

The Collected Works of Terry Pinder
Millersville University
Fall 2003

- A. **EMPIRE:** Hegemony in the Pax Americana
- B. **A Holocaust in Central Africa:** History, Genocide, and
Chaos in Rwanda
- C. **North Korea:** An Analysis of US Policy

This is incomplete, of course, but these are the big three papers I wrote this semester. I wrote about 15 papers or essays total.

Introduction

Pundits and academics alike called the era following the fall of the Soviet Union and end of international communism the "End of History." From there, a new, liberal democratic globe began to take shape as globalization opened up new trade routes, fostered more cultural exchange and cooperatives (Barker, 2000). However the trend of the globalization of ideas and business covers up a new history being created: that of capitalist hegemony. It counteracts the belief that history has in fact ended. The 'winner' of the old capitalist/communist struggle were obviously the capitalists, led by the United States which has ushered in a 'Pax Americana'- a new world Empire much different than previous empires that have come and gone through history. A new history is being created with the United States at the forefront, driving the global economy, capitalist globalization, forcing people in many nations to resist with their national and cultural identities, while forcing Americans to find ways to understand their new importance on the global scene.

Theoretical Grounding

Postmodernism and modernism are abstract concepts designed to designate historical periods. They broadly define themselves through art, culture, science, social systems, national identity, and identity (Barker, 2000).

Postmodernism and modernism differ. Modernism rejects realism and knowledge is constantly revised. Postmodernism is based on irony and a post-industrial context (Barker).

The phrase "End of History" would imply that modern times as defined by the Cold War have ended and a new history is being created. It would also imply that history is constantly being revised to fit the present day. Media provide a context for hegemony, creating hegemonies of the past (*Gladiator*) for entertainment value and consumption. A modernist perspective is needed to fully understand what is occurring to our world during this Pax Americana, how Americans are the dominant forerunners of hegemony, and how the rest of the world manages to survive with their own unique national identities and cultures fully intact. How has the new postmodern history manifested itself around the world with the Pax Americana in force?

Hegemony

The term Pax Americana is derived from United States doctrine: the peace in the world will be enforced through American power. The fall of the Soviet Union and international communism left the United States as the world's last remaining superpower. The Pax Americana is unique among 'paxes' as the hegemony of America is far-reaching, using military power and force all over the globe and money and capital to rework the global markets to American favor (Wilson, 2002). During the 19th and early 20th centuries, world peace was enforced through British power and during the Roman age, peace in the ancient world was enforced through displays and usages of Roman power (Parrerras, 2003). Pax Americana suggests American hegemony over capitalism, globalization, and culture around the world, as the British ruled over much of the world a century ago and the Romans ruled over much of the ancient world two thousand years ago when their empires were at their peak. Pax Americana also suggests that the United States is at its peak as well.

American hegemony differs from the old Roman and British hegemonies of the past. American hegemony allows for most nations to retain most their sovereignty and

allows peoples around the world to retain their national identities. American hegemony still has not erased old problems caused by nationalism such as xenophobia, ethnic tensions, and racism even within the hegemony (Wilson). American hegemony also relies much on consumption as the new global economy supplies Americans with products made in a variety of places with a variety of consequences (Parrerras). In addition, while British hegemony was controlled from London and Roman hegemony was controlled by Rome, American hegemony is decentralized with Washington controlling the military projection of hegemony, New York's Wall Street controlling the economic projection of hegemony, and Hollywood controlling the cultural projection of hegemony (Wilson, 2002, p. 71). Gender, home life, and the family play a role in the construction of American hegemony. The Cold War era was framed by masculinity (Briggs et al., 2003) Neither side in the struggle could be seen as weak, or feminine. Images from UNICEF of starving children in the third world, areas where American power is often displayed, played through media influence public opinion toward intervention (Briggs et al.) However, the oddest quirk of the Pax Americana is that Americans themselves do not seem to realize that they are not only citizens of a sovereign nation, but also citizens of a cultural, economic, and political empire, unlike ancient

Rome or 19th century Great Britain (Wilson). It would also appear that the United States reluctantly is taking the role as master of the world (Rupnik, 1996). Americans are clearly the dominant group in the Pax Americana, but their worldview does not suggest a desire for Empire as Pax Britannia or Pax Romana's subjects did.

Cultural exchanges with other nations allow Americans to experience the cultural offerings of other nations, and allow other nations to experience American culture. Note the American fascination with British television as seen by the programming on most American public television stations. Here, we can see how globalization, despite American hegemony, has allowed Americans to see Britain through television, although most representations on PBS are constructed as historical viewings of Great Britain's former empire, ignoring contemporary Great Britain for the most part and stripping it of the people who made up its empire: people from Asia, Africa, and the Caribbean. It allows Americans at home to deal with their own hegemony over home minority groups while exploring a nearly all British (as in white) cultural entertainment (Burton, 2003). Images and representations of Britain's empire - the ethnic non-whites, only show up in crime dramas on American public television (Burton), suggesting that British people of non-white descent have made no contribution to the

history of Great Britain and its former empire with the exception of crime. It also suggests that the hegemony of the Pax Americana is only white, as American television also neglects to display non-whites in programming - programming that gets sent overseas from Hollywood (Barker).

Other nations chafe and resent under American hegemony. The French, in their attempt to retain their language as it was centuries ago, created an academy to slow the tide of Americanization of the French language. Only French terms are permitted for use in government documents (Braden & Shelley 2001). Politically, the run-up to the recent war in Iraq, with old powers such as Germany, France, and Russia opposed to military action, was proof of resistance to American hegemony. The three smaller powers had hoped to recreate a multi-polar world to "contain American hegemony" (Katz, 2003). None of these three nations was actually prepared to constrain the United States in its perceived military power, however.

The uni-polar American-led hegemonic system, born out of the fall of Communism and the "us-versus-them" world, has led to a resurgence of national identities around the world.

National Identity

Pax Americana's hegemony over the globe has not erased local nationalisms from the globe. Nationalism and the State are concepts based in modernism and offer challenges and resistance to American hegemony and have created local hegemonies. National identity is a way that local cultures around the world retain a sense of themselves while resisting the hegemonic pull toward homogenization. The fall of Communism was supposed to sound the end of the State, and in some cases it has. State power is no longer centralized, corporations are trans and supranational, and international organizations (under the tutelage of American money and power, however) help connect the world. However national identity still exists and in many cases has resurged.

Preexisting cultures were organized into nation-states (Fuentes, 1991). These cultures are given a national identity that expressed identification with the nation-state that is expressed through politics and symbolism (Barker).

National identity is much apart of national culture and individual self-identification. It provides a sense of loyalty to a geographical construct (Charney, 2003) and

unity within a nation-state's borders (Braden & Shelley). National identity also provides the individual with an attachment. It is impossible, Evan Charney cites, for a person to regard himself or herself without any national identity as it is an integral part of an individual's self-identity (Charney), although it is a vague and imaginative concept (Barker). Not all people feel this way as identities are shaped by a variety of influences inside of and outside of their nation-state including socio-economic class, religion, language and institutions (Charney). The Cold War era and the distinct "us versus them" mindset held by Soviets and Westerners alike seemed to spell the death-knell of the concept of national identity (Braden and Shelley). The globe was divided into geopolitical blocs: American hegemony in the West and Soviet hegemony in the East. The fall of the Soviet Union and the death of international communism saw resurgence in nationalism (Rupnik, 1996). The "end of history" concept that swept the United States into the role of head and driver of globalization also assumes that democracy is the end result of national identity in the post Cold War era (Fuentes). Democracy also acts as the center to identification (Fuentes).

National identity also allows for the concept of the enemy (Braden & Shelley). Indian Hindu national identity is

a negative (from the point of view of outsiders) expression of national identity, as it expresses itself at the expense of minority religious and ethnic groups living within India.

India is a negative example of a culture's expression of national identity. In India, currently the world's most populous democracy, the lead dominant political party seeks to create Hindutva, a religious fundamentalist concept that calls for the creation of a Hindu dominated state as the center and homeland for all of the Indian Diaspora worldwide (Mukta, 2000). Much of the Bharatiya Janata Party's (BJP) aims in India since their rise in the 1980s are a reaction against what is perceived as the cultural imperialism of India's former colonial parent, Britain, and the West, namely America (Mukta). India's program of Hindutva is a form of cultural- national membership that is centered at home in India but is global as well.

Indian cities such as Bombay, Madras, and Calcutta have been renamed in Hindu names. Western practices such as Valentine's Day, beauty contests, and Western holidays are banned or attacked (Greenway, 2001). The globalization of the world economy has formed a new class of Indian elites and academics who launch attacks on the vestiges of cultural imperialism within India, such as religious minorities such as Christians and Muslims (Greenway, 2001

and Mukta, 2000). They define themselves as victims of cultural imperialism, or "Hindu hurt," and this has often led to violence within India (Mukta) as Hindus fight Muslims and Christians to claim hegemony over what the collective Indian national identity actually is (Mukta). This includes a revisionist stance toward Indian history taught in schools and disseminated through media (Greenway; Ali, 2000, 35-37) to pogrom-like violence toward religious minorities sponsored by the State (Mukta; Ali; Greenway). Much of the political change in India (and thus the social change and questions of national identity) has much to do with the fall of India's Congress Party along with India's entry into the global markets as a capitalist and technologically oriented nation (Greenway). Globalization and the capitalist hegemony of the Pax Americana have helped to contribute to India's new Hindu national identity that some worry may lead to major reprisals against non-national identity groups such as the Christians and Muslim populations (Ali). It also does not help that the neighboring country of Pakistan is a nuclear power undergoing the same issues of fundamentalism, as is India (Greenway).

Economic globalization has reawakened nationalism and national identity questions in areas of Europe once behind the Iron Curtain. The fall of Communism allowed political

movements in Eastern Europe to move toward the democratic system (Barker). While many felt that the end of Communism would sound the end of the nation-state due to the globalization of the economy (Rupnik) it appears that the ideological vacuum left behind by the fall of Soviet Union and international communism has left an entry for new national identities to fill in Eastern Europe. Multiculturalism in many other nations, including the nations of Europe, adds to the idea of national identities as nations can be made up of smaller nations and so on (Rupnik). These smaller national identities are important to be protected as well as protecting the larger national identity as a whole, however, as in the case of India, they prioritize national identity over non-national identities, such as religious and ethnic minorities (Charney).

Conclusion

Pax Americana is the end result of the battle between capitalism and communism. As Communism lost, a new capitalist hegemony led by the United States overtook the globe, exporting money, governmental power, and culture. Cultures and nations resisted through asserting their national identities, sometimes at the expense of smaller

groups living among them. Many countries still benefited from the new global economy, but hung on to their own cultures, resisting the hegemonic pull toward homogenization. Unfortunately, some nation-states have created their own local hegemonies while creating their national identities.

A new world began with the Fall of Communism. It remains to be seen if the Pax Americana is truly the "end of history."

Introduction

It is perhaps the late twentieth century's worst, most misunderstood, and most ignored horror. In the short space of 100 days, the world looked on in absolute horror as nearly one million human beings in a small Central African republic were put to death and a country ripped asunder. While the world watched on, it surreally did very little to intervene in the murderous, genocidal chaos, even as the crisis spilled over the borders of the nation into neighboring countries. The Rwandan genocide of 1994 occurred with breathtaking and horrifying swiftness; out of an original population of 7.5 million between 800,000 and one million people were murdered and half of Rwanda's population fled to neighboring nations (Gourevitch, 1998, 4). The genocide and resultant refugee crisis that followed destabilized a vast swath of Central Africa, causing civil wars and other massacres in neighboring nations, namely the Democratic Republic of Congo. However, colonial influence cannot be ruled out as a cause of the genocide as many of the ethnic groups and borders were defined by former

colonial powers. The historical influences and meddling of European colonial powers led to the ethnic tensions that fomented the 100-day genocide in 1994, and the resultant refugee crisis led to the destabilization and chaos of the Central African region.

Prelude to Genocide

Rwanda was settled first by the Twa people, who are pygmies who make up less than one percent of the population (Gourevitch, 1998, 47). The Hutu and Tutsi arrived much later from other areas of Africa - the Tutsi from the north and the Hutu from the south and west (Scherrer, 2002, 18). They spoke the same language and intermingled, sharing political systems and religions. Ethnographers and historians agree that the Hutu and Tutsi, due to intermarriage and intermingling, cannot be called distinct ethnic groups (Gourevitch, 1998, 48).

The tribes organized themselves into about two dozen highly complex and organized kingdoms around the Central African great lakes that were based around family clans (Scherrer, 2002, 18). Later, as Belgian, French, and British colonial influence entered the region and took hold, the idea of "races" was introduced into what is now modern-day Rwanda and Burundi in addition to the partition of Africa (Scherrer, 2002, 18-20). Race Science- the idea that physical measurements and characteristics determined a persons' race - was the leading ideology in Europe during the colonial age of the 1880s and 1890s (Gourevitch, 1998, 49) and this played out how the colonial administrators dealt with the native tribes and kingdoms in what are now Rwanda and Burundi (Scherrer, 2002, 21).

The Belgians felt that the Tutsi, who tended to be taller and thinner were more European than the Hutu, who tended to be shorter and stockier (Scherrer, 2002, 21).

They divided Rwanda and Burundi up along these ethnic lines. The idea that the Tutsi were more European in nature stems from a theory created by the explorer John Hanning Speake who in 1863 stated that all civilized culture in Central Africa was descended from the biblical King David and that the taller, thin-featured Tutsi were evidence of that migration (Gourevitch, 1998, 52). The Belgians jumped on this theory and imposed it on the people as truth. Under the Belgian colonial administration, Tutsi were provided with education and jobs in the administration of the colony while Hutu were only allowed menial jobs as laborers and farmers (Gourevitch, 1998, 57). In 1926 the Belgian colonials introduced a system of ethnic identity cards to determine whether an individual was Hutu or Tutsi (Scherrer, 2002, 27). It was not until the late 1950s as the world reacted against colonialism that the Belgian administration in Rwanda allowed the Hutu into the education and public administration system (Gourevitch, 1998, 59). Ironically the Belgians, themselves from a nation divided along ethnic lines, later supported the Hutu who outnumbered the Tutsi in a 1959 revolution that installed the Hutu as the leading group in Rwanda. The Belgians later left and despite prophetic UN warnings that the Hutu regime they left in place could one day do genocidal violence to the Tutsi minority, Rwanda became independent in 1962 (Gourevitch, 1998, 60-61). Violence and discrimination against the Tutsi began almost immediately. Massacres and political violence, including seizing of property and exile, occurred again in 1963, 1964, and 1972 (Brittian, 2003, 18). Belgians who remained in the country aided the Hutu dictatorship in helping them discriminate against the Tutsi (Gourevitch, 1998). It was the rise of President Habyarimana that would stop the pogroms of the

1970s of which he was ironically apart (Gourevitch, 1998, 69). However, his government scape-goated Tutsis (McKinney, 2002, 121) and kept in place the many exclusions inspired by the Belgian colonial administration.

In 1990, following a failed attempt by the Uganda-based Rwandan Patriotic Front to depose Habyarimana, ruling elites in Rwanda began to consider the extermination of the Tutsi minority (Scherrer, 2002, 69). Habyarimana's regime began using propaganda to anger the Hutu majority and further marginalize the Tutsi (McKinney, 2002, 121). Outside powers, namely France, Egypt, and apartheid South Africa (Belgium later on) came to the aid of Habyarimana by arming and training President Habyarimana's elite *Interahamwe* guard (Scherrer, 2002, 70). The 1990 invasion also allowed Habyarimana to lock up all opposition forces to his regime and also allowed him to begin the methodical extermination of Tutsi and opposing Hutu people inside Rwanda (Gourevitch, 1998, 87). In 1992, the government began mobilizing the *Interahamwe*, who numbered as many as 50,000 men, and trained them (Carlin, 2003, 24). Much like the Belgians after they switched sides in the 1950s, the government in power told the young men who made up the *Interahamwe* that the Tutsi were originally from Ethiopia and were not really Rwandan and that the Hutu were the superior people (Carlin, 2003, 25). The Tutsi were labeled "cockroaches" and collaborators with the Rwandan Patriotic Front (Carlin, 2003, 25). Later in August 1993, Habyarimana's government signed a peace agreement with the rebel Rwandan Patriotic Front in Arusha, Tanzania (Scherrer, 2002, 87). A United Nations mission set up shop in Rwanda as well (Gourevitch, 1998, 100). Despite this, hate radio and state-funded hate propaganda continued to condition the Hutu people toward the genocide (McKinney,

2002, 121). Habyarimana also continued to build up the *Interahamwe* militias to fight rebel forces despite a permanent French military presence that kept rebel attacks to a minimum (Scherrer, 2002, 87). The Hutu extremists eventually took over the entire nation throughout 1993 and extended their views, particularly their opposition to the UN Peacekeeping force, over radio through Radio Television des Milles Collines (Gourevitch, 1998, 101). RTLMC was partially owned by the family of President Habyarimana (McKinney, 2002, 120). The stage was set. All that was needed was the signal.

In January 1994, the UN commander Major General Romeo Dallaire alerted his superiors in New York that a mass extermination- a genocide- was being planned against the Tutsi people and he recommended immediate action as the UN mandate in Rwanda was limited (Gourevitch, 198, 104). New York ignored his request. Belgian secret services warned in February 1994 of secret weapons being stored around the capital of Kigali and they warned the Belgian government (Scherrer, 2002, 91). Like the UN Commander, they went ignored and the Belgian government's request for an intervention was quashed by the United States and Great Britain at the UN (Rauch, 2001, 1151). Meanwhile, the Rwandan government ignored the agreements settled upon at Arusha in 1993 and did not democratize (McKinney, 2002, 120). On April 6, 1994 at 8:30pm local time, the plane carrying President Habyarimana and Burundian president Cyprien Ntaryamira was shot down near Kigali, killing everyone on board. Within one hour, the *Interahamwe* had set up roadblocks and begun killing Tutsi and moderate Hutu within the capital city of Kigali (Scherrer, 2002, 95). The genocide had begun.

The Genocide: 100 Days of Horror

Within hours of the plane crash, Hutu extremist political parties and paramilitary groups such as the *Interahamwe* set up roadblocks and began murdering Tutsi and moderate Hutu on the spot. Soon, telephone lines from Kigali were cut and radio broadcasts were used to relay orders to militia men in the countryside (McKinney, 2002, 122). The RTLMC would report inaccurate information that the country was under attack from RPF rebels, condemn a Tutsi individual (whose name was gathered from lists created by the government), and extort the Hutu population to murder their Tutsi neighbors (McKinney, 2002, 123). McKinney (2002, 122) cites that many rural Africans use radio as their exclusive source for news and they often believe everything broadcast is truth. Thus, many ordinary Hutu were convinced to participate in the genocide.

No stone was left unturned by the Hutu in their attempt to wipe Rwanda clean of the Tutsi. Hutu soldiers and militiamen besieged churches, schools, and hospitals. In the village of Nyamata, soldiers and *Interahamwe* systematically massacred several thousand Tutsi taking refuge in a church (Carlin, 2003, 25). School teachers pointed out Tutsi children in their classrooms to militiamen (McKinney, 2002, 123). Some teachers even killed their Tutsi students themselves. Doctors killed their patients, and employees killed their fellow employees at workplaces (Gourevitch, 1998, 115). Many stories of the first days were even more horrible and sadistic that ranged from pregnant women having their unborn children removed from them (McKinney, 2002, 124) to Hutu government officials offering money for the severed heads of Tutsi (Gourevitch, 1998, 115). Bodies were often left where they fell or bulldozed into hastily made mass graves. In many

cases, Hutu community leaders (who included mayors, pastors, teachers and even Catholic priests) would lure Tutsi refugees fleeing their home villages into churches and community centers, where they would then be killed by waiting *Interahamwe* militiamen, with some massacres taking up to five days to complete (Scherrer, 2002, 111). Thus, it was no coincidence that the largest of the massacres were often at or near the same locations of Catholic Churches (Scherrer, 2002, 112-113). One of the strange and unnerving aftereffects of the genocide was that there were no dogs in Rwanda; the RPF who would later stop the genocide had them all shot because they were eating the dead (Gourevitch, 1998, 147-148). The frenzied killing rate of the genocide has been reported to be five times the rate of the worst of the Nazi death camps (McKinney, 2002, 124). Even women and children participated in the killings (Scherrer, 2002, 115).

The Western world watched on, with horror, but did very little. In the United States, the Clinton Administration later claimed it did not realize what was truly occurring in Rwanda until late April (Rauch, 2001, 1152). It is also believed that the Clinton Administration, still smarting from US losses in Somalia, did not want to intervene again in Africa (Scherrer, 2002, 80). The UN commander on the ground Romeo Dallaire requested permission to jam the hateful RTLMC from broadcasting its instructions to the militias all over Rwanda (Scherrer, 2002, 81). His requests were denied. Later UN inquiries concluded that had his requests been granted, the genocide may have been significantly lessened or even stopped before it spread out from the capital city (McKinney, 2002, 125). In 1998, Dallaire testified that UN intervention could have ceased the genocide (Scherrer, 2002, 82). Even when officials in

the United States realized that genocide was occurring, no intervention occurred and government officials continued to deny that genocide was happening (Rauch, 2001, 1152). Commander Dallaire stated that he could stop the genocide, but in April 1994 the UN Security Council withdrew nearly all UN forces from Rwanda (Gourevitch, 1998, 150). It was the invasion of the RPF and other Rwandan Tutsi refugees that ceased the genocide in June 1994 (Scherrer, 2002, 140-141). Finally, France and the UN intervened militarily in July (Scherrer, 2002, 142) after the RPF had driven many of the Hutu extremists from the country into neighboring Democratic Republic of Congo (then Zaire) and Tanzania and retaken the capital city of Kigali (Gourevitch, 1998, 158).

Chaos, Aftermath, and Conclusion

After the RPF drove the extremist Hutu from Rwanda in July 1994, they put into place the agreements that the former Habyiramana regime had agreed upon in 1993, which was to end ethnic segregation (Scherrer, 2002, 147). In addition, over one million Hutu fled Rwanda into Congo-Kinshasa to escape retribution from the new, Tutsi-led government (Crawley, 2003, 50). Nearly one-third of Rwanda's Hutu population fled into Congo along with many of the individuals who participated in the genocide (Gourevitch, 1998, 166). The new RPF regime, led by Paul Kagame, arrested or killed thousands of Hutu extremists who were implicit or complicit in the genocide (The Economist, 2003a, 31). Later, when Hutu extremists regrouped in neighboring Congo and attacked Rwanda, Rwanda invaded and may have killed some 200,000 refugees in Eastern Congo, stripping the region for any resource it could find (The Economist, 2003a, 31). In 1996, the Rwandan government attacked and shut down the extremist-controlled refugee

camps in Eastern Congo. It then repatriated nearly one million refugees (Brittian, 2003, 17).

Many Tutsi who had been exiled from Rwanda during the 1960s and 1970s also returned home to help rebuild their shattered nation (Scherrer, 2002, 150). However, the French intervention that began in July 1994 did little to improve the situation that was brewing in neighboring nations (Gourevitch, 1998, 156). In fact, the French military often (and still do) derided the RPF and Paul Kagame's efforts to restore order to the shattered country (Brittian, 2003, 18).

While Rwanda rebuilt, neighboring Congo disintegrated. The chaos of a third of Rwanda's Hutu population fleeing into Congo-Kinshasa along with that nation's ongoing civil war began a complex and violent multi-side regional war that continues to this date. In 1996, after a series of extremist attacks, Rwanda and Uganda invaded eastern Congo (Masland, 2003, 28). A counter-genocide of sorts began. In addition, Rwandan forces and their proxy armies in Congo fighting the government in Kinshasa looted Eastern Congo of much of its mineral wealth using Hutu forced labor (Scherrer, 2002, 254 and Masland, 2003, 29) including a mineral used in the production of cellular phone capacitors (Masland, 2003, 29). Rwanda made at least \$250 million from the sale of the mineral in 2000 alone (Masland, 2003, 30). In the end, Sudan, Burundi, Uganda, Rwanda, Zimbabwe, Namibia, Chad and Angola would all intervene in Congo, fighting proxy wars with and against each other and the Congolese government (Scherrer, 2002, 250-257). Foreign armies from Rwanda have pulled out of Congo (Crawley, 2003, 50). The war still rages in northeastern sections of Congo however a recently-deployed French-led UN force (The Economist, 2003b,14) and the creation of a new coalition

government in Kinshasa may end the fighting there (Masland, 2003, 29).

Rwanda, however, has made efforts to reconcile the horror of what occurred in 1994. Kagame's government rebuilt the court system to head off a counter-genocide within Rwanda's borders (Temple-Raston, 2003, 14). In 2001, Rwandans created local informal courts called *gacaca* to deal with and try the nearly 100,000 local participants of the genocide using traditional methods (The Economist, 2003c, 42). The *gacaca* judges will number nearly 200,000 and will serve nearly 11,000 local courts (Scherrer, 2002, 373). The United Nations set up a tribunal in Arusha, Tanzania to try the worst cases of genocide but as of this date has only tried fifteen of the forty-nine suspects (Brittain, 2003, 17). Belgium, the United Nations and France all set up inquiries to examine their own complicity in the 1994 Genocide however the United States, as of this date, has not (Rauch, 2001, 1152).

In late August 2003 Paul Kagame, who led the RPF into Rwanda to stop the genocide, was elected President in Rwanda's first democratic election since the genocide occurred. He received nearly ninety-five percent of the vote (Temple-Raston, 2003, 14). Kagame, in addition, has released some 40,000 of the 100,000 genocide suspects to ease and reintegrate them back into civilian life (Carlin, 2003, 25). His government has also allowed Hutu refugees residing in Congo and Tanzania to return to their former homes without reprisals. His Rwanda has grown economically with nearly 10% in 2002 and the dividing ethnic references used by the colonial administrators and former Hutu regimes have been expunged from official use (The Economist, 2003a, 31). Rwanda, to the amazement of the world that ignored its horror, is healing despite losing nearly a tenth of its

population to the genocide.

It is perhaps the late twentieth century's worst, most misunderstood, and most ignored horror. Colonial influences and racism fueled by a hateful press and media helped cause the murder of nearly one million people in Rwanda. The world looked on and despite media and UN peacekeeper reports did nothing until the slaughter had ended. Changes have occurred at the UN and in other places.

Recommendations and proposals that peacekeepers be permitted to jam radio propaganda signals are being considered at the United Nations, despite the issues of sovereignty that action would raise (McKinney, 2002, 137). Fifteen of the worst offenders of genocide have been tried (Brittain, 2003, 14). The international community, whether out of guilt for its failure to act or out of goodwill, has helped Rwanda extensively as well (Scherrer, 2002, 372). In neighboring Congo, the lessons learned from Rwanda prompted the UN to intervene in Congo's long running civil war (Crawley, 2003, 50). It is hoped that these new positive developments help to stabilize Central Africa and the horror of Rwanda never occurs again. Perhaps the statement never again will finally mean Never Again.

Works Cited

Brittain, V. 2003. Letter from Rwanda. *Nation*. September 1-

8, 17-20.

Carlin, J. 2003. Could you share a pint with a man who killed your family? *The New Statesman*. September 15, 24-27.

Crawley, M. 2003. Agony in Africa. *Maclean's*. June 9, 50-52.

Gourevitch, P. 1998. *We Wish to Inform You that Tomorrow We Will Be Killed With Our Families: Stories from Rwanda*. New York. Picador.

Masland, T. 2003. Wars without end. *Newsweek*. July 14, 28-32.

McKinney, T. 2003. Radio Jamming: The Disarmament of Radio Propaganda. *Small Wars and Insurgencies*, 13(3): 111-144.

Rauch, J. 2001. Now is the time to tell the truth about Rwanda. *National Journal*. April 21, 1152-1154.

Scherrer, C. 2002. *Genocide and Crisis in Central Africa: Conflict Roots, Mass Violence, and Regional War*. Westport. Praeger Publishers.

Temple-Raston, D. 2003. Quiet Riot. *New Republic*. October 6, 14-16.

The Economist. 2003. On a patch of grass. *The Economist*. May 17, 42.

The Economist. 2003. Africa's Open Wound. *The Economist*. June 14, 14.

The Economist. 2003. Kagame won, a little too well. *The Economist*. August 30, 31-33.

Introduction

Misunderstood, isolated, hungry, dangerous and perhaps bitter. This describes the hermit Stalinist nation of North Korea. Situated in Northeast Asia and bordered by powerful world actors, North Korea remains underdeveloped and reverently Communist at a time where Communism has been repudiated worldwide. Despite North Korea's belief that the Korean Peninsula should be united under Communism directed from Pyongyang, fifty years of containment by the United States has kept the North from coming south and isolated the country from the world. However, it is this isolation from the world scene that has created the threat of North Korea. North Korea maintains a massive conventional army and arsenal of chemical and biological weapons¹. In addition, the North Korean economy has collapsed and famine conditions exist within the country. In 1994, after evidence arose of a nuclear program, the United States ordered a stop to it, putting into place a framework to help the isolated nation develop its economy and join the world scene. The North Korean government under Kim Chong-il secretly violated the framework. In October 2002, North Korea revealed it had maintained its nuclear program. In December 2002, North Korea removed the IAEA inspectors from the country and began to make blustering threats to its neighbors and the world. North Korea may have created at least one nuclear bomb and may be well on its way to creating a nuclear arsenal. The Bush Administration's tactic has been one of non-engagement and hawkish

¹ United States Government. "North Korea Handbook" *North Korea Handbook*. May 1997. Marine Corp Intelligence Agency [available online].

negotiation; however, this may be the wrong way to go on this matter. North Korea's isolation, hunger, and economic crisis may leave the regime desperate for money, international prestige, and attention. This is dangerous. Despite the arguments of the Bush Administration, the North Korean nuclear crisis that is currently brewing may be the greatest security threat, outside of the threat from religious fundamentalism, that the United States has faced in many decades.

North Korea: Geography, Government, and History

North Korea is an underdeveloped Communist nation with a powerful military.²

North Korea is located in Northeastern Asia on the northern section of the Korean Peninsula. The country's immediate neighbors are The People's Republic of China to the north and the country of South Korea to the south of the 38th Parallel. The capital and largest urban area in North Korea is Pyongyang.

The long name for North Korea is The Democratic People's Republic of Korea.³

In 2003, North Korea's estimated population was 22,466,481⁴. Demographically, North Korea is racially homogenous with only a small Chinese and Japanese community present within the country⁵.

North Korea's government is described as a one-man

² "North Korea." CIA World Handbook, 2003. August 1 2003. [Available online].

³ "North Korea."

⁴ "North Korea."

⁵ "North Korea."

authoritarian socialist regime led by Kim Chong-Il, who came into power upon the death of his father in July 1994⁶. Kim Chong-Il and the security forces he commands hold a tight reign over North Korea's economy, social structure, and government. There is only one party in the unicameral People's Assembly as well⁷.

North Korea was founded as a nation following the end of World War II. Following the Japanese withdrawal from Korea, the Soviets took control of the peninsula from the Yalu River south to the 38th parallel. In 1948, the DPRK as we now know it was established after a series of general elections⁸. In 1950, North Korean forces invaded South Korea, sparking the Korean War. After a three year war that ended inconclusively, the border between North and South was set at the 38th Parallel. No true peace treaty was ever signed, and only an armistice exists between North Korea and the United States, who led the UN coalition during the Korean War⁹. In that war, some 37,000 US lives were lost, with nearly 100,000 injuries¹⁰.

Current US Policy

The US State Department has designated North Korea as one of the six "rouge" states or states that sponsor international terrorism. North Korea was given this

⁶ "North Korea Handbook"

⁷ "North Korea."

⁸ "North Korea Handbook."

⁹ "North Korea Handbook."

¹⁰ Hearing of the House International Relations Subcommittee on Asia and The Pacific. "North Korea's Nuclear Program." Chaired by Rep. James Leach (R-IA). *Federal News Service*. February 13, 2003.

designation in 1988 when North Korean agents bombed a South Korean civilian airliner killing 115 people¹¹. Since then, they have not been known to overtly target areas for terrorism however they are known for exporting military technology to other states, rouge states, and possibly terrorist groups¹². The selling of technology to terrorist groups in the Age of Terror is perhaps the most troubling issue of North Korea's intent to become a nuclear power. US officials within the Bush Administration now declare the 1994 Framework dead due to the reactivated Yongbon nuclear processing facility in North Korea¹³.

Current US policy has been one of deterrence and almost appeasement-like containment. The deterrence may have helped keep the North from attacking its southern neighbors. 36,000 American troops have been stretched in South Korea across the Demilitarized Zone in South Korea¹⁴. In recent months, these troops have been moved away from Seoul and the Demilitarized Zone. In addition, President Bush's extreme distaste for Kim Chong-Il and his regime have been well documented, as the President as been noted as referring to the North Korean dictator as a "pygmy."¹⁵ His administration's opinion on the Clinton Administration-brokered 1994 Framework had been more than less than favorable prior to the October 2002 North Korean admission of its nuclear program¹⁶ which did culminate with a 2001

¹¹ Hwang, Barbara. "North Korea deserves to remain on list of US Sponsors of Terrorism." Heritage Foundation Reports. November 19, 2001. [Available online].

¹² Arnoldy, Ben. "How Serious is North Korea's Nuclear Threat?" *Christian Science Monitor*. August 27, 2003, pg 7.

¹³ DeYoung, Karen and Reid, TR. "Bush Administration shifts blame for North Korea Crisis; Clinton-Era Agreement signed in '94 with Pyongyang is called flawed." *The Washington Post*. January 13, 2003, pg A22.

¹⁴ Buchanan, Thomas. "The Coming Decade on the Korean Peninsula: Implications for Northeast Asia and the United States." *An International Quarterly*. Winter 1999, 17(3). pg 7-30.

¹⁵ Gourevitch, Phillip. "The Madness of Kim Jong Il: Saddam Has Gone, Iran Has Blinked and Now Only North Korea Retains Its Status as Number One Enemy in the Axis of Evil." *The Observer*. November 2, 2003. p 26.

¹⁶ "Bush Administration shifts blame for North Korea Crisis; Clinton-Era Agreement signed in '94 with Pyongyang is called flawed." *The Washington Post*.

Korea policy review¹⁷, and North Korea, during President Bush's 2002 State of the Union Address, named North Korea as part of his "Axis of Evil."¹⁸ The Bush Administration also ended the Clinton Administration's attempt to engage the North through South Korea's "sunshine policy." However, the Bush Administration does remain open toward some aspects of South Korea's "Sunshine Policy" including the reunion of families separated when the peninsula was partitioned after the Korean War¹⁹.

It is clear the US Policy toward the North Korean regime is moving toward a more hawkish policy under President Bush than the carrot-stick policies of the Clinton administration agreed upon in the 1994 Framework. The 1994 Framework is probably null and void now, from the point of view of the Bush Administration. Despite the view of the Bush Administration, the best route toward dealing with North Korea may only be engagement²⁰.

In 1992, North Korea (then under the father of Kim Chong-Il), agreed to allow the IAEA into the country to inspect its plutonium production reactors. Not long afterward, the inspectors noticed discrepancies in the amount of plutonium produced²¹. Alarm bells rang in Washington- the CIA estimated that enough plutonium was missing to have created at least one bomb²². The crisis developed in 1993 when North Korea began to bluster about destroying Seoul.

¹⁷ Panel One of the Hearing of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. "North Korea". *Federal News Service*. Chaired by Sen. Lugar. February 4, 2003.

¹⁸ Gourevitch, Phillip. "The Madness of Kim Jong Il: Saddam Has Gone, Iran Has Blinkered and Now Only North Korea Retains Its Status as Number One Enemy in the Axis of Evil."

¹⁹ Panel One of the Hearing of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. "North Korea". *Federal News Service*. Chaired by Sen. Lugar. February 4, 2003.

²⁰ Hearing of the House International Relations Subcommittee on Asia and The Pacific. "North Korea's Nuclear Program." Chaired by Rep. James Leach (R-IA). *Federal News Service*. February 13, 2003.

²¹ Gourevitch, Phillip. "The Madness of Kim Jong Il: Saddam Has Gone, Iran Has Blinkered and Now Only North Korea Retains Its Status as Number One Enemy in the Axis of Evil."

²² Gourevitch, Phillip. "The Madness of Kim Jong Il: Saddam Has Gone, Iran Has Blinkered and Now Only North Korea Retains Its Status as Number One Enemy in the Axis of Evil."

The Clinton Administration then created the 1994 Framework, which was to freeze the nascent nuclear program²³. The 1994 Framework was also to build a series of light-water reactors to help create an electrical grid to develop the economy of the North. Until an international consortium built the reactors²⁴, the United States and other nations would supply the North with fuel oil shipments²⁵. It is believed that North Korea did not freeze its program, but branched out to other budding nuclear powers, such as neighbor China and US ally on the War on Terror, Pakistan. Sometime around 1997-1998, Pakistani scientists worked with North Korea on a hidden nuclear program in exchange for missile systems to counter neighboring India's conventional missile and nuclear missile arsenal²⁶. At least thirteen trips by Pakistani scientists to Pyongyang were reported by intelligence services, and represent a possible worst nightmare in nuclear proliferation²⁷. Some of the bartered technology includes gas centrifuges used to create weapons-grade uranium. Pakistan continues to deny the allegations²⁸. However a Newsweek reporter in a North Korean state museum spotted gifts from Pakistan and Iran during a rare visit²⁹.
Ironical?

Sanctions exist between the United States and North Korea. United Nations sanctions, however, are not in place. In October of 2002, North Korea announced that it had been violating the 1994 Framework Agreement by beginning to

²³ Gourevitch, Phillip. "The Madness of Kim Jong Il: Saddam Has Gone, Iran Has Blinkered and Now Only North Korea Retains Its Status as Number One Enemy in the Axis of Evil."

²⁴ Federal News Service. Panel One of the Hearing of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. *North Korea*. Chaired by Sen. Lugar. February 4, 2003.

²⁵ Gourevitch, Phillip. "The Madness of Kim Jong Il: Saddam Has Gone, Iran Has Blinkered and Now Only North Korea Retains Its Status as Number One Enemy in the Axis of Evil."

²⁶ Sanger, David and Dao, James. "A Nuclear North Korea: Intelligence; US says Pakistan gave technology to North Korea." *The New York Times*. October 18, 2002. pg A1.

²⁷ Hersh, Seymour. "The Cold Test: What the Administration knew about Pakistan and the North Korean nuclear program." *The New Yorker*. January 27, 2003. p 42.

²⁸ The Economist. "My Enemy's enemy." *The Economist*. October 4, 2003. p. 39

²⁹ Knight, Gary. "A Secret Place." *Newsweek*. October 27, 2003. p. 34.

produce nuclear fuel to make atomic weapons³⁰. It also later withdrew from the nuclear non-proliferation treaty. In December 2002, North Korea expelled the United Nations inspection teams and restarted its nuclear facilities³¹. During the summer of 2003, the isolated nation made blustering threats to test a nuclear weapon, and intelligence suggested that the nation might have already created one or more nuclear bombs. Significant evidence also exists that other nuclear powers, namely Pakistan, may have aided North Korea in its process to become a nuclear power itself³² in exchange for North Korean missile technology. There are also allegations that the Bush Administration withheld knowledge of both Pakistani aid to the North Korean regime³³ and knowledge of the North Korean nuclear program itself before the run-up to the war in Iraq³⁴. Congressional officials argue that the Bush Administration purposefully kept the information regarding the North Korean program secret in 2002 because it wanted to garner support for its regime change in Iraq³⁵. There is also evidence that the Clinton administration may have been aware of the Pakistani-North Korean exchange³⁶.

The United States has had several military plans in place since the Clinton Administration to deal with a North Korean threat to South Korea and its neighbors. Envisioning a North Korean first-strike, the general tactic would be to

³⁰ Pincus, Walter. "North Korea's Nuclear plans were no secret; US Stayed quiet as it built support for Iraq." *The Washington Post*.

³¹ Pincus, Walter. "North Korea's Nuclear plans were no secret; US Stayed quiet as it built support for Iraq." *The Washington Post*.

³² Sanger, David and Dao, James. "A Nuclear North Korea: Intelligence; US says Pakistan gave technology to North Korea." *The New York Times*. October 18, 2002. pg A1.

³³ Hersh, Seymour. "The Cold Test: What the Administration knew about Pakistan and the North Korean nuclear program." *The New Yorker*. January 27, 2003. p 42.

³⁴ Pincus, Walter. "North Korea's Nuclear plans were no secret; US Stayed quiet as it built support for Iraq." *The Washington Post*. February 1, 2003. pg A1.

³⁵ Pincus, Walter. "North Korea's Nuclear plans were no secret; US Stayed quiet as it built support for Iraq." *The Washington Post*.

³⁶ Pincus, Walter. "North Korea's Nuclear plans were no secret; US Stayed quiet as it built support for Iraq." *The Washington Post*.

defend South Korea with as many as 600,000 US and coalition troops, push the North Korean army back into the North, and then proceed to destroy the North Korean regime as a political entity and reorganize it under South Korean control³⁷. US Military planners admit that such a war would be costly in monetary and human terms, with as many as one million Koreans and Americans dead³⁸. Although the United States has seen success in its recent short conflicts in Southwest Asia, the Middle East, and Central America, a new Korean War would not be simplistic, nor easy³⁹. The military option, however, remains current US policy if all diplomatic and multilateral actions fail. This is an option that no one wants, except perhaps the North Koreans.

Position of Major Allies in the Region

Japan

Japan has maintained a distant stance from North Korea. North Korea and Japan have traditionally never had good diplomatic relations. In the 1970s, the North Korean intelligence service kidnapped several Japanese citizens and forced them back to the North to live their lives. It was not until recently that the Japanese kidnapped civilians were permitted to return to Japan⁴⁰. Much of the animosity between the two nations stems from Japan's occupation of the Korean Peninsula prior to and during World War II. North Korea has also demonstrated that it can attack all of Japan with its Taepo-Dong three stage missiles, which it test-fired over the Japanese home islands in 1998. Hundreds of No-Dong missiles are currently aimed at Japan. Japan in recent months has noted that it

³⁷ Global Security

³⁸ State Department Briefing. "The North Korean Nuclear Crisis: What's Next?" *Federal News Service*. May 7, 2003.

³⁹ State Department Briefing. "The North Korean Nuclear Crisis: What's Next?" *Federal News Service*. May 7, 2003.

⁴⁰ The Economist. "Japan, North Korea end deep freeze." *The Economist*. September 1, 2002. p6

reserves the right to preemption military action against North Korea and rumors of a Japanese nuclear program in response to a nuclear-armed North Korea have surfaced⁴¹. Japan, in addition to the kidnapping issue, has dealt with North Korean spy ships violating Japanese territorial waters⁴². Japan in recent months has participated in joint operations with the United States and Australia designed to stop illicit weapons and drug trade from North Korea⁴³.

However, Japan has attempted to normalize relations with North Korea. Japan would also prefer a diplomatic approach to dealing with the possibly nuclear North⁴⁴ in addition to maintaining the status quo between Japan and the United States and South Korea and the United States⁴⁵. The Japanese government prefers a multilateral approach to the growing crisis, but would also like the United States and North Korea to talk face-to-face⁴⁶.

South Korea

Like Japan, South Korea would prefer to see a peaceful approach toward dealing with the North Korean regime through diplomacy and persuasion. Indeed, South Korea is perhaps the one nation under the greatest military threat from North Korea than any other nation in Northeast Asia.

Stretched along the 38th Parallel is the De-Militarized Zone. On North Korea's side of the DMZ lies much of North Korea's million-man army and mechanized arms. In addition, geography played South Korea a bad hand as well. Seoul, capital city and largest urban area in South Korea, lies

⁴¹ Marquand, Robert. *Christian Science Monitor*. April 17, 2003, p. 1.

⁴² State Department Briefing. "The North Korean Nuclear Crisis: What's Next?" *Federal News Service*. May 7, 2003.

⁴³ The Economist. "Practicing to Provoke." *The Economist*. September 20, 2003. P 41.

⁴⁴ State Department Briefing. "The North Korean Nuclear Crisis: What's Next?" *Federal News Service*. May 7, 2003.

⁴⁵ State Department Briefing. "The North Korean Nuclear Crisis: What's Next?" *Federal News Service*. May 7, 2003.

⁴⁶ State Department Briefing. "The North Korean Nuclear Crisis: What's Next?" *Federal News Service*. May 7, 2003.

merely 50 miles from the border and is heavily populated with as much as forty percent of the South Korean population living within 50 miles of Seoul⁴⁷. Seoul also lies in the sights of nearly 12,000 units of North Korean mechanized artillery, possibly including shells tipped with biological and chemical weapons⁴⁸. These units could rain down several hundred thousand rounds of shell upon Seoul and the surrounding metropolitan area over the space a few days. Violent regime change is not within South Korea's self-interest, as a war could possibly reduce Seoul into ruin and kill tens, possibly hundreds, of thousands of South Korean civilians⁴⁹. Some sixty percent of South Korea's GDP assets also lie within range of North Korea's guns⁵⁰.

Knowing the sobering facts of what a military strike could do, South Korea has pursued a diplomatic approach to dealing with its hermit neighbor to the north. South Korean governments have instituted the Sunshine Policy, which opened rail and transportation links between the North and South; reunited families separated at partition, and allowed South Korean firms to operate within North Korea⁵¹. South Korean firms such as Hyundai have rebuilt rail links between the two countries and Samsung has begun to export electronic equipment created at its plant in Pyongyang⁵².

There has been some anti-American sentiment in South

⁴⁷ Global Security. 1998. "OPLAN 5027: Major Theater War West." [available online at <http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/ops/oplan-5027.htm>]. Accessed November 15 2003.

⁴⁸ Global Security. 1998. "OPLAN 5027: Major Theater War West." [available online at <http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/ops/oplan-5027.htm>]. Accessed November 15 2003.

⁴⁹ Global Security. 1998. "OPLAN 5027: Major Theater War West." [available online at <http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/ops/oplan-5027.htm>]. Accessed November 15 2003.

⁵⁰ Federal News Service. Panel One of the Hearing of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. *North Korea*. Chaired by Sen. Lugar. February 4, 2003.

⁵¹ Kang, David. "International Relations Theory and the Second Korean War." *International Studies Quarterly*. September 1, p 301-324.

⁵² Kang, David. "International Relations Theory and the Second Korean War." *International Studies Quarterly*. September 1, p 301-324.

Korea regarding the long-term US military presence⁵³. In addition, South Korea is also not focused on the task of regime change much like the United States is, as they would prefer a slower, peaceful approach to the concept⁵⁴.

China

China is currently North Korea's only friend and ally, although they refer to the North Koreans as "merely a neighbor"⁵⁵. However, in recent months, a slow but noticeable gap has been noticed between the two Communist States. China, bordered by several nuclear states (Russia, India, and Pakistan), does not want a fourth state with nuclear arms on its borders⁵⁶. China also fears that North Korea's nuclear program may spark a nuclear arms race in Japan, South Korea, and possibly even Taiwan, which it seeks to reclaim after 50 years⁵⁷.

China, however, is North Korea's principal trading partner. In 2002, two-way trade amounted to \$728 million⁵⁸. This crucial amount of trade amounts for as much as one-third of North Korea's total trade volume⁵⁹. In addition, roughly half of China's foreign aid budget according to some estimates goes to North Korea⁶⁰. In addition, China came to North Korea's aid during the Korean War. Without Chinese help, North Korea likely would not exist today but

⁵³ Federal News Service. Panel One of the Hearing of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. *North Korea*. Chaired by Sen. Lugar. February 4, 2003.

⁵⁴ State Department Briefing. "The North Korean Nuclear Crisis: What's Next?" *Federal News Service*. May 7, 2003.

⁵⁵ Global Security. 1998. "OPLAN 5027: Major Theater War West." [available online at <http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/ops/oplan-5027.htm>]. Accessed November 15 2003.

⁵⁶ Federal News Service. Panel One of the Hearing of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. *North Korea*. Chaired by Sen. Lugar. February 4, 2003.

⁵⁷ Gourevitch, Phillip. "The Madness of Kim Jong Il: Saddam Has Gone, Iran Has Blinkered and Now Only North Korea Retains Its Status as Number One Enemy in the Axis of Evil."

⁵⁸ Gill, Bates. Capitol Hill Hearing Testimony. "Changing Nuclear Equation on the Korean Peninsula." *Congressional Testimony*. March 12, 2003.

⁵⁹ Gill, Bates. Capitol Hill Hearing Testimony. "Changing Nuclear Equation on the Korean Peninsula." *Congressional Testimony*. March 12, 2003.

⁶⁰ Federal News Service. Panel One of the Hearing of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. *North Korea*. Chaired by Sen. Lugar. February 4, 2003.

a united Korea would stand in its place⁶¹. South Korea and China have created more friendly relations beginning in 1992 with the establishment of diplomatic relations between the two countries, which served to further isolate North Korea⁶².

Despite long-time links between China and North Korea, China has been instrumental in creating and hosting the multilateral talks between the United States, North Korea, Japan, and South Korea. It is believed that Beijing has expended considerable backchannel effort between the United States and North Korea to get them to the table, beginning with a visit by former Chinese president Jiang Zemin to the Bush Ranch in Crawford, TX⁶³. It is also possible that US-Chinese trade, which amounts to as much as \$100 billion a year, may have helped the Chinese in getting the United States to the table with North Korea⁶⁴. China has also shifted troops along the border between China and North Korea, suspended oil shipments for a short period, and kept up pressure on the North Koreans to cooperate with the multilateral talks⁶⁵. China also does not want a refugee crisis with massive outflow of North Koreans pouring into China as there may already be as many as 300,000 North

⁶¹ "North Korean Handbook."

⁶² Gill, Bates. Capitol Hill Hearing Testimony. "Changing Nuclear Equation on the Korean Peninsula." *Congressional Testimony*. March 12, 2003.

⁶³ "In Korea Crisis, China takes lead."

⁶⁴ Hearing of the House International Relations Subcommittee on Asia and The Pacific. "North Korea's Nuclear Program." Chaired by Rep. James Leach (R-IA). *Federal News Service*. February 13, 2003.

⁶⁵ Medeiros, Evan and Fravel, Taylor M. "China's New Diplomacy". *Foreign Affairs*. Nov/Dec 2003. p22-35.

Koreans illegally living in China⁶⁶. China clearly desires a nuclear free Korean peninsula⁶⁷. It is also not likely that the Chinese will come to North Korea's aid if Kim Chong-Il's regime chooses to attack the South⁶⁸. China does not want an unstable northeast Asia, however, it has acknowledged North Korea's right to self-defense⁶⁹.

Analysis and Conclusion

My opinion is that there is very little left for the United States to do with North Korea. Fifty years of containment has kept the North from coming south and forcefully reuniting the Korean Peninsula, however, it has not stopped North Korea from seeking to become a nuclear power. Currently, North Korea's economy has collapsed and famine conditions exist within the country. The United States may soon find itself facing a new nuclear power that could cause other nations in the region to develop nuclear weapons of their own for their own security. The Clinton Administration used a "red-line" during the 1994 crisis, which was evidence of the reprocessing of nuclear fuel. The Bush Administration has no set "red-line."⁷⁰

North Korea's actions are worrisome to the long-term stability of Northeast Asia. North Korea has already withdrawn from the Non Proliferation Treaty to pursue its nuclear program. Neighboring nations, and the Chinese and Russians have bought up this concern⁷¹, may feel the need to

⁶⁶ Gill, Bates. Capitol Hill Hearing Testimony. "Changing Nuclear Equation on the Korean Peninsula." *Congressional Testimony*. March 12, 2003.

⁶⁷ Federal News Service. Panel One of the Hearing of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. *North Korea*. Chaired by Sen. Lugar. February 4, 2003.

⁶⁸ Global Security. 1998. "OPLAN 5027: Major Theater War West." [available online at <http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/ops/oplan-5027.htm>]. Accessed November 15 2003.

⁶⁹ "In Korea Crisis, China takes lead." *Christian Science Monitor*.

⁷⁰ Global Security. 1998. "OPLAN 5027: Major Theater War West." [available online at <http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/ops/oplan-5027.htm>]. Accessed November 15 2003.

⁷¹ Gourevitch, Phillip. "The Madness of Kim Jong Il: Saddam Has Gone, Iran Has Blinkered and Now Only

do the same. There already have been rumors in Japan of starting up a nuclear program to deter the North Koreans from attacking, which is something they can do quite easily⁷². This action would appear, to the Chinese, to be threatening to their security. These concerns need to be taken seriously when dealing with the North Korean threat.

There is evidence that North Korea may merely be blustering. The North Korean regime knows that any first-strike on its part would be suicide, as officials in Washington has made it quite public that it seeks to remove the Stalinist regime from power and reorganize the country under South Korean control. Although North Korea's aim is and always has been to reunify the peninsula, the regime probably knows that any attempt on its part to forcibly and violently reunify the Korean peninsula would mean the end of the regime, period, and no questions asked⁷³. However, North Korea is undergoing significant economic collapse and needs the money. There are also large gaps in American intelligence regarding North Korea's biological and chemical weapons programs⁷⁴. North Korea also is known to supply weapons to terrorist and drug trafficking groups in Burma and Sri Lanka, and has supplied missiles and weapons aid to Libya, Sudan, Burma, Pakistan, and Syria⁷⁵. It does not take much of a stretch of the imagination to imagine that North Korea could develop its nuclear weapons not only as a deterrent to an American pre-emptive attack, but also as a way to raise hard currency. This, I regard, is the most significant threat North Korea places upon the world

North Korea Retains Its Status as Number One Enemy in the Axis of Evil.”

⁷² State Department Briefing. “The North Korean Nuclear Crisis: What’s Next?” *Federal News Service*. May 7, 2003.

⁷³ Kang, David. “International Relations Theory and the Second Korean War.” *International Studies Quarterly*. September 1, p 301-324.

⁷⁴ Federal News Service. Panel One of the Hearing of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. *North Korea*. Chaired by Sen. Lugar. February 4, 2003.

⁷⁵ Hwang, Barbara.

scene, regardless of the regime's need for self-preservation.

Neighboring nations also have a stake in keeping the status quo, providing North Korea cooperates. China does not want a refugee crisis stemming from an American reaction to a North Korean attack on the South⁷⁶. It also does not want the buffer zone between South Korea (and therefore US military forces stationed in South Korea along the DMZ) and itself to vanish⁷⁷. However China also does not want another nuclear power on its borders, as it already has three. It also does not want Japan to build a nuclear arsenal, and despite its past friendly relations with North Korea, it wants to maintain friendly relations with the United States⁷⁸. South Korea also does not want to see the destruction of where nearly forty percent of its population resides.

However, it is my personal belief that other than the threat from fundamentalism, North Korea is probably the greatest threat to American, and therefore international, security in many years. Without better diplomacy and some kind of security agreement to placate the North Koreans, military action with a coalition from the UN, led by the United States, may be necessary.

⁷⁶ Gill, Bates. Capitol Hill Hearing Testimony. "Changing Nuclear Equation on the Korean Peninsula." *Congressional Testimony*. March 12, 2003.

⁷⁷ "In Korea Crisis, China takes lead." *Christian Science Monitor*.

⁷⁸ Gill, Bates. Capitol Hill Hearing Testimony. "Changing Nuclear Equation on the Korean Peninsula." *Congressional Testimony*. March 12, 2003.

Bibliography

- Arnoldy, B. 2002. "How Serious is North Korea's Nuclear Threat?" *Christian Science Monitor*. August 27, p 7.
- Buchanan, T. 1999. "The Coming Decade on the Korean Peninsula: Implications for Northeast Asia and the United States." *An International Quarterly*. Winter, 17(3). p 7-30.
- DeYoung, K and Reid, T.R. 2003. "Bush Administration shifts blame for N. Korea Crisis; Clinton-era agreement Signed in '94 with Pyongyang is called Flawed." *The Washington Post*. January 12, p A22.
- Global Security. 1998. "OPLAN 5027: Major Theater War West." [available online at <http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/ops/oplan-5027.htm>]. Accessed November 15 2003.
- Gourevitch, P. 2003. "The Madness of Kim Jong Il: Saddam Has Gone, Iran Has Blinkered and Now Only North Korea Retains Its Status as Number One Enemy in the Axis of Evil." *The Observer*. November 2, p 26
- Hersh, S. 2003. "The Cold Test: What the administration knew about Pakistan and the North Korean nuclear program." *The New Yorker*. January 27. p 42.
- Hwang, B. 2001. "North Korea deserves to remain on US list of sponsors of terrorism." *Heritage Foundation*

- Reports*. November 19. [available online]. Accessed November 15 2003.
- Kang, D. 2003. "International Relations Theory and the Second Korean War." *International Studies Quarterly*. September 1, p 301-324.
- Knight, Gary. 2003. "A Secret Place." *Newsweek*. October 27, p 34.
- Marquand, R. 2002. "Japan, North Korea end deep freeze." *Christian Science Monitor*. September 16, p 6.
- Marquand, R. 2003. "In Korea Crisis, China takes lead." *Christian Science Monitor*. April 17, p 1.
- Medeiros, E. and Fravel, T. 2003. "China's New Diplomacy". *Foreign Affairs*. Nov/Dec, p 22-35.
- Pincus, D. 2003. "North Korea's nuclear plans were no secret; US stayed quiet as it built support on Iraq." *The Washington Post*. February 1, p A1.
- Sanger, D. and Dao, J. 2002. "A Nuclear North Korea: Intelligence, US says Pakistan gave Technology to North Korea." *The New York Times*. October 18, p A1
- The Economist. 2003. "Practicing to Provoke." *The Economist*. September 20, p 41.
- The Economist. 2003. "My Enemy's enemy." *The Economist*. October 4, p 39.
- United States Government. Hill, Bate. 2003. "Changing Nuke Equation: Korean Peninsula." *Federal News Service*, March 12.
- United States Government. 2003. "Hearing of the House Int'l Relations Sub-Committee on Asia and the Pacific." February 13. transcript. *Federal News Service*.
- United States Government. 1997. "North Korea Handbook" *North Korea Handbook*. May. Marine Corp Intelligence Agency [available online at www.globalsecurity.org] Accessed November 15 2003.
- United States Government. 2003. "North Korea." *CIA World Handbook*. August 1. [Available online]. Accessed November 15 2003.

United States State Department. 2003. "North Korean Nuclear Crisis, What's Next?" State Department briefing. May 7, *Federal News Service*.

United States Government. 2003. "Panel One of the Hearing of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee: North Korea." February 2. Transcript. *Federal News Service*.

