3 begins the process of constructing a plan to deal with the situation in North Korea. In this chapter I describe the framework I will be using to construct a plan for the de-nuclearization of North Korea. The framework that I have chosen is called interest-based bargaining. I adapted the method from the book *Getting Past No*, by William Ury. The basic concept behind interest-based bargaining is to establish the broad interests of every negotiating party, and formulate solutions to satisfy those interests rather than narrow bargaining positions, of each negotiating party.

One method behind interest-based bargaining is to avoid coercing the other side into a situation that you may find favorable. Rather, a negotiator needs to insist on fair standards for solving a problem and reframe initial positions in order to find mutual interests. I chose this style of negotiating because it has the potential to resolve, not merely settle a conflict by addressing the interests of all parties. This style of negotiation relies on cooperation, and not competition. It demands that the participants be willing to give a little to get a little. And with 6 parties in the talks it becomes crucial that all parties come away with something from the negotiations. Later in this paper I discuss some of the techniques that are used to ensure fairness to all sides, and how to influence parties to agree.

Then, in Chapter 4 I outline some criteria that will create an acceptable peace proposal for the situation in North Korea. I have outlined the three major areas that should be concentrated on by the outside 5 countries (China, Russia, Japan, South Korea, and The United States) during the negotiations. These areas are Basic Human Needs, International Status & Recognition, and Security. International Status & Recognition, and Security are subsets of the dominant area concerning Basic Human Needs. The goal
of any proposal that I put forth must also satisfy the basic human needs of the citizens of North Korea. I assume in this paper that the overall goal of the negotiations is to have a de-nuclearized North Korean state. However, the underlying long-term goal of the outside 5 countries is to provide a better standard of life than the people of North Korea currently are subjected to living. Any proposal that is made must be able to meet the basic human needs of the North Korean citizens, and it must focus on providing them with the building blocks for developing a modernized country. Also, while this paper is not intended to provide a guide to Korean re-unification, it does suggest that if all sides fulfill their commitments in the proposal, then re-unification of the two Koreas could be possible in the future.

Finally, I offer a conclusion that discusses the reality of the situation, and whether or not the proposal that I offer could actually work. I re-examine the proposal to determine if there are areas where some countries may not get what they desire. I also describe strategies to increase the likelihood of cooperation between all the sides in the negotiations. The goal of the conclusion is to assess the viability of the plan, which is an aspect of the policy process that the original Agreed Framework seemed to ignore. My proposal is projected to be more realistic, because there are 6 countries taking part, as opposed to just two like the Agreed Framework.
CHAPTER I

A Comparison of the Clinton & Bush Administration’s Policy Towards North Korea

The Korean peninsula is technically at war today. While it is reasonable to assume that a peaceful end to this conflict is within expectations, the overall progress towards peace moves at a sluggish pace. The United States plays a major role in the process of brokering peace on the peninsula between North and South Korea. In this chapter I intend to analyze both, the Bill Clinton Administration’s application of the Agreed Framework (AF); I also analyze the diplomatic efforts of the George W. Bush Administration in dealing with the “Hermit Kingdom.” The second chapter of the paper will analyze the positions of both the United States of America (USA), and North Korea (DPRK) using theories of International Relations to help explain why the countries posture as they do. And finally, after analyzing the previous two U.S. administrations, I offer some suggestions as to how U.S. strategy needs to adopt in order to effectively bring North Korea into the international community as a productive member again.

After the Second World War, the United States and the Soviet Union divided the Korean peninsula following its 35-year occupation under the Japanese Imperial Forces. Both Syngman Rhee in the South and Kim Il Sung in the North wanted to engage in war to end the division on the peninsula. The result of this friction was in fact the Korean War, which ended in the 1953 armistice, which still exists to this day. Some 800,000 Koreans on both sides of the thirty-eighth parallel had lost their lives, together with 115,000 Chinese and 36,400 Americans. (Harrison, xi.) Since 1958 no Chinese or Soviet forces have been in North Korea. However, the United States continues to maintain
37,000 troops in the South at a direct cost of $2 billion per year. (Harrison, xv). The result has produced a stalemate that exists with fractured relationships, and the possible threat of another war on the peninsula at any time. This paper intends to examine the types of policy-making that must exist in the future in order to avoid any more war on this peninsula.

The Korean conflict is a situation that can end peacefully. However the two previous administrations in the White House were unsuccessful in their attempts at de-nuclearizing North Korea, and ending the standoff on the peninsula. I hope that in analyzing these two policies I can draw conclusions, which would aid the next administration in dealing with the DPRK. If we can build off of the positives that the previous two administrations used, then it is possible to construct a new policy that can finally resolve the conflict.

The First Nuclear Crisis & Reaction

In 1994 the death of Kim Il-Sung, the former President of the DPRK, and the onset of a food shortage supported the idea that the regime in the North was ready to collapse. Both U.S. administrations are guilty of believing that the regime of Kim Jong II, son and successor of Kim Il-Sung, would collapse and eventually be absorbed by the South. As Harrison explains, “The persistence of this belief on the part of many U.S. officials is the main reason why the United States has failed to develop a coherent long-term policy toward the Korean peninsula, relying on short-term fixes while waiting to see what happens.” (Harrison, xvii).

The “battle” with the DPRK has also seen the members of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) repeatedly granted and denied access to nuclear
operations within the country. (Clemens, 2005). The result has produced great distrust that has become the crux of the conflict. In 1992 the IAEA discovered that North Korea had been secretly reprocessing weapons-grade plutonium from a five-megawatt nuclear reactor. The result of this finding prompted the DPRK to expel the members of the IAEA from the country, and the DPRK also threatened to withdraw from the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). (The withdrawal from the treaty didn’t happen until 2003 consequently.) This resulted in the first and only bi-lateral agreement between the United States and North Korea, which became the Agreed Framework. The main goal of the United States was to ensure a non-nuclear Korean peninsula. (Minnich, 6). As Minnich explains,

> With the signing of the Agreed Framework, both sides agreed to cooperate to replace North Korea’s two existing nuclear reactors and the two under construction with two light-water reactor (LWR) power plants. Additionally, agreements were made to provide 500,000 metric tons of heavy fuel oil (HFO) annually until the first LWR became operational, move toward full normalization of political and economic relations, and work together for peace and security on a nuclear-free Korean peninsula. (Minnich, 7).

The idea behind the Agreed Framework was to use incentives to influence the DPRK to abandon its nuclear weapons program. In other words the Clinton Administration chose to use positive sanctions to achieve its goal of a non-nuclear Korean peninsula. (Martin, 51).

> The theory behind using positive sanctions is to use an incentive based strategy to achieve policy success. The usage of positive sanctions between the U.S. and the DPRK refutes conventional wisdom as to when positive sanctions should be used. This is further explained by Curtis H. Martin, “Sanctions theory predicts that positive sanctions will generally be less likely to be chosen and less likely to be effective between adversaries than between friends.” (Martin, 51-52). As stated, much of the problem that exists
between the U.S. and the DPRK has to do with trust. The use of positive sanctions should be treated with some skepticism at first due to the nature of the relationship between the two states. The Clinton Administration intended to reverse the normal course of American politics in dealing with perceived enemies, which usually involved negative sanctions, and instead try to reward a state for “good behavior.” The idea was to stabilize the peninsula on all accounts. (Martin, 52).

**Agreed Framework: Specifics**

In striking this deal, the United States needed to first answer a few questions of its own first in order to negotiate an agreement. As described by Kwak:

1) How would the U.S. compensate North Korea for shutting down its nuclear reactor at the Yongbyon Nuclear Research Center located about one hundred kilometers due north of Pyongyang? 2) How would the U.S. place the 8,000 spent nuclear fuel rods at Yongbyon into long-term safe storage? 3) What kind of nuclear reactor would the U.S. provide to North Korea? (Joo & Kwak, 174).

Since the structure of the Agreement was neither a legally binding contract, nor a treaty much of the questions described above could be disputed. One such example of this was in regards to energy compensation. However, the U.S. wanted the energy compensation to come in the form of power plants fueled by coal. North Korea’s chief negotiator, Kim Jong-Ju, rejected this idea. The DPRK knew ultimately that it wanted to use some kind of nuclear power to generate its electricity. (Joo & Kwak, 176-178). The Agreed Framework then needed to be constructed in order to satisfy the parties of the Agreement. The overarching cost of doing this wasn’t the main concern with the initial outset of the plan. Rather for now the concern was to diffuse a crisis that could get out of hand, and the United States wanted to deter any more activity related to nuclear proliferation.

The following paragraph is an abbreviated layout of the plan that made up the Agreed Framework, which was completed in Geneva Switzerland on October 21, 1994.
First, both sides agreed to replace the DPRK’s graphite-moderated reactors and related facilities with light-water reactor (LWR) power plants. Second, the U.S. was to make arrangements to offset the energy forgone due to the freeze of the DPRK’s graphite-moderated reactors and related facilities, pending completion of the first LWR unit. This energy was supplied by the U.S. in the form of heavy fuel oil (HFO). Third, upon receipt of U.S. assurances for the LWRs the DPRK would freeze its graphite-moderated reactors and related facilities and eventually dismantle these reactors and related facilities. The last condition was centered on both sides working out the technical aspects of the energy transition. Also the two sides were supposed to continue to work towards normalization of economic and political relations, establish peace and security on the peninsula, and continue to work towards non-proliferation. This was all meant to comply with IAEA safeguards as well. In summary there were some very optimistic proposals that were meant to reward a rogue regime for complying with the plan laid out by the United States. As stated earlier much of this was contingent on the two parties being able to establish a much better relationship based on trust. Up to this point this kind of commitment to one and other’s goals, and aspirations was not present in negotiations. (O’Hanlon & Mochizuki, 177-181).

Korean Energy Development Organization (KEDO)

Another important aspect of the AF involved KEDO. This was a multilateral approach taken by the Clinton Administration to involve the DPRK’s neighbors of Japan and South Korea in helping to cover the energy costs that the AF demanded. The main idea behind this consortium was to create the necessary funding for such a large project as building the two LWRs, and also to involve the neighbors of the DPRK. However, the
United States was clearly in control. (Harrison, 2002). Harrison explains the relationship behind the original three members of KEDO:

The Clinton Administration bullied South Korea and Japan into accepting virtually complete financial responsibility for building the reactors. South Korea agreed to cover $4 billion of the cost and Japan $1 billion in the expectation that the White House would get as much money out of Congress as it could to finance the multilateral consortium created to carry out the project, KEDO. (Harrison, 259).

The estimates that I have found varied as to exactly when the completion of the LWRs would occur. According to Charles K. Armstrong the two LWRs would be completed by 2003. (Armstrong, 19). James M. Minnich speculated that it might have taken until 2009 to complete the LWRs. (Minnich, 11). The bottom line is that it was a work in progress that required a lot of money. In the meantime while these reactors were being built, the United States was supposed to supply the DPRK with heavy fuel oil (HFO) that would substitute for the loss of energy from the frozen Yongbyon reactor. (Armstrong, 19).

The Use of Positive Sanctions

As stated earlier, the Agreed Framework was centered on the idea of using positive sanctions as an engagement tool. The DPRK was challenged with continued economic problems, and also repeated famines that had riddled the country during the 1990s. There are estimates that between the years of 1997-1998 as many as two million North Koreans may have died. (Martin, 38). This kind of atmosphere convinced many officials that the North had vital interests in the continued engagement sparked by the AF, and that the DPRK would be more likely to lash out if the agreement were to break down. The result might produce a conflict situation where usually negative sanctions are used. The Clinton administration hoped to avoid this in their approach. This is because conflict may result in the use of the military, which at this point is not favored by the Clinton administration. Once Clinton decided to go with a strategy that used positive sanctions
he realized it might in fact be more beneficial to reward a rogue regime for good behavior, rather than punish it for bad behavior.

To some extent, the US decision to employ positive sanctions was dictated by the conclusion that both military counter-proliferation and negative sanctions carried unacceptable risks. The USA concluded that it lacked a satisfactory BATNA- or best alternative to a negotiated agreement. But it was not just a matter of rejecting coercion. Despite sanctions theory’s generally negative view of employing positive sanctions with adversaries, the Agree Framework did meet several important theoretical criteria for successful use of positive sanctions. (Martin, 62).

Thus by using positive sanctions the U.S. reversed its normal policy with enemies, which favored punishment, and instead sought to take its foreign policy approach in a different direction. This is an aspect of the Agreed Framework that I hope to use in my proposal later in this paper.

The administration faced some internal pressure for adopting this kind of strategy, because it steered away from the typical foreign policy the U.S. had been accustomed to in the period after the Vietnam War. Martin explains,

In the USA, the climate for positive sanctions, never favorable, has been adversely affected by three recent developments: the rise of congressional assertiveness in foreign policy, Republican control of Congress after 1994, and eroding support for all forms of foreign aid. (Martin, 55).

However, it seems as though the Clinton Administration viewed the AF as a way to build confidence between the two countries. The U.S. was also still coming out of the Cold War era, and the ability of the government to trust adversaries was weakly developed. The Cold War only served to make the government react with brinkmanship, and to primarily pursue power politics in the external relations. One of the hopes of using positive sanctions was to try and overcome the relationship woes that have hindered U.S. policy in the past. However, a criticism of this strategy states that due to prior U.S. policy, the environment may not be suitable for the use of positive sanctions. As Morgan states:
Positive sanctions and other confidence-building measures may only become effective after ‘fundamental problems in the relationship’ have been overcome and significant ‘shifts in political judgement’ about the overall relationship have already occurred. Therefore, it may become necessary to transform relations among adversaries before specific security concerns can be addressed successfully. (Morgan, 176) (Davis, 19).

The point is that the Clinton administration attempted to use this engagement tool as a means to improve better relationships. Clinton had made the choice that rewarding a rogue regime would be more beneficial to them as opposed to punishing the regime.

Clinton believed this as stated earlier because; the military option, and negative sanctions brought with it too many risks that Clinton didn’t want to deal with. In doing this he actually went against the theory of positive sanctions, which says positive sanctions are less likely to be effective between adversaries. Martin states:

U.S. non-proliferation diplomacy towards North Korea has defied the expectations of sanctions theory. The USA offered positive sanctions to one of its most feared adversaries despite a strong domestic aversion to perceived appeasement and a preference for coercive diplomacy. (Martin, 64).

However, despite this Clinton is following a tenet of Liberalism in that he favored cooperation with an adversary as opposed to competition. Clinton used a concept that was adopted from David Mitrany that focused on extending the cooperation to other aspects of relations between states. As outlined in the Agreed Framework both the DPRK and the U.S. wanted to “normalize” relations with each other. Dunne describes the idea envisioned by Mitrany:

His core concept was ramification, meaning the likelihood that cooperation in one sector would lead governments to extend the range of collaboration across other sectors. As states become more embedded in an integration process, the ‘cost’ of withdrawing from cooperation ventures increases. (Dunne, 114).

Clinton viewed the possibility of cooperation with the DPRK on the nuclear issue as a way to cooperate with the DPRK on other areas of concern, i.e. human rights, in the future.
North Korean Perspective of the Agreed Framework

It is also important to take a look at how the DPRK may have interpreted such an agreement. There was an obvious economic incentive for the DPRK to adhere to these negotiations, and improve its standing among other states in the international system. It may have been motivated by gains of power, but more than anything it could be assumed that the DPRK was motivated more by the fear of continued losses. Martin argues:

A strategy of assurances and promised rewards maybe in fact be the best path to influence. If the North has framed its calculations ‘in the domain of losses’, then positive sanctions may be an efficient strategy to ameliorate ‘pre-emptive and preventive situations.’ (Martin, 63).

This point is very important, especially once we discuss how the Bush administration approached foreign policy. To not take it could have meant they would continue to accrue losses, both economically and politically.

Another aspect of the AF that the DPRK could have seen as very enticing was that they were still going to receive the two LWRs. This worried some, because these reactors still had the possibility of producing nuclear weapons. It was possible that North Korea could have been up to their old tricks, and simply expel the IAEA inspectors once they had completed LWRs in order to create new nuclear weapons. According to Minnich it is conceivable that this could have been accomplished.

According to the analysis conducted by the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, the LWR, in its first fifteen months of normal operation, will produce more than 300 kilograms of weapons-grade plutonium, enough to build 60 implosion warheads. Likewise Dr. John Holdren of Harvard University, in 1989, reported that in one year a 1 gigawatt LWR could produce between 200 and 250 kilograms of reactor-grade plutonium, enough for at least thirty to forty bombs. (Minnich, 14-15).

While there are still some complicating factors with this production it leads us into the transition of the Clinton administration to the Bush administration, and some the analysis of the AF in there of.
Transition from Clinton to Bush

When the Clinton administration was coming to a close it was unclear what the future would hold for the situation on the Korean peninsula in terms of U.S. policy. Contra, the “Sunshine Policy” that was initiated by South Korean President Kim Dae-Jung, was creating an environment conducive to negotiating agreements between the U.S. and the DPRK. The South Korean policy was enacted as an engaging policy that sought to heal old wounds on the peninsula. Right before the end of the Clinton era it seemed as though the transition to the new administration would be relatively smooth. For example, Secretary of State Madeline Albright visited Pyongyang in 2000, and set the stage for a follow up meeting with President Clinton. However, after the Democratic Party lost the election of 2000 to George W. Bush, the trip was cancelled. The transition would be met with a very different approach to dealing with a “rogue” state such as North Korea.

My analysis of the Agreed Framework shows that while some stabilization of North Korea was definitely accomplished, the overall strategy may have lacked realistic objectives. James Minnich makes the argument in evaluating policy that we should use three criteria. The three criteria are; feasibility, acceptability, and suitability. The project was slated to cost between $4-5 billion, and that number was likely to increase. Also South Korea was going to need to provide $4.5 million to help complete the LWR project. It was also highly unlikely that the DPRK would be able to afford to fix its decrepit power grid, or even operate any kind of power grid without significant help from South Korea. Even running a completed grid would be financially very difficult, and dismantling their old nuclear facilities would require funds that they didn’t have. Therefore Minnich states, “as long as North Korea is held responsible for financing the
refurbishment of its power grid, it is plausible to expect that financially it either will not or cannot meet its obligations.” (Minnich, 22). From this he deemed the plan to be un-feasible. The overwhelming costs of the project could have been very difficult to complete, and this could have been made even more difficult with the transition of different U.S. administrations every 4 years.

The acceptability of the Agreed Framework can also be questioned. North Korea has gone back and forth several times with regards to allowing the IAEA to have access to its facilities. Minnich feels that the AF is unacceptable as a final solution to the Korean Peninsula problem for three reasons,

1) political and economic engagement is currently undesirable; 2) LWRs produce fissile material that can be used to create nuclear weapons; and 3) LWRs cannot safely operate on North Korea’s decrepit power grid. (Minnich, 23).

With the transition from Clinton to Bush, and the differing philosophies on how to deal with the DPRK we have seen more of a deadlock with the relations between the two countries. There was also too much distrust that the DPRK would expel IAEA officials, and then try to produce nuclear weapons with the LWRs, despite what the contract of the AF says. And last, it just doesn’t seem at this time that the DPRK has the capabilities of handling the power required to support this kind of energy system. (Minnich, 12).

The last item of criteria Minnich was concerned with was suitability. (Minnich, 25). As stated above many thought that by this time the regime running the DPRK would have changed. As a result the regime has stayed in power, and still threatens the world with possible use of a nuclear weapon. This makes the AF unsuitable at this time. The advancement of the regime to disregard the NPT, and its pursuit of nuclear weapons has made it untrustworthy. The desire to move forward with good political relations must be
built around trust. Much of this trust has been damaged due to the collapse of the Agreed Framework, and the stance that the Bush administration took towards North Korea.

*The Bush Administration*

The transition from the Clinton administration to the Bush administration involved different philosophies from the former. Likewise, there were also different philosophies within the Bush administration itself. Clinton’s administration had briefed Secretary of State Colin Powell, and National Security Adviser Condoleezza Rice on the policy towards North Korea. The goal was to continue the plan that had been laid out by Clinton in the form of the Agreed Framework, and also the “sunshine policy” exercised by South Korea’s President Kim Dae-Jung. The problem was that the Bush administration was basically split within its own administration. This made policy making a very difficult task, and actually reaching a consensus even more difficult.

The two camps that are referenced when talking about the Bush administration foreign policy are the neo-conservatives and the realists. The neo-conservatives believed economic or political engagement with such a brutal regime as North Korea would only serve to prolong the evil that is being done inside the DPRK. This camp had followers such as Vice President Dick Cheney and Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld. The more moderate, tough dialogue group favored forming alliances and regional relationships when dealing with the North Korean issue. They were not all completely satisfied with the AF, but did agree that some form of negotiation was necessary. This camp had advocates such as Powell, and Deputy Secretary of State Richard Armitage. (Mazarr, 2007).
With the two differing, but not always contrasting viewpoints, present in the administration it seemed obvious at the outset that setting policy would be difficult. It was also going to be difficult because of the man in charge of the operations. President George W. Bush viewed Kim Jung Il as a “loathsome tyrant”, and wanted him out of power. Bush also tended to administer by his gut instincts, and favored those instincts over actual policy process. Forming policy for Bush was something that he did by viewing the world in terms of good and evil. Walter C. Clemens, Jr. describes his outlook with North Korea as such.

For his part, the 43rd President probably saw the North Korean regime as the embodiment of evil. Viewing the world in terms of good and evil. Bush in 2002 formally assigned North Korea to the axis of evil. For passionate conservatives, America stands with the sheep; North Korea with the goats. Negotiating with regimes is useless, dangerous, and perhaps even immoral. (Clemens Jr., 466).

This split ultimately leads to policy paralysis, and the direction that foreign policy should encompass was never quite present for Bush. When Bush decided to make decisions from his personal view of the world, the end result usually was distorted and without proper foresight.

A common critique of the Bush policy towards North Korea referred to the lack of a strategy that was absent even from the beginning of the administration. Michael J. Mazarr states that the administration came off in the public as militaristic driven, however this may have been misleading.

But a look back at the history of the Bush administration’s approach to North Korea highlights a somewhat different aspect of the White House’s foreign policy. The portrait that emerges is not one of a confrontational, militaristic administration; what instead becomes apparent is an image of a White House with extremely poor conceptual strategies and decision-making processes. (Mazarr, 75).

The criticism isn’t then levied so much at the views the administration may have had towards certain regimes in the world, but rather that the policies that were targeted at
those regimes lacked any real kind of direction. There never appeared to be any clear foreign policy doctrine. Rather the administration seemed to be more attached to a number of principles that it had. Mazarr explains:

The President himself appears to have been attached to a number of basic principles: the importance of strength and credibility, the universal appeal of democracy, a Reaganite belief that dictatorships are morally reprehensible and cannot be trusted. But beyond these core attitudes, in the North Korean case the basic elements of strategy- ends, means, and the balance between them- were not lucidly expressed or rigorously debated at the most senior levels of the U.S. government. (Mazarr, 75).

The results of this lack of direction made the relationship a contentious one throughout most of the tenure of the administration.

*The Second Crisis*

The neo-conservative school had achieved a victory in terms of strategy towards North Korea after a visit from Assistant Secretary of State James Kelly’s delegation to Pyongyang in October of 2002. After that trip Kelly confirmed:

from North Korean officials in Pyongyang, that the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea had a covert nuclear weapons program using highly enriched uranium. North Korea’s alleged admission of a highly enriched uranium program sparked the second nuclear crisis on the Korean peninsula, openly accelerating North Korea’s nuclear weapons development program. (Kwak, 15).

After this violation of the Agreed Framework occurred, the Bush administration needed to decide on a response. Earlier in the year in Bush’s State of the Union Address he had referred to the DPRK as part of the infamous “Axis of Evil.” There were arguments inside the administration between the two different camps about how to proceed with the response. Some members of the administration and of KEDO felt that they should “cut off the fuel oil but not do it formally and publicly, because [they] were afraid that it would provoke the North Koreans and precipitate a crisis.” (Funabashi, 136).

What emerged was a decision that favored the neo-conservative school of policy. They decided to suspend the HFO, and based it on three decisive beliefs. “North Korea
has a uranium enrichment program and has acknowledged as much. North Korea has
violated the Agreed Framework. North Korea has deceived us.” (Funabashi, 136). After
this incident relations deteriorated, and the DPRK agreed that the AF had more or less
collapsed. The DPRK had suspected that the United States didn’t really take the AF
serious in the first place, and pointed out the lack of attention that the United States had
given the original agreement.

North Korea accused the United States, essentially, of bad faith. It pointed to, among
other things, the lack of progress in lifting the economic embargo, the setbacks in
normalization, and the failure to build the light-water reactors on time as indications that
the United States had never been serious about abiding by the Agreed Framework to
begin with. (Armstrong, 26-27).

Some have speculated that the Bush administration may have known the DPRK was
covertly enriching uranium, and was using information that they had since 1990 to scuttle
the Agreed Framework. This evidence is not substantiated, however the reaction this
time from the DPRK did in fact result in withdrawal from the NPT. (Armstrong, 27).
The IAEA inspectors were kicked out of the Yongbyon facilities, and cameras were
removed from Yongbyon. The administration needed now to take a new approach with
the possibility of another crisis on the peninsula.

After Bush won his second term as President, his administration began to push for
a new strategy. The DPRK wanted to have two-party talks only with the United States,
but the U.S. was now beginning to realize that 6-Party talks would be a much more
effective way to move forward. By using 6 countries North Korea could gain some
comfort in knowing that China and Russia may look out for their interests, and guard
against the U.S. bullying the negotiations. The 6-Party process would involve Japan,
South Korea, China, Russia, The United States, and North Korea. James Kelly had
attempted this approach as well in 2003 after the initial revelation, however nothing was
accomplished. It would basically set up a 5 against 1 scenario. Clemens explains, “Washington replied categorically that it would take part only in six-party negotiations.” (Clemens 467). One problem with these negotiations was that the U.S. was now involved in Iraq, and Afghanistan and their attention may have been diverted. This may have taken much of their attention away from the situation on the Korean peninsula. Clemens explained that,

> Whether the Bush team wanted the six-party talks to succeed or believed that they could, however, remains unclear. *It is conceivable that Washington wanted them to fail and knew that they would.* The U.S. Vice President and President focused on Iraq, and showed little interest in Korean issues. (Clemens Jr., 470).

The above citation is very provocative indeed, but I can’t completely substantiate the claim. However, if it is true and the 6-Party Talks were just a ploy to make it appear as though the U.S. was paying attention to North Korea it didn’t fully work. Once the talks began, although sluggish, they have enabled the North Korean situation to move forward somewhat. Nonetheless, I prefer it because of the ability to have all the neighboring countries to North Korea address their interests as well in the negotiations.

This process has had several rounds, and has moved very slowly. The issues that the DPRK would like to see solved are that the U.S. gives up its “hostile” policy, and drop financial sanctions imposed on the country. The United States wants to see the de-nuclearization of the country first and foremost, and then they would focus on the financial issues. In 2006 the DPRK did halt construction on nuclear facilities, and in October of 2008 the United States did remove the DPRK from the terrorist blacklist. A basic summary of the last couple of years is given by the CBS news. “North Korea, which conducted a nuclear test in 2006, agreed last year to disable its nuclear reactor in exchange for aid. But it recently denied having agreed to allow inspectors to take samples
from its nuclear complex to verify past nuclear activities.” (cbs.com, 2008). The issue of obtaining samples has become a contentious area for the two sides. It is a crucial measure to be taken in order to determine past nuclear activities. The DPRKs refusal to cooperate just creates more suspicion, and mistrust that the relationship is already riddled with anyway.

The near future will require re-mobilization from all sides for negotiations to move forward. However, a new U.S. administration has taken the helm. And perhaps that could change the outlook that we have in this process. Next, I would like to examine the theories behind the relationship between the United States’ two previous administrations, and their policies towards the DPRK. Then I will explain the theory behind the DPRK’s actions, mysterious as they are. Lastly, I plan analyzing theory to put forth a brief policy recommendation that can move this process forward.
CHAPTER II: THEORY

In examining the approaches that the United States and North Korea take towards foreign policy, I first provide a summary of the theories that are relevant to this paper.

_Liberalism_

The first theory of international relations discussed is Liberalism. Liberalism has a long tradition that includes names such as Immanuel Kant and Jeremy Bentham, who were two liberal thinkers during the Enlightenment. Baylis et al. summarize the main themes of Liberalism as follows:

Human beings are perfectible, that democracy is necessary for that perfectibility to develop, and that ideas matter. Behind all this lies a belief in progress. Accordingly, Liberals reject the Realist notion that war is the natural condition of world politics. They also question the idea that the state is the main actor on the world political stage although they do not deny that it is important. They see multinational corporations, transnational actors such as central actors in some issue-areas of world politics. (Baylis et al., 5).

Liberalism theory also states that order in world politics comes from many different layers of governing arrangements, comprising laws, agreed norms, international regimes, and institutional rules. (Baylis et al., 5). Liberals argue that a state’s identity comes from its outward orientation, and that in order to avoid war and maintain a balance of power states must use collective security and allow a multicultural international system to deliver liberalized values. (Dunne, 111).

Finally, Liberals do not place such a great emphasis on sovereignty as opposed to Realists. They feel that states must be willing to open their borders, and seek outside help instead of remaining isolated. This is because the global world has become too connected, and it takes cooperation from all states in order for peace to prosper. A state can’t rely on its military power to ensure its safety, and it is more important to engage in
economic, environmental, and technological issues as well as security concerns. (Baylis et al., 5).

Realism

The next theory discussed is Realism. Realist theory focuses on states being the main actors in international relations, and as such sovereignty is placed as a top priority for states. Sovereignty means, “that there is no actor above the state that can compel it to act in specific ways.” (Baylis et al., 5). Therefore a state leader needs to regard their state’s sovereignty as highly protective, and it is in the state’s best interest to protect sovereignty to any ends. Realist theory focuses on how states are always in pursuit of power, and trying to obtain as much as they possibly can. They argue that the international environment is in a state of anarchy, and that a state leader’s first priority is to ensure the survival of the state, which is not guaranteed. (Dunne & Schmidt, 93.) Dunne and Schmidt elaborate stating:

Power is crucial to the realist lexicon and traditionally has been defined narrowly in military strategic terms. Yet irrespective of how much power a state may possess, the core national interest of all states must be survival. Like the pursuit of power, the promotion of the national interest is, according to realists, an iron law of necessity. (Dunne & Schmidt, 93).

Therefore a state must seek to gain as much power as it can at the expense of others, without provoking a backlash, in order to protect its own interests.

As a result of the above stated criteria in Realist theory it becomes very crucial that a state possesses a strong military. Dunne and Schmidt point out however that some weaker states may not be able to build up their military arms capabilities; therefore preserving the balance of power of states requires states to align with stronger hegemonic states to offset this power. They state:
That if the survival of a state or a number of weaker states is threatened by a hegemonic state or coalition of stronger states, they should join forces, establish a formal alliance, and seek to preserve their own independence by checking the power of the opposing side. The mechanism of the balance of power seeks to ensure an equilibrium of power in which case no one state or coalition of states is in a position to dominate all the others. (Dunne & Schmidt, 94).

As a result, Realists argue that world politics is a self-help system where states must use their own military resources to reach their own ends. Cooperation between states is possible, but the threat of conflict is always present. (Baylis et al., 5).

**Social Constructivism**

A third theory of International Relations is Social Constructivism, which is a social theory that attempts to conceptualize the relationship between agents and structures. For example, how should we think about the relationship between states and the structure of international politics? (Barnett, 162). Constructivism is concerned with how ideas define the international structure, and then how this structure shapes the identities, interests, and foreign policies of states. I chose to look at Social Constructivism in an attempt to better explain some of the reasons behind why North Korea behaves the way that it does, and maybe more importantly how it behaves in relationship to other states due to the fact that they possess nuclear weapons.

Social Constructivism also attempts to explain how the environment that we grow up in forms reality. Barnett explains:

> What makes an Arab state an Arab state is not the fact that the populations speak Arabic but rather that there are rules associated with Arabism that shape the Arab states’ identity, interests, and foreign policies….Reality does not exist out there waiting to be discovered; instead, historically-produced and culturally bound knowledge enables individuals to construct and give meaning to reality. (Barnett, 163).

This also helps to explain how a state such as North Korea is still in existence in its extremely isolated nature. The fact that knowledge in that country is so controlled, and
bound offers little hope of progress until influence from outside North Korea is allowed to penetrate in.

The last point of relevance concerning Social Constructivism in this paper has to do with the models of success that developing countries sometimes draw from the developed countries. By this, I mean that sometimes a developing country may choose to mimic what a developed country does, because they believe that this may deem them a greater status in international politics. Barnett explains:

Many Third World governments have acquired very expensive weapon systems that have very little military value because they convey to others that they are sophisticates and are a part of the ‘club.’ Iran’s nuclear ambitions might owe to its desire for regional dominance, but it also could be that it wants to own this ultimate status symbol. (Barnett, 169).

This method of “follow-the-leader” may help to explain why the North Koreans have pursued nuclear weapons, as a response to American influence and a possible perceived threat from the Americans.

**Neo-Conservatives**

The final theory that I would like to introduce is neo-conservativism. This theory becomes important because it will help to define the other “camp” of the Bush administration that differed from the Realists. A book by Peter Steinfels interviewed neoconservative Irving Kristol and outlined some of the tenets that neoconservatives adhere to.

The first point in defining neo-conservativism is that a welfare state is not seen as totally unacceptable, however a paternalistic state is completely opposed by neo-conservatives. The second is that neoconservatives have considerable respect for the market as an instrument for allocating resources efficiently while preserving individual freedom. Thirdly neo-conservatives have high respect for the traditional values and
institutions of religion, family, and culture of Western civilization. Straying from this is seen as very un-productive. Much of this stems from the origins of neoconservatives following the counter-culture revolutions of the 1960’s in the United States. Fourth, is that neoconservatives reject the idea that everyone deserves to have a share of everything. It is seen as a socialist, egalitarianism idea that infringes upon others liberties, because the government would be able to take away what some people have earned. And lastly, in foreign policy the belief is that American democracy is not likely to survive for long in a world that is so hostile to American values. (Steinfels, 51-52).

Ultimately the neoconservatives are very comfortable with the power that the United States possesses, and feels that they should not be afraid to use it when necessary. Steinfels elaborates on the view; “The United States must have a strong, confident elite willing to employ American power swiftly and decisively if the nation is to cope with international danger.” (Steinfels, 69).

Clinton Liberalism

The Clinton administration did choose a strategy of engagement when dealing with North Korea in its attempt to get North Korea to denuclearize. The problems that they faced however stemmed from mistrust, domestic divisions, and the changing political environment. Curtis Martin suggests that in the future,

Efforts to employ engagement strategies to achieve specific agreements on nonproliferation or arms control will have to address the problems encountered in attempting to persuade the DPRK to give up the potential benefits of weapons of mass destruction and the means of delivering them. (Martin, 48).

The Clinton administration found that they were able to engage with North Korea, and make some progress. However, this progress was met with skepticism as to the feasibility of the agreement. As stated earlier the LWRs did have the capability with
added effort of producing a nuclear weapon. If this became a reality then the United States would have in fact contributed to such a cause. The issue of trust was never really addressed in either campaign, and the negotiations as such may have lacked real integrity as a result.

The Agreed Framework did involve neighboring countries that would have contributed aid, and money for fuel. However, the crux of the negotiations was conducted under a unilateral strategy. The United States was interested in increasing its influence towards North Korea. But, the United States did not want to do this through the pressure of military coercion. In fact, under the Clinton administration the military saw drastic cutbacks in its funding. This strays from a Realist perspective of international diplomacy that in fact would be re-initiated under Bush. An essay by Condoleezza Rice written in 2000 on how the United States needs to change its perspective on rogue regimes refers to what she saw as a mistake by the Clinton administration.

America’s military power must be secure because the United States is the only guarantor of global peace and stability. The current neglect of America’s armed forces threatens its ability to maintain peace. (Rice, 50).

She continues to elaborate on the cuts made by the Clinton administration, which show that some of her views on foreign policy strongly align with the Realist school.

But the Clinton administration witlessly accelerated and deepened these cuts. The results were devastating: military readiness declined, training suffered, military pay slipped 15 percent below civilian equivalents, morale plummeted, and the services cannibalized existing equipment to keep airplanes flying, ships afloat, and tanks moving. (Rice, 50).

This kind of outlook focuses on the power that is so important in Realist assumptions of international relations, and it becomes vital to understand this viewpoint once I talk about the Bush theories behind diplomacy.
Another key aspect of the Clinton Liberalism approach has to do with collective security. Roberts and Kingsbury describe the idea behind collective security as “an arrangement where each state in the system accepts that the security of one is the concern of all, and agrees to join in a collective response to aggression.” (Roberts & Kingsbury, 30). In other words the engagement by the Clinton administration was an attempt to neutralize the military threat that North Korea was imposing on the region in Southeast Asia. Clinton felt that with engagement action, and the use of the IAEA under a recommitment from North Korea to join the NPT would lessen the need for a military strike. (Minnich, 8).

While under the Clinton administration, and in conjunction with the “sunshine policy” of South Korea, the atmosphere seemed pleasant. However, we also learned that the DPRK was cheating on the deal the whole time anyway. Again the lack of trust and commitment from either side created a guessing game. This may have led to cheating on the part of the DPRK. Regardless of how much, or exactly how the DPRK was cheating, they would later be called out by the U.S. after the visit made by Kelly.

*Neo-Conservatives vs. Realists Under Bush*

The Bush administration used a much more direct, and firm approach with their attitudes based both in realism, and neo-conservative theory. Again going back to the Kelly visit there was some speculation as to how accurate the reports on the DPRK uranium enrichment program actually were. Selig S. Harrison writes,

But what if those assessments were exaggerated and blurred the important distinction between weapons-grade uranium enrichment (which would clearly violate the 1994 Agreed Framework) and lower levels of enrichment (which were technically forbidden by the 1994 accord but are permitted by the nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty [NPT] and do not produce uranium suitable for nuclear weapons. (Harrison, 99).
This account suggests that the Bush administration did see a threat with the North Korean levels of enrichment, but may have embellished them to create a more threatening atmosphere. Regardless of the motivation, the policy approach was an effort to treat the options with a “worst-case scenario” approach. A quote from General James Clapper, Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA), stated,

Personally as opposed to institutionally, I was skeptical that they ever had a bomb. We didn’t have smoking gun evidence either way. But you build a case for a range, of possibilities. In a case like North Korea, you have to apply the most conservative approach, the worst-case scenario. (Harrison, 110).

The Bush strategy was one that simply did not have any respect for the regime of Kim Jong-II. They used posturing and a form of intimidation that warned North Korea of the seriousness with which the U.S. took nuclear proliferation. With the War in Iraq being waged on very similar terms, they hoped to push the DPRK back on its heels. Armstrong states that on the eve of the invasion of Iraq the United States mobilized bombers and an aircraft carrier from the Pacific into striking range of North Korea. Donald Rumsfeld even went as far as saying that the United States could fight a two-front war if necessary. (Armstrong, 27). This kind of rhetoric came to characterize the first few years of the Bush administration. Basically we are right, you are wrong, let us fix the wrong and everyone else get out of the way.

As stated in Chapter 1 the Bush administration was divided into two camps within the administration. Colin Powell, Richard Armitage, and Condoleezza Rice led the Realists. This particular group felt that a tougher dialogue was needed when dealing with North Korea, and felt that the U.S. should be militarily ready if it needed to deal with the DPRK in that way. Rice explains:

Military readiness will have to take center stage- new weapons will have to be procured in order to give the military the capacity to carry out today’s missions. Thus the next
President should refocus the Pentagon’s priorities on building the military of the 21st century. (Rice, 51).

This kind of view clearly falls under the Realist way of approaching international relations. Develop a strong military, and assert your power in the world. Rice concludes:

Moreover, that kind of power is usually accompanied by a sense of entitlement to play a decisive role in international politics. Great powers do not just mind their own business. (Rice, 49).

Realism explains this type of behavior from the defensive realist strategy. It also helps to explain why the continued levels of mis-trust exist in the DPRK/U.S. relationship to this day. This behavior can be attributed in the following way,

Under anarchy, many of the means a state uses to increase its security decrease the security of other states. This security dilemma causes states to worry about one another’s future intentions and relative power. Pairs of states may pursue purely security-seeking strategies, but inadvertently generate spirals of mutual hostility or conflict. (Taliaferro, 129).

The Bush policy in other words only served to exacerbate the current state of affairs with North Korea. The classic security dilemma exists for the United States under Realism theory. It is attempting to make itself feel more secure, which in turn causes other states to feel less so. Charles Glaser points to three ways in which a state’s attempts to make its adversaries feel less secure in fact prove self-defeating. His argument states that some security seeking measures will weaken the legitimacy of the military. Second that the adversary may look to means of expansion of its military as a means of self-defense, which makes deterrence even more difficult. Lastly, he states that with a military buildup on both sides adversaries may believe each other to be more dangerous than previously thought. The result is that trust can never be built upon, and we see this reflected in the current relationship today. (Glaser, 1997).
The other side of the Bush administration headed by Bush, Dick Cheney, and Donald Rumsfeld were coming from more of a neo-conservative approach to international relations, which is basically Realism with a twist. They viewed North Korea as an enemy without any distinction from the very beginning of the administration. The policy reflected a viewpoint that didn’t favor engagement, and in fact was more based on ignoring the DPRK. Jonathan Pollack states:

In the absence of substantial changes in North Korean policy, the United States would not undertake major new initiatives with the North, let alone be drawn into open-ended negotiations akin to those of the Clinton administration, which many senior officials judged demeaning and simply not worth the effort. (Pollack, 19).

This approach evokes a strong nationalistic stance that the United States is the supreme authority, and by engaging with an enemy the U.S. has weakened itself.

Irving Kristol again explains the position that neo-conservatives emanate from and it pushes the idea of making a nation’s power the most important aspect of foreign policy. It borders on extreme bravado that if your nation has the military might it should not fell ashamed, and it should in fact use it to keep enemies in line. He states,

First, patriotism is a natural and healthy sentiment and should be encouraged. Second, world government is a terrible idea since it can lead to world tyranny. Third, statesmen should, above all, have the ability to distinguish friends from enemies. The number of intelligent men who could not count the Soviet Union as an enemy, even though this was its own self-definition, was absolutely astonishing. Behind all this is a fact: the incredible military superiority of the United States vis-à-vis the nations of the rest of the world, in any imaginable combination. This superiority was planned by no one, and even today there are many Americans who are in denial. (Kristol, 3).

This resulted in the United States taking a more confrontational stance towards North Korea, and as stated earlier Rumsfeld even considered the idea of a two front war. However, I argue that with the approach that the Bush administration took towards North Korea, they actually made the DPRK less secure.
The Realist and Social Constructivist theories explain how North Korea was actually less secure as a result of obtaining nuclear weapons to protect themselves. This kind of escalation can lead to a confrontational stance as stated by Taliaferro on page 32. I will use these ideas in the next section to try and help explain why North Korea behaved the way that they did, and how their behavior made them less secure as a result.

*Explaining North Korea from a Realist Position*

In trying to get inside the mind of Kim Jong-II it is first necessary to try and understand why he may have wanted nuclear weapons. I think that recognition, as a serious power in the region is definitely one. However, how realistic is this in fact? Surrounded by South Korea, Japan, China, and Russia even Kim Jong-II must understand how far his nation has fallen behind the neighbors that he shares borders with. I have found that North Korea seems to respond to actions that the U.S. takes against them. This can be explained by Realism, and the security dilemma. The DPRK continues to build up its military efforts for fear of an attack from the outside, mainly the U.S.

The fact that North Korea spends approximately 20-25% of it’s feeble gross domestic product on military defense, is a sign that they feel the need to build up their defense capabilities for fear of being attacked. (O’Hanlon & Mochizuki, 18). As I pointed out above, the U.S., specifically Defense Secretary Rumsfeld did entertain the idea at one point of a two front war. It could be assumed that North Korea continues to cheat on its nuclear policies, because at times it does feel un-safe. However, this buildup and cheating may leave it in a state of being less secure as a result.

It is also reasonable to assume that the DPRK is worried about its survival. Again, regardless of the rhetoric that the DPRK regime may tell its people, the fact
remains they are struggling severely as a state. The DPRK may feel that it needs to build up nuclear weapons to discourage its neighbors from intruding on its dictatorial system. Also if they are able to build nuclear weapons then they can deter any kind of standard military attack that may incur from an adversary such as the United States. Taliaferro states that sometimes states will favor short-term military preparedness over long-term economic prosperity. This seems to explain some actions by the DPRK, because even in the Agreed Framework they wanted the LWR to provide energy. However, this energy could be used for military purposes as well. The well being of its people does not seem to be at the top of their agenda, rather the regime seems more interested with staying in power. It would seem rather that keeping people in check, and just on the verge of survival enables the regime to move forward and survive inch by inch. Taliaferro remarks, “States that lack defensible borders or have strong neighbors will have a powerful incentive to build strong central institutions, maintain standing armed forces, and adopt offensive military doctrines.” (Taliaferro, 140). North Korea resembles many of these very characteristics. They seem to reflect a personality that casts a light of insecurity, and constant anxiety about what those around them may want to do to them.

This anxiety that the DPRK possessed then spilled over into other countries. The fact that the DPRK was trying to obtain nuclear weapons did invite engagement from the United States under Clinton. However, once the administrations and policies changed as well, the security that North Korea believed it possessed by having nuclear weapons vanished. This is because the Bush administration saw North Korea as a hostile terrorist military threat. Mazarr explains, “Bush had directed his national security team to pursue negotiations with a North Korean regime that he believed to be evil and dishonest.”
The two camps and the lack of direction thus created a muddled policy, which made the DPRK less secure, because they couldn’t rely on the United States to offer them a clear policy objective of how to deal with each other. Again Mazarr states, “The administration as a whole entered office without a clear foreign policy doctrine.”

With this kind of mistrust created due to lack of direction it still is important to look at why the DPRK behaves the way that they do now that they have these powerful weapons. Besides the security issue, they still may possess nuclear weapons for other reasons, and in fact they still obey some of the norms that come with having such weapons.

Using Social Constructivism to Explain North Korea

The fact that North Korea seeks nuclear weapons, and the “status” that comes with owning such weapons has to be explained. It may be that they want to use them, or it may be the last bargaining chip of a desperate regime. Victor D. Cha, and David C. Kang describe the strategy behind Kim Jong-Il’s bargaining.

Provocations such as test-firing missiles, shadowing spy planes, and walking away from treaties can grab attention and even force the United States and its allies to provide inducements persuading North Korea back from the brink. A risky approach, perhaps-but rational, too. If you have little to negotiate with, it makes sense to leverage the status quo for maximum bargaining advantage. (Cha & Kang, 21).

Social Constructivism can help to explain some of the reasoning behind why North Korea may want to obtain nuclear weapons. North Korea uses the credible nuclear threat, which they have developed, in order to gain a sense of security in the global system. Social constructivism also explains the rationale behind building up such expensive defense systems, even when you may have a country that is literally starving. Yet, somehow a leader can find a way to justify having such expensive weapons. It makes states such as
North Korea feel part of a group, or “club.” Barnett explained this earlier on page 26. The next question however, is with the threatening behavior North Korea has exercised so often, why do they not use these weapons? Is it because they don’t fully have the capabilities, or do they in fact stick to international norms on nuclear weapons just as everyone else does?

The social construction theory on deterrence says that moral concerns will play a role in the non-use of nuclear weapons. Once these weapons are acquired the actors who have them must adjust their behavior accordingly to comply with the responsibility of having such powerful weapons. Price and Tannenwald explain:

Actors conform to norms in order to validate social identities, and it is in the process of validating that interests are constituted. Thus both the creation, and reproduction, of norms and their salience for actors are inseparable from the social constitution of actor’s identities. (Price & Tannenwald, 125).

In other words Kim Jong-Il may have been acting to become a member of the “club”, therefore he was hoping to be taken more seriously as a leader and a nation. It appears that part of the reason North Korea acquired nuclear weapons were for this reason. All nations since World War II have abided by the non-use norm. So that really doesn’t need explanation. But it is necessary to view how North Korea uses their weapons on the international stage, not in terms of actual detonation. Rather North Korea uses nuclear weapons as a bargaining, and a coercive tool.

Looking to the norms behind the non-use of nuclear weapons we can explain that North Korea may in fact only be using these weapons as a bargaining chip as describe above. Countries usually acquire these weapons out of fear in order to deter another state from attacking them. This may have led North Korea to acquiring these weapons as well. So it seems reasonable to assume that the weapons are used as a coercion tool, and also
for bargaining. North Korea, although considered a rogue regime, seems to be complying with the norms of legitimacy for non-use of nuclear weapons. That may be the only norm that they comply with in the global system today, because even the act of acquiring the weapons was technically illegitimate. The acquisition went against the NPT, and ultimately led to their withdrawal from the treaty. Realism theory of international relations assumes that due to the anarchic state of the world you must make yourself as powerful as possible. This power will actually help to guide your state’s actions as a result. However, with the social constructivist’s viewpoint it seems that it is the society of states that creates the norms for non-usage of nuclear weapons. It may also explain the fact that even a rogue regime as North Korea will abide by these norms when it comes to these weapons. (Price & Tannenwald, 1996).

Thus, North Korea seems to act rationally when it comes to nuclear weapons, and the norms that accompany such a responsibility. The problem for the rest of the world is how much longer do we trust the DPRK to abide by these norms? Surely it would be safer, and more lucrative for the citizens of the DPRK if no money were used for defense let alone nuclear weapons. Rather, spend what little they have on building infrastructure to help a suffering population. As a result the world is safer, and the country can move towards a more prosperous future.

To summarize the relationship of the United States, and North Korea continues to lack trust, making it very difficult to establish good relations. The one side is never comfortable, nor aware of what the other is doing. This kind of mistrust has created escalation, and as a result the two countries may be making the region surrounding the
Korean peninsula less secure. It is up to the new Obama administration to find a way to deal with North Korea that can benefit all in the affected countries.

Theory Discussion

After reviewing the theories, and the ways in which they describe the Clinton and Bush administrations as well as North Korea, I argued that certain aspects of each theory need to be looked at in order to construct a new policy outlook for the future. While the Clinton administration had a plan that did not succeed it was not because of their approach to international relations. It was due to other exogenous factors that the Agreed Framework failed, Congressional funding, and North Korean deception. But Liberalism theory teaches us that engagement may lead to a more secure outcome than a Realist approach. Liberals in fact believe that “actors would enter into cooperative agreements if the gains were evenly shared.” (Dunne, 115). This is not the viewpoint from a Realist perspective, where absolute gains are favored. In other words you must gain more than a rival. After applying the theories I conclude that Realism best explains the actions of North Korea, and the United States during the Bush years. Both countries used defense as an excuse for their actions, and as a result both were less secure.

Judging from this simple point alone, I want to move forward with an approach that favors Liberalism. The 6-Party outline that I will discuss later is based on equality, and mutual gains. A Realist approach to foreign policy will not suffice under that kind of framework. I also feel that using this kind of approach may help to change the thinking of North Korea once they enter negotiations. Their behavior is suspect, however working in a framework that favors cooperation over competition could entice them to work together with their “enemies.” It will require a policy approach of knowledge and
preparation that the Bush administration lacked, because it never had direction.

Liberalism will argue that while cooperation is possible between adversaries it is not automatic, and requires planning and negotiation. (Dunne, 116).

The other important lesson to draw from the discussion of theory is how to deal with North Korea. They clearly operate with their own interests only, and use the nuclear weapons as a means of coercion to get what they want. While it is true that they haven’t actually detonated the weapons against an enemy yet, it is still a risk that needs to be avoided. Thus the goal of this paper becomes finding a way to eliminate the need for North Korea to possess their nuclear weapons. And not just eliminate the weapons, but finding an equal substitute so North Korea does not feel they have lost something in the negotiations. Whatever status, and recognition that they feel the nuclear weapons have given them must be replaced in a way that allows them to feel they have retained their credibility even though they have lost their nuclear weapons.

What to do Now?

Reunification is inevitable, but it can only take place once Pyongyang has stopped crucifying the population under its control. How can we stand by while troops and orphans cross the Yalu and Tumen Rivers seeking refuge in China? How can we stand by while parents sell their daughters for something to eat? I don’t want to see any more skeletal children with wide, frightened eyes. I don’t want any more children sent to the camps and their mothers forced to divorce their fathers. I want their grandfathers to be around to tell them stories and their giggles on the banks of the Daedong never to be interrupted by the arrival of bureaucrats from the Security Force. (Kang, 238). – Excerpt from an escaped survivor of North Korean concentration camps.

As stated earlier the goal of this paper is to review the previous two administration’s policies in regards to North Korea, then build upon what has been effective, and abandon what has not worked. Under Clinton the United States was committed to engagement with its enemies. This is the direction that policy needs to focus on in the future with regards to the North Korean situation. The Agreed Framework was successful in
employing a strategy that engaged with an enemy, and strayed from resorting to military confrontation. However, North Korea still didn’t maintain their part of the agreement and cheated on it. A reason why North Korea did this is because the U.S. didn’t follow through on the funding for their part of the AF. But, this was not due to a failure on the part of the Clinton White House; rather it had to do with a Republican controlled Congress. Martin states:

   In the USA, the climate for positive sanctions, never favorable, has been adversely affected by three recent developments: the rise of congressional assertiveness in foreign policy, Republican control of Congress after 1994, and eroding support for all forms of foreign aid. (Martin, 55).

Therefore one of the main reasons the Agreed Framework fell apart from the U.S. perspective is because of a failure on the part of Congress to support the President. Thus Congress was behaving more consistent with the theoretical expectations behind positive sanction theory. Congress was successful in applying “linkages” to the Agreed Framework, which are used to influence the diplomatic agenda of their own government. (Martin, 57). The function of these linkages is described by Martin:

   The general form of these explicit linkages has been, “You won’t get your reward for good behavior on issue (A) unless you also show good behavior on issue (B). Linkage strategies are hardly new, but they have played a central role in the negotiation and implementation of the Agreed Framework. (Martin, 57).

This enabled Congress to withhold funding, and block certain moves of the Agreed Framework that were crucial for its success.

   The difference now with the Obama administration is that control of Congress has changed to the Democrats side, and pushing through legislation shouldn’t be as difficult. This is a variable that could change again in a few years so urgent action is necessary to accomplish the goals now. Nonetheless the use of engagement, and positive sanctions is
something that I will use in my proposal as well. It was a better strategy than ignoring
the problem, which is where Bush’s strategy seemed to linger from time to time.

Another problem that future proposals need to avoid lies with regards to the
energy situation. The Agreed Framework promised a LWR, which as discussed earlier
could produce nuclear weapons at some point. This type of energy needs to be avoided,
so North Korea is not tempted to develop nuclear weapons. The new proposal I outline
later will shift attention from this kind of energy, and focus on oil and electric.

Although the Bush administration was responsible for employing the multilateral
diplomatic effort of the 6-Party Talks, be it accidental or not, they still never had a clear
strategy or goal behind what the wanted accomplished with the talks. As Mazarr
explains, “negotiations are a tactic and a process, not a strategy.” (Mazarr, 85). Thus the
ideological component behind the Bush administration never really changed, but they
finally did develop a process that they felt they could move forward with. While I do like
the 6-Party Talk negotiations, I think an overall new strategy is much needed in order to
move forward with North Korea. That means simple things like what is reported in the
media needs to show positive attitudes directed towards North Korea, and not statements
such as the now infamous “axis of evil” quote from George W. Bush.

That is the main negative that I don’t want to repeat with the new proposal that I
put forward. Just having the 6-Party Talks is not enough. All sides need to go into the
negotiations under the mindset that they are working together, and not at odds. The Bush
administration under the neo-conservative influence was too hawkish to employ graceful
diplomacy techniques with adversaries. Mazarr explains:

This strategic muddle was in part a consequence of key policymakers’ thinking in
principled rather than strategic terms—a major feature of the Bush administration.
(Mazarr, 86).
Thus a focused strategy is needed before entering into negotiations, otherwise the U.S. will just stick to their principles, and not focus on what the interests of the other parties may be. Mazarr concludes with a quote that nicely characterizes the two administration’s strategies towards North Korea:

In the end, an administration that had abandoned engagement for moralism ended up deserting its moralistic principles after all. Embracing full-scale engagement would have been anathema, of course, and so the administration turned instead to a meager denuclearization offer unlikely to break North Korea fully free of its entrenched position as a declared nuclear power….From the perspective of today, life under the Clinton administration’s much-maligned Agreed Framework looks very good indeed. (Mazarr, 87).

While parts of both administrations plans had some problems, it appears that the Agreed Framework was still a step in the right direction. It also appears that had Congress been willing to allocate the necessary funding, and a Republican administration did not follow Clinton the Agreed Framework may have succeeded fine. As it stands, however, this didn’t happen and the Obama administration must pick up the pieces from where the Bush administration left off.

This relationship must be healed, but I think it is more important to heal on the side of North Korea. Yes, the world will be better off without North Korea being a nuclear state. The region will be much better off, as they still look to heal the wounds that divide from World War II. But, the most important aspect of dealing with North Korea must be focused on the people who live in such a tyrannical regime. The approach that the new U.S. administration uses must focus on realistic measures, and most importantly providing aid for those who so severely need it. They must first ask for energy aid in the form of a powerful electric grid from China, and South Korea. It is essential to turn away fully from the use of nuclear power. It also becomes essential to
offer security to the DPRK so that they do not feel the need to build up their own arms in an effort to ward off attacks, that they seem to feel are imminent. This could be done by the United States drastically scaling down the number of troops that they have in the region. The main aspect of this strategy must inject trust into the opposing sides. It is nonexistent as of now.

However, by punishing this regime we will lose the ability to help those at the bottom of their society who in fact are the people that are most in danger in this contentious relationship. Using engagement is crucial to helping this country, and if we ignore them then we can expect another nuclear crisis. A desperate act of a desperate regime deserves attention. It is time to steer away from Realist policies in our foreign relations. It is time to foster other actors into the process that can offer help to the DPRK. If both sides continue to escalate an arms race, then no one will be more secure as a result. I think the last 20 years or so have proved just that.
CHAPTER III

With the last two administrations attempts at solving the “Peninsula Question” going nowhere it now is the task of the Obama administration to develop a strategy for dealing with North Korea. This chapter is designed to describe the method that I feel could be most effective for dealing with North Korea. Taking what I have learned from the Clinton, and Bush administrations I will attempt to propose a new strategy. It will build on what has already been done, and also attempt to inject some new ideas into the 6-Party Talks.

Using An Interest Based Approach to Resolve the Conflict

The main negotiator in the 6-Party Talks is the United States, but involving all parties is crucial to coming up with an agreement that every side can be comfortable with. A week after the inauguration of Obama, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton stated that the United States would like to take a more direct approach with North Korea. The January 27th 2009 edition of the New York Times reported that, “Mrs. Clinton also suggested there could be some form of direct negotiations between the United States and North Korea.” (http://www.nytimes.com/2009/01/28/washington/28diplo.html?_r=1&hp). A key for the United States is to outline a fresh approach to dealing with each party’s grievances. The U.S. needs to find a way to satisfy the interests of each party, while meeting the basic human needs of those affected most by North Korea’s belligerence. Those affected most are the citizens of North Korea. The main approach to doing this will be by using an interest-based approach to bargaining. This is different than the approach used by the Bush administration, which favored very hard bargaining. It is also different from the current
policy approach being exercised by Lee Myung-Bak in South Korea, which favors taking a very tough stance against their northern neighbor.

Next I will outline the standard steps in interest-based bargaining, which is adapted from *Getting Past No*, by William Ury (1991).

*Interest Based Bargaining Process*

- First, all parties need to separate the people from the problem. The goal is to not bring up issues that divide the states due to past grievances.
- Next, the initial positions must be determined. This step is used to determine what each side says it wants out of the negotiations.
- Third the negotiator needs to discover what the interests of each side are that lay behind their actual positions.
- Then negotiators need to generate many options that can satisfy some of each parties’ interests. Where possible the options should include ways to “expand the pie”, of increase rewards for an agreement.
- Fifth, for issues where the pie must be divided, there needs to be agreement on a standard of fairness that is used to ensure that the pie is fairly divided.
- Threats and coercion should be avoided, because this may cause harsh feelings and tends to make negotiations head in a negative direction.
- Each party should determine its BATNA. This is the Best Alternative To a Negotiated Agreement. If negotiations fail this is the option that each party will pursue. (Ury, 1991).

Interest based bargaining assumes that it is possible to find one if not many mutual interests shared between the negotiating parties. The approach focuses on being open,
listening, educating, and insisting on standards of fairness as opposed to using power to coerce your opponents.

**Securing Basic Human Needs**

For these negotiations the main goal is to de-nuclearize the DPRK. However, it must be a vital interest of the outside 5 countries in the negotiations to secure the basic human needs of the North Korean citizens. Without meeting these basic needs the conflict will likely recur. Whatever solutions the negotiating parties devise, it is vital that the citizens of North Korea not be left in famine from the agreements. Staub explains why creating institutions, and the conditions for people to live under is essential to providing basic human needs:

> Even apart from societal crises constituted by difficult life conditions or group conflict, in everyday life the nature of culture, relations between groups, the institutions of society, and the existence and nature of local communities provide the frame in which families and individuals live. They greatly affect the extent to which basic needs are fulfilled under normal, everyday conditions. (Staub, 3)

At this point there needs to be a dramatic change in the manner in which North Korean citizens live on a daily basis. They have lived through famines, and gulag camps where beatings and brainwashing were a daily occurrence. Those that do not live in the center of power in the country are faced with dismal living conditions everyday. Due to this fact people are divided into classes, and the aid and the small majority of elites only receive limited amounts of economic resources that the country possess. A congressional research report states:

> North Korea reportedly officially classifies its citizens into three ranks and fifty-one categories based on their ideological orientation. However, in actuality, the economy has created five classes of people. The official categories are used to allocate rations for daily necessities, jobs, and housing. The top class consists of the elite who claim the first rewards from society. (Chanlett-Avery & Nanto, 10).
The society is also divided so that those who live outside of the capital of Pyongyang can’t even enter without special permission. A goal for the outside 5 parties has to be to restore the dignity of the North Korean citizens, and allow them to reach the most basic first level of human needs that is explained in Maslow’s pyramid. The levels of the pyramid are ordered from bottom to top, and include these needs: physiological, safety, love, belongingness, esteem, and self-actualization. (Jang, Ott, Shafritz, 2005). Fulfilling the most basic level of these needs could help to lift the North Korean people out of some of the repression that they have been living under since the Korean War ended. This group of needs includes food and sleep. Food being the focal point here, as many of the citizens of North Korea are on the verge of starvation. However, fulfilling this basic need could begin the process of building a better state for the citizens of the DPRK to live in. Staub states:

However, in a country that practices repression, the easing but not lifting of repression increases hopes and expectations. This may lead to further demands and revolutionary movements. An effective response to grievances, whether they arise from people in a particular neighborhood or from larger groups, must be multifaceted, involving constructive actions, continued engagement, and the building of relationships among parties. (Staub, 8).

The above citation brings up another very important aspect of any kind of engagement with North Korea. As stated earlier in this paper, the United States during both the Clinton and Bush years believed that the regime of Kim Jong-Il could not last much longer. Unfortunately it has. I think the outside parties need to keep in the back of their minds the potential for the people of North Korea to someday demand more from their government. This can’t take place however, until they are able to meet their basic needs. Then, maybe with continued progress, the people will someday reach self-actualization,
and be able to participate in a non-violent uprising that can bring them a new way of life through a new kind of governance.

Using the framework of interest based bargaining, it becomes crucial to identify the different interests that each side has in the negotiations. The initial positions are set when each side comes to the negotiating table, but it becomes a necessity that each party takes a step back and decides to search for mutual interests that all parties can benefit from.

**Positions: Russia, China, United States, Japan, and South Korea**

The initial positions that those 5 countries are taking in the 6-Party Talks are all very similar. They all want to see a North Korea without any nuclear weapons, or capabilities to develop nuclear weapons. This position has been in place since the 6-Party Talks first began, and it will continue to be the main position until the negotiations or the conflict is solved. While re-unification is often mentioned when talking about the Korean peninsula, it is not an actual position that any of these countries have at the outset of the negotiations. South Korea would obviously be the most concerned with re-unification, and while it is talked about in future aspirations of the government, it is not a goal in the medium term or near future. Each individual country’s interests will be discussed later. How each country deals with the de-nuclearization goal will be different, and I will talk about those aspects in the interests section.

**North Korea**

While much of North Korea’s ambitions are still quite opaque, it is reasonable to assume that they have used their nuclear arsenal and ambitions as bargaining chips to get what they want from the other countries involved in the 6-Party Talks. While North Korea has
said now and in the past that they will dismantle their nuclear programs, it remains a major question whether or not they can be trusted to actually do this. The United States, and Japan usually are much more pressing on complete and immediate dismantling, while the other three countries favor a step-by-step process. Of course this gives North Korea breathing room for their position and can allow them to take actions that may increase the interests that they want satisfied. Nonetheless their position is that they would get rid of their nuclear capabilities, but in return they want normalized diplomatic relations and aid for doing so. (Chanlett-Avery & Nanto).

Their posturing of intimidation has worked for engagement in the past, and the DPRK is still using threats of missile testing to draw attention to themselves even today. In other words North Korea is using coercion, and threats to try and get what they want. While the threats must be taken seriously, it is also necessary for the other countries to enlarge the pie for the DPRK so they have more of an incentive to actually negotiate rather than just making threats.

*Interests:*

William Ury proposes how to reframe a debate, and trying to not just assert each side’s position in a negotiation. He states, “Reframing means redirecting the other side’s attention away from positions and toward the task of identifying interests, inventing creative options, and discussing fair standards for selecting an option.” (Ury, 78). The fact that there are six different countries involved in this negotiation means that there are a lot of interests to be satisfied. The five outside parties to the talks would all like to see a denuclearized North Korea. Along with this they want to see a Korean peninsula that is stable, and a country that no longer has its people living in such dire conditions.
Russia

Russia’s main interest involving the peninsula is to expand their geopolitical influence in the region. Takeda states:

Russia’s (Putin’s) foreign policy is based on the geopolitical concepts of balance of power and spheres of influence. These notions, byproducts of territorial expansionism in Russian and Soviet history, remain at the core of Moscow’s external agenda. (Takeda, 191).

Russia also has economic interests involved with North Korea, in that they would like to see the exports of their natural resources increase. Also at some point they would like to develop a transportation link that connects the Trans-Siberian Railroad to the Inter-Korean Railroad for economic and security reasons. But, the main idea behind all of this is to increase Russia’s status in the region. Takeda explains Russia’s incentives for their foreign policy:

First, it was critical for Russia, the weakest power in the region, to steer the Korean Peninsula toward an outcome that leaves no power stronger than the others. Russia saw that the United States had secured a dominant position on the peninsula and, consequently, Russia’s national interests were not strongly represented. (Takeda, 194).

Simply put Russia has seen its influence on the peninsula dwindle, and they would like to regain some of the status of power that they have lost in recent years. Their main interests thus rests in geopolitical concerns, and for long-term economic desires involving a peaceful Korean peninsula.

Russia was also not pleased with the way that the Bush administration abandoned the Agreed Framework, and the former Sunshine Policy of South Korea. They accuse the United States of provocatively creating more strenuous conditions on the Korean peninsula with their rhetoric in reference to the “axis of evil.” With this in mind, Russia feels that they actually have a very important role to play with stability on the peninsula. They feel that without them the DPRK doesn’t have as many allies in the talks whom
they can trust. As Rozman states, “Russia claimed credit for advising Pyongyang against a hard-line position and in favor of a multilateral framework to address the crisis.” (Rozman, 220). Therefore Russia seeks to emphasize the need for normalization of relations so the other interests that they actually have can be met with increased engagement with a new, more stable neighbor. Rozman states, “Russia’s preference is for North Korea to emerge from the crisis with a favorable deal that inclines it toward a regional security framework and large-scale reconstruction projects.” (Rozman, 236). This kind of deal will enhance Russia’s position in the region, and they hope to increase ability to work with the DPRK as an economic partner.

Japan

Japan actually has had very poor diplomatic relations with North Korea since World War 2, and as a result they have lacked the ability to build confidence with their neighbor. Funabashi states:

Since Japan’s defeat in World War II, the nation’s foreign policy toward its Asian neighbors has always been designed to enhance confidence and reconciliation, starting with the payment of war reparations, followed by normalization of diplomatic, and economic cooperation……In Japan’s postwar diplomacy North Korea alone had been left out; it has been the only country in the world with which Japan has not had formal diplomatic relations. (Funabashi, 66-67).

As a result, some of the interests that Japan has stem from past grievances, which can be difficult to solve in interest-base bargaining. It is usually recommended to leave issues such as these out of negotiations for fear of creating a gridlock.

As stated earlier Japan, and North Korea have had some historical issues that are very hard to displace when it comes time to sit at the negotiating table with one another. The bottom line is that the Japanese are concerned with the past abductions of Japanese citizens that took place in the 1970s and 80s. As Funabashi explains, “However, while
the security threat posed by North Korea was of great concern to policymakers and security experts, the primary focus of the Japanese people has been the abduction issue.” (Funabashi, 7). The abduction issue has been the major divisive issue with these two countries, and while Japan wants to reassert its presence in the region, the issue of abductees will likely not go away anytime soon. Finding a way to resolve this issue will most likely have to be a part of the proposal in order for Japan to desire to give aid, and resources to North Korea. At least from the Japanese perspective it will have to be a major part of the objectives for solving the North Korea nuclear issue.

Japan also has an interest in deepening its ties with the United States to set up its negotiating position. Much of this desire has to do with Japan’s desire to deepen its economic interests in the region. As Rozman explains, “Japan figured it would become more vital to the South’s strategy for economic integration on the peninsula and would gain leverage to balance China.” (Rozman, 257). Japan has to rely more on the United States now, because of the United States presence in the region, and their influence on South Korea. So for the Japanese the abduction issue is vital, but it may be of lesser influence to the overall negotiations than they would like.

Japan has taken a tough stance with North Korea, and a lot of this attitude stems from past grievances between the two countries. The occupation of North Korea by Japan in the Second World War is a legacy that Japan wants to put to rest. Japan also has serious security issues with the fact that the DPRK has launched missiles into the Sea of Japan. While it is not recommended that past issues be addressed in interest-based bargaining; I believe I have found an area where both countries can address the issue, and move on to the greater concern of a de-nuclearized North Korea.
China

As stated earlier, China has the ability to have the most influence on North Korea. Rozman states that, “Along with Seoul, Beijing views the crisis in the broad context of a gradual process of reunification and, even more, of far-reaching realignment in the security architecture of the entire region.” (Rozman, 123). The Chinese represent North Korea’s number one source in both aid and trade. However, in recent years China has condemned the DPRK for its nuclear weapons tests, which the Chinese government rigidly opposed. Gregory Moore sums up the Chinese interests with North Korea as:

- First, the Chinese have been working hard to dissuade North Korea from advancing its long-range missile and nuclear weapons programs because they have great potential to threaten some of China's most fundamental interests – namely, regional stability, and possibly even China's economic modernization program, if worse came to worst. Second, China continues to support North Korea economically, and at times diplomatically, because a complete collapse of North Korea is not in its interest either. (Moore, 2).

The second concern is an ongoing problem that currently exists for China. China is the gateway for refugees from North Korea to escape too, and the collapse of the North Korean government could mean much more of this. It is not something that the Chinese want to see happen.

The relationship between the DPRK and China has shifted in more recent times because the interests of the Chinese have shifted. The Chinese and the DPRK used to share an antipathy for South Korea, but as Chinese economic interests progress so does its ability to bridge new relationships with former adversaries. Also the styles in which the governments are run have seen changes that loosen the ties with each other. Moore explains, “Both countries have long since departed from orthodox Marxist Leninism, but while China has moved forward past it, most Chinese and Western observers agree that North Korea has moved backward toward feudalism, becoming a ‘post-modern
Changes such as these have made the Chinese look for other ways to solve the problem that it has with North Korea. The Chinese, keeping their own economic interests in mind, could find themselves in the position to have the most impact on the negotiations with the DPRK.

In conclusion China wants to see a North Korean state free of nuclear weapons. And maybe most importantly it does not want a collapsed North Korean state. Moore explains:

China is propping up the North Korean economy in a minimalist sense while pressuring Kim Jong-Il to reform his economy, so China and South Korea will not be left with the bill (in both financial and security terms) for cleaning up after a collapsed North Korean state. (Moore, 23).

This may be their greatest interest of all. Increasing aid, and pushing for tough reforms on how to watch over the North Koreans and their nuclear plans may be the easy part. But, having to pick up the pieces of a failed North Korean state is something that China has no interest in, and would indeed be a very difficult task to perform.

South Korea

The main interest of South Korea is a rather obvious one, in that they do not want any kind of military conflict to erupt on the peninsula. Even with the hard-line approach taken by Lee Myung-Bak, the South Korean government does not want to see an escalation of war take place in their “backyard.” South Korea wants to end the conflict on the peninsula, but they want to do so gradually. The idea of instant reunification is not something that South Korea favors. Reunification has always been a policy goal, but the reality is that this will not happen for quite some time. The South, much like the other parties, wants the North to abolish all nuclear weapons and facilities. This can only be
accomplished by strict surveillance over the DPRK’s activities, which right now is something the North has never really cooperated in doing.

Another interest the South has, and which has already begun to implement, is that of economic agreements with the DPRK. The Kaesong Industrial Complex is managed by the South Korean companies Hyundai Asan, and Korea Land Corporation. It aims to attract South Korean companies seeking low labor costs, and also it offers actual jobs to many North Koreans. This complex, and the possibility of creating free-trade zones in this complex have developed rapidly despite the threats of ballistic missile tests from the North. Another benefit that this complex gives to the North lays in electric power, which the North so desperately needs. The Korea Electric Power Corporation was able to connect North and South Korea by a 100,000-kilowatt power-transmission line for use by the companies in the KIC. (Chanlett-Avery & Nanto, 20). This idea of economic incorporation between the two countries, and supplying the DPRK with power that it so desperately needs is of major interest to South Korea. Anything that promises power, but that is not nuclear power is progression in the “right” direction from the South Korean perspective. South Korea feels that being able to provide some kind of stability to the North economically will increase the desires for the North to step outside of their hermit lifestyle.

The Kaesong Complex idea grew out of the “sunshine policy” which has since been abandoned by Lee Myung-Bak. Chanlett-Avery, and Nanto elaborate on the idea:

The KIC serves both geopolitical and economic purposes. Geopolitically, it provides a channel for rapprochement between North and South Korea, a bridge for communication, a method of defusing tensions, and a way to expose North Koreans to outside ideas and ways of doing business. (Chanlett-Avery & Nanto, 21).
This kind of interest is crucial to develop both for South and North Korea. Ever since the election of Lee Myung-Bak South Korea has been shifting away from the “Sunshine Policy” that was used in previous administrations in dealing with North Korea. The end result has seen a much more hard-line stance from the South Korean government. They currently don’t see the need to engage with the DPRK if promises are not kept, and the security of South Korea is being threatened as a result.

The goal is that one day the citizens of North Korea can change the way their country is governed. Right now they are so cut off from the outside world, and resources in their own country that it isn’t a possibility. However, with the possibility of economic development which could lead to a higher standard of living the citizens of North Korea can hope that one day they can re-take control of their own lives. The basic position that South Korea has is that they will participate in increasing aid, and assistance but only once North Korea cooperates and stands by the agreements that they have made. They don’t want to make any concessions without the assurance that North Korea will dismantle their nuclear programs.

United States

While it appears the new Obama administration will soften the stance that it wants to take with regards to North Korea they still have some interests that could be difficult to engage. The United States along with all of the other parties obviously wants North Korea to abolish their nuclear arsenal, and related facilities. This is a strategic interest that not only means security for the United States, but also for the neighboring countries to North Korea. The United States has the chance now with a new administration, and new approach to engage with North Korea in a way that could really re-shape the
geopolitical situation on the peninsula. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton has stated that, “Our position is when they move forward in presenting a verifiable and complete dismantling and denuclearization, we have a great openness to working with them.”

(http://www.nytimes.com/2009/02/16/washington/16diplo.html?_r=1&scp=1&sq=clinton%20north%20korea&st=cse)

Another major interest that the United States has involves the human rights abuses that the North Korean government is guilty of. This issue creates some problems, because other members of the 6-Party Talks may reject the inclusion of this interest in any kind of negotiation. Emma Chanlett-Avery states:

Some outside analysts have pointed to the challenges of highlighting North Korea’s human rights violations in the midst of the ongoing nuclear negotiations, as well as the difficulty in effectively reaching North Korean refugees as outlined in the law. Further, the law may complicate coordination on North Korea with China and South Korea. (Chanlett-Avery, 1).

The law mentioned above is referencing the North Korean Human Rights Act of 2004, which was passed by Congress. The main point behind the law was just to assure that human rights legislation would be a part of any policy that was used when dealing with North Korea. The United States has confronted China on this issue in the past, and it could create for some difficulties when it comes time to negotiate. China is wary of U.S. involvement in this area, and may have some reservations if the U.S. becomes more involved in this area, because they fear some of their own violations may demand closer scrutiny.

In summary the United States seeks to bring North Korea out of its authoritarian rule, and horrid living conditions of its citizens. They hope to include human rights issues in whatever policy comes out of the 6-Party Talks. They also always hope to assert their influence in the region for peaceful stability, but the new administration seeks to do this through engagement, not through punishment in the form of sanctions and
other harmful techniques. The regime of Kim Jong-Il is something the U.S. would like to see dissolved, but first the people of North Korea must be considered in the policy. They are the ones who actually suffer the most due to the behavior of their government. For the citizens of North Korea, everyday is a security threat because of the standard of living that they are subjected to living under.

**North Korea**

The interest behind North Korea’s behavior has to deal with desperation. As Jo and Gartzke explain North Korea originally acquired nuclear weapons to make a statement to their neighbors, and the rest of the world. They wanted to be recognized as a power, and gain some kind of legitimacy in the international community by acquiring these weapons:

> In addition, pariah nations – states politically isolated by their neighbors or by other countries- are more likely to seek nuclear weapons to demonstrate their viability and power to the international community. Pariah states may also seek nuclear weapons for deterrence to dissuade adversaries from political or military hostilities. (Gartzke & Jo, 170).

Therefore one motive behind North Korea’s actions is their desire able to use their nuclear stockpile as a bargaining chip. They usually make threats when they desire attention, and they need something. (i.e. their interests of status, aid, food, and oil). For example, this recently happened after the new Obama administration took office. North Korea had threatened to test long-range ballistic missiles, but then toned down their rhetoric. However, this move seemed aimed at setting up their bargaining position for the re-convening of the 6-Party Talks. According to Assistant Secretary of State Christopher Hill, North Korea either threatens to launch, or actually does launch missiles for the following reasons.

I. To force the United States into serious engagement with North Korea.
II. To divert Chinese pressure on North Korea (to prevent economic domination by China and a China-U.S. coalition).

III. To be treated as a nuclear power (status)

IV. To appease the North Korean military, whose influence is growing (an indication of Kim Jong-Il’s reduced control of the military). (Funabashi, 474).

In summary, North Korea seeks to squeeze whatever amount of money, aid, and other resources it can from the other 5 countries in the negotiations. Kim Jong-Il is trying to keep his regime from collapsing, but the bottom line is that the country is in such dire need of basic resources for its people that it must begin to negotiate. The refusal of the DPRK to remove itself from isolation has forced it into the position that it finds itself in today. It is a state that has basically failed to provide for the needs of its people.
CHAPTER IV:

Getting Everyone to Agree

As stated earlier in this paper, one of the reasons that the Agreed Framework failed was because neither side (U.S. or DPRK) followed through on the commitments they had made to the agreement. Thus the Agreed Framework eventually fell apart, and any kind of trust that had been established between the countries was now long gone. Then the Bush administration took over, and the relationship between the U.S., and North Korea became even more strained. The challenge now becomes finding a method in which all the sides can satisfy their interests, but more importantly that all sides can follow through with the commitments that they make to the 6-Party Talks.

One of the main problems with the Agreed Framework was that it only involved the U.S., and North Korea. Therefore it relied on the U.S. Congress to pass the bills that would allow the necessary aid to actually make it to North Korea. However, once Congress fell heavily in the majority of the Republicans, who did not support the AF, the agreement fell apart. (Funabashi, 145). However, now with the 6-Party Talks aid can come from more places than just the U.S. The ability to get more resources involved, and actually delivered increases. This also means that there are now more interests to be satisfied. But, this needs to be accomplished anyway. After all North Korea is a neighbor to all these countries except the United States. The safety concern affects everyone involved in the negotiations.

Creating Trust?

Perhaps the most crucial element of the relationship between North Korea and the United States has involved the lack of trust the two countries have for one another. The lack of
trust has made it difficult for the two sides to engage in “normal” diplomatic relations. Neither side has done a good job in this regard, and both can share the blame for the lack of trust in the relationship. Following the Agreed Framework it was neglect on the part of both countries that led to the collapse of the agreement. North Korea felt that they shouldn’t have had to dismantle their nuclear facilities if the United States was refusing to follow through on supplying aid to the DPRK. Again, the fact that four other countries are now going to be involved in supplying the necessary aid, and resources makes it more realistic that the agreement can actually work. This is the theory behind positive sanctions. As Martin states:

Transfers of valued resources, such as money, technology, or know-how from one actor to another with the aim of driving the behavior of the recipient in a direction that is desirable from the point of view of the provider. (Martin, 52).

A large part of the attitudes that lie behind the images the U.S. and the DPRK have for one another stems from the enemy images they have created towards each other. The DPRK has such paranoia towards the outside world, and especially the United States that they have increasingly adapted behavior that is aggressive, and defensive towards their own interests. Kaplowitz explains:

Political attitudes and behavior can be generated and affected by needs, emotions, and images; and that such attitudes and behaviors can serve the defensive function of protecting against underlying feelings and dispositions which could be threatening, anxiety-producing, or damaging to self-esteem if they became manifest. (Kaplowitz, 42).

A crucial element for success then in making the 6-Party process actually work, is to follow through on commitments made during the negotiations. This will eventually help to chip away at the enemy images that these countries involved have created towards one another. Kaplowitz explains:

Negative images have a special impact upon conflict behavior. They often generate compensating defensive attitudes, which are especially evoked in conflict situations.
Conflict also provides opportunities to prove self-worth through assertive, aggressive, and defiant behavior. (Kaplowitz, 51).

In summary, trust will not be created from the outset of negotiations. Rather, it requires agreements that take each side’s interests into account during the negotiations, and then each side must follow through on the commitments they have made.

*Expanding the Pie to Meet The Basic Needs*

As discussed earlier for this negotiation to work the 6 Parties must make securing the basic human needs of the North Korean people as their primary motivation. Ury states:

> We miss the *intangible* motivations that drive their behavior- their basic human needs. Everyone has a need for security and a deep desire for recognition. Everyone wants to identify with some group and have control over their own fate. Nations and ethnic groups have basic needs too. If unmet, these needs can block agreement. (Ury, 117).

Therefore it is crucial for the other sides to recognize the interests that North Korea has. They are a country that does desire to be taken serious on the international stage.

However, they are struggling to find their own identity as a country, and they must be fostered back to a position of recognition that enables the people of the country to have a better life. The 5 countries that take part in the negotiations with North Korea must be able to expand the pie in order to meet the needs of everyone in the negotiations. There must be concessions made at certain points in order for everyone to get what they want.

Ury describes a key method in expanding the pie:

> The most common way to expand the pie is to make a low-cost, high-benefit trade. Identify items you could give the other side that are of high benefit to them but low cost to you. In return, seek items that are of high benefit to you but low cost to them. (Ury, 118).

The 5 outside countries must keep this in mind, because their main objective is to rid the DPRK of nuclear weapons. However, this cost will demand that these 5 countries are willing to give much in return. The outside 5 countries need to keep in mind that they do not want to insult the DPRK, but must approach the negotiations with the mindset of
confirming the recognition of the DPRK as an international presence. However, a presence that needs to step in line more with the rest of the world, as opposed to remaining in isolation as they have been for the last 50 odd years.

Ury describes this tactic as face-saving. The idea here is to meet all sides’ interests without compromising their integrity in the process. The paranoid isolationist attitude of North Korea makes it difficult to negotiate with them, because the DPRK usually feels that they are being “talked down to.” This requires the outside 5 countries to accept their “enemy” to a certain degree. They have to look at the DPRK as a cooperative partner, and not the opponent. Kaplowitz explains:

"Parties who only latently accept enemies emphasize threat and punishment, since they manifestly reject permanent solutions based on compromise regarding basic issues….they may even come to favor such agreements if these are designed so that the attendant humiliation is minimized. But such actors will not make permanent peace unless and until their latent acceptance of the enemy has become manifest." (Kaplowitz, 71).

Using a cooperative strategy will allow the 5 outside parties to meet the basic human needs of the citizens of the DPRK. This is because they will be attempting to get to the underlying interests of the DPRK. While North Korea does want to gain international prestige they are also aware of the dire straits their country faces. Kaplowitz describes the usage of a cooperative strategy. “A firm-but-cooperative strategy implicitly takes into account the adversary’s underlying needs and motives, as well as the tangible costs and benefits which result from his behavior.” (Kaplowitz, 67).

Now it is necessary to take a look at the 3 main areas where the parties negotiating must focus. They are Basic Human Needs, Security, and International Status.

**Securing Basic Human Needs**

With any kind of aid or assistance that the outside 5 parties offer to North Korea, they must make sure that they are able to meet the basic human needs of the citizens of North
Korea. The aid will need to come in the form of food, energy, and perhaps basic medical nutritional materials. Providing food is something that all of the countries involved in the talks can help to provide. The need for energy will be the responsibility primarily of Russia, China, and South Korea. As discussed earlier, part of the problem with the Agreed Framework was that the U.S. promised LWRs. These had the capabilities to produce nuclear weapons to a certain degree, and the main focus of the LWRs was not centered on helping the citizens of North Korea. It was trying to appease the heads of the North Korean regime. And on that matter, the North Korean leaders were not trustworthy enough to follow through on the dismantling of their nuclear program anyway. Minnich explains:

> The trust required for North Korea to operate its GMRs without diverting plutonium to build nuclear warheads is the same trust that is required to operate LWRs. Since the U.S. does not trust North Korea to operate its GMRs, it does not and should not trust North Korea to operate LWRs. (Minnich, 27).

What this points out is that the 5 outside parties must use this area of negotiations to secure the needs of the citizens. The abilities of China, Russia, and South Korea to help construct a working electric power grid for the DPRK would be extremely helpful in this point of the negotiations. As I will discuss later this method is a way to divide the pie, because it means that these three countries will put a lot of resources into this part of the plan. The United States, and Japan will be expected to pull more weight in other parts of the negotiations.

*Security*

The area of the negotiations surrounding security will heavily fall with the United States. I agree with some scholars that have already written on the strategy to massively reduce the size of the number of troops that are lined up on the DMZ. This falls in the hands of
both South Korea and the United States. However, it also would require the North Koreans to back off from the DMZ, and ease the confrontational stance that the two Koreas take towards one another. Mochizuki and O’Hanlon explain, “It is conventional forces that consume most DPRK military resources, thereby acting as an albatross weighing down the DPRK economy.” (Mochizuki & O’Hanlon, 104). This quote points out another advantage of reducing military forces on the peninsula, and that would be aiding the North Korean economy, and re-directing funds towards the people for sectors of the economy that benefit the citizens.

From the outside 5 countries perspective they can help their own interests out by aiding in the reduction of forces. If the United States drastically scales down its troops and armory on the peninsula they send the message to the DPRK that the United States does not want a military confrontation. And, as stated above if the DPRK agrees to scale down its own forces, then perhaps some of the money that is absorbed by their military can be used for other economic purposes. As of now approximately 20-25 percent of North Korea’s feeble GDP goes to the conventional forces of their military. (Mochizuki & O’Hanlon, 18). Asking both Koreas, and the U.S. to scale down forces could also widen the pie for the outside 5 countries, and allow them to satisfy another possible interest of helping the DPRK’s economy. I believe that the United States must take the lead in this effort, because it is they whom the North Korean’s fear the most. A strong commitment by the U.S. to scale back troops could be very influential in the two Koreas agreeing to take troops away from the DMZ, and thus diffusing some of the confrontational stance that these two countries make towards one another.
The main reason for the 6-Party Talks to take place at all is to remove the nuclear weapons capabilities of the DPRK. It is conceivable that with three of the five members of the NPT involved in the 6-Party Talks, there could be an initiative for Russia, China, and mainly the United States to reduce their nuclear weapons in return that the DPRK does the same. This will be talked about more in depth later in the paper.

*International Status*

One of the determinants why a country seeks to acquire nuclear weapons is to gain some international prestige for their country. Gartzke explains:

> A nation’s regional or global status may also influence decisions to proliferate. Nuclear weapons have been perceived as a symbol of regional or international prominence. States may seek to develop nuclear weapons to represent or enhance their perceived prestige. (Gartzke & Jo, 171).

While this is widely accepted, it is also reasonable to assume that some of North Korea’s actions are derived from their rejection and abandonment of the NPT. Gartzke explains once again:

> The nuclear ambitions of non-major powers bring opprobrium and often yield tangible punishments from other states. The NPT is thus a codification of a dual-standard sovereignty; a hierarchy where what is accepted for some nations is illegitimate for others. (Paul, 2000).

This can be seen as a power play from the North Korean perspective, which China, Russia, and the United States are using against them. The key concern for these three countries then becomes how to replace this “lost” status that the North Koreans would be lacking without their nuclear capabilities. At least from the North Korean perspective they now feel pressured to do away with something that they felt gave them recognition in the international community.

I will later discuss some strategies that could be used to satisfy the DPRK’s desire for international recognition. This part of the negotiations could be one of the most
difficult aspects to work out. Simply for the fact that “prestige” is an intangible thing. There is no way of actually giving this to the North Koreans. Instead the outside 5 parties have to devise a way of assuring to the North Koreans, and the rest of the world that they in fact do matter. One idea for doing this is to try and persuade the DPRK to open up their economic markets more. One of the problems that surfaces however if economic reform is attempted are that it could just prolong the Kim Jong-Il regime. But, at this stage with military action taken off the table it may be a necessary evil. Nonetheless at this point reviving the economic situation in North Korea is vital to its citizens, and it lies within the interests of the outside 5 parties who are involved in the negotiations.

O’Hanlon states:

The combination of reforms, aid, trade liberalization, and private investment offers considerable promise to the DPRK, even within a system of autocratic governance- if its leaders are seriously prepared to embark on such a course. (Mochizuki & O’Hanlon, 137).

The bottom line remains that the outside 5 countries must offer North Korea incentives to agree to the de-nuclearization arrangements, and try not to diminish North Korea’s self-image in the process. Kaplowitz explains why it is important for the rogue country to still have a positive image of itself, and not feel as though they have been “defeated.”

Particularly important are the most salient aspects of national self-imagery, the positive and negative boundaries of such imagery- i.e., what a people likes and dislikes about itself, how it views its history, the resultant “lessons” it has learned, its aspirations and desires, the ways in which it may want to change, its conceptions of national purpose and interest, and its perceptions of its powers and limits. (Kaplowitz, 47).

In other words, it becomes vital to the negotiations that North Korea is not made to look like a “loser” in any way. They must come out of the negotiations with their dignity still intact, and they must be aware of what it is that they have gained. A key for the outside 5
parties is to make sure that the DPRK government can report a positive message back to its people. While it is true that the regime of Kim Jong-II is brutal and loathsome in many ways, it is also true that the people of North Korea don’t really know anything better at this point. The ultimate goal of these negotiations is to have North Korea abandon their nuclear desires, and open this country up to the outside world. By doing this, the future of the DPRK could improve drastically.

Now I would like to offer several ideas for proposals to the 6-Party Talks. I will stay within the framework of the three areas that I have outlined above. Some countries may not be as involved in some areas as others, but the benefit of having 5 outside parties working together instead of one party, is that one side doesn’t get weighed down with all of the responsibilities. Instead help can come from all the countries involved, and each country can help in different areas with different levels of commitment.

Part 1: Basic Human Needs

The two main goals of these negotiations are to provide the citizens of North Korea with the basic human needs that they need to survive, and to get North Korea to abandon its nuclear weapons and related facilities. From the outset all parties will make it clear that they want the DPRK to abandon their nuclear capabilities. The basic method for abandonment that I have used is adapted from a Task Force proposal chaired by Korean expert Selig S. Harrison. The plan is summarized below, and would follow a structure similar to the following outline. (Harrison, 4-5).

Preparatory Phase: This stage would include a commitment from North Korea to completely eliminate their nuclear weapons programs. Also involved would be a security assurance from all sides not to engage in military attacks against one another. (This will
be talked about later). The United States would need to make great concessions in this area, because as of now the DPRK fears them the most.

**Stage One- Elimination of Inventory:** The DPRK needs to re-allow an inspection from the IAEA into their facilities in order to determine how much plutonium has been reprocessed since the expulsion of the inspectors.

**Step Two- Plutonium Cleanout:** This step involves the DPRK to agree to surrender the remainder of its plutonium inventory, and to agree to not re-start any such programs to reprocess additional plutonium.

**Step Three- Eliminating the Plutonium Weapons Infrastructure:** North Korea would need to open up previously barred waste and storage sites to allow the IAEA to inspect. All 6 countries taking part in the negotiations would need to outline the plans for installing a new electric grid for supplying the DPRK with an energy source. The original part of this plan called for a re-initiation of the LWR project, but as discussed earlier in this paper the LWR project has been scrapped from this plan.

**Step Four- Elimination of Weapons-Grade Uranium:** North Korea needs to allow the unimpeded inspection to determine what, if any, weapons-grade uranium enrichment facilities exist. Also the United States, and North Korea need to establish full diplomatic relations, and allow the process for future engagement between the two countries to take place. Once this basic outline takes place then it is the duty of the outside 5 parties to in turn make the necessary offerings to the DPRK based on their compliance of the above-mentioned conditions.

This above framework will be an ongoing process, and the aid and assistance that accompanies the deal will be distributed during and as each stage is successfully
completed by North Korea. I outline this in more detail following the overview of the various types of aid that will be distributed. The following list describes in more detail the different types of aid that will go to fulfilling the basic human needs of the DPRK citizens.

**Humanitarian Assistance**- This type of aid will include various forms of the following:

- Long-term food security
- Irrigation and agricultural modernization
- Short-term energy security, including the integration of the North Korean electricity grid with South Korean and/or Chinese and Russian electricity networks.
- Long-term energy security, including oil and gas prospecting and natural gas pipeline links with Russia. Also the possibility of authorizing Exxon-Mobil to pursue a natural gas pipeline to South Korea that would cross North Korea.
- Rehabilitation of hospitals, clinics, and other public health facilities.
- Modernization of the economic infrastructure, including harbors, ports, railroads and the electric grid. (Harrison, 14).

**Time Table**

1st. The first steps involve actual disablement of the nuclear facilities at Yongbyon. This includes a 5 Megawatt-Electric Reactor, Radiochemical Laboratory, Fuel Fabrication Plant, and a 50 Megawatt-Electric Reactor. (Albright & Brannan, 20). This process needs to be underway in the first 60 days after the agreement is reached. It should be supervised by the United States and the IAEA. Once a 60-day checkpoint
is reached then aid will begin to be distributed into North Korea from all 5 parties. The estimates I found in Albright and Brannan’s paper add up to 3-4 years to complete all of these disablements.

2nd. Once step 1 is underway Russia, China, and South Korea will begin to supply energy and help to construct a new electric grid for the DPRK. Some of the supplied energy will resemble the Heavy Fuel Oil (HFO) that was distributed under the Agreed Framework, and be distributed by all 5 parties. The electric grid will involve the three neighboring countries, and construction depends on North Korea’s adherence to the disablement plan, and could take 4-5 years. (Minnich, 13).

3rd. As aid continues to flow into the DPRK and assuming that everything is operating according to plan, step 3 can begin. This step involves the scaling back of the military troops and armaments along the DMZ. It should take place after one year of successful application of the first two steps. The United States will need to also reduce military exercises that take place along the DMZ.

4th. Assuming that all other steps are in working order, approximately 2 years into the agreement the outside 5 parties will need to help the DPRK rebuild its economy. This involves investment into the country, opening of the DPRK markets, and hopefully bringing in companies that can provide jobs to the citizens.
5th. Lastly, perhaps 3-4 years into the agreement the DPRK must allow outside consultation in helping to rebuild schools, hospitals, and other infrastructure that directly meets the needs of the citizens. Aid, and such will be a continuous aspect of the agreement throughout all steps, but actual construction will not take place until it is clear the DPRK is cooperating with the agreement. This part of the agreement is crucial to supplying basic needs to citizens, but cooperation and trust on all sides must be evident before this step can begin. For example, if the first step of nuclear disablement hasn’t not even been completed then it will be obvious that there are problems that need to be worked out before the final stages can be implemented.

The aid that is listed also complies with the interests that each country had as listed in Chapter 4. The United States is very concerned with the human rights violations that North Korea commits. While actually calling the DPRK on the floor for those violations may not be a viable option for these negotiations, there is solace in knowing that humanitarian aid will reach people who so desperately need it. Russia, and China have economic interests vested in the DPRK so the build up of the North Korean infrastructure is vital to the DPRK being able to maintain any kind of economic prosperity. It also fulfills the basic human needs of the people, because of the supply of energy, which the citizens so desperately need. South Korea wants normalization, and if re-unification is ever going to be a reality then a North Korea that can stand on its own is imperative. Finally, Japan does have economic interests in North Korea, but they still have a concern regarding the kidnapping victims from years ago.
The abduction issue causes some rifts in the negotiations, because it brings up some serious past issues that have caused major problems with the participating countries. As described in interest-based bargaining, one of the very first steps of bargaining concerns not bringing up issues from the past. First, the people must be separated from the problem. (Ury, 1991). However, for Japan to agree to supply the substantial amount of aid, and assistance that will be asked of it, they will in return want this seemingly minor interest fulfilled. However, it may be necessary that Japan set up this interest to be fulfilled at a later time.

This part of the negotiations will require an expanding of the pie for Japan to fulfill this interest, and without causing a major stall in the negotiations. One point of view is that if Japan is going to supply large amounts of aid then North Korea should have no other rational choice but to submit to the demand of releasing the abductees. I feel, however, that Japan should be required to improve the lives of those Koreans living in Japan currently. An article from the Seattle Times talks about a few of the issues that are of concern: Described below is a brief summary:

There are about 200,000 Koreans living in Japan who have ties to North Korea. All Koreans in Japan face discrimination. All were stripped of their Japanese citizenship after World War II. North Koreans face especially limited economic opportunities, confined to tight-knit community-run businesses. Graduates of North Korean schools find it nearly impossible to enter public universities. (http://seattletimes.nwsource.com/html/nationworld/2003321601_nkorea25.html).

Existing racial tension usually heightens when North Korea makes threats to their neighbors. I think the Japanese for this part of the negotiations need to ensure that the Koreans living in their borders can expect better lives in the future. This may include some kind of legislation resembling affirmative action plans, or a bill that can ensure Koreans access to universities and better economic opportunities. While this may not be
a major interest for the North Koreans, it does take care of a sensitive issue of past concerns. It also addresses the issue that much of Asia still has with regards to the colonialization that Japan forced upon their neighbors in the early 20th century.

Applying a Sustainable Development Model for Securing Basic Human Needs

An important aspect of securing the basic human needs that the citizens of North Korea so desperately need, is to use a model of development that can sustain the people’s needs for future generations. In the next section I will talk about the importance behind the North Korean’s opening their markets, but that kind of development is different than the kind I’m talking about in this section. In order to secure basic human needs for people, the idea of development must start from the ground up. Sustainable Development accomplishes this task, and it focuses on the citizens first. The definition of sustainable development taken from the Brundtland Report states that development must “meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.” (Cohn, 345). Taking this idea, which was started by NGO’s, and applying it to the problems of North Korea could be very vital.

The problem that arises from this is that the negotiations involve countries not NGOs. Therefore, the negotiators need to push for the North Korean government to allow some NGOs to work in North Korea. These groups could involve an organization like KIVA, for example, which focuses on micro-finance as a way for individuals to become private entrepreneurs. The basic idea behind this strategy is to get organizations in the country that can actually help the DPRK citizens on a grassroots level. Also this may lead to certain human rights groups being able to push into the country, and
educating the people there on some of the atrocities that they have been subjected to while living under the Kim regimes.

This part of the negotiations will present major challenges, because of the North Koreans paranoia of the outside world, and their desire to be self-sustaining. In order for this part of the negotiations to work the outside 5 parties must really widen the pie for the DPRK. One way of doing this is to include NGO funds in the operations of new schools, and public facilities. While aid from the 5 countries will go towards some of these types of facilities already, using NGOs can be an independent source of aid that doesn’t have the ideological attachment necessarily to a country. So the key for negotiators is to open the door for these groups to get into the country so they can then do their work independent of state sponsored help.

**Part 2: Status & International Recognition**

The next step in the negotiations to address is the interest that North Korea has in being recognized as an international power, and how the rest of the international community will view them. Scott D. Sagan states:

> Nuclear weapons are often imagined as fulfilling functions similar to those of flags, airlines, and Olympic teams: they form part of what a number of states have believed they must possess to legitimize their status as modern states or to lay claim to a “great-power” role in international politics. (Sagan, 2000).

North Korea will take a loss to their self-image if a de-nuclearization of the country does in fact occur. This desire of theirs to be recognized by the rest of the world needs to be fulfilled, and I believe this part of the negotiations will involve the most creativity on the parts of the outside 5 parties.

I think the first aspect of fulfilling this interest for North Korea would be to encourage them to open their markets. The juche system that emphasizes national self-
reliance, and extreme isolation needs to be lifted. (Mochizuki & O’Hanlon, 27). The United States, and Japan would need to lift any remaining sanctions that they have on North Korea to allow market relations to occur. In return the United States, and the other countries have the right to ask North Korea to stop all illegal sources of funds that they currently acquire. This may include arms sales, heroin trading, and counterfeiting of currencies. (Chanlett-Avery & Nanto, 36). If North Korea would open their markets more it could in turn increase trade that they need to satisfy some of their citizen’s basic needs. Chanlett-Avery, and Nanto explain below how trade could affect conditions that the people currently live under:

So far, deliveries of food aid, Pyongyang’s reforms, and increasing trade with South Korea and China have enabled the country to bridge to some extent its shortfall between food production and basic human needs. U.N. trade sanctions along with U.S. financial sanctions may have had some effect, judging by the complaints coming out of Pyongyang and progress in the Six-Party Talks. U.S. trade sanctions alone, however, tend to have little impact because the United States already has virtually no trade with the DPRK. (Chanlett-Avery & Nanto, 5).

Therefore, it seems that sanctions have really done little to actually help the people of North Korea. Instead they have just created worse relations between the two countries. By increasing trade with one another we may see much friendlier relations between the two countries, and the citizens of North Korea could see their standard of living rise.

In order to actually elevate the recognition of North Korea for agreeing to terms such as these the outside parties need to promote the image of reform that the DPRK is willing to make, and also promote the people who actually work in the country. This in turn could reflect back upon the citizens of North Korea a positive self-image that is so desperately needed. The image that North Korea could develop coming out of these negotiations also could in turn influence future policy. If they shed the image of an un-cooperative rogue state, and in turn are seen as a cooperative developing country, their
future diplomatic relations may be conducted with greater ease. Kaplowitz explains further:

The more positive the self-images, the greater the tendency toward a firm-by cooperative strategy, one which aims at mutually satisfying outcomes in conflict situations. (Kaplowitz, 50).

In other words, if the outside 5-Parties can get the DPRK to agree on this set of Talks, then the chances for dealing with the DPRK in the future with less conflict increases. It is very necessary for the other countries negotiating to form an image to the public that North Korea took a cooperative, and pro-active stance in the negotiations. And as such they were able to secure security, status, and resources for their people allowing the country of North Korea to grow stronger. The outside 5 parties should make it very clear that they want the international community to take notice of the kind of reform North Korea is willing to partake in when engaged properly. They could also talk of how this should set an example for other countries to follow in negotiating over peace and de-nuclearization.

The process of allowing your counterpart in a negotiation to exit the negotiation without a loss of dignity is called “face-saving,” or building a golden bridge. Ury describes this procedure as something that needs to be done in order to allow your counterpart to exit the negotiations gracefully. Ury states:

It is shorthand for people’s self-worth, their dignity, their sense of honor, their wish to act consistently with their principles and past statements- plus, of course, their desire to look good to others. All these may be threatened if they have to change their position. Your success in persuading them to do so will depend on how well you help them save face. (Ury, 120).

The outside five parties need to make it a goal of theirs to make sure that North Korea walks away from the 6-Party Talks with their sense of dignity still strongly intact.

Part 3: Security
The last area that all parties need to focus on for the 6-Party Talks deals with security. Not only security for the neighbors of North Korea, but also for North Korea itself. The DPRK feels threatened by the United States because of their military activity directly south in South Korea. This fear needs to be taken as legitimate, and not brushed off by the United States, and South Korea. These two countries do not want to go on the defensive on this issue and make it seem that the only reason for heightened military activity is in fear of an attack from the DPRK, but rather come up with a solution for easing the military tensions on the peninsula.

As stated earlier in this paper the DRPK spends 20-25 percent of its feeble GDP on its military. This figure is way too high for a country that gives its citizens so little. But, the question can’t be that the DPRK wastes money on a military that it never uses; rather it should be why does the DPRK spend this money on a military it never uses? Again, this comes back to the fact that North Korea feels threatened by the United States being so militarily engaged on the peninsula. Therefore it is imperative that the United States reduces its conventional forces on the peninsula. Currently the United States has 37,000 troops on the peninsula. They should make a commitment to cut that in half as part of the 6-Party Talks. As well they need to greatly reduce their artillery, and other aircraft from the peninsula.

The U.S. currently runs large military exercises on the peninsula as well that give the impression to the DPRK that they are gearing up for an invasion. Just recently this occurred as reported by the Associated Press, “The U.S. military said Tuesday it would push ahead with plans to hold joint exercises with South Korea next week despite North Korea's warning that it would consider the drills preparation for an attack.”
While this may just be an exercise from the standpoint of the U.S. military, it certainly does send a message that the DPRK has perceived as dangerous. As a result the DPRK may feel that the U.S. is considering using military action, and invading North Korea. Acts such as this, while procedural for the military, only add to the paranoia and strain of the relationship between the United States and North Korea.

Along with the scaling back of forces from all parties (South Korea, North Korea, and U.S.) there also needs to be a softening of the confrontational stance that the sides take towards one another. This involves moving forces away from the DMZ. Being able to not only reduce the overall number of troops on each side, but also moving away numbers of troops from the DMZ could reduce the hostile stances each side takes towards the other. Much of the hostilities that the two sides have against one another derives from the fact the sides have such negative images of the opposing side. The DMZ itself is littered with land mines, and often times it is the place where tensions between the two sides erupt. Since the end of the Korean War there have been approximately 1,400 incidents across the DMZ, resulting in the deaths of 899 North Koreans, 394 South Koreans, and 90 U.S. soldiers. (Cha & Kang, 24).

The ability, and mobilization of the United States to pull back their forces sends a message to the North Koreans that they are not interested in being adversaries any longer. The goal of the United States with this proposal is to change the image that they project of themselves to the North Koreans. Kaplowitz talks about the need to transform an adversary’s views from negative to positive in order to negotiate conflict resolutions. He states:
What each party most dislikes about the other can be a particularly important source of behavior. Negative perceptions are also the most salient ones for actors in conflict. Moreover, such perceptions are especially resilient. Positive perceptions can point to potential grounds for cooperation.....devising strategies for altering conflict processes, and opening up new possibilities for constructive outcomes. (Kaplowitz, 57).

Another area where the United States, Russia, and China could make significant gains in convincing the DPRK to de-nuclearize is by actually scaling back their own nuclear weapons stockpiles. Treaties such as the NPT, and campaigns such as Global Zero call for the major powers to reduce their nuclear arsenals. And the two countries that comprise 96% of the world’s 27,000 nuclear weapons are the United States, and Russia. (http://www.globalzero.org/en/getting-zero). If the United States and Russia show leadership on this issue it could greatly influence the North Koreans to abandon their nuclear ambitions. Even recently U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton was quoted as saying, “If North Korea abides by the obligations it has already entered into and verifiably and completely eliminates its nuclear program, then there will be a reciprocal response.” (http://www.globalsecuritynewswire.org/gsn/nw_20090217_2313.php).

While this comment does remain rather ambiguous, it does sound optimistic that the United States would be willing to move in the direction of lessening the number of their own nuclear weapons stockpiles in order to persuade the DPRK to abandon its program.

The question now becomes if this is in the interest of the U.S., Russia, and China. Since the main goal of these negotiations is to de-nuclearize North Korea, it should be in the main interest of these countries to accomplish this goal in whatever way they can.

The approximate numbers of nuclear weapons possessed by each of these three countries is [U.S.~ 5400, Russia ~ 5200, China ~ 350]. (Mochizuki & O’Hanlon, 124). This scenario presents a perfect opportunity to widen the pie for the countries that possess nuclear weapons. If they can also make a commitment to scale back the numbers of their
nuclear weapons then it becomes more likely North Korea will agree to do the same.

This represents a standard of fairness that is crucial in interest based bargaining.

Another option that the outside 5 countries could seek is to allow for an “under-the-table” type deal where they allow the DPRK to still possess the basic materials to build a bomb, however it just can’t be assembled. I don’t think this can be an option for the outside parties to allow, simply for the reason that North Korea’s reliability for compliance in the past has been so bad. This kind of trust is something that the different sides do not have at this point, and allowing for such a maneuver only invites trouble.

Cha, and Kang elaborate on the DPRK’s history in this regard:

But the North also has a history of engaging in “strategic deception”- This history of inter-Korean relations, for example, is littered with pacts that Pyongyang has not honored, including the 1992 denuclearization declaration in which North Korea agreed to forgo developing nuclear and nuclear-reprocessing facilities. (Cha & Kang, 22).

If this were to be an option for any reason it would have to be a total last resort, because the whole goal of these negotiations is to get rid of the nuclear weapons in North Korea. Not allow them to exist under some kind of covert identity.

*Last Step: Building the Golden Bridge*

William Ury states that once it is time to reach an agreement of all the sides in a negotiation, you must draw your opponent in the direction that you want them to go instead of pushing them in the direction you want them to go. Ury describes the process:

Building a golden bridge means making it easier for the other side to surmount the four common obstacles to agreement. It means actively involving them in devising a solution so that it becomes their idea, not just yours. It means satisfying their unmet interests. It means helping them save face; and it means making the process of negotiation as easy as possible. (Ury, 110).
Looking at this idea, and applying it to the three main issues of these negotiations requires some trust building between all the sides partaking. It could actually be the first stages in building the trust that these countries lack with one another.

For the first part of the negotiations this strategy will be crucial. To say that the DPRK should not have any nuclear weapons the outside 5 parties means to say that there is a lack of trust. And while the DPRK will receive benefits from abandoning their nuclear capabilities it will be crucial for the outside 5 to help North Korea save face. This can be done by promoting the people of the DPRK as the “state builders”, and not the outside countries. This also ties into the North Korean self-reliance philosophy named juche. Currently the United States is playing the role of state-builder in Iraq, and this type of image needs to be abandoned in order to help the North Koreans. Instead, the aid etc. will come from the outside, but it should be the North Korean people who actually help to develop their country. This could create the opportunity for new companies to play a role in the state building, and create jobs for the people of the DPRK. This also helps to fulfill the basic human needs of the people of North Korea by allowing them to partake in their own development. Staub explains how this can eventually lead to self-actualization as previously discussed by Maslow:

Optimal human functioning is an outgrowth of the fulfillment of basic human needs. Their personal goals embodied helping others: Acting in others’ behalf brought a fulfillment of their own personal goals as well. (Staub, 18).

Therefore, it is important to create the atmosphere of self-reliance through the people of North Korea. This will be aided by outside help, but it will take the North Korean people’s work and desires to carry out the goals. Therefore outside parties do not want to walk away from the negotiations touting themselves as “victors,” rather they need to
place the emphasis on the North Korean people and leadership as stepping up and taking charge in their own developmental efforts.

The second aspect of the negotiations focuses on the North Korean Status, and International Recognition. A golden bridge in this part of the negotiations could occur by the outside 5 countries pledging to support whatever industry, and businesses develop out of North Korea. For example, they could agree to buy North Korean ores like iron, and zinc. (Chanlett-Avery & Nanto, 14). While the DPRK’s economy is in dire straits at the current time, the outside 5 parties could agree to supporting the industries that come from the DPRK in the future, and make pledges to assure that they follow through on the commitments. This might help increase the likelihood of the DPRK opening up their economy more. Russia, China, and South Korea would play a major role in this commitment.

The last aspect of the negotiations where building golden bridges becomes vital involves the security needs of the DPRK. As discussed previously I think the most obvious area where a golden bridge could be built would be with the current nuclear states scaling back on the number of weapons that they have, and even making a pledge to work towards absolute zero possession of nuclear weapons. This could even be done during negotiations to show the DPRK the level of commitment the outside parties have towards non-proliferation.

Analysis: What Works & What Doesn’t?

Analyzing these negotiations from the three subject areas that I have looked at, I have made some judgments as to what may not work for all the sides involved.
**Step 1:** The main problem that exists in this part of the negotiations is in regards to Japanese abduction cases. In interest-based bargaining you are not supposed to bring up issues from the past, because usually it musters up animosity between adversaries. I think in this case that would be very likely. For the Japanese, and especially the Japanese public the issue of former abductions is a major concern. However, trying to satisfy this issue could be very difficult in these negotiations. Even with a solution that I presented I think this part of the negotiations could be too much of a tangent to the issue of nuclear weapons. This part of the negotiations may not succeed, and frustrate Japan. However, it is an issue that could be resolved in the future between only Japan, and North Korea. Also, because of the ties Japan has with the United States they may be willing to go through with the initial 6-Party Talks if only to rid North Korea of their nuclear capabilities.

**Step 2:** The difficulty in this part of the negotiations will be in convincing the North Koreans to actually open up their economy to the outside world. They have shown some ability to do so in the past, so it is not completely out of the question, however outside influences are usually met with skepticism. But as Armstrong points out there is some hope, “In 2001, for example, North Korea sent nearly 500 government officials and students abroad to study technical subjects, economics, and business, mostly in other Asian countries and in Australia.” (Armstrong, 31). But, even with this North Korea has made some reforms to allow more open markets, and international investment. It just comes down to the North Koreans trusting in the kinds of results that bringing in outside influences will do for the citizens of their country.
Another problem that could result from this issue is that the regime of Kim Jong-Il will be propped up for some time. At this point it seems like a necessary evil for the countries negotiating to have to endure. As Cha & Kang point out, “Observers have predicted an imminent North Korean collapse since the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989. The country’s economic situation is desperate, but signs of political collapse are absent.” (Cha & Kang, 22). Therefore at this point it would be logical for the outside countries to at least boost the DPRK’s economy so the people who are living there have the possibility of a better standard of living.

**Step 3:** With regards to the security issue it will take some serious commitment from Russia, China, and the United States to greatly reduce their nuclear weapons stockpiles. It has been done in the past, and currently the nuclear powers are faced with the issue again with states like Iran pursuing nuclear ambitions. However, starting the process of reduction is well within the possibilities of the U.S., and Russia especially because of the vast number of weapons they actually have. It may take some time for the actual reductions to occur, but it is possible. Hopefully it would build greater trust between all the sides involved in the negotiations.

**Conclusion**

After researching the diplomatic methods of both the Clinton, and Bush administrations when dealing with North Korea I have found that engagement is a better strategy for dealing with North Korea. When left alone and ignored, North Korea only acts more belligerent, and makes more threats to acquire aid that they so desperately need. This is exactly the scenario that exists currently as a result of the Bush administration’s approach. As I have argued in this paper a more Liberal approach towards North Korea
is desired. The neo-conservative/Realist approach taken by the Bush administration only served to heighten tension, and make the citizens of North Korea less secure as a result. Currently North Korea wants to test a missile, but is calling it a satellite. And they are doing this in response to the U.S. and South Korea performing a massive military maneuver in South Korea. The New York Times reported:

> The North Korean statement reinforced fears that it might resort to military provocations to vent anger at South Korea, which has stopped sending the North free food, as well as to drag the United States into negotiating. North Korea’s missile and nuclear threats are the impoverished country’s main tool of extracting foreign aid. ([http://www.nytimes.com/2009/03/10/world/asia/10korea.html?_r=1&ref=asia](http://www.nytimes.com/2009/03/10/world/asia/10korea.html?_r=1&ref=asia)).

While these tactics are nothing new, it is too much of a recurrent theme to be ignored any longer. More than any other reason it is necessary to get involved because the citizens of North Korea are the ones suffering more than anyone.

Suppose a military campaign did occur, and Kim Jong-Il’s regime was overthrown; then what happens next? The peninsula would be in ruins, and the process of state building would be left to the United States. But, also China and South Korea would be left with refugee problems, and could be left holding the bill as well. We have already tried doing this in Iraq, and we don’t even know what the end result of that situation will be as of now. Engagement with North Korea is the only viable option right now. However, it is not only to get the DPRK to abandon their nuclear weapons, but more importantly to help out the desperate citizens of North Korea.

The three areas outlined above are set up to provide the citizens of the DPRK with the basic human needs that they need in order to raise their current standard of living. Therefore the aid given in return for de-nuclearization is satisfying the basic human needs of the people of North Korea.
The section where International Status is the major concern satisfies the basic human needs of the people of North Korea as well by supplying the people with jobs, and the possibility of raised standards of education and work. And lastly, a reduction in the military for the DPRK will provide desperately needed funds that currently go to the military, and instead can be used for other sectors of the North Korean economy. Also a decrease in the military presence on the peninsula, both from the North Koreans, and the U.S. and South Korea, makes all citizens safer. This is because it reduces the possibility of military escalation into actual combat.

In the end it will take a lot of giving on the parts of the outside 5 countries to get North Korea to abandon their nuclear ambitions. Trust will only be built between former adversaries if they can begin to work through their differences now. Then, with strict adherence to the commitments they make, it is possible to see progress in the future for all parties involved. As Kaplowitz explains once enemies begin to heal their relationships towards one another the future can lead towards prosperity:

Analysis of reciprocal interaction effects and of strategies most appropriate for producing adversarial change in a cooperative direction, therefore requires assessing and taking into account the self-images and perceptions of enemies. It is in this way that knowledge of the psychological and cultural sources of international behavior can ultimately make a crucial difference in enhancing possibilities for constructive conflict resolution. (Kaplowitz, 76).
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