

NORTH KOREA'S NATIONAL SECURITY STRATEGY AND ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR SOUTH KOREA

Seoyeon Yoon¹, Kyunghan Lim²

¹ Graduate school of International Studies, Seoul National University,

² Military Science Divisions, Korea Naval Academy,
KOREA.

greenwhite@snu.ac.kr

ABSTRACT

This paper aims to draw policy implications for the South Korean government's policy towards North Korea as year 2013 will be a defining moment for the two Koreas. South Korea's new Park Geun-Hye Administration is expected to pursue a North Korean policy that is similar to the previous administration's strong stance. Both the incoming and outgoing administrations have expressed their will to cooperate and have consistency on its North Korean policy in response to North Korea's 3rd nuclear test occurred in February 2013. Meanwhile the Kim Jong-Un regime is expected to continue on solidifying the regime as did during the past two years. Nuclear weapons and their unique brinkmanship tactics, whether be it successful or not, will be at the forefront of their negotiation strategies.

In this paper, North Korea's strategy is analyzed in the context of their value, international and domestic threats, military and diplomatic strategies, and urgency to lay a foundation for unwavering leadership transition from Kim Jong-Il to Kim Jong-Un. Based on the analysis, this paper proposes suggestions for the South Korean government in three fields of military, diplomacy, and politics. South Korean government shall take a multifaceted approach towards North Korea, and expedite its policies in a proactive manner.

Keywords: North Korea, national security strategy, Kim Jong-Un, nuclear test, Korean Unification

INTRODUCTION

North Korea's 3rd nuclear test on February 12, 2013 draws the international society's attention to the Korean Peninsula again. The test has been conducted right after the UN Security Council passed *Resolution 2087* on January 22, 2013, condemning North Korea's launch of ballistic missile technology in December 12, 2012. The international organizations and governments heavily criticized North Korea's nuclear test and are keeping a close watch on the moves in the Korean Peninsula. Why did North Korea exercise the missile launch and nuclear test? Were these actions which will naturally entail intensive military restriction or strengthen sanctions from the international community necessary? What is North Korea's national security strategy and what lies at the core of their policies? How will they try to achieve such goals? This paper started by asking such questions.

Specifically, year 2013 is not only the first year for South Korea's new government but also a critical year for North Korea as they are still in the process of stabilizing the leadership transition to Kim Jong-Un after Kim Jong-Il's death in 2011. The new North Korean leader, Kim Jong-Un, actually has been in power for longer than a year since the death of his father. Having such dynamics around the country, South Korea shall prepare security strategy and unification policy in details. Authors thought having a close look at North Korea's national

security strategy during this period is a timely and necessary work. This work will also contribute to building a strategic way to prepare for the future of the unified Korean Peninsula.

This policy oriented study plans to suggest recommendations for the South Korean government. There is a need to approach North Korean policies in a systematic and comprehensive manner as there are a lack of accurate information and resources, and many reports and predictions are based on a few North Korean studies' experts and their assessments in response to occurring incidents and occasions *per se*. Therefore, this paper aims to understand the target clearly in order to propose effective policies. In short, North Korea's national security strategy will be examined, and then policy implications for South Korea will be drawn.

This article is broadly divided into three parts. First part studies North Korea's political power transition from Kim Jong-Il to Kim Jong-Un. Second segment analyzes North Korea's national security strategy through David A. Baldwin's security analysis. Last section examines the policy implications for South Korea drawn from North Korea's national security strategy analysis.

NORTH KOREA'S LEADERSHIP SUCCESSION PROCESS AND ITS NATIONAL GOAL

North Korea started an official leadership succession process from Kim Jong-Il to Kim Jong-Un in 2010. On September 27, 2010, Kim Jong-Il promoted his youngest son, Kim Jong-Un to a four star general position by issuing *Order No. 0051*. The following day on September 28, Kim Jong-Il appointed Kim Jong-Un as a member of the Central Committee of the Worker's Party and Vice Chair of the Central Military Committee at the Korean Worker's Party (KWP) Representatives Convention. Kim Jong-Il endowed his son with the authority over the Korean Worker's Party and the military. On April 13, 2012 Kim Jong-Un was elected as first chairman of National Defense Commission during the fifth session of the 12th Supreme People's Assembly. Finally, Kim Jong-Un became the new leader of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) after his father's death.

Then after, there was an overflow of researches related to topics range from leadership transfer, regime change, internal conflict, stability of the post-Kim Jong-Il era, sudden collapse of the regime, change in China-North Korea relations, to adjustment in South Korea-US relations and policy towards North Korea. North Korea's national goal of building a "Strong and Prosperous State" was a frequently discussed topic as well. The notion of "Strong and Prosperous State" appeared in *Rodong Sinmun* for the first time on July 22, 1997. North Korea's plan was to build a Strong and Prosperous State by 2012 focusing on four areas: ideology, politics, the military, and the economy.¹ However, they slowed down the plan by proposing two stages of achieving the goal. First stage provided a stepping stone, and the country will complete its aim by the second stage. As year 2012 marked the 100th anniversary of the birth of the country's late leader Kim Il-Sung, North Korea placed an importance on its stepping stone stage. North Korea plans to open its gates by 2012, and then fully industrialized the country by 2020.

¹ Song-Jong Kang (2004). *North Korea's Strategy to Build a Strong and Prosperous Country*. Seoul: Hanul Academy.

ANALYSIS ON THE NATIONAL SECURITY STRATEGY OF NORTH KOREA

What is National Security?

Security is a commonly used term in international politics yet its definition is broad and vague.¹ In the 1950s, Wolfers defined security as “an absence of threat to acquired values”.² The security for survival was the biggest acquired values during the Cold War period.³ On the other hand, Baldwin defined security as “a low probability of damage to acquired values”.⁴ Baldwin’s definition reflects the expanded fields of security. Security does not necessarily come from absence but also from low probability of threat or damage. Unlike during the Cold War period when the first priority for national interest was survival, in the post-Cold War times, nations have to consider other factors such as territorial dispute, national influence, power or wealth to secure one’s nation.⁵

Wolfers’ focus on the military security aspects reflects his time period during the Cold War. On the other hand, Baldwin’s criteria signals his time period of post-Cold War when the concept of security expanded. Security should be understood in the context of its time frame reflecting the circumstantial changes. With this reason, this study uses Baldwin’s security framework. Authors acknowledge that Baldwin’s security framework is not the only way to analyze security strategies. There are other scholars with different definitions; however, the authors consider this to be one of the most reasonable security framework that gives a systematic approach in viewing the two Koreas. Being the only divided country in the world, North Korea’s first national interest will be national security; however, North Korea’s counterparts may have to consider various factors of the nontraditional security strategies. Baldwin divides the seven strategy analysis tools into two categories of scientific understanding on policy, and systematic comparison of policy alternatives.

National Security Strategy of North Korea

National Security for Whom?

In general, national security can target three different levels: individual, the state, and the international system. The major national security concern for North Korea is based on the pinnacle of the North Korea’s regime, thus, North Korea’s security target is limited to individual level. A particular characteristic of North Korea’s individual level is that such individual level covers the state level. For North Korea, the regime maintenance for *the Kims* equals to the nation’s survival. This is because North Korea seems to exist for the core group. The three central parts under the individual level are first *the Kims* and their closest aides, second, the military, referring to national defense commission, senior military leadership, and third, the Korean Worker’s Party, especially the loyal core of the Worker’s Party.

North Korea proposed to provide all the needs for everyone when it was first established. Through the past six decades, the leaders have mentioned how the nation cares for the people; however, the actual situation happening in North Korea reveals that North Korea is not for the people but for the very core group of the nation. North Korean leaders do not intend to

¹ Arnold Wolfers (1952). National Security as an Ambiguous Symbol. *Political Science Quarterly*, 67, 485.

² Arnold Wolfers (1962). *Discord and Collaboration*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, xiv.

³ Hans J. Morgenthau (1954). *Politics among Nations: the Struggle for Power and Peace*. (2nd ed.). New York: Alfred A. Knopf; Kenneth N. Waltz (1979). *Theory of International Politics*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

⁴ David Baldwin (1997). The Concept of Security. *Review of International Studies*. 23, 1, 13.

⁵ Randall Schweller (1994). Bandwagoning for Profit and Bringing the Revisionist State Back in. *International Security*, 19, 1, 72-107; Randall Schweller (1996). Neorealism’s Status Quo Bias: What Security Dilemma. *Security Studies*, 5, 3, 90-121.

lavish or give minimum support to the North Korean people, but to service themselves. For example, North Korean leader Kim Jong-Il named the tragic famine which killed more than three million people as an “Arduous March” or “the March of Tribulation.”

National Security for Which Values?

North Korea’s national security values are *Juche* (self-sustaining) and the hegemony of the *Kims* regime. North Korea values the nation’s founding ideology called regime *Juche*. According to Kim Il-Sung, *Juche* means the independent stance of rejecting dependence on others and of using one’s own powers, believing in one’s own strength and displaying the revolutionary spirit of self-reliance. This strong nationalistic ideology and spirit of voluntary self-sacrifice enables the *Juche* ideology to be an instrument of domestic political power.¹ Another proof demonstrating the value of *Juche* is the dynastic calendar which counts from the birth year 1912 of Kim Il-Sung. It is also named after his ideology.² *Juche* is an important value supporting North Korea’s national agenda such as Military First, and Strong and Prosperous State. Kim Jong-Un has already appeared to be associating himself with *Juche* ideology.

Another important value for North Korea’s national strategy is Kim Jong-Un’s leadership. The country plans to maintain the ruling of the Great President Kim Il-Sung and his families.³ Thus, an immediate critical value for North Korea is maintaining the total hegemony of the leadership of Kim Il-Sung and his heirs. Second is restoring the full sovereignty of North Korea through North Korea’s political, military, and economic independency and autonomy. Afterwards, North Korea will eventually pursue the unification of the two Koreas through its value systems and leadership.

National Security from What Threats

North Korea’s threat perception is rather simple. Any security problem related to their survival is a threat to the nation. Therefore, what will harm the survival of the nation and the values of keeping the legacy of the Kims and the *Juche* ideology are threats. North Korea’s threat will be examined under two categories: International and domestic.

International Threats

North Korea’s international threat can be explained by economic and military threat. First is the economic threat. The isolation from the international community has cut down the international aid North Korea was receiving. North Korea’s severe famine in 1994, forced North Korea to demand international aids but North Korea does not have many places to ask for help. Isolation from their source of income is a serious threat as people are dying, and such instability damages Kim Jong-Il and Kim Jong-Un’s leadership.

Second is the military threat. North Korea seems to clearly recognize that the war has not ended. The two Koreas are in an armistice status from 1953. Twice *Yeonpyeong* naval battles in 1999 and 2002, *Daechung* naval battle in 2009, *Cheonan* warship attack and *Yeonpyeongdo* bombing in 2010 are examples of their war perception. North Korea has also kept its nuclear weapons development. They have withdrawn from the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) in 2003, and continued to execute missile tests and conduct illegal sales for weapons. These actions made changes in North Korea’s relations with the US. The

¹ Homer T. Hodge (2003). North Korea’s Military Strategy. *Parameters*, 80.

² Kongdan Oh and Ralph C. Hassig (2000), *North Korea: Through the Looking Glass*. Washington D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 3.

³ *The New York Times*. March 13, 2012.

US has been threatening North Korea to cut down its sudden provocations through economic sanctions, and direct and indirect warnings.

Domestic Threats

Internal threats of North Korea are represented by regime instability. More people are defecting from the country as they get exposed to the outside world. As of the end of 2012, there are 24,614 defectors living in South Korea. Such phenomena caused substantial leaking of military and private information and secrets which eventually supported South Korea in building its strategies against North Korea. North Korean polices are losing control over restraining the spread of information. There are many reports revealing regime instability. People are starving and losing trust in their government. Testimonies from defectors and news reports have indicated that North Korean people have access to Korean TV shows, and Korean pop songs. Also, the failure of the “2009 Currency Reform” caused more internal instability among the people as it aggravated people's suffering.

Table 1. Numbers of North Korean Refugees Entered South Korea (Unit: Persons)

Year	~2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	Total
Male	3426	512	571	608	671	589	797	402	7,576
Female	4,298	1,510	1,977	2,196	2,258	1,813	1,909	1,107	17,038
Total	7,724	2,022	2,548	2,804	2,929	2,402	2,706	1,509	24,614

Source: Ministry of Unification.

Another domestic national security threat representing regime instability is the weak solidarity for Kim Jong-Un and doubts on his leadership within the elite group as the new successor of the regime since Kim Jong-Il’s death. Examples such as the mocking pictures and songs of the leader and their military achievements, and the intensified government's propaganda and promotion of successful succession reflect the nation’s weak solidarity. North Korea has said Kim Jong-Un as “great successor” to give him the highest respect. Even if Kim Jong-Un has tried to be the great successor for the past one year, many examples show that stabilizing needs more time.

How much Security?

North Korea has been emphasizing on securing an absolute level of security. Absolute security means achieving the goal of sustaining the Kim family’s leadership. As mentioned above, North Korea’s value on sustaining Kim’s regime is strong. The international community has provided incentives through the six party talks to render North Korea to make complete resolution of its nuclear weapons. In response to such suggestions, North Korea has both directly and indirectly expressed its needs for absolute security to the six party talks partners of China, the US, Russia, Japan, and South Korea.

Another important point to note is the “will” of the North Korean government. It is not only about how much they have but how willing they are to operate their means for national security strategies. North Korea’s Military First policy reflects the country’s volitional commitment on operating the military forces. Militarism has remained an essential aspect of the character of the North Korean state since its founding in 1948. Kim Jong-Il adopted the Military First political method as a means to guarantee its survival from outside threats. Military First Policy establishes security as a core value, and the primacy of the military as a

political and social institution. Pursuing absolute security, therefore, leads to discuss the means of national security in details.

Security by What Means?

Military Power

First, North Korea's military power can be explained by their size of military troops, nuclear weapons, chemical and biological weapons, and missile programs. North Korea has regular military force with 1,106,000 persons: Army 950,000, Navy 46,000, and Air force 110,000. Also there are paramilitary forces of 189,000 persons and reserve persons of 4,700,000.¹ That is, 1/5 of the total population of 23 million can form a military force in case of war. Also, North Korea has a special force command, known to be competent, has about 88,000 personnel. The North Korean Army, the Korean People's Army (KPA) has four major principles in its military policies: Arm the entire population, fortify the entire country, train the entire army as a unified cadre, and modernize equipment, doctrine, and tactics under the *Juche* ideology. The KPA will continue to follow their operating principles to make the most of its military force.

Most experts believe that North Korea has several nuclear weapons. According to Siegfried Hecker, a scientist, North Korea's estimated capacity includes 4-8 bombs. He stated that the North Koreans insisted that there are already 2,000 centrifuges operating.² Director Park Chang-Kyu of the Agency of Defense Development of the South Korean Defense Ministry said that North Korea has continued to develop nuclear weapons minimization programs, and conducted its second nuclear weapons test for its quality improvement.³ The US Intelligence has also reported that North Korea has 8 to 12 bombs constructed from spent fuel produced at the *Yongbyon* reactor.⁴ Also, according to records from Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, North Korea has some 35kg plutonium stockpiles which will be sufficient to make seven nuclear weapons.⁵ North Korea's biological and chemical weapons are another means for their security. According to South Korea's government report in 2010, North Korea's estimated capacity of chemical weapons is 2,500 to 5000 tons.⁶ Also, North Korea is reported to have biological weapons using anthrax, cholera, smallpox and others. North Korea seems to use their biological weapons as a coercive diplomacy tools.⁷

Strategic and Negotiation Means

North Korea will exercise its strategic and negotiation means to secure its nation. North Korea can use two ways for its negotiations. First, North Korea's representative strategy will be brinkmanship. Brinkmanship is one of the typical methods North Korea has taken dealing with the 1st and 2nd North Korea Nuclear Crisis.⁸ Also, North Korea bargained at the six party talks to get what they want, and used its nuclear and missile tests as their negotiation sticks. Second, North Korea can strategically use their closest allies, China, which can back North Korea up. North Korea's relations with China were specified through "the 1961 Mutual Aid and Cooperation Friendship Treaty". China has taken North Korea's side through its veto

¹ International Institute of Strategic Studies (2010). *The Military Balance 2010*. London: IISS, 411-413.

² *The New York Times*. November 20, 2010.

³ *The Chosun Ilbo*. June 15, 2009.

⁴ *The Times*. November 22, 2010.

⁵ Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (2011). *SIPRI Yearbook 2010*. Stockholm: SIPRI, 365.

⁶ Ministry of National Defense (2013). *Defense White Paper 2012*. Seoul: MND, 30.

⁷ Steven A. Hildreth (2009). North Korean Ballistic Missile Threat to the United States. *CRS Report for Congress*, 25-26.

⁸ Yong Chool Ha and Chaesung Chun (2010). North Korea's Brinkmanship and the Task to Solve the "Nuclear Dilemma". *Asian Perspective*, 34, 21, 87-109.

power in the United Nations Security Council. China lightened the UN Resolutions 1695 and 1718 of year 2006, and 1874 of year 2009. Also China's neutral positions in *Cheonan* and *Yeonpyeongdo* incidents, which demonstrated North Korea's attack on South Korea, show China's favor upon North Korea.

North Korea will continue to keep close relations with China. At the same time, it desires to pursue holding bilateral negotiations with the US to guarantee its absolute security of regime stability and economic aid. North Korea will exercise its strategic diplomatic means of having support from China, using its nuclear weapons card, and further development of other weapons and trade, to receive economic aid from the US. North Korea had series of meetings with the US to get what they want until its missile test in early 2012. It had been reported that North Korea has agreed to suspend nuclear weapons tests, a moratorium on launches of long-range missiles. These are perfect examples to support North Korea's strategic means.

Security at What Cost?

North Korea has put all it had to keep its national security, and used it for its military budget because of the Military First policy. Based on the data from the 1990s to mid 2000s, North Korea increased the absolute volume of military expenditure in order to strengthen its nuclear capacity. However, due to its deteriorating economy, the increase was neither gradual nor consistent.

Table 2. North Korea's Budget for National Defense (2005-2011)

<i>Year</i>	<i>Defense Budget (billion North Korean Won)</i>	<i>Defense Budget/National Budget(%)</i>
2005	-	15.9%
2006	67.1	16.0%
2007	69.2	15.7%
2008	71.3	15.8%
2009	-	15.8%
2010	82.3	15.8%
2011	89.7	15.8%(approx. USD 900M.)

Source: Data collected through release reports of North Korea's yearly budget estimation.

As Table 2 shows, North Korea has been spending 15-16 percent of total budget for the past six to seven years. These numbers also show that North Korea will need to use asymmetric weapons such as nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons in order to compensate for the low budget. A report noted that North Korea has been purchasing high-tech weapons from Russia, China, Austria, Germany and Italy for the past 10 years, and the estimated cost was KRW 510 billion.¹ Moreover, North Korea has imported weapons from Singapore and Hong Kong, even after the UN sanction on trading arms in 2006. A recent report has also indicated that "a reconstruction of missile deliveries based on unclassified, publicly available US government data shows that more than 40 percent of the roughly 1,200 theater ballistic missile systems supplied to the developing world between 1987 and 2009 came from North

¹ *KBS News*. April 8, 2011.

Korea”.¹ In sum, the cost for North Korea’s national security strategy is 15-16percent of national budget and resources saved for asymmetric weapons.

Security in What Timescale?

In general, national security strategies are formulated with short term and long term goals. North Korea’s short term goal is sustaining the current regime. This goal renders North Korea to build national security strategies with immediate response to the current security dynamics. If there is any gain for their national interest, North Korea will just go for it. There is neither need nor time for North Korea to patiently wait because there are factors to consider align with their long term plan. North Korea has a long term goal of self-sustaining and full sovereignty recovering. Yet, it is more important for North Korea to focus on its short term goals.

North Korea seems to understand that the international security dynamics is not in favor of them. North Korea was heavily criticized by the US and Western countries because of their nuclear weapon tests and missile fire attempts. Economic sanctions were imposed to cut the financial funds entering into North Korea. Yet, North Korea carried on its damaging actions. Their actions reached its peak when the *Cheonan* warship and *Yeonpyongdo* attack occurred in 2010. Such actions reflect the urgency of North Korea’s intention on achieving the short term goal. North Korea could have intended to acquire domestic support and smooth leadership transfer by pointing South Korea as a common enemy.

North Korea’s Strategic Moves

According to Baldwin, means, cost, and timescale of the national security strategies are used for policy alternative comparison. Thus, North Korea can make changes and build strategies using their means, cost, and adjustment of timescale in their strategic moves. First, as North Korea puts the principle of fortifying the entire country at the core of its Military First Policy, North Korea will keep building up its military capacity. In addition to strengthening its Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) such as nuclear, biological and chemical weapons, North Korea will utilize conventional weapons to prevent attack from outside powers. Although deterrence fails, North Korea will at least be able to defend its territory. With such preparation, North Korea will be able to stand up under military threat from the outside world including the US and South Korea.

North Korea will also make smart moves with its diplomatic means. North Korea’s possible countermeasure for the US threat could be deterring the US through terminating the ROK-US alliance and rendering the US military forces to withdraw from South Korea. As the US plays a critical role in North Korea’s efforts to achieve its national objectives, cooperation from the US is necessary to accomplish both security and economic goals. North Korea’s strategy, therefore, remains to bring the US to bilateral talks and take advantage of the relations with the US to keep receiving economic aid. North Korea’s national security for domestic threat damaging regime solidarity will be dealt by raising security level of territorial border with China, sending more espionage, and making assassination attempts for the high level government officials defected to South Korea. North Korea will continue on the closed policy of limiting citizens being exposed by the outside world as they will be allured by the outside world which has more food and has a higher quality of living.

¹ Joshua Pollack (2011). Report Ballistic Trajectory, The Evolution of North Korea’s Ballistic Missile Market. *Nonproliferation Review*, 18, 2, 2.

Second, North Korea will continue to invest available financial resources in arms buildup and development for nuclear weapons. Despite the political and economic risk it has to bear due to the isolation from the world, North Korea will maintain its defense budget ratio and will make best efforts to build up its military force by using various resources. According to a report from Strategic Studies Institute, there are three reasons why North Korea desires to possess nuclear weapons for defense purposes.¹ First, Pyongyang's leaders are paranoid. The North Korean elites do not even trust the countries considered amicable such as China and Russia, and very fearful of countries like the US. Second, North Koreans view themselves as the victims of the threat and actual use of destructive weapons. They have a mindset as such since the outbreak of the Korean War. Third, since the war on Iraq, North Korean elites consider possession of nuclear weapons as nations' best insurance policy against United States attack or invasion.

North Korea will also pay the cost for holding a bilateral talk with the US as they believe the first priority for sustaining the regime is to get a guarantee from the US, a country causing the biggest threat to North Korea. To bring the US to the bilateral negotiation table instead of six party talks, North Korea suggested that they, as a country possessing nuclear weapons, plan to discuss problems of transferring their nuclear weapons, development techniques, and weapons of mass destruction to a third nation or terrorist groups.

Third, the timescale for national security. North Korea's national security will be based on short term goals of regime stability as Kim Jong-Un will officially take over both the military and the KWP very soon. The new leader will face challenges such as managing the international threat of US, deteriorated threat perception of North Korea from the outside world, and domestic threat of poverty, weak solidarity, and environmental security.

CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS FOR SOUTH KOREA

Scientific and systematic analysis of this study shows that North Korea will pursue the sustaining of total hegemony of *the Kims* regime with *Juche* ideology, and negotiate with its military and diplomatic strategies for its survival. Above all, as this period, most of North Korea's strategic moves will be based on short term. Under this backdrop, this segment draws implications for South Korea as it needs to make countermeasures in response to North Korea's moves as well. Suggestions are addressed in three parts of military, diplomacy, and politics. These three parts also review the three policy agenda of the South Korean government: Policy towards North Korea, policy for inter-Korean relations, and policy for domestic affairs in preparation for unification.

First, South Korean government should strengthen its military readiness and reaffirm its firm stance on North Korea. South Korean government should make it crystal clear to North Korea that it will not allow any hints or signs of military provocation any more. The new Park Geun-Hye administration also emphasize that the government will not accept any kind of infringement on the national sovereignty and security of South Korea, and provocations of North Korea. Park's response to North Korea's 3rd nuclear test demonstrated her hard stance towards provocations.

South Korean government should build a system that will closely examine North Korea's belligerent moves of military provocations and nuclear tests, and also make concrete efforts

¹ Andrew Scobell and John M. Sanford (2007). North Korea's Military Threat: Pyongyang's Conventional Forces, Weapons of Mass Destruction, and Ballistic Missiles. *Strategic Studies Institute*, 80-82.

in collecting the needed information. Closer cooperation with the US for building sensitive reconnaissance and surveillance system is required. On the other hand, a tight strategic partnership with China is essentially necessary to detect movements related to its possible military attempts to cause further conflicts.

According to the security analysis, North Korea's military is their most powerful leverage stick with substantial strength. Therefore, it seems rational for North Korea to not give up its only negotiation card that works all the time, nuclear weapons. The previous South Korean Lee Myung-Bak government had put denuclearization process as a prerequisite. But such policy was proved to be merely unrealistic. In terms of military arena, instead of directly facing North Korea, the South Korean government should tightly depend on the US in dealing with North Korea's nuclear issue. Intoxicated with recent launched a long-range rocket, Kim Jong-Un will keep going on launching missile and even nuclear weapon tests. South Korea should strengthen alliance with the US, South Korea's most powerful and closest ally, for the denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula.

Second, South Korean government should exercise its diplomatic means to be a mediator between the US and North Korea. The US has been requesting North Korea to completely give up its nuclear weapons and join the six party talks. Meanwhile, North Korea demanded for bilateral negotiations to get full guarantee of its system and leadership before joining the talks. North Korea wants an election-proof contract with the US. As of 2013, North Korea is rejecting to come to the negotiation table which has a precondition of giving up nuclear weapons. The US has not been interested in being back at the bargaining table either after a failure of exchanging food assistance for nuclear and missile freeze deal with North Korea in March 2012. Therefore, South Korea should approach North Korea for dialogues before the US, and function as a mediator between North Korea and the US.

On the other hand, South Korea should put weight on the diplomacy with China, North Korea's closest ally, as much as it does on the US. The above security framework indicates that the diplomatic means of North Korea's national security strategy is close cooperation with China for its political, economical, and international survival. North Korea relies on China for economic subsidies and resource support. North Korea will persuade China that they will later take after China's open economic reform model. South Korea should continue to cooperate with China in bringing North Korea to the table for talks. In this way, South Korea can conduct its diplomatic means with both the US and China to pressure North Korea to join the talks.

Using the diplomatic means will also be useful for the new Park Geun-Hye administration as the government proposed to improve inter-Korean relations through building a trust-based process in the Korean Peninsula. The government desires to build political and military confidence, have more social and economic cooperation, and hold various dialogue channels.

Third, South Korea should continue on its strategic preparation for unification taking a long-term perspective. South Korea's preparation for unification needs a multifaceted approach. The above security analysis shows that massive defectors and loosened domestic control is a domestic threat to North Korea. To weaken North Korea's solidarity, and protect citizens who came into South Korea, the South Korean government should strengthen and expand its policies for the North Korean defectors. The government needs to provide more effective educational programs in addition to basic residential facilities. Government should continue on its policies such as "Job Fair for North Korean Refugees" held by the North Korean Refugees Foundation. Information from the South will go into the families and friends of the

North Korean defectors. More people will try to come out of North Korea and the hearts of the people will start to move and lose trust of the North Korean government.

South Korea government can use China-North Korea border areas for business joint ventures to weaken North Korea's solidarity as well. South Korean government should encourage business people to invest in projects that Chinese companies are dealing with North Korea. North Korea is making business moves to tighten its relationship with China, and this can be a chance for South Korea. If the direct route to do business with in the Korean Peninsula is blocked, an alternative way to get into North Korea is through China. As far as North Korea has contact with the outside world, North Korea's solidarity will be weakened.

In addition, South Korean government should keep on its unification policy with strong determination. The incoming government should conduct the project of building funds for unification with smart operating measures. Funds will be a viable substitute for the unification tax policy proposal which faced massive protest. This will work as a clear sign to all related countries that South Korea is willing to taking the ownership of problems related to the Korean Peninsula and its needed negotiating process. This can be connected with the new Park Geun-Hye administration to first pursue a 'smaller' unification which is based on establishing a South-North Economic community, and ultimately going into a 'bigger' unification which will have very little military confrontation and eventually political integration.¹

REFERANCES

- [1] Kang, S.-J. (2004). *North Korea's Strategy to Build a Strong and Prosperous Country*. Seoul: Hanul Academy.
- [2] Wolfers, A. (1952). National Security as an Ambiguous Symbol. *Political Science Quarterly*, 67, 485.
- [3] Wolfers, A. (1962). *Discord and Collaboration*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, xiv.
- [4] Hans J. M. (1954). *Politics among Nations: the Struggle for Power and Peace*. (2nd ed.). New York: Alfred A. Knopf; Kenneth N. Waltz (1979). *Theory of International Politics*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- [5] Baldwin, D. (1997). The Concept of Security. *Review of International Studies*. 23, 1, 13.
- [6] Schweller, R. (1994). Bandwagoning for Profit and Bringing the Revisionist State Back in. *International Security*, 19, 1, 72-107; Randall Schweller (1996). Neorealism's Status Quo Bias: What Security Dilemma,. *Security Studies*, 5, 3, 90-121.
- [7] Homer T. H.(2003). North Korea's Military Strategy. *Parameters*, 80.
- [8] Kongdan, Oh. & Ralph, C. H. (2000). *North Korea: Through the Looking Glass*. Washington D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 3.
- [9] *The New York Times*. March 13, 2012.

¹ Park Geun-Hye's Presidential Election Pledge (2013). http://www.park2013.com/policy/eyepledge_1.html (accessed on February 22, 2013).

- [10] International Institute of Strategic Studies (2010). *The Military Balance 2010*. London: IISS, 411-413.
- [11] *The New York Times*. November 20, 2010.
- [12] *The Chosun Ilbo*. June 15, 2009.
- [13] *The Times*. November 22, 2010.
- [14] Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (2011). *SIPRI Yearbook 2010*. Stockholm: SIPRI, 365.
- [15] Ministry of National Defense (2013). *Defense White Paper 2012*. Seoul: MND, 30.
- [16] Steven, A. H. (2009). North Korean Ballistic Missile Threat to the United States. *CRS Report for Congress*, 25-26.
- [17] Yong , C. H. & Chun, C. (2010). North Korea's Brinkmanship and the Task to Solve the "Nuclear Dilemma". *Asian Perspective*, 34, 21, 87-109.
- [18] *KBS News*. April 8, 2011.
- [19] Pollack, J. (2011). Report Ballistic Trajectory, The Evolution of North Korea's Ballistic Missile Market. *Nonproliferation Review*, 18, 2, 2.
- [20] Scobell, A. & John, M. Sanford (2007). North Korea's Military Threat: Pyongyang's Conventional Forces, Weapons of Mass Destruction, and Ballistic Missiles. *Strategic Studies Institute*, 80-82.