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Abstract

THE NEXUS BETWEEN U.S. FOREIGN POLICY AND CONFLICT RESOLUTION OR PROTRACTION: THE CASE OF NORTH KOREA

Roland B. Wilson, Ph.D.

George Mason University, 2015

Dissertation Director: Dr. Richard E. Rubenstein

This study analyzes the connection between U.S. foreign policy and its mechanisms for either the resolution or protraction of conflict using the case of North Korea. This case is particularly ripe for resolution\(^1\) with regard to the United States’ recent “Pivot to Asia.”\(^2\) Moreover, now that North Korea is under the new leadership of the young, relatively unknown leader Kim Jong-un, this may be an essential the time to explore and implement alternative methods for ending this conflict. The purpose of this study is to enquire whether combining conflict analysis and resolution (CAR) tools and practices with alternative and dynamic soft foreign policy efforts might play a positive role in resolving this conflict. This study was conducted by analyzing current and historical documents on U.S. foreign policy, studying its desired or stated effects and comparing

---

\(^1\) Ripeness is a concept stating that there are a set of conditions that are appropriate for and support peace initiatives during conflicts (Zartman 1989, 1995; Haass 1990; Coleman 1997).

\(^2\) The “Pivot to Asia” and “Rebalance to Asia” are terms used by the Obama Administration to emphasize the new focus on Asia by the United States (Denyer, 2014; Campbell, 2014)
them to the known actual effects on the North Korean regime and its people. To help understand these effects, this study also sought the unique foreign policy perspectives, opinions, needs and desires of former North Korea refugees. The significance of this is in understanding and evaluating where CAR opportunities surface by promoting the participation of stakeholders as catalysts for change³ from the group of people directly affected by foreign policy: North Koreans themselves.⁴ The findings show that the U.S. foreign policy approach towards North Korea has not significantly evolved over the past 60 years. Moreover, even those North Koreans interviewed who steadfastly support a continued U.S. hard policy approach toward their former homeland conceded that positive change would also require alternative approaches that promote direct and indirect high quality contact. The findings also show even in a controlled interview environment, North Korean Refugees can change how they think, interact, and receive information, based on direct HQC and the positive repositioning of self and other. Many also had sustained contact with their loved ones still living in the North, and provide them with aid. Most North Koreans interviewed had received indirect and or direct information about the outside world when they had lived in North Korea including such things as listening to radio, watching movies or drama and receiving aid, which had a positive effect on them. While most North Koreans (still in the north) do not believe in religion, it can be an effective tool for change. The regime has continued for so long due to the structural violence and deprivation it has over society. Finally, local markets in North

³ John Paul Lederach refers to this as the critical yeast, which is the “who” that can ignite and sustain the change in a conflict (Lederach, 2010, p. 87). For this PSC, we must use the full potential of North Koreans to be the “who” of this conflict in helping to resolve it.

⁴ This is also referred to as “people or peopling,” which means to get citizens and CAR practitioners involved with the process of FP discussions, developments, implementations and decisions.
Korea play a key role in changing the lives of North Koreans and that North Korean diaspora can help change North Korea. The analysis provides innovative conflict resolution methods and offers potential tools and recommendations for a multi-dimensional foreign policy approach, which may affect and alter foreign policy discussions and decisions. This study, the results and recommendations are intended to be an initial step toward rethinking U.S. foreign policy for purposes of “provention.”

5 A term coined by Conflict Resolution Scholar John Burton to emphasize that traditional approaches used by decision makers can cause or exacerbate conflict; and to avoid the negative connotations associated with the term, “prevention.” For more on this, see John Burton’s book titled, Conflict: resolution and prevention (1990).
Chapter 1: Overview

Introduction

During my 28-plus years of U.S. military and government service as an Asianist, subject matter expert, and a senior intelligence, geopolitical, military and foreign policy analyst, I have increasingly been drawn to and interested in East Asia, particularly the Korean Peninsula.

In fact, I have spent the majority of my adult life, well over 20 years, working and living in the Asian-Pacific Region, specifically in the Republic of Korea (South Korea) and Japan. There I was introduced to international culture, language, history, foreign policy, Cold War politics, protracted conflicts and humanitarian issues. I have also authored lengthy classified policy papers and intelligence reports based on various government, academic, and independent sources while interacting with numerous South Korean civilian, government, and military officials. In short, I have seen first-hand how the actions we take or do not take, as Americans and as a nation, directly affect and influence allies and adversaries, our regional and global relationships, and conflicts around the world.

This is particularly true of our efforts to coordinate and make intelligent and well-informed foreign policy decisions relative to the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea (North Korea). More importantly, through this experience, I have come to the realization
that foreign policy decisions made only by the elite risk continuous failure.  

6 This class of elite can be defined as those in the top level of our society based on family, education, income, prior association, and political allegiance. Increasingly, as we see in U.S. society, the political system allows this “unrepresentative national coterie”7 to be selected, who then make and control foreign policy decisions regardless of their expertise or experience (Wittkopf, Jones, & Kegley, 2007, pp. 284–292; Rosati & Scott, 2010, pp. 446–462; Rosati & Scott, 2013). Therefore, decisions are not necessarily being made based on first-hand, up-to-date information, yet remain flexible enough to allow modifications to meet the best interests of all parties concerned. Moreover, these decisions and actions are not necessarily taking into consideration the historical, cultural geopolitical and ideological differences of the nations involved.

In the CAR field, it is widely recognized that conflicts are an inevitable social phenomenon that have been with humankind throughout history (Bercovitch, Kremenyuk, & Zartman, 2008). CAR also recognizes that conflicts can be either constructive and expressed nonviolently or destructive and expressed violently (Ramsbotham, 2010). Furthermore, conflicts can normally exist anywhere from individual, group, regional, state, and international levels of society; and they can range anywhere from intrapersonal to global in nature (Grant & Kirton, 2007, p. 221). Attempts to analyze and resolve conflicts at only one level, such as the state or elite level, risk further escalation and protraction.

6 By elite, I mean the top-level management or small minority, which includes the socioeconomic or social strata of society that make the decisions. This elite theory is also the opposite of pluralism (Higley, 2010).  

7 This means a small exclusive group of people with shared interests or tastes.
Because of these diverse issues, CAR practitioners seek to dynamically and holistically analyze and resolve conflicts at multiple levels throughout all stages of the conflict. For CAR efforts to be successful, those involved in resolving conflict should, over an extended period of time, use multiple dynamic efforts that are both well informed and integrated at all levels of society, and that involve all stakeholders from local grassroots level to the elite. I believe these CAR qualities, practices, and tools have the greatest potential to help inform and assist both the creation and execution of foreign policies, and to address the conflicts that arise or are exacerbated by them.

Although the United States and South Korea have remained close allies since the end of World War II, the United States seems to have underutilized the geopolitical, historical, cultural, diplomatic and CAR-centered methods, skills, and tools that could help transform relations regarding the conflict on the Korean Peninsula, and more specifically, America’s conflict with North Korea. The lack of any significant adjustments in U.S. foreign policy or in developing innovative ideas when it comes to resolving the conflict with North Korea exemplifies the issue. As a result, I will argue that the conflict with North Korea has created a deeper protraction and division. Remnants of the Cold War continue to take a toll in terms of the lives lost and families divided in a once great and unified Korean nation.

Therefore, we should look at new ways to consider and analyze the foreign policies that affect this conflict. In particular, we should attempt to use conflict analysis and resolution-centered methods, skills, and tools that operate on a different
understanding of social change and power, and that integrate multilevel approaches, such as problem-solving workshops and people-to-people dialogues, exchanges, and engagements, to help achieve positive change, transformation, and resolution in this and other conflicts.

In foreign policy, power can be defined as “getting people or groups to do something that they don’t want to do” or as ‘the ability to get others to act in ways that are contrary to their initial preferences and strategies (Nye, 2011a, p. 11). In addition, hard power consists of methods of coercion and payment, which include threats, and the use of force (Nye, 2009).⁸ Therefore, in foreign policy, when power is used almost exclusively in this way, it is difficult to see productive international relations come of it.

However, when foreign policy and conflicts are seen through a CAR lens as opposed to primarily a realist view of international relations and hard power centric lens, an entirely new field of possibilities emerges, as CAR scholars and practitioners operate with differing and holistic visions and values, taking into consideration all stakeholders, from grassroots to the elite.

Research Hypothesis

During the latter days of my government career and continuing here recently with the research for this dissertation topic, I realized that there might be some systemic problems with our foreign policy that could be leading to more conflict instead of helping

---

⁸ For more on power, see chapter 4.
to prevent or resolve conflict. The research for this dissertation inspired a testable hypothesis:

The current U.S. foreign policy toward North Korea is not producing the desired results, and in fact, seems to be exacerbating and protracting the conflict. The possible reasons for this are: 1) U.S. foreign policy has been superseded by a post-colonial mindset based largely on hard power that promotes state interaction perceived to be focused almost exclusively on self-interests; 2) the United States does not interact at a “state-to-state” level with most smaller states that it believes can either be molded or ignored through economic and military incentives, threats or force, coercion and/or isolationism; thereby displaying what some have referred to as an imperialistic position based on Super Power status.

**Justification for Study**

There are many knowledgeable regional and foreign policy experts in the United States and abroad. There are also increasingly more academics, scholars, practitioners and authors trained in the skills of conflict analysis and resolution (CAR). However, despite the best efforts of these experts, there appears to be few concerted efforts to identify the reasons this protracted conflict continues; the real gaps between the desired effects of foreign policies and the actual outcomes or effects of those policies on conflicts around the world are evident. Thus, our current foreign policies and actions could be termed *preventive* foreign policies, which tend to deal more with restraint, coercion, threat, and control, rather than “*proventive* foreign policies,” which look at innovative ways to anticipate issues and get to the sources of potential friction or conflicts while
Applying preventive policies could help shift the current one-dimensional paradigm and possibly create new CAR-centered visions, tools, and methods that can be used in our foreign policy efforts, and to help resolve complex protracted conflicts.

CAR is a transformative, holistic, dynamic and hybrid field made up of many other academic disciplines; it seeks, among other things, to understand and resolve the underlying causes of conflict; to ease human suffering, reduce and end violence; and to work toward positive peace from the local to global levels. Due to this multi-disciplined and dynamic hybridity, there are many CAR academics, scholars, practitioners, and authors who have worked on and written at the juncture between the study of diplomacy, foreign policy, international relations, and the study of conflict resolution, and they have widely spoken from a CAR perspective.

The following are some of the major academics, scholars, practitioners and authors who have written on international relations, foreign policy and conflict resolution.

Career diplomat John Burton, as well as Johan Galtung and Dietrich Fischer, have expressed deep concern regarding systems and structures, state and state power, and national interests, specifically in light of their leaving foreign policy and diplomacy decisions in the hands of the government and its advisors. Therefore they see little positive conflict resolution or positive peace coming from foreign policy and formal

---

9 Here, I use the word “preventive and proventive” after the writings of John Burton in his book titled, Conflict: resolution and provention (1990).

10 By hybridity, it is meant using a combination of methods, theories and approaches.

Fellow diplomats Joseph Montville and John W. McDonald have written about the need for a type of Citizens Diplomacy and Track 2 diplomacy (Montville 1991; Solomon et al. 2010; McDonald and Bendahmane 1995; Kriesberg and Thorson 1991; Crocker, Hampson, and Aall 1996).\(^{11} \quad ^{12}\) Montville first used the term Track 2 more than 30 years ago, which “grew out of the observation that private individuals, meeting unofficially, can find their way to common ground that official negotiators can’t. Put bluntly, ‘citizens could take some action rather than simply being bystanders while the grown-up governments acted like jerks’” (IBID; Volkan, Montville, & Julius, 1991; Homans, 2011).

Due in part to the pessimism over Track 1 diplomacy and his work in the State Department, McDonald began to write extensively on the need for Track 2 or Citizens Diplomacy. “This is person to person, small group to small group, it’s dynamic, it’s risk-taking, it’s imaginative, it gets things done that governments are either afraid to do or don’t want to have to do” (2006; 2005). Later, he expanded the tracks of diplomacy into multi-track system consisting of eight unique tracks, which he referred to as “a systems approach to peace” (Diamond & McDonald, 1996b; J. L. Davies & Kaufman, 2003).

Diplomat Harold Saunders applied his more than two decades of experience to create two frameworks consisting of five elements and five stages that emphasize the

\(^{11}\) There are several tracks of diplomacy used by the state, systems and individuals. For more on tracks of diplomacy, see chapter 4, Tools and Execution of Foreign Policy.

\(^{12}\) Tracks of diplomacy can be spelled out such as “Track One” or used in conjunction with numbers “Track 1” and can either be capitalized or not. For the purpose of this paper and consistency, the author has chosen to capitalize “Track” and use a number designation with it.)
need for sustained dialogue. Understanding this dialogue framework is necessary for people to continue to return to discussions over extended periods and focus on “transforming and building relationships” so that all participants may effectively deal with the problems, issues and concerns (Saunders 1985; 2001; 2005; 2011, pp. 24–26; Lederach & Saunders, 1999).

Other CAR scholars such as William Zartman and J. Lewis Rasumussen address foreign policy and diplomacy when writing about such things as negotiation, ripeness, hurting stalemates, and the need for education in conflict resolution and peace studies (Zartman and Rasmussen 1997; Zartman 2007). Marc Gopin’s broad work, specifically in the Middle East, has largely focused on “citizens’ diplomacy,” faith diplomacy, interfaith dialogue, and peace building, and what he, along with some others, have referred to as “Track 1.5 diplomacy” (Gopin 2009, 2012).

Joseph Nye, a renowned international relations (IR) scholar, has written extensively on public diplomacy and the use of power, which includes CAR concepts, methods and tools. Power can be defined as the ability to affect or change the behavior of others in order to obtain a goal. This can be at the personal level all the way up to the state level. To do this, three types of power can be used: hard power, consisting of methods of coercion and payment; soft power, consisting of methods of attraction; or smart power, consisting of a strategy that combines hard and soft power (Nye, 2009). Nye argues that soft power is as important as hard power in international relations, and that preventing conflicts is also guided by such things as the states’ institutions for conflict resolution (Nye 2004, 2005, 2011).
Additional liberal IR scholars such as G. John Ikenberry and David Baldwin, have written what they have called U.S. imperial military ambitions, and liberal institutionalism, an arousing and arguable statement questioning U.S. preeminence and the need to use cooperation and Soft Power to work through diplomacy issues (Ikenberry and Nye 2004; Baldwin 1993; Parker 2013).

Michael S. Lund writes that effective preventive diplomacy, which includes Track 2, third-party involvement, and grassroots dialogue, may even prevent conflicts from becoming intractable (Lund 1995, 1996). Also, the United Nations refers to preventive diplomacy as “an enduring idea” and “integral part of broader conflict prevention efforts…to prevent disputes from arising between parties, to prevent existing disputes from escalating into conflicts and to limit the spread of the latter when they occur” (UN Staff, 2013, p. 2). Recently, we even hear the term preventive diplomacy in foreign affairs circles being used in ever-increasing discussions over the South China Sea disputes (Snyder, 2009). Finally, CAR theorists like Roger Mac Ginty and Oliver Richmond argue that we must have new perspectives on, and move beyond, just liberal peacebuilding by using such things as hybridity and hybridization to help resolve various conflicts (Mac Ginty 2010; Paris, Newman, and Richmond 2009).

Like many CAR academics, scholars, diplomats, practitioners and authors, I believe that the study of international relations, foreign affairs, and peace and security is also the study of foreign policy and diplomacy. Therefore, these disciplines are an important part of the field of conflict analysis and resolution. Thus, following in the

---

13 Liberal Institutionalism is defined as a world order characterized by the post-World War II preeminence of the United States, but the viability of this system is in question.
tradition of these well-known scholars, theorists and practitioners, this study hopes to advance the idea that CAR can help inform and assist all levels of foreign policy, has and have a direct impact on many conflicts around the world.

Contribution to CAR

There are already substantial amounts of literature written at the intersection of foreign policy, international relations and CAR. This research hopes to advance the current literature while providing new CAR-centered dynamic and hybrid ideas on how our field can positively inform and affect the creation and implementation of foreign policies and their related discussions and actions. It also helps provide practical choices to our decision-makers on foreign policy, which would then feed directly back into CAR by highlighting what CAR can do for and in support of foreign policy and conflict efforts when combined with other unique and diverse diplomacy tools.

Protracted conflicts exacerbated by such issues as poor or stagnated foreign policy and misunderstandings between states will most likely be prominent in this field well into the next decade. By writing on this subject, I hope to help drive future discussion, research, and practice on this connection. Finally, by fully identifying and examining the desired and actual impact of U.S. foreign policy on the North Korean regime and its citizens, key recommendations have been made that may help lead to more flexible and effective approaches and new proventive foreign policy decisions on North Korea, which may have applications for other countries and conflicts.
Methodology and Analytical Scope

For this study, I used a qualitative method design that focused on current and historical document research and semi-structured interviews. This allowed me to collect and analyze important data on a single-explanatory case study—North Korea (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003). Qualitative research is used to explore, understand, and inquire about such things as the “meanings of individuals or groups ascribed to social or human problems” (Creswell 2002, 4; Creswell 2006, 15).\(^{14}\) I believe this qualitative approach of analyzing historical data and semi-structured interview was the best lens for my research as it helped obtain “data bearing on cause-effect relationships” that can help inform my practice and recommendations (Yin, 2008, p. 5).

The research was conducted in three phases. The first phase focused on current and historical documents collection and qualitative content analysis in order to understand what the U.S. government, media, and academia claim to be the causes of this protracted conflict and to determine the basis of the U.S. foreign policy toward North Korea. The literature that was reviewed included formal studies on the conflict, academic reports, NGO reports, journal articles, major news articles, blogs, think tank reports, historical reports, books, and government reports. It also included any “gray

\(^{14}\) It also helps the researcher to develop a complex, holistic picture, analyze words, reports and detailed views of informants, and to conduct the study in a natural setting. Furthermore, qualitative research can also be used to explore and test theories.
literature,” which consists of unpublished or rare studies, and studies published outside widely available journals and newspapers.¹⁵

The second phase consisted of semi-structured interviews with former refugees from North Korea designed to seek their unique perspectives and opinions in a direct high quality contact (HQC) environment. Often, U.S. foreign policy and “Track 1” negotiation decisions are made at the top or elite levels of society without taking into consideration, or asking what may be needed or desired by, those most affected by the results—the grassroots stakeholders on the ground—the North Koreans (Busby, Monten, Tama, Smeltz, & Kafura, 2015). Interviewing North Korean refugees provided me with a unique and seminal proof-of-concept for the need to advance various soft power and conflict initiatives through the repositioning and mutual recognition that comes with HQC,¹⁶ which helps drive my recommended interventions. The interviews further helped determine the extent to which, if at all, the findings from the first phase along with the desired foreign policy effects reflected the actual effects, understandings, and desires of this unique group. The significance of this approach was in understanding and evaluating where CAR opportunities exist by promoting the participation of stakeholders from the group of people directly affected by foreign policy.

In practical terms, it was necessary to assess the sense of the conditions on the ground and to determine where the opportunities are for implementing new approaches

---

¹⁵ Gray literature is more difficult to obtain, but has the potential to bring in new views and idea (Conn, Valentine, Cooper, & Rantz, 2003; Shannon & Lauseng, 2013).

¹⁶ Many scholars have interviewed North Korean refugees for a variety of reasons, but no literature has been found on scholars interviewing this group for the purpose of understanding why this conflict remains protracted or how foreign policy affects them.
that this study hoped to find. Moreover, these interviews helped in identifying what type of high-, mid-, and grassroots-level leadership positions and organizations (local government leaders, church groups, civic organizations, NGOs and diaspora), could be supportive of new approaches and processes in our foreign policy and CAR efforts. Finally, these interviews helped examine, identify and ascertain the most culturally appropriate ways to conduct CAR-focused and Soft power activities with North Korea. Thus, understanding North Koreans’ potential as catalyzers for change, helped to highlight unique insights, ideas and CAR-centered tools that offer the potential to transform and ameliorate or settle grievances in this protracted conflict, while possibly affecting and altering foreign policy discussions and decisions.

The final phase was to conduct a comprehensive qualitative content analysis of all the data in order to discover the major themes directly pertaining to my hypothesis. This process helped drive my final research findings, CAR-centered practices, and key recommendations to those concerned with foreign policy and conflict analysis resolution.

More details on the research methodology and the study timetable are found in chapter three.

**Results of Research and Hypothesis**

Based on my professional background, travels, and initial research, I hypothesized this research would show that U.S. foreign policy in North Korea has been superseded by what some have referred to as a post-colonial imperialistic mindset that has remained myopic and one-dimensional, and based almost entirely on hard power (Bower, 2010)
(Engelhardt, 2011). It would also show that the United States has continued to promote state interaction focused solely on self-interests, and not the interests of others in the region, including its allies. In addition, I hypothesized my research would show that the United States does not interact at a “state-to-state” level with most smaller states that it believes can either be molded or ignored through hard-centered foreign policy tools such as economic and military incentives, coercion, threats or force, and/or isolationism.

The results of this research will further attempt to show that due to continued autistic hostility between the parties in conflict, the United States has resisted repositioning itself and has continued to under-invest in soft power tools, such as meaningful direct and indirect HQC. By autistic hostility, I mean that the initial state of the conflict has protected itself from change by reducing meaningful communication when direct and indirect contact takes place, which also prevents positive repositioning of self and other.

There is a theme throughout this study that the U.S. policy as currently conceived and implemented has made the conflict with North Korea more protracted and worse. However, this is not something that I will seek to prove. Instead, what I hope to present are suggested policy measures that have a good chance of being more effective. This will be done in Chapters 7-10.

Positioning aims to analyze social interaction over time, based on structures of meaning, and “in accordance to local rules, conventions, and customs of correct conduct”

---

17 The idea of autistic hostility in individual and group inter-personal relationships was first hypothesized by Theodore M. Newcomb in his article, “Autistic Hostility and Social Reality” (1947).
Repositioning reflects changes in social interaction when the position in the relationship changes. In addition, as the conflict became exacerbated, the parties in the conflict essentially broke off all remaining attempts at meaningful communication and contact, and constructed further barriers that reinforce their contrasting frames of reference making positive repositioning more difficult to achieve and further protracting the conflict (Rubin & Brown, 2013, p. 93; Thibaut & Kelley, 1969, p. 72).

HQC can only be fully embraced through open communication, mutual respect, and the repositioning of self and other (changing individuals’ frames of reference). In other words, the discursive positioning of both parties, which has stymied meaningful two-way communication and further polarized the conflict, should be shifted for change to occur and positive social interaction to take place. Ironically, autistic hostility and discursive positioning have also extremely limited the change makers’ ability to engage those most affected by the conflict, the North Koreans. Engagement is needed in order to more fully understand the North Koreans’ thoughts on FP and why this conflict remains intractable, and to explore new ways to resolve it. Thus, interviewing North Koreans provided me a rare opportunity to understand their thoughts on the conflict and ask what types of HQC may have affected their perceptions of the outside world, and provided a mechanism to test repositioning and HQC in an interview environment.

Therefore, as the results will hope to show, a more comprehensive and balanced foreign policy that looks at and considers international issues that are important to all

---

18 For more on positioning theory, see chapter 2.
stakeholders while using alternative and diverse ways to resolve the conflict is more likely to succeed. This includes changing individuals’ frames of reference and initiating meaningful and full two-way quality communication (both face-to-face and through indirect efforts such as media). These changes may work best if made in conjunction with a complex multi-dimensional foreign policy using CAR centric tools. The tools that work at all levels of society from grassroots to elite over an extended period of time, which should prove more likely to effectively evoke sustained change on all sides.

**Theoretical Framework**

This research sought to identify a connection between positioning and contact theory, in that the position and types of contact one country has or does not have with another may directly affect its foreign policy, international relations, perceptions and abilities to resolve complex relations and conflicts. Furthermore, autistic hostility between parties may prevent one’s position from changing, which mutes productive discourse and reinforces initial structure, thereby inhibiting further quality contact. Although not exhaustive, I believe that this is the first research conducted in this area for conflict resolution scholars.

**Study Significance**

The results of this study, could be used by those interested in understanding, challenging and informing U.S. policy makers on foreign policy, and could directly impact the resolution of many protracted conflicts and state-to-state relations. It is hoped
that the findings from this study might also help provide new, dynamic, and holistic methods and tools for use in state-to-state relations and in the resolution of conflicts.

**Study Delimitations**

Perhaps the most noticeable delimitation of this study was that the North Korean interviewees were former refugees who are now living in South Korea as new South Korean citizens. Since the operational environment did not allow the researcher to freely ask questions in North Korea, this group of participants was chosen over others realizing that former refugees and diaspora would typically have stronger views than others.

However, there have recently been questions raised about the authenticity of stories told by North Korea refugees living in South Korea (Anna, 2015; Kwon & Kwon, 2015; Power, 2014).

Beyond these questions and the possibility that some may have altered their stories, this does not mean many of the stories are not valid or true, at least from a psychological standpoint. Many psychotherapists have written that it is not uncommon for the stories of those who have been victims of rape, trauma, or other forms of abuse to evolve and change over time based on repressed and suppressed memories (Kulikowski, 2013; Kammerer & Mazelis, 2006). Some stories may even change due to shared memories and discussions that take place, or through suggestion or implantation of memories (Loftus, 1996; Lucid, 2015).

At other times, stories may change due to memory distortion, false or confabulated memories, which can indicate interpersonal trauma, Post-Traumatic Stress
Disorder (PTSD), or other dissociative disorders (Terr, 1992; J. Herman, 1997). Confabulation is a reconstructive process that occurs without the conscious intent to deceive others (Fotopoulou, Conway, & Solms, 2007; Schacter, 1997, p. 226). It can be spontaneous or provoked and both verbal and behavioral (Kopelman, 1987; Kassin & Kiechel, 1996; Gilboa et al., 2006). In addition, these often conflated or changing stories can be attributed to such things as tangled, imagined, or fantasized memories and material, to even a willful misrepresentation and lying to gain notoriety (Terr, 1992).

Some may change their stories to emphasize the abuse or for financial gain. Finally, there is a strong possibility that a cultural element might induce the conflation and evolution of stories told by victims of trauma. Although most trauma victims tend to avoid fame, others may look for notoriety based on specific archetypal, historical, and cultural traits. In addition to history and culture, there may be a linguistic element as to why stories change and how some languages may include exaggeration to provide more meaning to the discourse and maximize the emotional component of the experience. Moreover, with notoriety and monetary gain comes a form of social power, position, acceptance, and attention that could be therapeutic for the victim. Regardless, self-inflation and forms of narcissism can be powerful coping mechanisms for those experiencing pain, shame, indignation, and mortification.

Although much more research is needed on how North Koreans and others remember, deal with, and talk about trauma, I believe that this does not affect the validity of study. None of those interviewed for this study were well-known to the media or were
receiving compensation, despite their often horrific and detailed stories. In addition, due to my experience in dealing with this group of participants in my former job, I felt gaining access to this group in South Korea would be the best-balanced choice. Being able to directly observe and interview North Koreans in North Korea would have benefited the study. Regrettably, these observations and interviews are not currently possible.

**Study Limitations**

Because part of this study dealt with the participants’ thoughts, ideas, and perspectives after they left North Korea, it stands to reason that a different set of participants may have yielded entirely different results. For this reason, the findings are limited to this specific study. However, the process and recommendations may be able to be adapted for other countries, purposes and conflicts. In addition, detailed information on what U.S. foreign policy is, or is intended to be, and what this policy is intended to accomplish, may be limited due the lack of U.S. government transparency.

In this chapter, I have argued the need to look at how we use foreign policy from a CAR-centered position when it comes to the protracted conflict with North Korea. I have also posited that positioning and contact theories are both directly related to the tools we use, or do not use, in our state-to-state relationships, and to peacefully deal with conflicts. Finally, I have attempted to show the justification and need for this research, and the overall contribution that I hope to make to the CAR field.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

Geographical and Historical Related Literature and Overview

In order to better understand any conflict, it helps if both the researcher and reader first have a geographical and historical foundation of the countries involved in conflict and the possible reasons the conflict is protracted.

Geography

The Korean Peninsula is located in East Asia west of Japan, and extends south of China and Russia from the main part of the Asian continent. The entire peninsula is approximately 85,000 square miles with more than 5,000 miles of coastline. The peninsula is surrounded by water on three sides, with five major bodies of water including the East Sea (Sea of Japan), the Yellow Sea, the Korea Strait, the Cheju Strait, and Korea Bay (Briney, 2010).

There are well over 3,000 islands surrounding the peninsula. In addition, about 70 percent of the Korean Peninsula is covered by mountains; the highest peak, Mount Baekdu, is on the North Korea/China border. Most of its mineral wealth is located on the northern half of the peninsula, while most of the usable farmland is located on the southern half of the peninsula. North and South Korea share a common language and writing system. Separately, South Korea is approximately the size of Indiana and has
population of about 50 million people in nine provinces. North Korea is about the size of Michigan and has a population of about 25 million people, also in nine provinces

(Library of Congress, 2009). A map of the Korean Peninsula is provided below:19

---

Figure 1: Map of Korean Peninsula

19 Map is provided courtesy of Library of Congress (Library of Congress, 2014).
Early History

Paleolithic excavations show that humans have inhabited the Korean Peninsula for about 500,000 years. Around 7,000 to 8,000 years ago, Neolithic humans also inhabited the area, leaving behind pottery and stone tools. Around 2000 B.C., a new pottery culture spread into the peninsula from China. By the fourth century B.C., there were a number of walled-town city-states in Korea. One historical site, known as Old Chosŏn, was located in what today is the southern part of northeastern China and northwestern Korea. The Old Chosŏn civilization was based on bronze culture and consisted of a political federation of fortified cities. The boundary formed by the Amnok (Yalu) and Tuman rivers has been recognized for centuries as Korea’s northern limit. However, this was not always the case. In the past, Korea’s territory and population ranged far beyond this border into northeastern China and Siberia, where sizable Korean minorities still live in the 21st century (Seth, 2006; 2010).

The recorded history of Korea (both North and South) goes back to about 57 B.C. (B.C.E.), and from that point to 668 A.D., Korea was ruled by the Three Kingdoms of Silla, Goguryeo, and Baekje (C. H.-J. Lee, 2012). Throughout the early history of Korea, various alliances formed either with or against China, which was the most dominant country directly to the North (IBID, p. 27). In 660 A.D., the Silla rulers allied their forces with forces from T'ang China in order to defeat both the Baekje Kingdom in the southwestern part of Korea, which fell that year, and the Goguryeo Kingdom in the northern part of Korea, which finally fell in 668 A.D. (W. Kim 1960; Lueras and Chung 1992). From 668 - 935 A.D., the new unified Silla Kingdom led the cultural
development of Korea, and further divided the Korean society into distinct classes wherein a large semi-slave population supported an aristocratic minority class.

Eventually, the unified Silla Kingdom weakened under internal strife, and surrendered to a rising Goryeo Kingdom in 935 (Ipb Usa, 2005). From about 918 – 1392 was the Goryeo period, but like the Silla Kingdom that proceeded it, Goryeo period was marked with internal strife, foreign threats, and even occupation, most notably from the Mongols who had taken over China and ruled Korea for about 100 years (Seth 2006; 2010). The Chosŏn Kingdom was not only the last of the kingdoms, but also Korea's longest-ruling dynasty lasting from about 1392 up until 1910 when the Japanese forcefully occupied and annexed Korea (C.-Y. Shin & Stringer, 2005).20 It was also during this period, that Korea adopted Confucianism as its set of ethical norms, replacing Buddhism, from which it took much wealth and power.

Modern History

The Korean Peninsula has a turbulent history of encroachment; many conflicts were fought in or near the country. Korea’s strategic location in East Asia afforded great land and water access to the continent of Asia along with several deep-water ports that could be used by states for trade or war. This key location, including its surrounding waters, was the site of many wars and naval battles. The Chinese, Manchus, Mongols, and the Japanese each invaded the region, with the latter known as the Imjin War (1592–98). The Imjin War is most notable, as it is where Korean Admiral Yi Sun Sin used iron clad “turtle ships” to defeat the Japanese navy (Perez 2013; Palais 1996; Stueck 1997, 13).

20 The Chosŏn Kingdom was also called the Yi Dynasty after the founder of the kingdom.
After this, Korea found itself in the midst of two other predominantly naval wars: the Sino-Japanese War of 1894 - 1895, which Japan won; and the final war, the Russo-Japanese War of 1904 - 1905, which Japan also won, gaining increased power and influence over Korea (Blank 1995; Paine 2005; Ivanov 2012).

During this time period, the United States, led by President Theodore Roosevelt, was also trying to more forcefully expand its trade and colonial dominance into East Asia, and Japan’s victory over Russia allowed for a policy deal to be reached between Washington and Tokyo. This deal, known as the secret “Taft-Katsura Agreement of 1905,” gave Japan recognition and dominance over Korea and gave the U.S. recognition and dominance over the Philippines. This secret deal also sealed the fate of Korea by allowing Japan the ability and freedom to move onto the Korean Peninsula (Yi 1984; Schmid 2000; Spingola 2012). To complete its dominance over Korea, Japan forced Korea to sign the Japan-Korea Protection Treaty of 1905 (also known as the Eulsa Treaty), which gave Japan virtual complete control over Korea; in 1910, the Japanese officially annexed Korea (Lone, 1991).

From about 1910 until the end of World War II, a period of more than 35 years, Korea was forcibly and violently occupied by the Japanese. Japan stripped Korea of most of its natural resources and wealth, forced men into the military to fight and women as young as 11 to work as “comfort women” (sex slaves) for the Japanese Imperial Army (C. K. Armstrong 2013; P. Armstrong 2013). These issues did not start at the start of
World War II, but soon after the Japanese annexed Korea to help with Japan’s military expansionism in Mongolia, Manchuria, and other places (C. K. Armstrong, 2006, p. 19).

It is also recognized that for the 35 years of occupation, Japan modernized Korea by vastly improving the road, rail and other infrastructure, by building hospitals, and by establishing heavy industry, primarily in the northern half of the Peninsula (Editorial, 2010). However, these efforts were primarily aimed at helping with their totalitarian rule, and fulfilling their own economic and security goals, such as manufacturing products for the Japanese market, supplying its army with the raw material and food staples needed for the war effort, and for other economic benefits of the Japanese homeland. During this period, the Japanese also tried to erase Korea’s ethnic identity, history and culture (Kim 1979, 2; Robinson and Shin 2001; Ko and Huang 2010).

At the end of World War II, Korea was liberated from the Japanese. However, in a series of quick barters and divisions, the Korean Peninsula was divided into two parts with Russia occupying the north and the United States occupying the south, with both sides agreeing in theory to open free elections by 1948 (Johnson, 2010). The combined free election for the entire peninsula did not happen; the United States, with United Nations approval, held elections in the south. The Soviet Union responded by allegedly holding separate elections in the north (Cumings 2005; Cumings 2010; Pritchard 2010).

This act officially divided the Korean Peninsula into two separate countries. The north, a communist state ruled by a dictator named Kim Il-Sung, and supported by the Soviet Union and China; and the south, a fledgling semi-democratic state ruled by a
leader named Syngman Rhee, which some believe was not much better than a dictator, but was supported by the United States and the west.\(^{21}\) Thus, this division greatly exacerbated tension on the Korean Peninsula and pushed it toward the first open conflict of the Cold War period. The colonial and ideological bartering by the United States and subsequent Cold War division mentioned above are important issues that will be discussed further.

**Introduction to the Modern Protracted Social Conflict in Korea**

Long before the Korean War erupted, there were already some ideological differences between the Koreans living in the northern half of the peninsula and those living in the south. In the 1800s and 1900s, the Yangban class,\(^{22}\) who lived mostly in and around Seoul on the southern half of the peninsula, greatly discriminated against the Koreans living in the Pyongyang area in the north. In addition, once the Japanese began to occupy Korea, many Koreans in the Southern half of the peninsula, at the least, passively tolerated and in some cases implicitly assisted the Japanese, while adopting many Western traits.

Meanwhile, many in the North more violently resisted the occupation and began to work with the Communist Chinese, taking on more Communist traits. This rift of more Western-leaning Koreans in the South and more Communist-leaning Koreans in the

\(^{21}\) The term semi-democracy has variations in meaning, but normally applies to a state that still has reaming authoritarian qualities and which lacks some democratic freedoms. This type of state has become prevalent in Asia after the end of World War II (Zakaria 1997, 27; Levitsky and Way 2002, 52; Mundt 2013, 9).

\(^{22}\) These were high officials and their descendants. For more, see Dr. Philip Jaisohn's Reform Movement, 1896-1898: A Critical Appraisal of the Independence Club (O, 1995).
North was greatly exacerbated by the United States and Russia’s forceful division of the Korean Peninsula.

In June 1950, North Korea, tacitly supported by the Former Soviet Union and China, launched what has widely been reported as a surprise attack against the south. However, there are also conflicting reports by many historians such as Bruce Cuming that South Korean President Rhee provoked various border clashes and wanted war with the north, which may have eventually pushed North Korea to attack (Cumings, 2010c; Edwards, 2000, p. 48; Schulzinger, 2008, p. 279). There are also reports by other historians that North Korea conspired with Russia and China in order to plan, prepare and execute the war against the south (Boose & Matray, 2014; C.-J. Lee & Park, 1996).

Regardless of what party may have initiated or instigated the war, the United States and UN responded on the side of South Korea. Then, on 27 July 1953, after three turbulent years of fierce fighting and more than three million deaths, the war finally stopped (without resolution) when the two sides signed an armistice agreement (Matray 2005; Stueck 2002). At that time, there was an understanding that a final peace agreement would soon follow (Wilma, 2001). However, this did not happen.

Regrettably, those who negotiate peace often seem to focus too much on halting violence and not enough on settling the dispute; in this case, the non-resolution resulted in what Johan Galtung referred to as negative peace and the protraction of the conflict (1964). Instead of striving for positive peace, which is the integration of human society (Hewitt, Wilkenfeld, & Gurr, 2010, p. 1), the Cold War powers pushed for an armistice.
Thus, this war started a new chapter of protraction and is now the longest remaining Cold War legacy between the East and West (Feffer 1999; Hart-Landsberg 1998).

Michael Colaresi and William Thompson describe protracted conflict as something that “embodies intense and violent conflict over important issues persisting for long periods of time” (2002, 168). In the book, *Contemporary Conflict Resolution*, Edward Azar describes protracted social conflict (PSC) as “a struggle by communal groups for such basic needs as security, recognition, and acceptance,” which includes monopolizing power by dominant individuals or groups (Ramsbotham, Woodhouse, and Miall 2011, 84–87). North Korea represents the prototypical case of a PSC that has cost well over three million lives during the active years of the war (White, 2010). However, this estimate does not include deaths from continued violence, suffering and deaths from regime brutality, gulags, starvation, disease and malnutrition (Windrem, 2003).

**Primary CAR Theories**

Because conflicts are inherently complex, there are many theories that could be applied, and the protracted conflict with North Korea is no exception. However, for the purpose of this conflict, I have chosen two primary theories to help guide my research, and inform my analysis and practice: Contact Theory and Positioning Theory.

*Contact Theory*

Relationships from individual up to and including international relationships, aren’t feasible without social interaction or what can be called “contact.” In 1954, Gordon Allport in “The Nature of Prejudice” advanced the “contact hypothesis,” also
known as intergroup contact theory, or just contact theory. This theory, asserted that getting people of different races or ethnicities together under the right conditions either as individuals or groups (such as majority and minority members), can vastly change their perceptions of each other, help remove prejudices, and possibly lead to new positive relationships (1954; 1979).

Thomas Pettigrew further developed intergroup contact theory to explain how contact with members of different groups work to “decrease prejudice, and increase perspectives and tolerance” (1998; 2003; Diaz & Perrault, 2010). Looking, in part, to lessons learned from mediation, he proposed four processes to help with contact: learning about the outgroup, changed behavior, affective ties, and ingroup reappraisal (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2013; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). If the contact is of “high quality” referred to as high quality contact (HQC) and direct, it will have more of a positive impact on the individual or group (Cameron et al. 2011; De Tezanos-Pinto, Bratt, and Brown 2010; Turner et al. 2008). Contact also tends to work because it is mostly emotional not cognitive, because “your stereotypes about the other group don't necessarily change, but you grow to like them anyway” (Pettigrew, 2001).

Direct HQC seems to have the natural ability to influence one’s thoughts and perceptions of another, which can lead to a gradual improvement in relations. Effective direct HQC is based on mutual respect and cultural and historical understanding, and lacks biases. Regardless to the length of the contact, if bias is present, relationships are not as likely to form. Moreover, if the only purpose of the contact is to negotiate, then it
is not of high quality and change will most likely not occur. It will only act to solidify the negative frames of reference that already exist between people and governments.

Like direct HQC, indirect contact can also be used to improve the relations between different people, groups, and states. At times, indirect HQC may work even better to positively influence relationships due to its strong social interaction component, and ability to provide positive input in a non-threatening environment. Moreover, indirect HQC can help create new or positively change relationships, and is easier to implement as it can transcend barriers. If this indirect HQC is extended for a long period of time and of sufficient quality, like that of direct HQC, it can have a profound effect on members by reducing prejudices and establishing friendships, which then positively affect other members of society (Dovidio, Eller, and Hewstone 2011; Wright et al. 1997; Hewstone et al., 2014).

Indirect HQC can also have a positive influence on others by reaching audiences that are typically difficult to reach in closed societies and dictatorships, such as what we have in North Korea. An example of indirect HQC would be to use such diverse and innovative means as media, North Korean refugee diaspora and interlocutors to get a positive and sustained message to North Koreans. The key to this type of contact is that it should be sustained until the message is received, or until it can be used in coordination with direct HQC.

A key element in effective direct and indirect HQC is the social interaction that takes place based on positive discursive behavior. If communication is not positive in
nature, than true dialogue, such as understanding differences in identity, power, and privilege asymmetry will not take place. Furthermore, discourse should be dyadic, interactive, and based on cultural understanding, all of which can work to reduce prejudices and alter attitudes leading to positive and sustained social change (H. Z. Li, 2009; Gurin, Nagda, & Zuniga, 2013; Gamble & Gamble, 2004).

Like all theories, contact theory also has its share of critics. One of the major criticisms emphasizes the difficulty in trying clearly define extended, positive, and high quality contact. Others question the amount of time required for contact to influence or change one’s perception of another or reduce the natural social distance that exists between people and governments. They ask, how can we measure the effects of contact on one person and how he/she relays these effects to the larger group? Through contact, are one’s perceptions of another permanently replaced or are the effects merely temporary until the individuals part ways? What happens when members or groups in contact are not all of the same status or their positions do not change? Finally, does contact bond individuals equally across extremely diverse cultures?

Despite these questions, I believe contact theory relates to conflict analysis and resolution, and to foreign policy as well. I hypothesize that the positive effects of individual and group direct and indirect high quality contact (HQC) also apply to states’ relationships with other states. In addition, according to a recent study on the effects of direct contact and authoritarianism, extended HQC has the strongest positive effect among high authoritarians with low levels of direct contact (Dhont & Hiel, 2011), which
is the kind of regime we find in North Korea. Therefore, contact, particularly HQC, can help decrease prejudice and bias between two or more entities, positively influence other individual or intragroup members, and increase each members’ empathy and understanding for the other group. All are critical in fostering healthy individual, intergroup and state-to-state relations (Swart, Hewstone, Christ, & Voci, 2010).

Ironically, North Korea has been isolated and continuously embargoed since 1950 when the United States imposed a near total economic embargo on the country. Since the discovery of North Korea’s nuclear weapons program in the 1980s, sanctions were also applied to North Korea with little success. Thus, the current conflict with North Korea could be termed as the opposite of contact, or a “no-contact hypothesis.” This hypothesis falls directly in line with the sanctions against North Korea and the deepening protraction of the conflict.

For the purposes of this paper, I hope to show through evidence that key advances can be made in improving relations with North Korea by conducting constructive engagement through direct and indirect HQC among all levels of society. This HQC could effectively work to reduce intergroup anxiety and the threat that anxiety creates, both real and perceived (Stephan & Stephan, 2000). This HQC should be positive in nature and include such things as equal status among members, shared or common goals, and intergroup cooperation without competition for those common goals (Forsyth, 2009, pp. 431–32; Pettigrew, 2003, p. 771). Successful indirect and direct HQC would also require re-positioning relationships.
**Positioning Theory**

Positioning theory, similar to contact theory, by its nature is an operational element created through discourse and other social interaction. It is an interactive relational process through which people, groups and nations are located or positioned in a relationship, and locate or position others in that relationship (Urwin, 2003; Harré & Langenhove, 1998, p. 37).

Through the social interaction of positioning, one can realize the importance of language, culture and human relationships (Phillips, Fawns, & Hayes, 2002). Depending on the position taken, this importance of social interaction can be conveyed or ignored. Position can be negotiated through dialogue and the social action between individuals or groups (Moghaddam, Harré, & Lee, 2010, 42). This includes “civil positioning” where the politicians and societal elite try to compete and persuade civilians to support their positions and issues (Korostelina, 2012; Simmons, 2013).

According to Harré and Moghaddam, “Positions are social in the sense that the relevant beliefs of each member [of a group] are similar to those of every other in the group” (2003, 4). Through positioning theory, one can analyze how discourse (discursive positioning) and social interaction helps create or strengthen relationships during negotiation. (Winslade, 2006; Harré & Moghaddam, 2003). Discourse can be understood as “the institutional use of language” that occurs on different levels: disciplinary, political, cultural, and in small groups (Tirado & Gálvez, 2007a, p. 5).
Discourse demonstrates how knowledge is produced through language, to include how people understand their own and each other’s positions (Foucault, 1982). In other words, discourse is used “as a privileged mechanism for understanding social action” that takes place (Tirado & Gálvez, 2007b). When positioning and discourse are accompanied by actions and structures, which are not opposing concepts as positions can work within a given structure; it becomes a very powerful combined tool that can either assist or impede FP, and help resolve or further exacerbate conflicts. There is also a “duality of structure” as there is no fixed meaning: structures used in the positioning can be material or semiotic in nature. They can therefore be manipulated and changed by the social activities of individuals (Bourdieu, 1977; Giddens, 1993; Sewell, 1992).

It is important to differentiate between the terms “position” and “role.” The former implies the importance of interaction, whereas the latter implies a fixed and very rigid stance or experience (Phillips et al., 2002). Since it is dynamic, positioning theory is a natural equipoise of the static structural approach to role. Position, meaning how individuals, groups or states are self-positioned, repositioned, or positioned by others within a specific dialogue. Roles may be viewed as “systems of responses which are hinged to various references” and are more directed toward “how an individual actually performs in a given position, as distinct from how he is supposed to perform” (K. Davis, 1973; Yablonsky, 1953). Positions can and often do change (IBID, 17). Inherent to positioning theory, specifically intentional positioning, are determinants of how power and agency are used during social interaction and dialogue to support, defend, or reject certain positions (Harré & Langenhove, 1991, p. 399; Arkoudis, 2005, p. 175).
Positions can be thought of in terms of first-, second-, and third-order placement or forced placement. First-order placement involves the initial positioning act, which relates to how an individual, group, organization or state jockeys for positions, or is positioned by others. Second-order positioning refers to a challenge of the initial positioning act, and occurs when an individual, group, organization, or state attempts to change its position. Third-order positioning occurs outside the direct social exchange such as through the influence of media (Harré & Langenhove, 1998).

In the social sciences, the foundation of positioning theory can be traced back to “symbolic interactionism” and the early works of George Herbert Mead and his protégé, Herbert Blumer with their interpretation of human behavior (Herman & Reynolds, 1994; Blumer, 2004). Symbolic interactionism refers to the way objects are given meaning in a relationship. The symbols can be used to unite, incite, or distance people, groups, or states from each other. The symbolic interactionism concept was based partly on Charles Cooley’s 1902 “looking glass self-image theory,” which had three main concepts that related to how one creates a self-image in social interactions: how we appear to others, how we imagine the judgment of that appearance, and how we develop our identity through the judgments of others (Cooley, 1983; Boundless, 2014).

Early on, Mead developed the “triadic nature of meaning,” the three-fold relationship between the gesture, social act, and response that is derived through social interaction (Blumer, 2004, p. 25). This further influenced Blumer as he developed his framework for symbolic interactionism, making three assumptions about human
behavior: meaning is made through human interaction; language gives a way to negotiate meaning through symbols and social interaction; and thought is a human interpretive process carried out through symbols (Blumer, 1969; E. Griffin, Ledbetter, & Sparks, 2014). Another important part of symbolic interactionism is the role-taking conducted during interaction or what Erving Goffman referred to as “dramaturgical framework,” a way to “manage the impressions that others might gain of them—in effect, individuals put on a ‘show,’ or performance, for others” (Pascale, 2010, p. 86).

One quandary of using positioning theory is in determining how to define the order of position, and if or when an order is needed. In addition, some point out, there seems to be no method one can use to identify self and other or how one is identified by the others. In addition, some are concerned that a shift in position can actually change the dynamics of contact after the differences between the various roles and positions are identified. Others are concerned with how some may struggle or toggle between different positions, and what role culture plays in the understanding of various positions. Moreover, some are concerned that the diversity between Western and Eastern cultures can affect the perception and meaning of position. Finally, there is debate as to whether Harré’s approach to positioning theory possibly “overlooks the action orientation of positioning in attempt to reveal a realm of moral order and social rules” (Korobov, 2010).

Although these questions and concerns indicate a need for further research, they do not directly affect the use of positioning theory in this study. Positioning plays a large part in CAR and foreign policy, and ties to the power of relationships. It is well suited
for an expansion of scale from analyzing the dynamics of person-to-person encounters to the unfolding interactions between groups and states. Therefore, positioning theory is a tool that can help practitioners analyze different types of conflicts as it “is concerned with revealing the explicit and implicit patterns of reasoning that are realized in the ways that people [and states] act towards others” (Harré, Moghaddam, Cairnie, Rothbart, & Sabat, 2009; Henriques, Urwin, Hollway, Venn, & Walkerdine, 1984).

Positioning theory not only helps construct our relationships with others, but also shows how we try to position others in that relationship. Since positioning theory inherently involves responsibility and “rights and duties” for individuals, groups, and states, it has great potential to help explain the social interaction and dialogue used in U.S. foreign policy, and its role in either resolving or protracting conflicts. It can help us better understand why and how people, groups, and states behave, and how to help reposition in a relationship.

With regard to the conflict with North Korea and this paper, the order of action, discourse, or position are irrelevant, as they collectively affect each other. What matters is that one person’s, group’s, or nation’s negative view of another does not prevent their position in the relationship from shifting, as this has stymied meaningful two-way communication and engagement in the past thereby making most forms of direct and indirect HQC impossible. Furthermore, each state’s position shows the relative power and asymmetry in the relationship, which can cause more conflict to occur.
It is fully recognized that power is always present in relationships. However, the way in which power is or is not used in relationships is equally important. In a culture like Korea, deference is a unique way to limit the negative effects of power. In addition, when power is associated with real or perceived force and coercion it can manifest fear among those on the receiving end. In the conflict with North Korea, this asymmetry in position and power has caused the smaller state, North Korea, to use its own asymmetric tools, such as the threat to use nuclear weapons, and small limited attacks in an effort to try to deal with and manage the conflict.

In this conflict like many others, the glue that keeps it protracted, and connects both contact theory with positioning theory is the autistic hostility that has existed based on fixed perceptions and frames of reference (Newcomb, 1947). Autistic hostility is a form of “breaking contact,” making negative views and positions rigid while preventing change from occurring (Morcol, 2006; Coleman, Deutsch, & Marcus, 2014). The hostility and its associated behavior have two parts: the state of readiness to injure another; and the state of readiness to view another person as a threat (IBID). This persistent attitude, which reinforces each state’s position, has created barriers to communication that have been systematically imposed and reinforced by mutual isolation and distance, further perpetuating hostile frames of reference. In addition, each state’s historical and culturally based narrative has helped to reinforce these barriers. Meaningful, consistent, and full two-way open communication can be vital tools in changing these seemingly fixed frames of reference (IBID, p. 73).
Positioning theory seems especially useful in state-to-state relations and conflicts where there is an asymmetry in real or perceived power. This seems especially true when the United States interacts with smaller countries that are non-aligned with the U.S. such as Iran, Cuba, and North Korea. Therefore, there is great potential in using positioning theory to help guide new initiatives with North Korea.
Chapter 3: Research Methodology

Methodology and Design

For this study, I used a qualitative method design, which allowed me to collect and analyze important data on a single explanatory case study: North Korea (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003). Qualitative research is used to explore, understand and inquire about such things as the “meanings of individuals or groups ascribed to social or human problems” (Creswell 2002, 4; Creswell 2006, 15). I believe this qualitative approach provided the best lens for my research as it helped obtain “data bearing on cause-effect relationships” that can help inform my practice (Yin, 2008, p. 5). The explanatory case study lens also allowed me to use multiple sources of evidence (Yin 2008, 16–20; Bromley 1990, 302).

The vulnerability of using a single case like this is that the “uniqueness and artificial conditions surrounding the case” may not transfer to other cases (IBID, 61). In addition, seldom can we find all the factors or drivers causing a conflict during one run of research or a single case study. Yet, in exploring the nexus between foreign policy and

---

23 It also helps the researcher develop a complex, holistic picture, analyzes words, reports detailed views of informants and conducts the study in a natural setting. Qualitative research can also be used to explore and test theories.

24 Yin (1994; 2008) states case studies are the preferred strategy when we ask “how” and “why” questions.

25 To mitigate this, the author advocates a continuous look at the research findings and practices during all phases of peace building.
the protraction or resolution of conflict, this method offered the best set of tools. The rest of this section will be dedicated to explaining the phases of data collection, analysis, and interpretation of information.

**Data Collection (Phases)**

As stated, I used a qualitative method approach, which was well suited to trying out a new research design. The approach consisted of three distinct phases:

**Phase I**

For phase one, I conducted documents collection and qualitative content analysis to try and understand what the U.S. government, media, academia, and others cite as the causes of this protracted conflict, and to determine the U.S. foreign policy toward North Korea. The literature I reviewed included formal studies on the conflict, academic reports, NGO reports, journal articles, major news articles, blogs, think tank reports, historical reports, books, and government reports. It also included gray literature not typically available in the media and academia.

I used a snowball process to find more relevant documents. This was important as it provided me a deeper understanding of the conflict and U.S. foreign policy along with a pool of potential baseline questions that was used for phase II to either help confirm or deny what may and may not be accurate. I used these baseline questions to conduct semi-structured interviews of former North Korean refugees\(^\text{26}\) living in South Korea.

\(^{26}\) The term “former North Korean refugee” is used because once these refugees arrive in South Korea; they are automatically considered South Korean citizens by South Korean law.
Korea to gather their unique understanding of the causes of this protracted conflict as well as their understanding of the role of U.S. foreign policy and its effects on the conflict.

**Phase II**

For phase two, I conducted semi-structured research interviews of former North Korean refugees to seek their unique perspectives, opinions, needs and desires, which provided me the greatest flexibility to determine whether the findings from the first phase reflect the understandings and desires of this group. Crabtree states, “semi-structured interviews also allow informants the freedom to express their views in their own terms,” and “interviews can provide reliable, comparable qualitative data” (2006, 2). I manually recorded the discussions and then transcribed the tapes. Before each interview, I ensured I had permission to take notes. Since the operational environment did not support the ability to interview people within North Korea, I interviewed former North Korean refugees who live in South Korea.

Often, U.S. foreign policy and Track 1 negotiation decisions are made at the highest, or elite levels of society without taking into consideration or asking what may be needed or desired by those most affected by the results—the grassroots stakeholders—the North Korean citizens.

Interviewing North Korean refugees helped determine whether the findings from the first phase along with the desired foreign policy affects reflected the actual effects, understandings, and desires of this unique group. The significance of this approach was

---

27 This method allowed them to freely elucidate on ways they feel may be better to help end this conflict—including potential policy changes.
in understanding and evaluating where CAR opportunities fit in by promoting the participation of stakeholders from the group of people directly affected by foreign policy discussions. In addition, interviewing former North Korean refugees helped build theoretical support from the CAR literature for more robust multi-level, dynamic and holistic approaches to foreign policy and conflict resolution.

In practical terms, it is necessary to assess the conditions on the ground, and identify potential opportunities for implementing those new approaches. Moreover, these interviews also helped in identifying high-, mid-, and grassroots-level leadership (local government leaders, church groups, civic organizations, NGOs and diaspora), that could be supportive of new approaches and processes in our foreign policy and CAR efforts. Finally, these interviews helped examine, identify, and ascertain the most culturally appropriate ways to conduct CAR-focused activities in North Korea. Thus, by understanding the North Koreans’ potential as catalyzers for change, we can highlight their unique insights, and discover new ideas and tools, which offer the potential for looking at the settlement or amelioration of grievances in this protracted conflict while possibly affecting and altering foreign policy discussions and decisions.

I fully recognized, however, that the refugee interviews came at a tradeoff. These refugees may not have totally and accurately reflected the overall makeup of North Koreans either involved or not involved in the conflict. In addition, the diaspora of any country typically has stronger views based on historical bias (Carter 2005; Holstein and Gubrium 2003). North Korean refugees were no different. Regardless, I tried to seek a
balance of people to interview from all the classes, ages and political parties involved in the conflict. I did not seek a specific age group or class of North Koreans, as I wanted to obtain the widest diversity of opinions. I conducted 40 interviews. Although the typical number of interviews required varies, based on epistemology and questions to be asked, many authors agree that between 20-30 is the average (Baker & Edwards, 2012).

For these interviews, I maintained a balance between control of the interview and openness so that the participants could “generate novel insights” (Willig, 2008, p. 24). The interview process included a series of open-ended questions using four primary categories: descriptive, structural, contrasting, and evaluative (Spradley, 1979; Willig, 2008):

- Descriptive questions prompt the interviewee to provide a general account of ‘what happened’ or ‘what is the case.’
- Structural questions are about how the interviewee organizes his or her knowledge. They prompt interviewees to identify the categories and frameworks of meaning that they use to make sense of the worlds.
- Contrasting questions allow the interviewee to make comparisons between events and experiences.
- Evaluative questions are about the interviewee’s feelings toward someone or something.
- The data collected from both Phases I and II drove the final analysis that was conducted during phase III, which supported my hypothesis, and informed my research, proposed practice and recommendations.
**Phase III**

In the final phase, analysis and interpretation, I continued to use qualitative content analysis in order to discover the major themes directly pertaining to my hypothesis and research questions, which helped drive my research findings and recommendations. The details of this qualitative content analysis are contained in the qualitative content analysis section.

**Qualitative Content Analysis (during all phases)**

I analyzed all phases using *qualitative content analysis* in order to discover the major themes pertaining to the North Korean conflict and our foreign policy. Catherine Kohler Riessman (2007, 53–76) talks about how the content of oral and written narrative can be analyzed based on themes while working with such diverse data as interviews, archival documents and even field notes. This type of analysis is what Morgan refers to as the quantitative analysis of qualitative data (1993) and is well suited for my study. Qualitative content analysis can be used both unobtrusively and nonreactively, and is a particularly beneficial procedure for assessing events or processes in social groups when public records exist (Berg, 2007, p. 259).

A potential disadvantage of using qualitative content analysis may be in locating unobtrusive messages relevant to the particular questions, which may at times limit the content to written text and prerecorded messages. However, when using qualitative

---

28 Data may also be such things as, “verbal, print, or electronic survey questions, interviews, focus groups, observations or print material such as articles, books or manuals” (Kondracki, Wellman, & Amundson, 2002).
content analysis to analyze interview data or responses to open-ended questions such as semi-structured interviews, “this weakness is virtually nonexistent” (IBID).

**Timeline**

The following data shows the timeline of my study:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop and refine plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defend dissertation proposal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop questioning procedures and submit HSRB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct Phase I of research (Document and Archival Study)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyze and produce questions for Phase II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct Phase II of Research in Korea (interviews)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase III analyze</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write chapters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide chapters to committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edit and revise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissertation defense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publish dissertation and policy paper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Timeline


Objectivity, Role of Researcher, and Validity

I approached this research from a professional background in which the qualitative method provided me with the needed flexibility to explore all the major issues and fully understand the complexity of the problem. In addition, the method used here provided the right outputs needed to speak to the language of policy makers, with whom I am intimately familiar. Policy makers have little time to read detailed findings of research and are more accustomed to shorter reports that succinctly identify the key information and findings. Additionally, the information provided to me in phase II helped drive a second project or intervention, which is to publish a book of stories in the voices of former North Korean refugees.

I have worked professionally with displaced civilians, North Korean refugees and other targeted populations for many years. I fully understood the complexity and sensitivity of using human subjects and the need to properly protect them at all costs. This need also extended to their families and others who may become targets due to their participation in the research. Although as practitioners, we strive to be neutral, we realize that there is really no such thing as true neutrality. Through my experiences, I also brought a personal bias on both the North Korean issue and issues surrounding U.S. Government involvement in this PSC. However, instead of looking at this as a weakness, I embraced it as strength. The validity of the research will be judged by the rigor of my research, dedication to CAR, and findings along with the proposed interventions for foreign policy.
Human Subjects Protection and Ethical Considerations

Although the interviewees were no longer considered North Korean refugees, I still made it a major priority to fully protect them, their identities and their information. I submitted a request to the Human Subject Review Board (HSRB) to interview former North Korean refugees and diaspora. Many of these new South Korean citizens live in neighborhoods that predominantly consist of other former refugees as this provides them with a sense of group belonging. Therefore, the site selection for the interviews was based in these areas, and in places where they felt most comfortable and familiar (Ambrosini & Bowman, 2001, p. 821).

The need to protect this group was made even more pressing after two American journalists were negligent when they were captured by North Korean officials with personnel data on other refugees, their relatives, and the network setup in China and North Korea to help them. This grave error put at risk a large population of North Koreans, and caused the disruption of many underground networks (J. H. Lee, 2009).

I made sure I gained formal consent from all persons taking part in this case study (note, this consent was verbal, due to the culture and preferences of the people who were interviewed); I coded and protected these participants from harm; and I protected the privacy and confidentiality of the participants at all costs. Finally, I ensured I had received approval from HSRB prior to conducting phase two of the study. This study was deemed to be one of minimal risk to the participants. The probability of harm or discomfort inflicted during research was no greater than that of normal daily life.
Many Asians dislike signing forms due to the cultural stigma; therefore, I asked for verbal consent prior to the official start of each interview. However, a hard copy of the consenting details and all other files pertaining to this study are coded and kept under lock and key. Only I have access. The files will be discarded at the proper time. In addition, this paper will be released to the general public six months after the end of the dissertation.

**Logistics**

There was no major language barrier, as I have spoken Korean for more than 20 years and have interacted with this population on many occasions. However, based on my experience interviewing this population, depending on the interviewees’ level of comfort, it was necessary to have a familiar face in the room during the interview process. Finding funding for this research was extremely problematic and despite my application for many types of grants and scholarships, I was unsuccessful at obtaining funding. Therefore, this research was conducted at my own expense.

Some estimates put the North Korean diaspora at between 50,000-100,000 or more people, including many who are unregistered living in China and Russia; the availability of North Koreans for interviews was abundant (Yoon, 2001). In addition, in South Korea alone, there are more than 20,000 former North Korean refugees; the government has resettled these people through an active program that helps them adjust to life in South Korea (Fackler, 2012). Although at a much slower rate, the United States also continues to accept North Korean refugees due to passage of the reauthorization of
the North Korean Human Rights Act in October 2008 (Embassy, 2011). Furthermore, proactive governments in Canada and Australia have continued to support pro-refugee policies and the immigration of this group.

Therefore, there was a large pool of accessible former North Korean refugees for interviews. In order to have maximum access to the main pool, I coordinated with the South Korea government and major think tanks, and they provided me with full access to the former North Korean refugee populations. I selected interviewees based on the amount of time they have been in South Korea. Ideally, I tried to interview those who had less exposure to South Korea. I anticipated that at least some of these participants would deny my request for interview; however this was the case with only four potential participants. Although I had a contingency plan to also interview former North Korean refugees in Canada, Australia, and the United States, this was not needed.

This chapter discussed the research process and methodology of the dissertation. In addition, it emphasized both the importance of interviewing former North Korean refugees, and the importance of protecting them from harm. The next chapter will discuss in detail the history of U.S. foreign policy, and how it has been used since the founding of our nation.
Chapter 4: Defining and Creating U. S. Foreign Policy

Definition of U.S. Foreign Policy

U.S. Foreign Policy (FP) can be defined as a set of diplomatic policies that dictate foreign relationships (international relations); that is, how a country acts toward, interacts with, and influences the behavior of other countries, international organizations, non-governmental and private organizations, and even private citizens. Under the U.S. Constitution, the two branches of government must develop U.S. FP by sharing powers and resolving tensions (Zoellick, 1999). In addition, U.S. FP is designed to achieve, first and foremost, national objectives and interests that promote security, economic competitiveness and national prosperity while helping to ensure the well-being of its citizens (Spalding, 2010).

U.S. FP rarely focuses on creating, building, improving, and sustaining good relationships with other nations (Clinton, 2011). Since U.S. FP is tied to and impacted by domestic issues, some U.S. FP efforts are meant to either directly or indirectly influence and sway the opinion of societies both abroad and here in the United States. In other words, FP is often an inseparable part of domestic policy. U.S. FP can be executed unilaterally, bilaterally, or multilaterally and can target a country, countries or even a region. Multilateral FP execution involves a group of countries or even organizations
such as the United Nations (UN), the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), to name a few (Wittkopf, Jones, & Kegley, 2007; Dumbrell & Barrett, 1998).

The Making of U.S. Foreign Policy

The creation and implementation of FP is not an easy task in the United States. “The Constitution has been described as an ‘invitation to struggle’ between the president and Congress over the making of foreign policy. Compared to every other liberal democracy, the United States conducts foreign policy in a cumbersome way” (Foreign Policy Association, 2014). The executive branch has the primary responsibility for making and implementing foreign policy. The president, among other duties, is the head diplomat and spokesperson for our nation. When making FP, he is assisted by a select group of close advisors, with input from the various departments and agencies including intelligence agencies, Department of Defense, Department of State and even Homeland Defense. The legislative branch shares many FP responsibilities and, among other tasks, approves funding and the declaration of war (Crabb, Antizzo, & Sarieddine, 2000, p. 82). The judicial branch also plays a small role in FP by ruling on presidential authority and other foreign policy related matters.

Beyond the government and its agencies, special interest groups, including defense manufacturers and other lobbyist for think tanks, foundations, and various ethnic and religious groups try to influence FP creation and implementation. Academia and media also try to influence FP through their papers, positions and reports (O’Heffernan,
However, in the United States, there tends to be a general lack of knowledge and interest in FP matters. This “lack of knowledge and interest [in FP] is especially prevalent, and especially worrisome, among high-level government officials and the scholars and analysts who work in universities, the national media, and the think tanks—all of whom are responsible for developing, studying, and carrying out the foreign policy of the United States” (Mead, 2002). Regrettably, except for a few times in our history, the public seems predominantly indifferent to foreign policy matters and rarely gets involved (Friedman, 2014). The typical exception to this is when there is a major crisis, or concern such as the Vietnam War or human rights violations. When this does happen, the public can be a powerful voice to influence decision makers.

**General Goals and Objectives of U.S. Foreign Policy**

It is often stated that some of the primary goals of foreign policy are to ensure the survival and independence of the nation, military, and economic security, and promote democratic values and ideals (Bolton, 2008, p. 16). However, U.S. FP objectives are as varied, fluid and vague as the members of our government, and often lack long-term concrete objectives and goals (Goldstein, 1984, p. 132). Yet, there are some basic objectives that remain relatively constant.

In particular, these include: protecting the homeland and its territorial integrity; protecting U.S. citizens and interests (broadly defined) both home and abroad; upholding, supporting and protecting U.S. allies; maintaining the balance of superiority in power; protecting strategic resources; furthering U.S. economic and political interests at home.
and abroad; and protecting and promoting human rights, democracy, and other American values. Those objectives that directly affect politics and military relations are often referred to as “high politics” whereas all others are at times referred to as “low politics.” Nevertheless, the lines of distinction between these two are often blurred, and those on the low politics scale are often ignored (Doran 1991; Beitz 1979; Barnett 1990).

**Tools and Execution of U.S. Foreign Policy**

There are essentially three primary vehicles or tools for the execution of a nation’s FP efforts: hard power, soft power and more recently, smart power.

Hard power are those tools an actor or state uses to force or reinforce the position and imposition of a nation on another nation, through the influence that comes from such things as military and economic might, sanctions, isolationism, coercion, the show of force, or the threat or actual use of force (M. D. Taylor, 1990). Many realists prefer hard power, quoting Lyndon B. Johnson, “when you’ve got them by the balls, hearts and minds will follow” (Held & Koenig-Archibugi, 2004, p. 127).

This is in contrast to soft power, which Joseph S. Nye describes as, “the ability to get what you want through attraction rather than coercion or payments. It arises from the attractiveness of a country's culture, political ideals, [economic incentives] and policies. When our policies are seen as legitimate in the eyes of others, our soft power is enhanced" (Joseph S. Nye, Jr 2004; Jones 2013). A key element to soft power is the importance of legitimacy (IBID). Nye and others further define soft power as the ability
to affect others by framing the agenda, persuading, and eliciting positive attraction in order to obtain preferred outcomes (2011b, p. 22; Wagner, 2014).

Finally, smart power is founded on the belief that soft power is not necessarily better than hard power and that the two foreign policy tools should be complementary parts of an effective overall foreign policy strategy (Nye, 2006a). Hard power, soft power and smart power include the general view by many in government that these efforts are primarily the responsibility of the state.

The use of hard power, soft power and smart power, are often associated with the type of power used and level of actors involved (hard power-State, soft power-non-state, and smart power-both). In addition, although many regard hard and soft power as being distinct and separate, others see little difference between the two (Mustonen, 2010). Some even refer to economic sanctions as being a soft power option, but as Nye points out, “there is nothing soft about sanctions if you are on the receiving end. They are clearly intended to coerce and are thus a form of hard power” (2006b). Therefore, neither is straightforward, as hard power is about coercion but soft power can in fact be anything (IBID, 167).

A state can use the threat of war or sanctions as a hard power tool, so too can a state use the threat not to give food aid as a hard power tool. Aid and incentives can be used as soft power tools, or when denied or threatened to be taken away, they can become hard power tools (carrot and stick). Moreover, hard power tools can be used by those not
typically associated with traditional hard power, such as individuals at the grassroots and personal levels of society, who can use relationships and positions.

Hard, soft, and smart power tools are interchangeable with the levels of actors. In today’s world, we see that “soft power is increasingly effective and hard power less so” (Wagner, 2014). Yet, many countries prefer to use hard power over soft, as they believe it is easier to measure (IBID). Finally, these foreign policy tools are often delineated and executed by different actors and agencies under several tracks of diplomacy. These diplomatic tracks are Track 1, Track 1.5, Track 2, Track 3 and Multitrack.

Track 1 Diplomacy includes discussions, negotiations, mediations and interventions, typically involving high-level political and military leaders on difficult foreign policy and conflict issues such as cease-fires, peace talks, treaties and other agreements. Track 1.5 Diplomacy includes discussions and other actions taken by official actors working in an unofficial role with some non-official actors to help resolve foreign policy and conflict issues. More recently, Track 1.5 has also been associated by some with “citizens diplomacy” or faith-based diplomacy, which incorporates religious non-governmental efforts and dialogue to help resolve conflicts (Gopin, 2009b).

Track 2 Diplomacy, coined by Joseph Montville in 1982, “grew out of the observation that private individuals, meeting unofficially, can find their way to common ground that official negotiators can’t” (Homans, 2011). It is at times a supporting element to traditional Track I diplomacy, but generally uses private rather than official governmental channels. Like Track 1, Track 2 normally occurs behind closed doors in
order to discuss sensitive matters. Many times, Track 2 will employ official actors in an unofficial capacity. However, it can also include actions by influential academic, religious, NGO and other civil society leaders and actors who can interact with others more freely than high-ranking officials to help resolve foreign policy and conflict issues.

Track 3 Diplomacy involves actions taken by unofficial actors and institution, particularly at the civil, people-to-people, or grassroots level to encourage and facilitate interaction, awareness and mutual understanding to help resolve foreign policy and conflict issues. Finally, Louise Diamond, co-founder of IMTD, “coined the phrase ‘Multitrack Diplomacy,’ \(^{29}\) in order to incorporate all aspects of mediation from the ground-level work of private citizens to the top-level meetings of state heads” (IMTD, 2015) Multitrack Diplomacy, combines actions and efforts by different actors operating on several tracks and levels simultaneously (USIP, 2013).

Recently, due to the complexity of conflicts and efforts, John McDonald and others have further defined Multitrack Diplomacy into nine tracks that operate together as a system. This systems approach is necessary for the cross-fertilization of official and non-government sectors of the society to occur, which allows real change to happen (Diamond & McDonald, 1996a; Staff Writer, 2005). Although each track of diplomacy has its unique set of actors and methods to assist in various capacities, often these tracks, actors, and efforts are blurred when working on the ground (Hottinger, 2002).

\(^{29}\) The term “Multitrack Diplomacy is found in some literature to be capitalized and in other literature not to be capitalized, and at times it is spelled with a hyphen. For consistency, this term will be capitalized and no hyphen will be used.
When economic tools, natural resources, financial aid, and sanctions are used in dealing with State relations, it can become what has been coined “Resources Diplomacy” (Gutman, 1975; UN Report, 2013). Resources Diplomacy (RD) can be used as a hard power, soft power or smart power tool, but has recently been associated more often with hard power in States relations. To help deal with the mostly negative use of RD, many organizations are looking at this problem including the UN, World Bank, OECD and IMF (MOFA, 1972). Yet, RD remains a very prevalent hard power tool used by many States, organizations and large corporations.

Public Diplomacy (PD), an integral part of soft power, is an important foreign policy tool that usually falls under Track 2 Diplomacy, but is normally controlled and influenced by the government. PD is official and sometimes non-official, communication with the general public, almost always in open forums. PD works to help promote democracy, security, economic stability, political relations and ties among nations. It has been described as “official government efforts to shape the communications environment overseas in which American foreign policy is played out, in order to reduce the degree to which misperceptions and misunderstandings complicate relations between the United States and other nations” (Tuch, 1990). PD attempts to affect foreign perceptions through such diverse means as using various media and communication outlets and educational, cultural, sports and fine arts exchanges and engagements.

The United States uses PD to “understand, inform, engage and influence global audiences, reaching beyond foreign governments to promote greater appreciation and
understanding of U.S. society, culture, institutions, values and policies” (State Department, 2010). The United States traditionally considers PD a role and function of the state. However, I believe that true PD includes public (citizens) and private autonomous efforts to help resolve foreign policy and conflict issues, and that these efforts are mutually supportive and necessary. This view of PD or what can be called “civil diplomacy and engagement,” is not normally talked about under state sponsored and controlled PD. However, it falls directly in line with CAR-centered efforts and is therefore considered for the purpose of this dissertation, an additional CAR tool that will be explored later.

The tools and execution of foreign policy discussed above, including tracks of diplomacy, are inherently tied to power at all levels of society. To help advance the thesis on how to deal with power in conflicts, it is therefore necessary to define it. Kenneth Boulding in the book “Three Faces of Power,” divided power into three categories: destructive (threat), productive (economic) and integrative (Boulding, 1990). These categories are not mutually exclusive, as each possesses some elements of the other two (IBID). Power has also been defined as having three dimensions or “faces:” the ability to legitimize and affect decision; the ability to set agenda; and the ability to shape, persuade or manipulate perceptions and interests (Dahl, 1959; Bachrach & Baratz, 1962; Lukes, 2004; Heyward, 2007). It is the ability of one party or group to covertly, overtly and sometimes unintentionally influence or force the behavior of the other party or group in order to achieve its objectives (Isaac, 1987). Power is an imposition of will, which can be a threat (Korostelina, 2013). Power is causal in that it is can act or not act, and can either
promote or limit interaction. Moreover, the structural relationship can determine behavior, and behavior in turn can determine power based on the position within the structure.

Power during conflicts can be associated with competition over scarce resources and status, and different principals and beliefs. It is also socially and culturally constructed and is salient (Avruch, 1998). Yet, despite this salience, power can also become irrelevant during conflicts when deep-rooted issues are at stake or when it is not used in a productive way (Avruch, 2012).

One of the chief reasons conflicts become unproductive, violent, or protracted is the asymmetry in power, both real and perceived that exists between parties. Power should be looked at as more than just what one person, group or state can use against another—particularly against the weaker party (IBID). To resolve conflicts we should work to make all parties understand that power is not always about force and position (or imposition) as it only further escalates the conflict. Power should also be looked at as the ability to persuade and create balance in a relationship. For this conflict, promoting power is about the actions that can and should take place, in this case, the use of Soft and Smart power to engage by repositioning in order to have HQC. The full understanding of the dynamics of power can therefore help to resolve, this and many other conflicts.

This chapter provided a working definition of foreign policy, how it is created by our government and the various types of tools used in the execution of foreign policy. It also discussed how power is an inherent part of conflict, and how the full understanding of it can help guide the positive use of power in order to create sustained change. Now
that we have learned about the background of foreign policy and power, we will now turn to the history of foreign policy in the United States and how these diplomacy tools have been used.
Chapter 5: The History of U.S. Foreign Policy

Since the beginning of our nation, there have been primarily two schools of thought and continuous debates concerning our foreign policy. The first school of thought is that U.S. FP originally was based on realism and then shifted to idealism. One view of realism is the belief that there is a key difference between domestic and international relations and that power is the key factor for FP. A realist approach to FP generally supports and reflects our national interests and security over ethics, morality and ideology. Traditionally, a “realist approach to morality and foreign policy is not rejection but ambivalence” (Frankel, 1996, p. 354).

However, an idealist approach to FP generally reflects our exceptional ethical and moral values, and is based largely on liberal ideals and principles. Idealism, also known as liberalism or even Wilsonianism to some, is the belief that domestic values such as peace and prosperity, democracy, respect for human rights, and self-determination are protected by laws, and should be applied both domestically and internationally, even if these are traditionally Western values.

Idealism also holds that FP should be conducted in a multilateral way, using international bodies such as the United Nations (UN), European Union (EU) and North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). Michael Joseph Smith, in his book Realist
thought from Weber to Kissinger, characterizes idealists that began to appear around World War I as "idealist provocateurs" (1990). In addition, some realists are quick to cite the failure to prevent World War II as an example of the dangers of idealism. Indeed, U.S. foreign policy is often debated, formed, and played out in the arena of realism and idealism, and seems on the surface to suffer from a dichotomy of principles and values.

The second school of thought is that U.S. FP began as isolationism, and after World War II, changed to internationalism (also referred to as expansionism). Isolationism is the belief that the United States should stay out of alliances and not become involved with the affairs of other nations or other nations’ wars. Max Savelle wrote that the United States wanted to “escape from the turmoil of Europe” (1934, 336). When the United States wanted to stay out of both World Wars, the terms neutrality and non-interference were also applied to isolationism.

The Early Years of U.S. Foreign Policy

As our nation was forming, it was Thomas Paine, in the book Common Sense, who first put forth the idea of isolationism (1918). Then George Washington stated in his farewell Address, "Tis our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliance with any portion of the foreign world; so far I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it..."(Washington, 1812, p. 31). Furthermore, Thomas Jefferson endorsed just as clearly in his inaugural pledge, "peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations-entangling alliances with none" (Jefferson, 2002, p. 173). From the 1700s until the end of World War II, it would seem that the United States had, for the most part, heeded the
precepts of its Founding Fathers when it came to foreign policy. However, a closer scrutiny shows that the United States, even in the beginning, never really imposed complete self-isolationism, or retreated from the international arena and foreign relations.

Washington’s speech about “entangling alliances” was fitting, given that our young country was still relatively economically and militarily weak and spread out along the east coast. Jefferson’s words on “avoiding foreign entanglements” seemed equally wise. However, it was Jefferson’s westward expansion and Louisiana Purchase that directly put U.S. foreign policy into European affairs, and eventually may partially been the cause of the War of 1812 (Friedman, 2013).

After the War of 1812, the United States was fighting the Mexican War of 1846-1848, and the Spanish-American War of 1898, each of which expanded America’s economic and foreign policies into the Caribbean and Pacific Ocean, gave it new markets and a stronger position in the Western Hemisphere.

In 1823, President James Monroe spoke on what would later be coined the Monroe Doctrine. This doctrine was created to warn other nations that the Western Hemisphere was no longer open for colonization; the political system of the Americas was different from that of Europe; and that the United States would regard any interference in Western Hemispheric affairs as a threat to its security (Hart, 1917). Later, the Monroe Doctrine was used more aggressively as a FP tool by President Theodore Roosevelt to facilitate interventions in Cuba, Nicaragua, Haiti, and the Dominican
Republic, and then by the Wilson administration for interventions into Nicaragua, Mexico, Haiti and the Dominican Republic (Carlisle & Golson, 2007, p. 54).

Ironically, during this same period, the term “Manifest Destiny” came into existence. The term was first used by John L. O’Sullivan in an article published in 1845 edition of the United States Magazine and Democratic Review (Merk & Merk, 1963, pp. 24–27). It then quickly developed into a motto or precept as it claimed, it was "our manifest destiny to overspread the continent allotted by Providence… and to extend its influence beyond its continental boundaries into the Pacific and Caribbean basins” (McFerson, 1997, p. 82; Horsman, 2009, p. 186). Manifest Destiny was increasingly used throughout the 19th Century to expand U.S. size and influence.

A Growing Nation’s Desire for more Power, Influence and Control

The U.S. desire for new markets and foreign policy influence though was not limited to the Caribbean, Americas or even the Philippines in the Pacific. American merchants and ships began to visit the Far East and China for trade in the early 1800s. Then, the United States became actively involved in the Opium Wars, also known as the Anglo-Chinese Wars (the first from 1839 to 1842 and the second from 1856 to 1860), which were fought over disputes on trade and diplomatic affairs (Sutter, 2010, pp. 21–23). For the United States, not only was this expansion about new markets in the Far East, but it was also about the growing influence American missionaries had on the U.S. government and FP.
Eventually, the activities in China led the United States to initiate the Open Door Policy that was allegedly put forth to protect equality of privileges among countries engaged in trade with China (Hodge and Nolan 2007a, 188; Li 2012, 333). Yet, realistically, trade ensured the U.S. had its share of the bounty from occupying and influencing parts of China, and in the process, helped establish the United States’ key position within that region. During the second half of the 19th century, the United States and its FP also started to become involved in the affairs of the Korean Peninsula, a subject that will be discussed in the chapter on U.S. FP toward North Korea.

As the United States grew into a “great power” due to industrialization and urbanization, so did its desire to further expand, influence and control. Even in the early years of our nation’s rise to power, U.S. foreign policy was never a clear-cut case of isolationism or internationalism, as was “the strange fossilized conventional wisdom” of many (Mead, 2009). The United States, even from its founding days was expanding and gaining a position of hegemony in the Western Hemisphere and beyond.

**The World Wars and the effect on U.S. Foreign Policy**

In the early part of the 20th century, President Woodrow Wilson sought to avoid the problems in Europe and keep the United States out of World War I. President Wilson, best known for his brand of idealism or Wilsonianism, “was the embodiment of the tradition of American exceptionalism, and originated what would become the dominant intellectual school of American foreign policy” (Madaras & SoRelle, 1997, p. 177). However, despite these efforts, the United States reluctantly entered the war and proved
to be the decisive factor in the outcome. Yet, Wilson’s ostensible reluctance before the war and his desire to stay neutral, did not seem to affect him after the war or prevent him from sending American troops to northern Russia and Siberia during the Russian Civil War from 1918 to 1920 (Trani 1976; Davis and Trani 2002).

Towards the end of involvement in the Russian Civil War, President Wilson was instrumental in establishing the League of Nations, which, in part, was supposed to bring in a new era of idealistic foreign policy based on multilateral cooperation (Lawson, 2012, p. 63). However, many in the U.S. Congress, led by the Republicans and Henry Cabot Lodge, who personally disliked Wilson, led the opposition against it (Klose & Lader, 2001). Thus, the U.S. never passed it, thereby dooming its real potential for effectiveness. Between the wars, the United States returned to its quasi-isolationism policy, but the drums of war were beating again as World War II was at America’s doorsteps. After the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, the United States entered into another world war and, with its allies, was victorious. However, since the League of Nations failed to prevent World War II, idealism was heavily criticized for being ineffective for FP. At the end of this war, the United States was not only a great power, but became a superpower.

**Superpower Status, Communism and Containment**

After the end of World War II, George F. Kennan, a diplomat stationed in Moscow became concerned about the battle between communism and democracy. In 1946, he was asked by the State Department to clarify what the Soviets were doing. In response, he wrote a foreign policy paper known as the "Long Telegram," in which he
promulgated the need for a “long-term, patient but firm and vigilant containment of Russian expansion tendencies” (Kennan, 1947). Largely based on Kennan’s paper, the U.S foreign policy of containment started under President Harry Truman with the intent to suppress the spread of Soviet power and Communist ideological influence in Eastern Europe and Asia (Watson, Devine, and Wolz 2005, 89; Margolies 2012). “Under the guidance of three strong and influential Secretaries of State: George Marshall, Dean Acheson, and John Foster Dulles, the ‘Cold War’ brought major changes to U.S. policy abroad, while McCarthyism targeted the Department at home” (State Department, 2014).

For the most part, this FP based largely on IR-centered deterrence theory and its accompanying coercion, helped maintain relative world power symmetry, most notably due to the invent and rapid development of nuclear weapons and the principle of mutual assured destruction (MAD) (A. L. George & Smoke, 1974; A. L. George, 2009; Brodie, 2007; Sokolski, 2004). However, internationalism, containment and MAD did not stop the two superpowers from fighting their battles and pushing their ideas onto third-world countries such as Korea, Cuba, Vietnam and Afghanistan. Even later presidents, like Jimmy Carter, considered a liberal new internationalist who emphasized human rights, still embraced a FP of containment (Jackson 2007, 15; Seliktar 2012, 6). Later, President Ronald Reagan came to office embracing a form of conservative internationalism, and mixed it with both limited engagement and unilateralism (Viotti, 2010, p. 18; Hook & Jones, 2012). However, containment was still a large portion of the administrations FP.
End of the Cold War and new Containment

After the collapse of the Soviet Union, the United States enjoyed being the world’s only superpower, also referred to as a hyper-power (Cohen, 2004). Despite this, the policy of containment never ended with the Cold War. President George H.W. Bush, under his plan for conservative internationalism, reinvented the idea of containment or “dual containment” in response to the Gulf War in order to contain Iran and Iraq (Watson et al., 2005).

When President William J. Clinton came to office, he repositioned U.S. FP back toward liberal internationalism, but mixed it with the policy of democratic engagement (Hodge & Nolan, 2007, p. 368). In response to the attacks on the United States in September 2001, President George W. Bush led America far into the unilateralist foreign policy camp that included the right to launch preemptive strikes (Bush, 2004). This foreign policy decision created a series of problems, including alienating many European nations, as well as China and Russia, along with most of the world’s Muslim countries (Duncan, Jancar-Webster, & Switky, 2008).

President Barack Obama turned the foreign policy tide back into liberal internationalism, but this time with a twist. In Obama’s 2009 Cairo speech, he put forth the ideal of strategic engagement while downplaying U.S. democratic values and exceptionalism (Singh, 2012). Former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton once stated, “Our approach to foreign policy must reflect the world as it is, not as it used to be. It does not make sense to adapt a 19th century concert of powers, or a 20th century balance of
power strategy. We cannot go back to Cold War containment or to unilateralism …. As long as engagement might advance our interests and our values, it is unwise to take it off the table” (Department Of State, 2009).

While many countries in the world embraced this FP after the aggressive years of the Bush Administration, the ideal of strategic engagement quickly met its limitations, and forced Obama into a policy that looked much like most of his predecessors of the 20th century.

**United States and Imperialistic Tendencies**

It seems that today’s FP debates are not really about isolationism versus internationalism, or idealism versus realism; they seem to be more about trying to balance American’s needs and interests with its obligations and Western values. However, to me, it also seems to be partially about imperialist ideals of expansionism and colonialism, and the desire for power and hegemony based, in part, on the distorted understanding by some of what our Founding Fathers meant by exceptionalism. The United States often speaks of employing internationalism or multilateralism, but typically in conjunction with an implication that the United States will be at the head of the table and may reap the benefits. Although, in some ways the United States may be exceptional as our Founding Fathers once said, in my opinion, this exceptionalism would best be shown as lead by example, and by reaching out and engaging those who may dislike or oppose us, instead of trying to forcefully impose our values, ideas, and desires on them.
The United States often uses force in the world, not necessarily to always enforce higher values, but seemingly to enforce its will and influence and to gain and retain hegemony and its position. “An empire is a multinational or multiethnic state that extends its influence through formal and informal control of other polities” (Cohen, 2004). “American claims of benign intentions are no more or less sincere than those of imperial powers in the past” and “U.S. military power seems to invite hubris” (IBID). Walter A. McDougall once wrote:

What is often seen as a Hegelian clash in the national discourse between theses and antitheses is actually a clash between competing syntheses of what American values and national interests require. A democracy composed of numerous religious and secular faiths is always at war with itself over matters of right and wrong, prudence and folly. In domestic politics, its battleground is the law. In foreign policy the hallowed traditions, the holy writ, instructs the nation. Americans have a veritable bible of foreign affairs. Its Old Testament, which dominated U.S. diplomacy in the 19th century, was designed to deny the world the chance to reshape America, and it canonized the traditions of Americas Exceptionalism, Unilateralism, the American System, and Expansionism. Its New Testament, which has dominated U.S. diplomacy in the twentieth century, was designed to give America the chance to reshape the world, and it canonized the traditions of Progressive Imperialism, Wilsonianism, Containment, and what one might call Global Meliorism. The first four traditions reflect the image of America as Promised Land. The New Testament traditions define America as Crusader State called to bring salvation to a world ravaged by revolution and war (McDougall, 1997, pp. 134–135).

This understanding of FP is similar to Senator J. William Fulbright’s, which sharply highlighted these foreign policy issues in *The Arrogance of Power* (Fulbright,
Raymond Aron, probably best known for his work *Peace and War* believed that “foreign policy is constituted by diplomatic-strategic behaviour, and international relations takes place in the shadow of war” (Frankel 1996, 354).

In my opinion, regardless of a person’s position on foreign policy, the country may be in diplomatic peril if its FP looks like imperialism, is in paradox, and oscillates continuously between realist and idealist schools of thought with few concrete short-term and long-term goals and objectives. Therefore, perhaps hard power diplomacy alone, which continues to be the most widely used tool in U.S. FP, is not that effective and further promotes to the world the self-positioned ideal of U.S. imperialism (Cullinane & Ryan, 2014, p. 105; Šrāders, 2014). Perhaps, a much more consistent, detailed and forward-thinking FP would greatly assist the United States and work to resolve many conflicts around the world.

This chapter covered the history of foreign policy in the United States. We have confirmed that throughout history, foreign policy has never been as clear-cut case between realism and idealism, and isolationism and expansionism, and that it has actually oscillated between these major schools of thoughts. We have confirmed that for many countries, the actions of the United States when it comes to foreign policy can be seen as a form of imperialism. Now that we know the history of U.S. FP, the next two chapters will show how it relates to East Asia and to North Korea.
Chapter 6: U.S. Foreign Policy toward East Asia

To fully explore and understand United States’ foreign policy toward North Korea, it is first necessary to examine the wider U.S. FP objectives toward East Asia (Far East) and the Korean Peninsula from the beginning of colonial times in the 1800s until the present. The U.S. FP toward East Asia and the Korean Peninsula can be categorized into three core themes based on three eras, although with some recognized overlap. These eras (for East Asia) are U.S. colonial desire for new markets; the defeat of the Japanese in World War II and the Cold War in East Asia, and proxy war, nuclear threats, and U.S. Hegemony in the region.

U.S. Colonial Search for New Markets

Originally, U.S. colonialism and its associated positioning in East Asia, were based on a trade-centered FP and a strong influence from missionaries who wanted to spread Christianity in the region. As discussed earlier, in the early 1800s, the United States pushed into East Asia looking for new markets and trade, starting with China during the Opium Wars. Soon missionaries and traders were looking for ways to approach the Korean Peninsula in hopes of creating additional markets for goods and avenues for developing potential Christian converts.
However, except for trade with China, the Chosŏn Kingdom wanted little to do with the West, or Western trade, culture, or religion (Geldenhuys, 1991, p. 24). After China opened to trade at the end of the Opium Wars, the United States’ next move was to force Japan to do the same. In 1854, Commodore Matthew C. Perry and his Black Ships steamed into Edo (Tokyo) Bay Japan to open up trade relations (Langellier 2012; Schechter 1999, 238). This show of force was enough to intimidate Japan into signing the Treaty of Kanagawa, which opened Japanese ports to American shipping and guaranteed safe treatment of shipwrecked sailors (Navy Department, 1904).

Despite both China and Japan succumbing to the hard power tactics of the United States, the Chosŏn Kingdom continued to resist outside influence and lived in self-imposed isolation. Nevertheless, in August 1866, without approval from the United States government, the merchant ship USS General Sherman with a crew of approximately 21 men (including Chief Mate Wilson, 13 Chinese and three Malay sailors) sailed up the mouth of the Taedong River, which runs into Pyongyang in hopes of establishing trade. The ship’s captain, Mr. Page, accompanied by a Protestant missionary named Robert Jermain who acted as an interpreter, met with Korean officials at the mouth of the river. The Korean officials bluntly told the visitors they were not welcomed (Southerton, 2005).

However, despite this warning, the ship continued to sail up the river toward Pyongyang until it bottomed out due to low water levels. Eventually, a fight erupted between the crew and the Koreans that had gathered along the river. The Korean
Provincial Governor, Pak Kyu-Su then ordered that the ship be destroyed. The Koreans lit several rafts on fire and floated them against the sides of the ship. Eventually, the ship caught fire and the Koreans killed the entire crew violently ending this voyage (Bechtol, 2003; Cumings, 2005b, p. 97).

After this incident, the United States conducted its first official FP move toward the Korean Peninsula in April 1870, by ordering Frederick F. Low, the U.S. Minister in Beijing, to go to Korea. His mission was to negotiate a treaty that would secure the safe treatment of shipwrecked American sailors, to establish trade, and to look into what happened to the *USS General Sherman* and her crew (Y. Kim, 2003a). That mission was a failure, as Korea wanted nothing to do with the United States.

In July 1871, a U.S. Naval armada known as the Low-Rodgers Expedition sailed up the Han River toward Seoul to open trade relations with Korea and demand to know the fate of the *USS General Sherman*. In the ensuing fight, known as the Battle of Ganghwa or Shinmiyangyo, more than 240 Koreans and three Americans died (George, 1988; Lindsay, 2013). Although this was a clear military victory for the United States, it did nothing to accomplish its political objectives to open up trade relations with Korea or clear up what happened to the *USS Sherman* (Surhone, Tennoe, & Henssonow, 2011).

Finally, in 1882, after several earlier attempts and with increasing pressure from Japan, the Chemulpo Treaty of Peace, Amity, Commerce and Navigation was signed between the United States and Korea. This treaty was purportedly based on friendship, fair trade and mutual defense (State Department, 1889, p. 216; Park, 2009, p. 62).
However, unbeknownst to the Koreans, the United States was simultaneously making FP
decisions in other parts of Asia that would have a direct effect on Korea. In 1898, the
U.S. Pacific Fleet attacked the Spanish fleet in Manila as part of the Spanish American
War, and continued to fight in the Philippines until 1902. Seeing U.S. colonial expansion,
Japan was apprehensive about U.S. encroachment in the region.

The United States, led by President Theodore Roosevelt, wanted to ensure U.S.
colonial dominance in the Philippines and Hawaii, and Japan’s victory over Russia in the
Russo-Japanese War of 1904 – 1905 allowed for that opportunity. President Roosevelt
sent Secretary of War and acting Secretary of State William H. Taft to meet with the
Japanese to work out a deal. This deal between Washington and Tokyo, known as the
secret “Taft-Katsura Agreement of 1905,” was signed by both parties, giving Japan
recognition and dominance over Korea while securing U.S. recognition and dominance
over the Philippines and Hawaii (Yi 1984; Schmid 2000; Spingola 2012).

Soon after this agreement was signed, Japan used it as a catalyst to move
aggressively onto the peninsula and make the country a “protectorate.” King Kojong,
unaware of the secret Taft-Katsura Agreement and understanding that the U.S.-Korea
Chemulpo Treaty included support on defense issues, sent Homer Hulbert (an American
friend and advisor to the Korean court) to Washington to seek U.S. aid. President
Roosevelt, under whose name the Taft-Katsura agreement was signed, refused to see
Hulbert (K. Y. Park, 2006, p. 3).
President Roosevelt's official stance was, "The Korean Government is in the position of an incompetent defective not yet committed to guardianship [and] we cannot possibly interfere for the Koreans against Japan" (Schnabel, 1998, p. 4). Moreover, in line with the United States stance on Korea, some of the American advisors assigned to Korea also believed that Korea would be better off under Japanese rule. Durham W. Stevens was one of these Americans who, while employed as an advisor to King Kojong, secretly worked for Prince Ito Hirobumi, known as the chief architect of Japan's annexation of Korea (Y. Kim, 2003b).

The U.S. position as a true colonial power in the region and its trade-centered FP were both near completion. Japan took the final action, forcing Korea to sign the Japan-Korea Protection Treaty of 1905 (also known as the Eulsa Treaty), which gave Japan virtually complete control over Korea. In 1910, the Japan officially annexed Korea (Lone, 1991). Thanks, in large part, to the U.S. positioning, which promoted a hard power-driven foreign policy of colonialism and thirst for trade in East Asia, the Chosŏn Kingdom, founded by General Yi more than 500 years earlier, then ceased to exist.

**Defeat of the Japanese in World War II and the Cold War in East Asia**

During World War II, there were four major conferences held by the Great Powers to decide the fate of many post-war nations: the Cairo and Tehran Conferences in November 1943, the Yalta Conference in February 1945, and the Potsdam Conference in July 1945. At the Cairo Conference, the U.S.-led Allies declared that after Japan was defeated Korea would become independent "in due course" of time, but not immediately
(Yale, 2008a). Although Stalin did not attend the Cairo Conference, he was said to have agreed to this at the Tehran Conference held just a few days later.

It has been purported that Roosevelt and others made the decision not to immediately give Korea its independence after it was determined the Koreans were not yet fully capable of exercising and maintaining an independent government. Roosevelt went on to state that Korea "should be placed under a 40-year tutelage" (Chay, 2002). Roosevelt most likely chose this course of action based on the case of the Philippines, which was kept under direct U.S. control for some 40 years. However, at the Yalta conference, Roosevelt reportedly changed the estimate for Korea to 20-30 years (Song, 1989).

As World War II neared its end, President Harry Truman decided to use the newly invented atomic bomb against Japan. On August 6, 1945, he ordered the detonation on Hiroshima, killing an estimated 130,000 people. Three days later, on August 9, he ordered the detonation of a second atomic bomb on Nagasaki, killing roughly 70,000 people. On August 14, Japan surrendered and World War II ended (Donohue, 2012; New York Times, 1945).

There are several reasons given as to why Truman ordered the use of the atomic bomb including: to end the war quickly and avoid further loss of American life; to justify the cost of the Manhattan Project, a lack of incentives not to use the bomb, as retribution for the attack on Pearl Harbor, and, probably most importantly, to impress the Soviet Union. The last foreign policy point is vital, as Soviet relations with the other Allied
Powers, particularly the United States, were becoming increasingly strained and many worried about how to counter the growing Communist threat (IBID). Although it was agreed upon earlier at the Yalta Conference that Russian forces would enter the war against Japan at a certain point, just a few days before the Japanese surrender, Russia, without warning, suddenly entered the war against Japan and pushed quickly into Manchuria, which vexed the United States further (Yale, 2008b).

Some Western politicians believed that Russia was interested in Korea as a warm-water port that remained ice-free in the winter, which would be useful for its fleet (Kwak & Joo, 2003, p. 144). This is a plausible theory, as that was one of the reported reasons for the Russo-Japanese War of 1904 – 1905, which Russia lost. However, Russia did not partake in any talks with the United States on dividing the Korean Peninsula. The United States unilaterally made the grave FP decision to divide Korea into two occupation zones at the 38th parallel when Japan surrendered. In August 1945, the State-War-Navy Coordinating Committee (SWNCC), led by John J. McCloy, was assigned responsibility for dividing Korea. In 30 minutes one night, Dean Rusk and Charles H. Bonesteel III, used a National Geographic map to arbitrarily draw a line at the 38th parallel to divide Korea (J. Kim, 2012, p. 364).

After Korea was divided, U.S. and Soviet forces quickly occupied its lands. These two new Superpowers were eager to impose their brands of governance on the Koreans. Therefore, each side held separate elections and installed Korean governments (Cumings 2005; Cumings 2010; Pritchard 2010). These actions were an unswerving
reflection of each government’s ideological, political, economic, and social systems, and Koreans both north and south of the 38th parallel paid for these actions.

In the end, the United States seemed to have made the same colonial FP mistake as it had almost 50 years earlier when it said Korea, which was being forcefully occupied by the Japanese, was not ready to govern itself. Koreans considered this the “second betrayal” of their country. They were completely unaware of the decision to divide their country and not give it independence, until after the fact. The United States policy makers sought no Korean experts, nor had they discussed their intentions with the Korean provisional government or other Koreans who were living in exile (Oberdorfer, Carlin, & Carlin, 2013). The price of liberation for Korea was “dismemberment” and, to the rest of the world, the Korean Peninsula became the prelude of the First Cold War battleground (McCune, 1950; Matray, 1981). More importantly, the Korean Peninsula became a spear with which the United States would test its new foreign policy of Communist containment.

Paradoxically, during the same era, a State Department-initiated document defined U.S. FP objectives in East Asia as, “directed toward encouraging and assisting the efforts of the peoples of that area to improve their welfare and security, to stabilize and develop their economies, to strengthen free institutions, and to advance the cause of self-government free from outside domination. Korea is one place in which the United States can continue to take well-defined positive steps to help a free democratic country
to survive in the face of efforts of communism to engulf it” (Keane & Warner, 1957, p. 2535).

Yet, similarly to the secret Taft-Katsura deal, Korea was reportedly unaware that Washington had denied it a voice again in its own destiny. Korea was not free from outside domination, nor was it free to make its own democratic decisions. Many Koreans both north and south of the 38th parallel strongly objected to the division of their country, and openly, and at times, violently resisted the perceived occupation by yet another colonial power. The U.S.-defined objective in East Asia, which seemed to be a contradiction based possibly on a lack of expertise that was needed to harmoniously structure various elements, seems to remains a cornerstone of U.S. FP in the region today.

**Proxy War, Nuclear Threats and U.S. Hegemony**

As the United States was trying to contain Communism, it was also working to fill the hegemonic void in East Asia that Japan had left after its defeat in World War II. This created increased friction between the United States, Soviet Union, China, and North and South Korea. In 1950, war broke out on the Korean Peninsula, and President Truman was reported to have opined, “Communism was acting in Korea, just as Hitler, and the Japanese had acted earlier... If the Communists were permitted to force their way into the Republic of Korea, no small nation would have the courage to resist threats and aggression... By God, I am going to let them have it” (PBS, 2014). This response defined how the United States would handle the Cold War until the fall of the Soviet Union: fight proxy wars in other areas of the world less likely to spiral into another world war.
After almost three long years of fighting and millions of deaths, there seemed to be no clear winner or end to the war in sight. General James Gavin and Professor Charles Lauritsen, concerned with the various problems ground commanders had in fighting the war in Korea, helped create “Project Vista,” a nuclear rocket capability that could be used in Korea or in Europe against the Soviet Union (Elliot, 1986, p. 165). President Dwight Eisenhower saw a new opportunity to use tactical or strategic nuclear weapons on the battlefield and believed that “the taboo against using atomic bombs should be lifted” (B. Lee, 2003, p. 217). This quickly became a new foreign policy tool of intimidation to be used throughout the Cold War.

However, it is important to note that in the early stages of the war, General Douglas MacArthur had already suggested the use of B-29s to deliver the A-bombs against troops, and to create a “cul-de-sac,” while having Taiwanese forces enter the war against the Chinese. President Truman rejected both proposals in light of concerns for world opinion and for widening the war (Cumings, 2010b; K. L. Hill, 2006, p. 148). When the Chinese entered the war and Russian bombers were put on standby, use of nuclear weapons was reconsidered. Under Operation Hudson Harbor, which was conducted to establish the capability to use atomic weapons on the battlefield, B-29 bombers took off from Okinawa in September and October 1951 for a mock run over Korea (Selden & So, 2004, p. 73).

As an end to the war was negotiated, the United States continued to use the threat of nuclear weapons. However, throughout the conduct of the war and negotiation process,
the United States seemed to pay little attention to the desires of South Korea. Because of this, President Syngman Rhee became increasingly belligerent and in response, the United States created a plan called “Operation Everready,” to conduct a coup and remove Rhee from office (P. M. Edwards, 2009, p. 120). This plan was never executed. In the end, the U.S. threat to use nuclear weapons was viewed by many as one of the chief bargaining chips used to secure the Korean armistice in July 1953 (DTRA, 2002, p. 110).

After the Korean War, the United States continued with its FP of containment against Communism, and liberally applied it toward all countries that were not deemed friendly to the United States, including North Korea. It also increased its military and economic presence in East Asia, and increased its position of hegemony in the region. However, the major difference in the containment policy was in how it was and is applied to different countries.

When it came to larger countries that could compete with or stand up to the United States, like the Soviet Union and China, the United States still used containment, but also had various types of communication, engagement, dialogue and exchanges. However, for smaller countries like North Korea, Iran and Vietnam, and until recently, Cuba, there have been few real efforts to promote engagement, dialogue or exchange, nor have there been U.S. Embassies or consulates in these countries (which could function as interlocutors or bridges for cooperation, understanding, and change). Cuba may seem like a break from the traditional use of containment and hard power against smaller “rogue” States. Conversely, to many the move at rapprochement between the two long-time
adversaries began years ago and is based more on economic needs and a public relations move by the current administration rather than a change in current policy based on a “slight liberalization in Cuba” (Radio Free, 2015). Regardless, reopening Embassies can have profound positive effects on both countries as it has in Vietnam since the reopening in Hanoi in 1995 (Crutsinger, 2006).

As this chapter shows, the United States’ primary interest in East Asia was not for the purpose of building and expanding relations. It was originally intended to open up and expand trade. In addition, East Asia later became a beachhead for the new U.S. FP for isolating Communism through economic and nuclear coercion, while gaining hegemony in the region. Finally, throughout this process, the United States made several grave and repeated FP errors when it came to the Korean Peninsula and the great East Asia Region.
Chapter 7: U.S. Foreign Policy towards North Korea

Extensive research has been unable to ascertain or find any lucid reports on what, if any, the U.S. FP short-term and long-term goals and objectives are for North Korea. In addition, regardless of the party in office, the FP actions and tools used toward North Korea have never dramatically changed.

Except for the numerous infiltration, assassination and bombing attempts (i.e., the capture of the USS Pueblo in 1968; the downing of a U.S. reconnaissance plane in 1969; the ax murder of U.S. servicemen by North Korean soldiers in the demilitarized zone (DMZ) in 1976; and the Korean Airlines terror attack of 1987), it could be argued that from the end of the Korean War until the 1980s, North Korea was largely an enigma to the United States (H. Kim, 1993; Michishita, 2013).

Until the 1970s, the United States, South Korea, and, to a lesser extent, other Western nations were heavily involved in Vietnam while trying to contain the spread of Communism in other parts of the world. Furthermore, until the 1980s, the United States was recovering from the effects of the Vietnam War while South Korea was simultaneously preoccupied with internal political problems and with trying to overcome years of uprisings and military dictatorships.
Continued Policy of Containment, Isolationism and Nuclear Assurance

From the beginning of the Cold War until the present, the U.S. FP toward North Korea has consisted primarily of the same strategy of using containment and isolationism with the assurance that the United States would employ nuclear weapons to protect its allies.

The policy known as “the nuclear umbrella” was intended to both deter and assure—to deter the Soviet Union [China and North Korea] from attacking the vital interests of the United States and its allies, and to assure those allies that the United States could and would stand by its commitment to assist in their defense in even the most extreme circumstances” (Roberts, 2013).

This limited FP toward North Korea has continued relatively unfettered while the U.S.-Korea Combined Forces Command (CFC) has handled any military related issues directly on the Korean Peninsula. In addition, from 1976-1993, the United States, with multiple allies, conducted “Exercise TEAM SPIRIT,” known as the largest annual military exercise in the world, on the Korean Peninsula. Although TEAM SPIRIT was regarded as an exercise to defend South Korea in event of a North Korea attack, to North Korea, it seemed extremely provocative in nature (AP News, 2013).

One of the primary reasons FP toward North Korea has not dramatically changed can be attributed to the erroneous belief that containment and isolationism will eventually lead to collapse either before or after the death of one of the leaders (Feffer, 1999b, p. 2). Essentially, this has been a popular premise for many decades. In 1991, with the collapse
of the Soviet Union; then in 1994, with the death of the founder Kim Il Sung; and again in December 2011, with the death his son Kim Jong Il, there were numerous predictions by government, military and Korea analysts alike that North Korea was facing imminent collapse (Hayashi & Komaki, 1997; Meer, 2009; Deane, 2005).

Surprisingly, many still believe in a U.S. FP that forces a regime change as the right approach to resolving the North Korea issue despite not understanding or even knowing what to do if a regime change or collapse actually happens (Bosco, 2015). Many also believe that if North Korea continues on its current path of no real economic gain and a starving populace with its new young leader Kim Jong-Un, eventually the regime will lose control, the North Koreans will rebel, and the peninsula can be reunified (Manning, 2014).

The problem with this insularity conjecture is a collapse has not occurred despite the years of North Korean suffering and deaths, two regime changes, and the policy of containment and isolationism imposed on that country (Metz, 2013). North Korea uses a very effective “feudalistic idea of filial piety” as a tool for absolutism, which helps in maintaining total control despite hardship (Hwang, 2008). Even with increasingly hard sanctions, the Kim dynastic regime seems to have a capacity to survive indefinitely, regardless of the human cost. Furthermore, the economic destitution felt by the citizens of North Korea has little effect on the insulated elite or the regime.

Moreover, even if the regime did begin to collapse, it is more likely to violently stamp out any resistance, much like it has in the past, or be tempted to relieve internal
pressure by starting an all-out-war with the South and the United States, causing millions to die while putting the greater region in chaos (O’Hanlon, 2009; Stanton, 2007; Ord, 2008). Regardless, waiting for an eventual collapse that may or may not occur means “condemning this and future generations of North Koreans to live under the banner of one of the world’s most repressive regimes” and for many more, sentencing them to starvation and death (Levi, 2010).

**Awakening of U.S. Interest in North Korea and an Increase in hard power Politics**

In the 1980s, information was released that North Korea had been working to acquire and improve technology needed for nuclear weapons and long-range ballistic missiles (Isenberg, 2002). When word of North Korea’s weapons of mass destruction (WMD) and long-range ballistic missiles (LRBM) programs reached Seoul and Washington, the U.S. FP toward North Korea became increasingly more aggressive and reactive. No longer was North Korea an enigma, nor was the United States content with merely keeping the country contained and isolated. Now, North Korea posed a supposed direct threat to the United States, international order, and to regional security and stability.

Consequently, the United States began to deal with North Korea using the threat of and actual increased sanctions, with limited conditional incentives in combination with its containment and isolationism practices (Ascione, 2011a). Nevertheless, this new interest in North Korea was not for warming relations with this Cold War relic, nor was it meant for actively engaging North Korea at all levels of its society. It was aimed
exclusively at preventing North Korea from obtaining nuclear weapons and long-range missiles capable of striking the United States.

North Korea made a practical strategic calculation that could help ensure the continued survival of the regime, its paramount concern. If it were going to compete with the United States and other nations on the international stage and get the recognition and incentives it desired, North Korea would have to use all asymmetric means available. This included using the same threat of nuclear weapons and long-range missiles that the United States had so effectively used since the end of World War II (M. Lee & Wilson, 2014). In other words, the North Korea’s decision to acquire nuclear weapons and LRBMs was one of economy of force, knowing that North Korea could not compete with the United States or South Korea on a conventional weapons or economic level.

**Instances of Minor Divergence in U.S. FP toward North Korea**

As discussed earlier, the overall U.S. FP toward North Korea has essentially remained static since the end of the Korean War. However, there are a few instances where there was some initial movement in U.S. FP towards engagement with North Korea.

*Modest Initiatives*

Dating back to 1988 and the Reagan Administration, the term “modest initiative” was created to show that the United States has tried, on a limited scale, to engage North Korea. These initiatives include: allowing unofficial non-governmental visits by North Koreans to the United States, (assuming they can get a visa from the State Department);
easing some financial regulations impeding U.S. citizens’ travel to North Korea; exporting U.S. humanitarian goods to North Korea; and granting permission for U.S. diplomats to engage in substantive discussions with North Koreans in neutral settings (Wit, 2001).

In 1991, President George H.W. Bush supported simultaneously admitting both Koreas into the UN and announced the withdrawal of all U.S. tactical nuclear weapons. Both of these actions were preludes to the IAEA nuclear safeguards agreement North Korea signed just a few months later. During its early days, the Clinton Administration attempted some limited official engagement with North Korea to deal with the nuclear issue. These initiatives included the 29 December 1993 agreement that, in part, was supposed to help warm relations and end the TEAM SPIRIT exercise; and the 21 Oct 1994 Agreed Framework under which North Korea agreed to freeze and eventually eliminate its existing nuclear program in exchange for the construction of two light water reactors (LWR) and other support (Davenport, 2014).

Regardless of the agreements, there was a continued, widely held belief in the United States that cooperation with North Korea would fail, and U.S. Congress did not want to use resources to induce positive change. Many politicians and Korean experts believed that, “threats seemed cheaper and more expedient than promises, at least in the political currency of Washington” (O’Sullivan, 2000).

This was reflected in the way the United States handled the implementation of various agreements with North Korea. Increasingly, from the Clinton Administration
forward, the United States thought it could get North Korea to comply through coercive diplomacy based on the increasing threat of military force, economic and other sanctions, and by a limited use of carrot with a lot of stick.

It seems the United States was unwilling to engage in sustained and candid give-and-take relations with North Korea. As such, many promises were either broken or sidestepped. This was epitomized by the United States and South Korea initially reneging on its promise to stop the TEAM SPIRIT exercises, which almost led to war on the Korean Peninsula in 1994 (IBID). Moreover, even after the Agreed Framework was signed, the United States was slow to provide the promised fuel and other support North Korea needed. Indeed, the United States stonewalled North Korea on almost every promise and agreement it made, partially in the belief that economic sanction would eventually lead to a collapse, and partially due the lack of cooperation from Congress and other hardliners (Deane, 2005).

For North Korea, this on again, off again limited engagement proved somewhat successful. The regime effectively used the threat of nuclear and long-range missiles to eventually halt the annual TEAM SPIRIT exercise and to force the removal of all U.S. nuclear weapons from the Korean Peninsula. It also used this threat to seek, and on many occasions, receive economic incentives and concessions, despite the many sanctions in place.

More significantly, the North Korean regime watched what was happening around the world to other small countries such as Iraq and Libya when the United States was not
satisfied with promises made (Kaplan & Baker, 2014). Consequently, from a North Korean perspective, it made perfect sense to hold onto its strategic cards in order to avoid the same fate as other former regimes. The recent case of Russia annexing Crimea after Ukraine gave up all its nuclear weapons provide another somber reminder what happens to weaker and smaller countries that do not have such capabilities (Myre, 2014). Therefore, honing a FP that only looks at removing the threat of nuclear weapons and LRBMs of certain countries is not very effective at changing relationships or paradigms.

**Humanitarian Assistance**

In the 1990s, the UN declared North Korea a complex emergency due to the economic collapse, floods and droughts, and starvation (Hardcastle & Chua, 1998). During this time, massive amounts of humanitarian assistance brought food, medical supplies, and some economic and development aid to North Korea. The United States was a major contributor in this effort, both directly and through the World Food Program, providing massive amounts of aid. However, for most, donor fatigue set in the late 1990s, and many governments and NGOs gave up and left North Korea and the suffering people to their fates (Bennett, 1999). Moreover, increasingly, aid was being used by some, including the United States, as a bargaining tool to deal with North Korea on a political level.

Mercy Corps and five other NGOs have openly criticized the U.S. government for using aid in this way. Ken Isaacs of North Carolina’s Samaritan’s Purse calls this type of behavior, “starvation as a foreign diplomacy tool” (Jaworski, 2013). In response, the U.S.
State Department and USAID have both stated that “food aid policy is insulated from politics,” but that North Korea could not be trusted to ensure that food reached the civilian population (IBID). Yet, if trust was the real issue, why would the United States promise to provide the aid to begin with?

Although politicians, human rights activists, and humanitarian workers all like to evoke Ronald Reagan's “hungry-child policy,” which separated politics from aid, the reality is that it is increasingly used as a hard power policy tool both for sanctions and negotiations. With the recent buzz around the UN Report on North Korean human rights violations including starvation, one would think that giving aid is paramount (UN Report, 2014). However, many believe that the case of “human rights is essentially a political impulse. Another name for this process is democratization” and the United States has used this tool incongruously since the 1800s when it has the urge and there is a political objective (Weingartner, 2013).

Despite the lack of complete success in the 1990s and through today, aid and assistance have and continue to be provided; some deaths have been avoided and key relationships have been established (H. Smith, 1999). Therefore, aid and assistance do help save lives, build relationships and could be part of the solution to bring about real change in North Korea, even if some of it falls into the hands of the regime.

**Six-party Talks**

Intermittent bilateral and multilateral negotiations started not long after the world discovered that North Korea was developing nuclear weapons and long-range missiles,
and that isolation and sanctions alone would not work. One of the first of these multilateral negotiations started out as four-party talks in 1997, comprising South Korea, the United States, China, and North Korea (Myers, 1997).

These talks were expanded to the six-party talks in 2003 to include Russia and Japan. The four- and six-party talks were a series of multilateral negotiations established and held intermittently in various places between 2003 and 2008 for dismantling North Korea’s nuclear program in order to ensure peace and security in the region. It was based on incentives offered primarily by the West and proof of improved relations required of North Korea (Liang, 2012). Regardless of the place, time, or incentives offered, the six-party talks failed to open lasting relationships, build long-term strategic trust, or dismantle North Korea’s nuclear and missile weapon programs.

There are various reasons stated for the failure of these talks. Some say that it is because North Korea really did not want to deal with the other parties and would not give up its nuclear weapons, particularly after what happened in Iraq and Libya. Others say that it is due to the hardline carrot-and-stick foreign policy of the United States, which demands specific North Korean actions before providing any long-term incentives or true easing of sanctions. Still others believe that these talks failed because China, North Korea’s primary benefactor, has continued to provide a lifeline of support to North Korea; some would say, in violation of many UN sanctions.

Paradoxically, the United States has pushed some smaller countries like North Korea, Burma, Syria, and Libya to give up their nuclear and missile programs while
remaining silent while other countries such as Israel, India and Pakistan continue with their nuclear and missile programs. This perceived FP inconsistency or double standard is a major reason some countries continue with their programs, despite what the U.S. desires or demands.

From a conflict analysis and resolution-centered perspective, all these reasons are certainly contributing factors, but not the cause of the negotiation failures. The most likely cause of the failure, as well as the lack of any real change, is that the six-party talk format lacks congruity and is not conducive for single parties to work out issues simultaneously in a multi-party environment. Each country participating in these talks had in paramount its own self-interests and varying security concerns. Some were against North Korea and for and against others participating in the talks; while still others were for North Korea and for and against others participating in the talks. This, in essence, made dialogue, negotiations, and progress extremely problematic.

True and open dialogue cannot be fostered between North Korea and any party or parties in this format. Moreover, using bilateral, multilateral, or six-party talk format to focus only on nuclear and missile issues is like trying to treat the symptoms while ignoring the disease. The real disease is the protracted social conflict, and the only way to cure it is by looking at and addressing the reasons it is protracted. Such analysis can only be achieved through dynamic forms of tailored Soft and Smart power engagement based on repositioning, and direct and indirect HQC, which in-turn would promote sustained two-way communication (G.-W. Shin, Straub, & Lee, 2014). Even the recent
UN Report of the commission of inquiry on human rights in the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea (UN COI) emphasized the need to work on relations. This report specifically recommends such things as people-to-people dialogue, various types of cultural, educational, sports, and business contact and engagement, and civil society exchanges. In addition, it emphasized the need for North Koreans to have opportunities to be exposed to outside people and information (United Nations, 2014).

The commission also recommends, “States, foundations, and engaged business enterprises provide more support for the work of civil society organizations to improve the situation of human rights in the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, including efforts to document human rights violations and to broadcast accessible information into each country. Eventually, and once conditions are deemed to be appropriate, such foundations and enterprises should join forces with the governments concerned to coordinate efforts to adopt a coherent plan for the development of the country, creation of livelihoods for the population and the advancement of the situation of human rights” (IBID).

Current Status of U.S. Foreign Policy on North Korea

Despite my various attempts to contact the White House and State Department, I was unable to determine the current administration’s complete FP on North Korea. However, Ambassador Glyn T. Davies, Special Representative for North Korea Policy provided two speeches that gave some startling details on the U.S. FP.
On 7 March 2013, in a testimony before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, Ambassador Davies stated, “the DPRK has consistently failed to take advantage of the alternatives available. The United States offered—and has continued to offer—Pyongyang an improved relationship with the United States and integration into the international community, provided North Korea demonstrated a willingness to fulfill its denuclearization commitments and address other concerns...” (G. Davies, 2013b). The ambassador went on to quote President Barack Obama when he stated, “[North Korea] let go of your nuclear weapons and choose the path of peace and progress....”

Ambassador Davies also said, “The United States will not engage in talks for the sake of talks. Rather, what we want are negotiations that address the real issue of North Korea’s nuclear program. Authentic and credible negotiations therefore require a serious, meaningful change in North Korea’s priorities demonstrating that Pyongyang is prepared to meet its commitments and obligations.”

On 14 June 2013, at a foreign policy conference at the Woodrow Wilson Center, Washington D.C., Ambassador Davies made several similar comments about the U.S. FP toward North Korea. He stated, “first and foremost, the United States will not accept North Korea as a nuclear-armed state” and, “the United States will not engage in talks merely for the sake of talks. Rather, what we want are negotiations that address the real issue at hand: North Korea's nuclear program.” He went on to state, “we've been consistent on this score. Successive U.S. administrations have made clear we are open to improved relations with the DPRK if it is willing to take concrete actions to live up to its
international obligations and commitments [added for emphasis]…” (G. Davies, 2013a). Many both inside and outside the U.S. Administration still believe that China holds the key to improving relations with North Korea (Auslin, 2015).

However, many believe that China is first and foremost concerned with maintaining its own stability and gaining power within the greater Asian region (Nathan, 2011; Mearsheimer, 2014). This was also highlighted by Mearsheimer who stated, “If China continues to grow economically, it will attempt to dominate Asia the way the United States dominates the Western Hemisphere” (IBID).

In other words, it appears as if the United States will make no movement or effort to establish or improve a positive relationship with North Korea. More importantly, there will apparently be no true and open dialogue or engagement with North Korea “unless” it first does as has been demanded by the United States and some other nations. Because North Korea has stated it will not give up its nuclear capability, this means that the United States would have no reason to establish real and meaningful dialogue or a comprehensive shift on its FP paradigm. Recently, with the alleged North Korean hacking attack on Sony, the United States has decided to increase sanctions (Royce, 2015), a move that is unlikely to affect change and may, in fact, further exacerbate the conflict and cause more North Koreans to suffer (J. Carter, 2014b; RPI Staff, 2015). Just as important, these new U.S. sanctions will most likely spoil any outreach efforts by the South Korean government, and could further interfere with North-South Korean relations (Y. Yi, 2015; Oh, 2015).
Both of these parties, based on asymmetry in power, seem to continue to promote symbolic demonstrations, which only serve to deepen the protraction and reinforce frozen positions (Kwak & Joo, 2006, p. 163). This analysis shows how positive repositioning could possibly help change the status quo, which will likely work to promote indirect and direct HQC. In turn, this HQC would likely lead to productive two-way communication and eventual positive change based on a reduction of threats both perceived and real, and the reduction in overt uses of hard power.

Despite the Obama Administration’s supposed pivot or rebalance to Asia and its earlier calls to engage all nations, true engagement and open dialogue does not seem to be part of its current FP agenda for North Korea. The same hard power-centered U.S. FP of containment and isolationism, combined with the threat to use nuclear weapons, seems to be the only reoccurring theme and tool in the international relations toolbox.

This seemingly stagnated, narrow U.S. FP and the accompanying U.S. threat to use nuclear weapons were highlighted recently during a U.S./South Korea joint military exercise. In March 2013, the United States flew two nuclear-capable B-2 bombers 6,500 miles to South Korea in order to drop dummy bombs onto a South Korean island as a direct show of its nuclear capabilities. This occurred just a week after the United States flew B-52 bomber near the Korean Peninsula in response to increased threats from North Korea to turn the U.S. ally into a "sea of fire" (Shanker & Sang-hun, 2013). Remarkably, the United States chose this exact same course of action during the Korean War when it flew B-29s over the Korean Peninsula simulating nuclear bombing runs.
True constructive engagement and dialogue, “with a view to eventually normalizing relations” could possibly help change the current relationship between the U.S. and North Korea (Coghlan, 2015, p. 11; Roehrig, 2006, p. 210). In my view, as a world leader, the United States is also not showing true leadership by continuing to wait on North Korea to concede to its demands. Moreover, increasing the rhetorical threat to use nuclear weapons against North Korea may be counterproductive. An increase in the U.S. rhetorical threat only seems to cause North Korea to also increase its threat and become more aggressive.

Another recommended approach to establishing better relations with North Korea is to use a CAR- centered process that includes mediation, sustained dialogue, and engagement, maintaining the principal that for two parties to work out differences, they should be present and actively engaged. In addition, in the case of state relations, just like individuals, each country should work on relations from a position of state-to-state equality, while building mutual strategic trust over time. Once strategic trust has been established, then individual issues over nuclear weapons, missiles, and security will most likely become easier to work out. However, in order for seeds of trust to take root, citizens at all levels of both North Korea and the other states’ would have to conduct constant and positive contact, engagement, and exchange. This most likely cannot be accomplished under the current U.S. FP paradigm.

Although U.S.-led resolutions, sanctions and isolation may be partially effective at slowing North Korea’s progress on producing and proliferating weapons of mass
destruction, they have had little effect on North Korea’s actions, the survival of the regime, or the human rights violations committed against its own people. In addition, these same resolutions and sanctions have, in many cases, unintentionally exacerbated the conditions of the same vulnerable group of North Koreans that is suffering from deprivation, malnutrition, disease and starvation, and which various NGOs, humanitarian groups and others are trying so desperately to assist (J. Carter, 2014a). According to a recent Stanford report, satellite images have shown that sanctions have increased the divide and hardship between North Korea’s urban and rural areas (C. Parker, 2014). In order to survive sanctions, the regime puts its resources and infrastructure into the loyal urban areas at the expense of the poor, increasing inequality and hardship for the majority of its population. In addition, these sanctions and increasing use of hard power, which have been instituted for the purpose of altering behavior, have discriminated and created negative attitudes that reinforce the autistic hostility, negative perceptions, and barriers between these two nations.

The North Korean case could serve as a reminder of the difficulties in trying to influence or change the actions of another state through external force, power, or coercion. This is particularly true of a recalcitrant dynastic dictatorship that holds onto power by defying international norms and forcefully controlling its citizens by means of extreme structural violence and numerous human rights violations. In the end, it is up to a nation’s people to desire and make change to their own government, particularly if provided with the information, tools and ability to do so. Hard power, sanctions and isolationism do not provide North Koreans with insight into the outside world, or the
tools to want and make changes to their government. Therefore, U.S. FP based on limited Track I diplomacy has been ineffective at promoting positive change in North Korea, or positively affecting the North Koreans.

It is fully recognized that the North Korean regime poses a threat to freedom, to our allies, and to security in the region. It is also recognized that the regime has continued to commit various offenses against its own people while ignoring the international community. Moreover, threats to commit violence against the United States and its allies do not provide a constructive way to move forward. Nevertheless, there seems to be little real effort by the United States to understand North Korea — not as we want it to be, but as it is. As a result, there is no easy solution to this protracted conflict, and a strong military presence will long be necessary to defend freedom, national interests and allies in the region.

Hard power actions, to include a robust military capability, are necessary parts of an effective foreign policy. However, hard power in itself, or when used with limited Track I diplomacy, rarely works and only reinforces the status quo. Moreover, hard power can have a tendency to usurp other diplomacy and soft and smart power outreach efforts. Furthermore, a country’s strength and greatness should be measured in peace made instead of the ability to coerce and use force (R. Wilson, 2013). When this does not happen, it only works to exacerbate relations, protract conflicts and create what has been referred to as a “hubris-nemesis complex” (Powell, 2002, pp. 28–46; Ronfeldt, 1986).
This complex situation involves a combination of arrogant actions—hubris, and one’s desire to punish and humiliate another—and nemesis, and is dynamic as each action creates a counter action that may lead to more destructive, high-risk behavior (Ronfeldt, 1995). For state-to-state relations, it does not matter who initiated the first act of hubris, as one act typically evokes another. What matters is how states attempt to prevent acts of nemesis while stopping further acts of hubris. To prevent acts of hubris, which lead to more symbolic demonstrations and frozen positions, positive repositioning of self and other, and engaging in direct and indirect HQC, may be the key to promoting and fostering long-term change while reducing dependency on power.

As we have discovered, for the most part, U.S. FP efforts to deal with North Korea have been static, insular and seemingly one-dimensional. There have been few real attempts by the United States at rapprochement with North Korea. When North Korea was engaged, it was primarily for the purpose of negotiations and not for the purpose of open dialogue and exchange. The United States has attempted primarily Track I diplomacy, with some incentives, and more times than not, hard sanctions, in an attempt to force the North Korean regime to cooperate, abandon its nuclear weapons and LRBM programs, and to cease their belligerent activities and brinksmanship. Unfortunately, as part of these hard sanctions, threats to food security have also been used to try to force North Korea to cooperate (Ascione, 2011b).

Furthermore, the United States has not appeared to make any concerted long-term efforts to use other tracks of diplomacy, civil-led engagement, or other various multi-
dimensional tools under the CAR umbrella, all of which have the ability over time to sway the hearts and minds of the target audience and alter relations. Although U.S. FP toward North Korea has been relatively consistent: it has been for the most part, a seemingly consistent failure, which has probably helped lead to an increased protraction of this conflict.

By looking at the incongruence between the current policies and their outcome with same moral, humanitarian, and spiritual values we espouse, we can help lead the way to alternative and more peaceful methods to resolve this protracted conflict and open relationships. Yet, to help fully understand what these alternate methods may consist of and how to best ameliorate foreign policy through such diverse efforts as engagement, dialogue, and exchange, it is first necessary to look at a few instances where the United States has engaged some countries, even those deemed a serious threat to national security and democracy. The next chapter will look at these instances.
Chapter 8: Examples of Past Engagement

As has been outlined in the previous chapters, the United States has not used many alternative and diverse tools to positively engage with North Korea. The method has been one-dimensional and, for the most part, ineffective. However, the United States has used a variety of multi-dimensional methods and tools such as soft power and grassroots centered efforts with other countries, some of which were Communist and posed a direct threat to the United States. It could be argued, as the next paragraphs will suggest, that the United States has only used alternate tools and multi-dimensional methods with larger countries that can compete with and perhaps even directly threaten the United States both militarily and economically.

The Former Soviet Union Case

From the end of World War II until the breakup of the country at the end of the Cold War in December 1991, the Former Soviet Union posed the largest threat to the existence of the United States and to democracy worldwide. The Soviet Union and Communist China were also the primary backers of the North Korea regime since the Korean War. The Soviet Union developed a large conventional military force, along with nuclear weapons and LRBM capability, that could compete with any other country, and at times, seemed to be directly geared for use against the United States.
On 18 November 1956, after Soviet tanks rolled into Hungary to stomp out the fight for freedom, Soviet leader Nikita Khrushchev stated in a speech given at the Polish Embassy in Moscow, “We will bury you,” which seemed directed at the United States and Western democracies (Margulies, 2009, pp. 202–203). Although there is debate on the true meaning of this translated phrase, many believe that this, along with other Khrushchev actions, were extremely hostile and threatening to the United States. Americans truly feared that nuclear war would soon break out with the Soviet Union, and throughout the Cold War era practiced “duck and cover” nuclear drills at school while families built fallout shelters in their back yards (Deis, 2013).

A few years later, in October 1962, a U.S. U-2 spy plane secretly photographed nuclear-capable missiles in Cuba (Staff Writer, 2014a). During the Cuban Missile Crisis, what later would be described as "the most dangerous moment in human history," the United States and Soviet Union seemed to be on the brink of nuclear war and mutual destruction (Dobbs, 2014). The ensuing 14 days of crisis was highlighted by President John F. Kennedy’s decision to declare the highest nuclear alert short of launch (DEFCON 2), which put forces on standby to bomb Russia (Polmar & Gresham, 2006). During the U.S. blockade around Cuba, U.S. destroyers dropped depth-charges on Soviet submarines at the height of the confrontation, which caused some Soviet submarine commanders to consider firing nuclear torpedoes (Chomsky, 2012). Despite all of this posturing and the real threat of nuclear war from an equally dangerous adversary, the

---

30 For more on the U.S. DEFCON system see Federation of American Scientists Website (FAS, 1988).
United States and Soviet Union had, and continued to maintain, a robust and quiet relationship based on multiple levels of indirect and direct engagement.

The United States maintained an Embassy in Russia throughout the Cold War that acted as a conduit for continued formal and informal contact, discussions and dialogue. The United States also had a healthy State Department-sponsored engagement program, called the Fulbright Program, which brought Russians to the United States and sent Americans to Russia for academic exchange. In addition, U.S. and Russian leaders communicated directly with each other throughout the Cold War.

An example of positive public or citizen-led diplomacy that started during the height of the Cold War is known as the Pugwash Conferences on Science and World Affairs (Kubbig, 1996). The Pugwash Conferences take their name from the fishing village of Pugwash, Nova Scotia, site of the first meeting in 1957, which was attended by 22 eminent scientists, including Albert Einstein (Rotblat, 1995). The genesis for the first Pugwash meeting was the "Manifesto" issued in 1955 by Bertrand Russell and Albert Einstein, “which called upon scientists of all political persuasions to assemble to discuss the threat posed to civilization by the advent of thermonuclear weapons” and conflicts (IBID).

These citizen-led conferences, which still convene 8-12 times per year, bring together influential scientists, scholars, and public figures from around the world in order to create opportunities for dialogue and seek new ways of thinking on complex problems such as reducing the danger of armed conflict (Frerks & Goldewijk, 2007, p. 230; Staff,
There are two other notable highlights citizen-led diplomacy and exchange with the Soviet Union during the Cold War.

In the 1950s, the late Alexander Nikolaevich Yakovlev came to the United States on one of the first Fulbright scholarships (Jouzaitis, 1991; Wilson, 2013b). Comrade Yakovlev was known to be involved with the KGB and was member of the Communist Party. Yet despite his affiliations, later as a member of the Politburo and Secretariat of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, he was called the "Godfather of Glasnost" as he is considered to be the intellectual force behind Mikhail Gorbachev's reform program of Glasnost and Perestroika (Russell & Cohn, 2012; Yakovlev, 2004).

The late renowned U.S. pianist Van Cliburn used his own form of musical diplomacy with the Soviet Union. In 1958, only six months after the Soviet Union had launched its first Sputnik satellite, Van Cliburn captured the hearts and minds of Soviet citizens with his musical talents. The 23-year-old young Texan transcended the Cold War animosity by performing Tchaikovsky's First and Rachmaninoff's Third Piano Concertos, bringing 1,500 Russians to their feet in a Moscow concert hall and winning the first International Tchaikovsky Competition (McLellan, 2013a). Van Cliburn, like Yakovlev, became a bridge between two diverse and competing political systems and cultures, and helped warm relations between the United States and the Soviet Union (Kozlov, 2013).

As we have discovered above, during the Cold War, the U.S. Foreign Policy towards the Soviet Union consisted of multiple dynamic and complex efforts including
hard power and soft power tools of engagement, and many private citizen-led diplomacy
efforts. These diverse efforts helped mitigate and defuse countless issues between the
two superpowers and their peoples. These above examples also highlight the multiple
and diverse efforts made by many citizens around the world in order to help prevent
armed conflict and reduce the threat of nuclear weapons. The foresight, actions, and
sacrifices of many have helped to pave the way for citizen-led diplomacy to be at the
front of world politics and diplomacy today.

The Chinese Case

People's Republic of China (PRC) or China, like the Former Soviet Union, was
Communist and posed a direct threat to the United States and its interests. China, like the
Soviet Union, supported North Korea since the Korean War. In the 1960s, China was
pushing into other parts of Asia and providing direct and indirect support to North
Vietnam. In 1964, China successfully tested a nuclear bomb, which greatly increased the
threat of confrontation with the United States. In the article "Whether To ‘Strangle the
Baby in the Cradle,’” it was argued that the U.S. was so concerned about China’s nuclear
weapons development that it considered many courses of action, including covert military
operations against targets in China (Burr & Richelson, 2000).

To deal adequately with China and Russia, the U.S. created a foreign policy called
“triangular diplomacy,” which was used to maintain stability in Asia, based on the belief
that these two countries would compete against each other for good relations with the U.S.
(Kissinger, 2011). This policy was also meant to bring “China’s 800,000,000 out of
‘angry isolation’” and push Russia for a nuclear arms deal, later known as Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) I agreement (State Department, 2015; Nathan, 2011b).

In the early 1970s, China was at the height of Mao Zedong’s Cultural Revolution, which killed between 15-30 million people (L. Edwards, 2010).³¹ Yet despite this, “one of the first public hints of improved U.S.-China relations came on April 6, 1971, when the American Ping-pong team, in Japan for the 31st World Table Tennis Championship, received a surprise invitation from their Chinese colleagues for an all-expense paid visit to the People's Republic” (DeVoss, 2002a). On April 10 that same year, nine players, four officials, and two spouses stepped across a bridge from Hong Kong to the Chinese mainland, ushering in an era of "Ping-pong diplomacy" (PBS, 2015). The U.S. Ping-pong Team was the first group of Americans allowed into China since the Communist takeover in 1949.

This successful civil engagement was not lead by politicians, but by sports enthusiast and Ping-pong players, who helped thaw relations and eventually achieve détente by playing a sport that China could relate to at both an athletic and political level, as the sport was originally designed to help spread Communism throughout the world (Staff, 2014; Biao, 2011; N. Griffin, 2014).

During the U.S. Ping-pong team visit to China, the United States announced plans to lift a 20-year embargo on trade with China. Right after this event, Kissinger made a secret visit to the PRC in July 1971, paving the way for President Nixon’s official visit in

³¹ Mao’s Great Cultural Revolution took place from 1966-1976 in order to purge China of intellectuals.
February 1972 (FlorCruz, 2008). During President Nixon’s visit, he signed the joint Shanghai Communiqué in which the “two countries began to normalize relations and 'agreed to disagree' on thorny issues such as Taiwan” (CFR, 1972). The two countries also agreed upon the elimination of any attempts to gain hegemony in Asia.

The Ping-pong engagement, which was called "the ping heard round the world" by Time Magazine, helped open relations with China. "Never before in history has a sport been used so effectively as a tool of international diplomacy," said Chinese Premier Chou En-lai who was premier from the day China was founded in 1949 until his death in 1976 (DeVoss, 2002a). He was also the savvy diplomat and pragmatist who kept the government of China running and the door open to a world hostile to Mao's regime (Staff Writer, 1999). The Chinese Ping-pong Team reciprocated by visiting the United States the following year. As a result of this engagement, liaison offices were established in both countries, which were later upgraded to Embassies.

Due, in large part, to these early acts of engagement, the United States and China today continue with robust engagement and public diplomacy programs. This includes such diverse things as news and educational exchanges including the United States’ Fulbright Program and China's Confucius Institutes, which help shape the view of its citizens and bridge the historical, political and cultural gap that exits between these two countries(Volodzko, 2015; Staff Writer, 2015b).

The above symbolic demonstrations of Russia and China are prime examples highlighting successful U.S. Foreign Policies with some countries based on multiple
levels of engagement and direct and indirect high quality contact. However, in addition to these government efforts, there were also continuous public and private efforts at direct and indirect high quality contact by schools, NGOs and other private citizens to bridge cultural and ideological gaps of prejudice and mistrust, which also contained consistent levels of high positive contact. After long-term diversified and coordinated engagement efforts, the outcomes in both these cases were the same: a dramatic and positive change in the relationships.

**President Eisenhower’s Culture and Peace Initiative**

In 1953, President Dwight D. Eisenhower had an old friend, Charles Douglas Jackson, who was a special assistant to the president. Jackson was also a prior executive with Time Life and former head of psychological warfare in North Africa during World War II. In addition, he understood the arts and helped developed the Lincoln Center. Jackson’s thinking centered on his belief of engaging the hearts and minds of the enemy in order to avoid war. Thus, out of these efforts, in Aug 1953, the United States Information Agency was born.

On 27 July 1954, in a letter to the House Committee on Appropriations, President Eisenhower announced: "I consider it essential that we take immediate and vigorous action to demonstrate the superiority of the products and cultural values of our system of free enterprise." He requested five million dollars "to stimulate the presentation abroad by private firms and groups of the best American industrial and cultural achievements, in order to demonstrate the dedication of the United States to peace and human well-being
[and] to offset worldwide Communist propaganda charges that the United States has no culture and that its industrial production is oriented toward war" (Prevots, 2011).

This was the first time in the history of the United States that American values and culture were promoted and supported for export to other countries based on Soft power. Ironically, this was accomplished despite the rise in Communism, the danger posed by the Cold War, the Korean War, McCarthyism, and civil rights violence going on back at home. Even during these trying times, Eisenhower had the foresight to understand the need to try and work with other foreign policy tools besides just hard power through such unique and diverse efforts as cultural and civil exchange and engagement programs at all levels of society.

Both the Former Soviet Union and China were major threats to the United States and democracy around the world. Both countries had nuclear weapons and LRBMs, and were trying to spread their versions of Communism throughout the free world. Both countries also committed various atrocities against their own people and had numerous prison camps (Gulags). However, despite the real threat of war and Communism posed by these two large countries and their notorious human rights records, the United States decided to reposition and engage through positive direct and indirect high quality contact.

On the other hand, the United States has not seemed to attempt to fully engage at all possible levels using multi-dimensional complex approaches over an extended period of time with many smaller non-democratic, unaligned countries that could or may oppose the United States, but do not necessarily pose a direct major military threat. As we have
learned over the past chapters, one of those cases is our relationship with North Korea. However, this is not the only case. Until recently, both Iran and Cuba were cases where the U.S. resorted to almost the exclusive use of hard power, sanctions, and coercion in an effort to force these countries to change to the will of the United States.

In the case of Iran, in August of 1953, the CIA assisted with a coup to overthrow the democratically elected leader in order to replace the government with a Shah more friendly to the U.S. government (Merica & Hanna, 2013). This authoritarian rule lasted until Dec 1978 when the Iranian people, tired of the repression by Shah Mohammad Reza, overthrew his government and forced him to flee to the United States. Since that time, the United States has continuously sanctioned Iran and even supported Iraqi President Saddam Hussein in his country’s war against Iran, which included the use of chemical weapons (Hersh, 1992; Harris & Aid, 2013).

In the case of Cuba, the United States began to sanction that country after Fidel Castro came to power in 1959 and increased those sanctions finally making them into a full embargo by 1962 (J. Diamond, 2015). just a year prior in 1961, the CIA sponsored a failed paramilitary invasion of the Bay of Pigs, Cuba with approximately 1,300 exiled Cuban militants (Zenko, 2015) in an effort to overthrow Castro. In 1962, the Cuban Missile Crisis erupted putting the United States and Russia on the brink of nuclear war (Staff Writer, 2015c). From that time until the recent thaw in relations, the United States has chosen to sanction and embargo Cuba in an attempt to get it to comply with U.S. demands.
The United States seemed to pursue an almost exclusive one-dimensional hard power based FP of containment and isolationism, which demonstrates a frozen position, similar to symbolic politics, a socio-psychological theory used in the political science field (Sears, 1993; Fiske, Gilbert, & Lindzey, 2010). Symbolic politics can be described as “a publicly displayed deception or surrogate action that is used to detract from actual political reality” (Badie, Berg-Schlosser, & Morlino, 2011, p. 2577). It seems for the case of these smaller countries, the United States may not feel a need to deal with them on an equal state-to-state level. Besides Iran and Cuba, there are other examples of this large state/small state U.S. foreign policy.

Throughout the history of U.S. foreign relations with Latin America, the United States has used a similar hard policy of containment, sanctions, and at times, covert and overt force to deal with smaller countries in that region that were not aligned with the United States. During the Cold War, the United States used a foreign policy consisting primarily of three actions designed to compel Latin American countries to comply: compulsory, meaning to use a policy of overwhelming political and military force; detachment, meaning to use a policy of relative inaction, occasional favors, and a display of military force in urgent matters; and cooperation, meaning a policy of economic assistance and interdependence (Karabell, 1999, pp. 112–114). This foreign policy added to the perception that the United States as an “imperial power wanted to keep Latin America poor and subservient” Chomsky, 2002). Moreover, this seemed to helped the United States establish hegemony and suppress economic nationalism, while turning such countries as Guatemala, El Salvador, and Nicaragua “into one of the Cold War’s final
killing fields” (Agnew & Rosenzweig, 2008, pp. 427–429). In many parts of Latin America, this policy continues, highlighted by the U.S. sanctions against Venezuela, which were signed into law by President Barack Obama on December 18, 2014 (Holland, 2014).

In the Asian region, U.S. FP and its quest to keep Communism in check through isolationism, sanctions, and force, severely punished those states that sought an independent course (McGilvray, 2005, pp. 264–266). According to the National Security Council Memorandum 68, the goal of the U.S. was to “destroy the Soviet system and to create a global environment in which the U.S. would preserve its wealth and power” (Blackwell, Smith, & Sorenson, 2008). George Kennan echoed this policy in 1948 when he stated among other things, “Our real task in the coming period is to devise a pattern of relationships which will allow us to maintain this disposition of disparity” (Blackwell et al., 2008, p. 88). This policy later included the devastating war with Vietnam and the secret wars in Laos and Cambodia (IBID; E. Herman & Chomsky, 1979). After these failed interventions, U.S. FP relied on increasingly crippling sanctions in an effort to subvert democracy, economic independence, and development (IBID).

The past century has shown a “lengthy history where the U.S. toppled democratically-elected governments of smaller countries in order to establish corrupt regimes that would serve corporate” and national interests, while actively suppressing genuine populist uprisings that could have served the best interests of the people living in those countries all in the name of “Anti-Communism” (Kuhlenbeck, 2015). Noam
Chomsky took this criticism of U.S. FP a bit further by stating how the strategy for U.S. global domination starting in the 1940s and continuing with successive administrations has been guided by a "godfather principle, straight out of the mafia" (Milne, 2009). Any "successful defiance" has to be punished in order to stop the contagion from spreading (IBID). Richard J. Barnett and others also saw a correlation between U.S. imperialism, capitalism, and war, and wrote how the U.S. “conducted a major military campaign or a paramilitary CIA operation in a foreign country on an average of once every eighteen months” (1973; 1980; Whitcomb, 1998; Rudolph & Rudolph, 2008).

This seems to indicate a possible double standard in U.S. FP in which it sees no need to deal with some smaller countries at an equal, state-to-state level where there is the possibility to force change or collapse through excessive use of hard power, particularly in the name of democracy. Perhaps Henry Kissinger was correct when he stated, “Although the use of force is ‘not excluded’ from relations among Asian [and other] countries, large countries such as China, Japan, and the U.S. recognize the possibilities for building relations that involve cooperation as well as a balance of military power (Rosenfield, 2014). If the United States does recognize this, then it could take this proven formula and apply it to smaller countries as well.

**Commonality between Superpower Status and Bullying**

History has shown that the United States seems to have either ignored or tried to coerce many other countries, particularly those that are smaller, into change and compliance by using its position as a superpower. Moreover, as the previous chapters
have shown, U.S. FP has not been consistently applied to all countries. More importantly, there have not been other unique initiatives when it comes to relationships with some smaller countries that the U.S. perceives as a possible threat. Thus, this frozen positioning of U.S. FP has not allowed for the positive engagement and high quality contact needed for real change to occur in the relationships with those countries. Ironically, when superpowers use their position and strength to press issues on smaller countries, these countries and their citizens can quite possibly perceive these actions not only as a threat to their sovereignty, but as intrusive, offensive, and as a form of global bullying (Blackwell et al., 2008, p. 70).

Bullying seems to be prevalent everywhere and is like a cancer in today’s global society (Elliott, 2013). There are few days where we do not hear something in the news about bullying at school, the workplace, in cyberspace, or in other parts of society. Bullying can be defined as “negative actions by one or more persons against another person repeated over time” in attempt to inflict injury or discomfort (Olweus, 1987). Psychiatrists and others often talk about the negative effect this aggressive behavior has on its victims. According to a recent study on the victims of bullying, one of the largest ever conducted, there are many negative long-term consequences of those who have been bullied (Copeland, Wolke, Angold, & Costello, 2013; Bradshaw, 2015; Saint Louis, 2013).

Countries, like individuals, can be perceived as bullies. When this happens, it is similar to adult bullying in the workplace, which is a unique form of conflict that includes
escalation between and among organizational members (states) due to the power disparity (asymmetry) between them (Lutgen-Sandvik & Fletcher, 2013). Like other types of conflict, bullying can have three types of bystander (bully allies, target allies, and neutral bystanders), and three types of bully (accidental, narcissistic, and psychopathic). The strategies of intimidation and other increasing acts of destruction used by bullies have an ultimate goal of total destruction of the opponent (Einarsen, Hoel, & Cooper, 2003; Lucade, 2012). When large states bully small states, it includes destructive communication that works to wear down those being abused which can eventually have a negative effect on other states around it (IBID).

In children and individuals, this aggressive behavior usually starts at an early age and escalates to the point where the negative perception can become psychotic or violent in nature resulting in a cycle of violent behavior, which in turn has serious effects on altering their perception of the world (Stuart, 2003; Schreier et al., 2009). For states, this "psychiatric issue" can quite possibly manifest into increased overt and autistic hostility toward the larger country, which further freezes positions, causing the smaller country to use asymmetric means to deal with this relationship.

According to a 2007 poll, “60 percent of the world's population feels that the United States bullies other countries,” especially smaller less-developed and poor countries creating a feeling of U.S. imperialism in the world (Tulley, 2007; Kavanagh, 2013; Wills, 1999; Graham, 2015). This is also a claim that both Russia and the United States have made against each other recently (Liptak & McLaughlin, 2015; Fox News,
The countries and their citizens under real or perceived thoughts of U.S. imperialism, based on its superpower status with its associated aggressive FP behavior, may react in a way similar to victims of bullying. If the conceptualization continues for a long period of time, then it is not surprising that states and their citizens develop animosity, hatred, and distrust towards the United States. Similar to individual bullying, state bullying can furthermore inflict long-lasting and intentional physical and psychological harm on those abused states that can manifest into hatred and stymied economic development (Perry, 2014; P. K. Smith & Thompson, 1991).

Some countries and even non-state actors may use this perceived or real bullying as a tool to indoctrinate their citizens and members on how evil the U.S. is. Moreover, this could be used as a recruiting tool to cultivate groups of extremists who have hatred towards the U.S and are willing to act on it. This may be exactly what we are seeing in the Middle East and on the internet with ISIS as this terrorist organization looks to capitalize on this bullying theme in effort to recruit new members (CBS, 2014). Furthermore, bulling may push vulnerable countries into alignment with radicals such as ISIS (Carassava & Aldrick, 2015).

For North Korea, the state uses years of this perceived bullying as a propaganda tool to indoctrinate its citizens that the U.S. is a bully that caused the Korean War, and that this evil enemy must be defeated and destroyed at all costs (Craft, 2013; Fackler, 2014). The regime also commonly states that South Korea is a puppet of the United States that must be liberated (Fisher, 2013; Hershberg, 1996). This indoctrination starts at
a very young age and is continuous (Staff Writer, 2012a). The country further uses this bullying as a way to explain its economic problems in order to help rally its citizens creating a cult in support of the leader, Kim Jong-un (Fifield, 2015).

The possible commonality between superpower status, the use of hard power, and perceived imperialism and bullying is an important area that requires much more research and a deeper understanding. However, perhaps an initial and very important first step to countering this bulling perception is for the U.S. to demonstrate that its FP is fair and compassionate. An effective path may be to seek out and use unique initiatives when it comes to building relationships with smaller countries including civilian-led diplomacy. This would most likely result in more positive engagement, dialogue and high quality contact at all levels of society.

Chapter 8 looked at two major cases where the United States, even when directly threatened by countries that had the capability to do serious harm on the United States and to the free world, repositioned itself and used complex and multi-dimensional foreign policy efforts, including engagement, over an extended period of time to successfully alter its relationships with these two countries. It also noted that these same diverse efforts have not been made with some smaller countries. Finally, similarities were explored between bullying and imperialism based on superpower status, which some countries may perceive when the United States pushes a FP relying almost exclusively on hard power.
A U.S. policy of displaying true international leadership and initiative by considering multiple alternative ways to defuse tensions and continuously engage North Korea, both officially and unofficially could help improve relations. Even though these efforts would most likely take time and initially be met with distrust, suspicion, and rejection on both sides of the Pacific Ocean, as were the cases for the former Soviet Union and China, they may be our best options for avoiding war, for helping North Korea, and eventually for achieving mutual understanding, positive change and peace on the Korean Peninsula.

To understand the complex minds and thoughts of those that are directly affected by U.S. foreign policy, and what initiatives have the greatest potential to be successful when it comes to North Korea, it is necessary to consult those closest to the problem and most affected: the North Korean citizens. Therefore, the next chapter will examine the key results of the interviews of 40 former North Korean refugees living in South Korea, which can help us determine what may be the correct steps to take in order to transform relationships and this conflict.
Chapter 9: Research Findings, Analysis and Discussions

Introduction

This chapter covers key findings, analyses, and discussions of the research based on the qualitative interviews, which were conducted in the summer of 2013. The detailed design of the qualitative interviews is covered in Chapter 3 of this paper.

The chapter is divided into three primary sections. The first section covers interviewees’ key demographic information including gender, age and their home province in North Korea. It also includes the education levels and self-identified social classes of these refugees. The second section is subdivided into two parts. Part one covers general findings from the interviewees. Part two covers specific findings relevant to this paper, conflict resolution, and foreign policy discussions, and includes a selection of the most common interviewee comments. The third and final section provides concluding thoughts on the analyses of the interviews, and recommendations for future research. The percentages provided in this chapter are based on a detailed analysis after entering the countable quantitative data into SPSS.

In general, the former North Korean refugees seemed relatively well informed on U.S and North Korean Foreign Policy and world affairs, and provided relevant and varying comments on what may need to be done in order to promote change within North Korea. All of the refugees were polite and most had no difficulty answering the majority
of questions. However, like all interviews, there were some who either did not want to or could not provide answers to some of the questions asked.

This was expected due to personal sensitivities and security issues surrounding some of these refugees. In addition, there were many of those interviewed who either mentioned that they had suffered various forms of trauma, or seemed to have suffered trauma (Jeon et al., 2005; Noland, 2008). Therefore, since the content of the interviews is very personal, I did not push the interviewees to reply when they did not have or hesitated to provide an answer, despite the feeling that a few may have had more to say. This decision was based on my personal experience working with this category of protected people in the past, respect for their position, and in light of the restricted amount of time to interview each person, which was limited to around two hours each. The time limitation was due to fatigue from the interviews, time the interviewees had to take out of their days to meet, and consideration for other personal factors.

The vast majority of those interviewed seemed to appreciate someone asking their personal opinion on how to help resolve this complex and protracted social conflict. Many of them had very private stories not contained within the pages of this text, including, as mentioned earlier, those of physical abuse and trauma. For the female participants, many gave personal accounts of the horrific events surrounding their individual escapes from North Korea. Many spoke of and suffered from multiple cases of abuse, rape, and being forced at times into years of sexual slavery and forced marriage to rural Chinese men while trying to escape North Korea. As expected, most of this abuse was at the hands of the Chinese, yet some was at the hands of brokers and self-
identified aid workers who were supposedly working to help these people escape North Korea. In addition, almost without exception, every participant emotionally pleaded for help in changing the current status quo with North Korea.

Section One: Demographic Information

In this section, key demographic background information of the interviewees is presented and analyzed in order to show the overall composition of interviewees based on such indicators as gender, age, and geographic origin. This information is important to the researcher and reader as it helps both understand why some interviewees may have responded to questions in a certain way. Furthermore, this section highlights where the majority of refugees are escaping from and the possible reasons for their escape.

Population Breakdown of the Interviewees

As shown in Table 2 below, 40 North Korean Refugees were interviewed, which were broken down by age and gender. It shows that the majority of the interviewees 26 (65%) were female, while 14 (35%) were male. The imbalance in gender of the interviewees is not by choice or design. However, this gender imbalance, although lower than the actual imbalance of refugees in South Korea, which is approximately 70% female, generally represents the number of female and male refugees coming out of North Korea (Staff, 2015a).

This is based on the current number of North Korean refugees in South Korea, which is approximately 30,000 refugees (Kim 2013; Staff Writer 2015). This also shows
the average age for all interviewees was 43. The male refugee average age was approximately 36, compared to the average age of female refugee, which was approximately age 46. This is indicative of the number of young female refugees who are being captured in the border region of China and sold either into prostitution or as Chinese wives due to the low male-to-female ratio in China.

Of all interviewees, approximately 37% were between the ages of 19-39, and approximately 37% were between the ages of 40-49. The youngest male interviewed was 19 and the oldest was 58 years old. The youngest female interviewed was 24 and the oldest was 73 years old. Some of the interviewees had been living in South Korea for more than 15 years while other interviewees arrived in South Korea as recently as two month after leaving North Korea (at the time of the interview).

Table 2: Interviewees by Age and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Mean Age</th>
<th>Number of Refugees</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>46.65</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>36.43</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female + Male</td>
<td>43.08</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wilson, 2015
Interviewees by Province

Table 3 below shows the number and gender of refugees from each province in North Korea and the two major cities, Pyongyang and Kaesong. A geographical representation of these numbers is provided in Figure 2. This composition shows that although the vast majority of refugees who escaped North Korea were from the Northeast Provinces, there were some refugees who made it out of North Korea from the other provinces including the city of Kaesong and the capital of Pyongyang. Furthermore, as to be expected, those who escaped from Pyongyang typically self-identified as being from the elite class of society. The lack of refugees from the interior of North Korea is due to the roughness in terrain, which is more than 70% mountainous. Furthermore, the lack of refugees from the southern provinces is due to both the distance needed to travel to the Chinese border to try and escape and the military control of the border region with South Korea.

Table 3: Interviewees by Province in North Korea

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provinces</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Pyongyang City</th>
<th>North Hamkyung</th>
<th>South Hamkyung</th>
<th>North Pyongan</th>
<th>South Pyongan</th>
<th>North Hwanghae</th>
<th>South Hwanghae</th>
<th>Kangwon</th>
<th>Chakang</th>
<th>Ryanggang</th>
<th>Kaesong City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender Female</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female +Male</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 4 below shows the self-identified education levels and social classes of the interviewees. It shows that when the interviewees left North Korea, approximately 40% had at least a high school education. Also, over 42% had a secondary education ranging from trade school to doctorate level. However, it should be noted that in North Korea, school completion up to high school is mandatory. Yet, this does not necessarily mean
that they attend class or even studied, as they are promoted each grade level higher based primarily on their age and not actual academic work or attendance at school.

In North Korea, there are three primary social classes in society based on allegiance to the regime: the elite class; the wavering class; and the hostile or undesirable class. The class of citizenship cannot be changed without a specific high profile event. In other words, citizens are born into and die within the same class and many of those from the hostile class are there because of relatives who were originally from South Korea before the Korean War. In addition, the interviewees came from across the social spectrum, from elite social origins including a former high-level North Korean spy, to the most humble of social origins including what is referred to as Gotjabes, young orphaned children who roam around the countryside without anything to eat.

Table 4 below also shows that overall, the majority who self-identified came from the wavering class, which is consistent with other refugee reports. Despite this, there is also good representation from the other two classes. Finally, over 27% of those interviewed said they had spent time in a political or labor detention (Gulag) camps.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4: Interviewees’ Education Level and Social Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female &amp; Male</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The findings in section one above show that there were adequate range and variety in the former North Koran refugees interviewed, which offers a very good representation of the overall North Korean population and of the refugees currently living in South Korea.

**Section Two: Analysis and Discussion of Key Research Findings**

This section centers on the key findings of the interviewees based on the primary research objectives. Part one of this section contains the broad-based general findings with key comments included. Part two of the section contains detailed research findings with key interviewee comments and analyses included. Separating general and detailed research findings allowed the encapsulation of both general and specific insights from the study, and further facilitated the summary and recommendations contained in section three and the recommendations chapter that follows.

**Part One: General Research Findings**

The general research findings from this study are shown below in Table 5. One key point revealed was that even in a controlled interview environment, North Korean Refugees can change how they think, interact, and receive information, based on direct HQC and the positive repositioning of self and other. Another is that there seemed to be little difference in the responses given by those who had lived in South Korea for a while and those who had just escaped North Korea. The exception to this rule seemed to be those who attended college in South Korea. The most probable reason for this is that North Korean refugees are still, for the most part ostracized in South Korea and therefore
keep within their own refugees groups. Therefore, except for those who attend college, their ability to have HQC is limited.
Table 5: General Research Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Finding</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The interviewees were very open and spoke freely when the interviewer</td>
<td>This is an important micro example of what direct HQC can do to open up the hearts and minds of North Koreans. This is also very similar to multiple experiences I had while in North Korea last year talking to members of the elite social class. When these members were separated from others and I was alone with them, they too opened up and expressed themselves freely. This was particularly true when non-threatening examples of how countries and people could have relationships were given, but without directly mentioning North Korea, the U.S. or South Korea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>changed his position from one of a researcher and academic professional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(who has power in Asian society) to someone who cares and wants to understand what is going happening.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Many had families or loved ones already in South Korea, and the vast</td>
<td>This shows that despite the divide, there are important paths for positive information flow through indirect HQC into and outside North Korea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>majority have relatives still living in North Korea. In addition, many</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>had direct sustained contact with their loved ones still living in the North.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Most had received indirect and or direct information about the outside</td>
<td>This further shows the importance of direct and indirect HQC on their society, and what it can do to change this population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>world including such</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
things as listening to radio, watching movies or drama and receiving aid. In addition, most commented that it had a positive effect on them.

4 The decision to leave North Korea was based more on economic than political reasons. This shows the need to provide tailored economic and humanitarian aid to North Koreans.

5 Except for those who were attending college, there were no significant differences between the answers given by those who had lived in South Korea for years and those who had just arrived in South Korea. In addition, there were no noticeable differences in answers based on age. This is probably due to two reasons. First, former North Koreans living in the South are for the most part, ostracized and still primarily live near and associate with other refugees. In addition, the younger generation of refugees seemed to be just as informed on world affairs as the older ones, despite their lack of exposure to a free society. This is probably due to the increase in the flow of information into North Korea and effects of the open markets as a way to pass information.
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Part Two: Specific Research Findings

The specific research findings from this study are shown below in Table 6. Some of the major themes revealed that although most agreed that hard power is needed in
dealing with North Korea, hard power by itself is not enough to change the strategic
direction of the North Korean regime and that multidimensional efforts are also needed,
including people-to-people exchanges and engagement. Furthermore, North Korea has
no intention of giving up its Nuclear Weapons. Finally, direct HQC, such as those
afforded by having an Embassy in North Korea and having dialogues and exchanges
along with more visitors to that country can positively affect North Koreans. These
findings and others are discussed in detail in the section that follows Table 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Finding</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hard power alone will not change the North Korean Regime.</td>
<td>Although approximately 50% agreed with the current hard power policy towards North Korea, most all also said that it would not change the regime.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The North Korea Regime will not give up Nuclear Weapons</td>
<td>Unless there is political change in North Korea, or we change the relationship with North Korea, the regime will not give up these weapons, mostly out of fear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Multidimensional Approach is needed</td>
<td>Even though most agreed with hard power, many also said that other Soft power type efforts such as civil engagement and dialogue were also needed to make change happen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct contact such as visitors to North Korea and a U.S. Embassy where there can be daily engagement is needed.</td>
<td>Although many were concerned that visitors primarily supported the regime as means to provide foreign currency, they also agreed that by foreigners being in North Korea, it provides hope and a window into the outside world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>There was division almost evenly among the refugees on whether we should provide aid to North Korea.</td>
<td>Those who were against aid, said the reason was that they thought it would only go to the regime. However, for those who thought aid is important, the overwhelming reason was that it would still help North Koreans and relationships with the outside world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Indirect high quality contact plays a major role in how North Koreans think about the outside world.</td>
<td>Many stated that news and information flow helped them understand the outside world and positively affected their perceptions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>While most North Koreans (still in the north) do not believe in religion, it can be an effective tool for change.</td>
<td>Due to the brainwashing about religion in North Korea, the best way for religious organizations to help is to show them how good they are through the actions and support services they provide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The regime has continued for so long due to the structural violence and deprivation they have over society.</td>
<td>Most interviewees said that the regime’s tight control on society, lack of information and services, and reporting system including the killing of entire families, have allowed the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9.</strong></td>
<td>The markets play a key role in changing the lives of North Koreans.</td>
<td>Open markets’ main functions are to provide a means for those who do not benefit from the government’s distribution system to survive. However, it also is bringing about a new generation of capitalists who are using this as a tool to pass information both directly and indirectly to others.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question:** When asked, “When you were living in North Korea, did you listen or were you exposed to information about South Korea or the United States,” approximately 50% of those interviewed said “yes.” When further asked, “Did this information have a positive affect or influence on you” approximately 80% said yes.

According to a 32-year-old woman, “I heard more indirect rumors about information on the outside world than directly listening to media. When I heard it, I thought it was just something going on in a foreign country. Also, I thought it was better for me to not continue to listen and divulge these things to others, so I stopped. This type of outside information increased around 1989 after the Seoul 88 Olympics. Also, even though I knew about it, regardless of the circumstances, if I said something about it by
mistake, I could easily be sent away to a prison camp. So I thought it was better not to pass this information along or express myself about it.”

According to a 45-year-old woman, “Yes, I knew. I was exposed a lot to radio and TV and watched such things as South Korean dramas, sports and even concerts. It was common to get these things near the border [with China], yet one had to be careful. That type of information was powerful. It provided a chance for people to see a new face of South Korea and means to wake them up from their sleep.”

According to a 73-year-old woman, “When I was in North Korea I listened to the radio and watched South Korean dramas often. This had an influence on both me and my relatives.”

According to a 51-year-old man, “I knew about all of it. It was part of my job to know and I heard it also from my seniors.”

According to a 72-year-old woman, “When I used to visit my relatives in China, I watched TV and listened to the radio. Yet, I was always afraid to talk about what I saw or heard so I never said anything.”

According to a 21-year-old man, “I was able to watch Chinese TV and Korean dramas on DVDs at odd times, and it made me fantasize about South Korea.”

**Analysis:** The above question and answers provide us with a key point and tool that can be used to help North Korea change: That is by increasing the flow of information into that civil society, it can positively directly and indirectly affect North Koreans. In order
to be more successful, the information flow should be passed through various methods including radio, TV, multi-media and interlocutors.

**Question:** When asked, “When you were living in North Korea, where you aware of aid being given by the United States, South Korea, or the International Community,” approximately 80% of those interviewed said yes, and of those, 40% said they saw the aid being given directly.

According to a 51-year-old man, “I heard it directly from a [North Korean] leader that aid was coming in from South Korea.”

According to a 32-year-old woman, “I knew about it. I directly heard about it and starting in 1996 when there was no domestic production or food, there were large deliveries of aid and everyone around me knew about this.”

According to a 48-year-old man, “Yes I did. Most of all, when I saw the South Korean aid, fertilizer and brand names, I thought without hesitance how developed South Korea must be….”

According to a 41-year-old woman, “I knew about it. At my school, the UN Children’s fund was donating flower and cookies, but not regularly. Right behind our school was a day care and nursery so each time the UN came to inspect them, we would devote time to washing our fence and improving the environment.”

According to a 56-year-old woman, “I knew about it, but I was not aware of the size of support given.”
**Analysis:** The above question and answers show us that regardless of the foreign policy stance of the outside world, aid which should be separate from foreign policy helps change the minds of those who receive it as it provides both indirect and direct HQC while building trust in foreigners.

**Question:** When asked, “Are you still in contact with anyone in North Korea,” approximately 50% of those interviewed said “yes.”

According to a 32-year-old woman, “I am in contact, and there is little change. Somehow they are managing to survive.”

According to a 56-year-old woman, I hear about North Korean indirectly through other North Korean refugees. Things are getting worse in North Korea.”

According to a 48-year-old man, “I contact them often and it seems that after Kim Jong-Un came to power, the control of the border area and all areas of North Korea is getting worse [tighter]. When the control gets worse, people worry if they can do business or not. They are worried about the increase in prices and life is getting worse.”

According to a 73-year-old woman, “I am still in contact with them and since Kim Jong-Un took over, things are getting worse.”

According to a 25-year-old man, “I spoke to them about a month ago and the central content of the conversation was that the gap between the rich and poor is growing. Especially, those that are doing business outside of Pyongyang are now controlling about 60% of the economy.”
According to a 45-year-old woman, “I am occasionally in contact with them. They directly told me that the situation in North Korea is getting worse.”

According to a 72-year-old woman, “I have not contacted them for about a year due to fear that they would be victimized. According to rumors I hear, it is now getting more difficult to make contact with loved ones.”

**Analysis**: The above question and answers give us yet another opportunity to use indirect high quality contact to affect North Koreans. By using the diaspora to pass information into and out of North Korea, it has a great potential to help expedite the change happening in North Korean society.

**Question**: When asked, “Do North Koreans believe in religion,” over 90% of those interviewed said “no.” However, when asked “Can religion help in North Korea,” almost 50% said yes. In addition, when asked, “Why is there no religion in North Korea, 87% of those interviewed said, “the regime is afraid of religion.” Of those who responded, the vast majority said that they were taught “religion is like opium and should be avoided.”

According to a 51-year-old man, “I believe that there are some in North Korea who believe in religion, but there is no way to know how many. I also think that religious aid organizations who are helping North Korea can continue to be of help to them in the future. However, the North Korean government is trying to prevent religion in North Korea by teaching everyone that it is similar to an opium revolution.”
According to a 32-year-old woman, “I was not a believer, but through various means I knew of some who were. I had also heard of the various things these Christian charity groups do such as providing aid, medicine and helping to build new factories. In the future, I hope that these Christian groups provide additional assistance in different areas of North Korea, and by doing so I believe it will continue to have a larger positive affect on North Korean society. However, the regime is afraid of this as it can create change to the political system.”

According to a 25-year-old man, “I found out about religion being in North Korea after I arrived in South Korea. The work religious groups can do in North Korea is very diverse. For example, they can work to eradicate famine and to improve sanitation. Yet, if these people’s primary objective is do missionary work [convert people to Christianity] North Koreans may reject them. Therefore, they should be approached primarily for the love that religion is based on. According to the basic principles of Christianity, Jesus Christ first provided for the hungry, healed those who were sick, and after that, he then talked about their salvation. For religious groups to approach North Korea, they must do as Jesus Christ did.”

According to a 56-year-old woman, “North Koreans don’t believe in religion. The regime is afraid of it. However, religious groups can help by providing humanitarian aid. Yet it will still be difficult for North Koreans to know that they are being helped by religious groups.”

According to a 48-year-old man, “North Korea is most fearful of religion. If the government allows religion, people will become disappointed in the Juche ideology and
the security system of the regime will collapse. In order for North Koreans to learn about and believe in religion, there must be people-to-people contact. For example, near the border with China or through others that they are in contact with, religion can act as a way to show them about the outside world and peace.”

**Analysis:** The above question and answers show the value of using religious groups and other NGOs to help change North Korea and replace the brainwashing of Juche ideology. However, it also shows that some religious organizations may be going about it in the wrong way. Instead of talking directly about being saved, they should show compassion and help, and by doing so, open up North Koreans’ minds in an indirect, but high quality way. This type of constructive engagement has great potential to help change North Koreans in a culturally appropriate way.

**Question:** When asked, “When you were living in North Korea, how often did you see or visit the open markets,” approximately 74% said on a daily basis. When asked, “What affect do markets have on society and politics,” most said that it has a positive affect and were ways to pass information out on regular basis.

According to a 41-year-old woman, “It is difficult to maintain life in North Korea without the markets. Each season the government gave permission for the markets, it was different. When there were special events, we were mandated to participate [in the market]. The products were about 90% Chinese origin. If we did not have the market,
life would be very difficult. When I think of all the various labor groups, women now have much fighting power [due to the markets].”

According to a 25-year-old man, “Markets are in every county and smaller ones are elsewhere. Markets have made a new social class in North Korea. In North Korea, the new social class is capitalist. The potential for these people to drive change is tremendous. This is because essentially these new merchants are creating sensitivity to profit, and therefore creating a sensitive government response to them. Especially, as these markets become more vibrant, it is also serving to loosen the structured life of North Korea: A structured life that is the primer for brain washing. Women merchants have not yet been able to have a big impact on change yet, but as time passes, they will. This is because women are the first line of education for their children as they continue to push back on the power of the regime, and the allegiance from the children will equally be eroded.”

According to a 72-year-old woman, “We can go into the market from early in the morning with government approval. We can buy and sell and even purchase things that are not legal to buy we can purchase if we pay a fine, but we could also be sent away to a camp. However, it is also dangerous due to other restrictions.”

According to a 51-year-old man, “the activities in the market have had a political and social impact; through the markets there have been a lot of rich people and merchants officially arise, which means they have expanded so much that their presence and influence can’t be ignored.”
According to a 32-year-old woman, “It was open every day and I went there every day. The influence of the markets is serving to increase the awareness of capitalism. Those that do business at the markets have many complaints about the country that ignores and does not take care of them. Also, it is increasing the position of women while serving as a means to hasten the flow of information. After these markets opened, the number of divorces quickly rose and along with the number of older women marrying younger men while providing a means for women to change.”

**Analysis:** The above question and answers clearly indicate markets, originally formed as a means to survive after the North Korean regime’s public distribution system, had broken down, but have also grown into a powerful tool for exchange of information and change within society. It has created a place for the flow of information similar to the Silk Road, while creating a new bold class of capitalist, which may someday have the ability to change the regime. Finally, these markets and a small, but powerful group of merchants can now use their contact as a direct means to influence larger groups in North Korean society as they have the power to persuade.

**Question:** When asked, “How is it that North Korea can stay in power for so long,” the vast majority’s answer that it was due to control.

According to a 73-year-old woman, “The suppression and exploitation of the people, which prevents freedom of movement, freedom of expression, and puts them in jail have allowed the government to keep the population tied up.”
According to a 45-year-old woman, “Without a break in history, it has been able to create a flawless system of control, and through a system where each person monitors the other, it has broken the people without even a crack.”

According to a 25-year-old man, “It is not difficult to think it is because of the brainwashing education and the power of the continuous structured society. This is especially true since those born before 1985 in North Korea are maintaining this system. However, just 10-15 years later, as the 1990s generation becomes the center of society, this system of control will become difficult to maintain. This is because as the 1990s came about, the economic depression started and the structured life became weaker. Then since the 2000s the markets have become larger and the structure life has become paralyzed, therefore shaking the political power of North Korea. Kim Jong-Un has recognized this and has therefore tried to concentrate on the ranks of the young and youth alliances who will be the future leaders.”

According to a 72-year-old woman, “Since it is the third generation succession based merely on identity, it is easy for Kim Jong-Un to control society.”

According to a 51-year-old man, “I think it is due to the systems of reporting and control of the population done without even a crack, along with the continuous brainwashing and blocking of foreign information flow into the country that is constantly being monitored.”

According to a 32-year-old woman, “Due to 500 years of oppression from the Yi Dynasty and 36 years from the Japanese occupation of Korea there has been no change, and because people are now afraid of the change due to the illusion of reality. In addition,
it is also true that the North Korean regime has learned how to control well by not satisfying peoples basic needs while equally [setting up a] control structure.”

According to a 48-year-old man, “The most likely candidate is the control system the regime has on information.”

According to a 46-year-old woman, “Due to excessive power and control of the information, and when someone commits a crime, their entire family is killed.”

**Analysis:** The above question and answers show us that the structural violence, control and deprivation of North Koreans’ basic human needs have all been used to fully control the North Korean population. It also shows that until we can help raise their level of existence though such means as aid and information, this control will most likely continue. Finally, it shows that the regime has used over 500 years of history as a means to create a control system that is not dissimilar to the Kingdomship and class structure of the past.

**Question:** When asked, “What does North Korea fear the most,” approximately 50% of those interviewed said that the government fears [outside] information the most. In addition, another 15% said the government fears North Korean refugees.

According to a 51-year-old man, “The regime fears the most the flow of outside information about the Kim family that would expose all the corruption and extravagant spending, which would turn the population against them.”
According to a 21-year-old man, “It seems they are afraid of the leaking of information into North Korea about the outside world.”

According to a 42-year-old woman, “The regime fears the invasion of foreign culture into society.”

According to a 25-year-old man, “It fears foreign information and capital made by the new social class of capitalists. In order to shake the foundation of North Korean power, [we] should push the influx of information and invigorate the markets.”

According to a 48-year-old man, “The regime is worried about the discovery of their true policies, the flow of information into the country, the discovery of the superiority of capitalism, the face of the outside world, and the understanding of what dictatorship really means.”

**Analysis:** The above question and answers show us that one of the ways to break the structural violence and control of the regime is by helping North Koreans understand what the outside world is all about. This can only be accomplished by supporting the mechanisms such as high-mid and grassroots-level leadership and efforts to get information into that society, while creating new paths of information flow.

**Question:** When asked, “What do North Koreans fear the most,” 45% said they feared not having enough food the most, while another 15% said they feared for their security.
According to a 72-year-old woman, “I fear being sent to a government detention camp, living without daylight, being executed or living in a world with little to eat. The security apparatus is scary.”

According to a 48-year-old man, “They fear not having enough to eat.”

According to a 41-year-old woman, “I think there is much anxiety about how to make money. There is nothing that cannot be done without money. In our country, it is so savage there is an expression that states, ‘a fist is closer than law.’”

According to a 45-year-old woman, “They fear internal security, ministry of security and the party organs the most.”

**Analysis:** The above question and answers once again, enforces the need and value of giving aid and providing information to North Koreans.

**Question:** When asked, “Why does North Korea want nuclear weapons,” 65% said it was to ensure the regime stays in power, whereas another 19% said it was for self-defense. When further asked will North Korea give up nuclear weapons,” 95% said that this would not happen.

According to a 48-year-old man, “The regime wants it as a safeguard for dictatorship power.”

According to a 72-year-old woman, “It is the way for which the third generation of succession can stay in control of the government. North Korea is absolutely not going
to give up its weapons because if it did, what it would have nothing to maintain control of its land.”

According to a 21-year-old man, “It is to protect their power of the regime and to survive from being hostage of the countries which surround it.”

According to a 41-year-old woman, “All the regime has is the nuclear weapon. It is a struggle for them to maintain their system of power. They will never give up these nuclear weapons.”

According to a 51-year-old man, “The regime thinks that by having nuclear weapons and long-range missiles, it can resist the power of the U.S. and other countries, avoiding both the collapse of the regime and war. The only way to make the regime give up these weapons is through a collapse of the current regime.”

Analysis: The above question and answers show us that until North Korea feels free from a possible attack by the U.S. similar to those conducted on Iraq and Libya, it will not give up nuclear weapons or long-range missiles. In addition, unless we change the strategic direction of our foreign policy and approach North Korea at all levels of society, no change will occur.

Question: When asked, “What do you think of the U.S. Foreign Policy towards North Korea, which can be defined as one that currently is focused first on ensuring North Korea eliminates its nuclear weapons and long range missiles through such means as UN
sanctions, isolation and military coercion” over 50% of those interviewed said they thought this hard policy was effective.

According to a 72-year-old woman, “I believe this tough policy is good. Even though the regime continues to maintain its control on power, I think the pressure should continue.”

According to a 26-year-old woman, “No! The U.S. should be trying to leak a lot of information into North Korea and continuously give aid while demanding the North Korean government change and talking about such things as human rights.”

According to a 25-year-old man, “If I had to sum up in the U.S. foreign policy in one word, I would say that the U.S. is ‘uninterested’ in North Korea. Don’t you think that way too? There is concern for nuclear weapons. The U.S. concern is not for North Korea, but for a North Korea that has nuclear weapons. The continued failure of U.S. foreign policy is due to the U.S. wanting to only focus on making the Korean Peninsula a nuclear free area instead of adjusting it in order create change in North Korea. North Korea knows this and therefore, the results are that the U.S. will not be able to resolve the nuclear weapons problem.

According to a 45-year-old woman, “I think the policy of the 1990s was probably not correct. If during that time we had completely isolated North Korea and pushed them to change, it would probably not have developed a nuclear weapon.”

According to a 41-year-old woman, “If you continue to isolate North Korea and ignore it, the regime will never give up nuclear weapons. There is one thing that is not understood: Even though South Koreans and others around the world know the
economic difficulties and level [of living] they dare not know what to do. Even though such a small country is not bugging, it is almost laughable knowing they cannot breathe, while it is also pathetic listening to various news media outlets and all the noise. We need to just leave them alone.”

According to a 48-year-old man, “I think it is a good job, and we should not believe in North Korean diplomatic skills. I think in order to change North Korea, we must also change the military and military leaders. In order to affect change on military leaders we need to get information into North Korea, and help the military make disturbances [uprisings] as the best method of convincing North Korea to give up nuclear weapons and long-range missiles.”

According to a 32-year-old woman, “I am not sure if the policy is correct or not, but because of China, there will be no collapse or change [in North Korea]. In addition, because of the problem similar to the War in Iraq the use of military force will not be successful or have any effect. I think the only way to find breakthroughs will come through relations between North Korea and China and North-South Korean relations.”

According to a 51-year-old man, “There is a lack of consistency in U.S. foreign policy. When there is a change in the government and at the time of incumbency, the same story about North Korea is told, but there is no patience [in dealing with North Korea].”

According to a 56-year-old woman, “I think first and foremost the policy is for the United States’ benefit. North Korea’s current situation has not worsened and they continue to manage while making nuclear weapons and blocking other countries [efforts].”
According to a 46 year old woman, “While continuing with sanctions, there must also be an appeasement policy put in place.”

**Analysis:** The above question and answers show that North Koreans think the U.S. does not care. It also shows that there is not just one single answer to what may need to be done to change the foreign policy towards North Korea. In addition, many are frustrated at the seemingly single objective of U.S. foreign policy, which is to get rid of North Korea’s nuclear weapons and long-range missiles. Although many of the answers state that hard power is a correct method, they also feel that it will not do much on its own to change North Korea. Therefore, multiple foreign policy and conflict resolution tools are needed to help change North Korea.

**Question:** When asked, “What do you think if the U.S. and North Korean exchanged Embassies, Consulates or Cultural Centers,” over 52% answered that they thought it was a good idea.

According to a 51-year-old man, “I think that of course this help.”

According to a 45-year-old woman, “Without condition I would rejoice at the idea of doing these things.”

According to a 25-year-old man, “Of course this would help. By having an embassy or culture center in North Korea it would show the North Koreans that you want normalize relations with them.”

According to a 41-year-old woman, “I think it is a good idea.”
According to a 48-year-old man, “Due to the bad information and education given to citizens about the U.S., it would be difficult for North Koreans to accept.”

According to a 46-year-old woman, “I don’t think it would help and this is because the government would control the ability of the people to get close.”

**Analysis:** The above questions and answers given show that having an embassy or cultural center in North Korea could help improve relations and the view of Americans by North Koreans. Of those opposed to this, the majority said they just did not think it was possible. The advantage of having an embassy or cultural center in North Korea would be that it would help to change the triadic nature of meaning, though the gesture, social act and response of North Koreans. It would also be a positive way to show the positive change in position through symbolic interactionism, through the symbol of American—a U.S. Embassy, and the social interaction can take place.

**Questions:** When asked, “Should the U.S. give food aid to North Korea,” approximately 55% said that it should. However, the opinion why or why not varied with no single reason given. Yet of those that were opposed to aid, the voices were very strong.

According to a 72-year-old woman, “We shouldn’t give them any aid until they move [in a positive direction]. Only after they submit their soul should we give them aid, and have them be thankful in order to change. Do not be soft and play like South Korea, use high culture to make them wake up.”
According to a 51-year-old man, “It is good work to give aid to North Koreans, but is difficult to distinguish the difference of aid given to the people and to the North Korean regime. Therefore, one has to think that when giving aid to the people, you are also giving aid to the regime. Furthermore, I think that there would work best if be expanded conditions set for transparency in the distribution of aid, and that aid should consist more of nutrition items and baby formula.”

According to a 26-year-old woman, “North Korean citizens need aid because the regime is not providing it. North Koreans are increasingly aware that the U.S. is providing aid to save their lives. If aid is not given in this way, then they could think that the U.S. is delivering food to the feet of Kim Jong-Un due to his greatness.”

According to a 46-year-old woman, “For clarity, the aid would have to be given direction with a monitoring system.”

According to a 25-year-old man, “As the world strongest power and police force, I think the U.S. should be responsible. Therefore, it should provide aid. In addition, the U.S., through those efforts, can help highlight the importance of human rights by giving aid to those people that are dying of starvation. I think providing aid is the best method. For example, if food aid is given, than the price of rice in North Korea falls at the markets. If rice cost 120 won then aid could make it drop to 100 won and give a chance for those that could not afford it to buy food at that 100 won rate. When South Korea gives aid, they say that North Korea uses it to make nuclear weapons, but this is merely a jump of logic. When South Korea sent aid on a regular basis, it gave relative stability to the markets, which allowed them to strive.”
According to a 41-year-old woman, “I think we should not give them aid. We know the aid given went to the regime. North Koreans really do not understand what aid is.”

Analysis: The above questions and answers show that providing aid, even if some of it goes to the regime, helps North Koreans. Not only does it raise them out of an extreme form of deprivation, but gives them a more positive view of the outside world, which weakens the regime. Conversely, when aid is not given, the regime simply uses it as another tool to create hatred towards the U.S. and international community. In addition, the important connection between markets and food aid provided a new look into how we can help raise new young capitalists in North Korea who want change, and which can positively affect the larger society and their children. Ironically, almost all those interviewed, even those that were adamantly opposed to giving aid, also said they were sending money to their relatives in North Korea each month. More importantly, of the aid that individuals are sending, 50-75% of it goes to the broker. In turn, a large part of that goes to the North Korean government in various ways including bribes. Yet, since this was for their families, most did not see the connection. This could possibly be similar to doublethink as put forth by George Orwell in 1984 (Bloom, 2009, pp. 67–72). Orwell believed, especially in dictatorships, “that to be conscious of complete truthfulness while telling carefully constructed lies, to hold simultaneously two opinions which cancelled out, knowing them to be contradictory and believing in both of them” is common (Manion, 2013).
Question. When asked, “Do North Koreans have the physical and mental capacity to think about the political situation in North Korea,” the overwhelming majority said that due to the violence and control, they do not have the freedom to do that.

According to a 72-year-old woman, “Due to the political pressure (force) of the government, I believe there is no mental capacity to think.”

According to a 21-year-old man, “I don’t think it is possible because they are worried about their livelihoods.”

According to a 42-year-old woman, “They do not have the strength. There is more they do not know than know about their country. They need to share information. There are too many people with their eyes shut and their ears closed. If they really knew about the regime, would they live this way?”

According to a 45-year-old woman, “No, they do not have enough mental or physical capacity, and they are not at a level where they can stand up.”

Analysis: Similar to the answers given earlier with how the regime stays in power, the above question and answers show that until we help North Koreans get out of this severe form of deprivation, it will be difficult for them to think about or want change to occur. Therefore, aid and information are both very important.

Question: When asked, should the U.S. continue to set preconditions to meet with North Koreans?”
According to a 51-year-old man, “I think that is a question [and answer] that those U.S. government officials who want to meet should fully understand first in order for the true answer to be revealed.”

According to a 26-year-old woman, “Of course, after you meet during negotiations, there will be conditions made. However, there is no need for conditions in order to just meet.”

According to a 25-year-old man, “If conditions are made before a meeting takes place than there is no real desire to have dialogue. Conditions are needed in negotiations, but if they are proposed for dialogue than it is not a rational action. In addition, if the U.S. requires North Korea to give up nuclear weapons in order to have dialogue then the U.S. attitude is that it wants North Korea to surrender in order to have dialogue. In order to survive and have dialogue, North Korea has made nuclear weapons, but the U.S. wants the death in order to have dialogue. Therefore, North Korea has no choice except to refuse the U.S.

**Analysis:** The above question and answers given show that creating pre-conditions to meet is not the path for changing North Korea, and that the regime is acutely aware of the way in which the U.S. and international community conducts meetings. True dialogue, without pre-conditions, break down the walls of mistrust. In order for dialogue to help positively change relationships and create a means for social interaction to take place, the repositioning of self and other along with second order positioning are needed.
**Question**: When asked, how can long-term dialogue with North Koreans help improve relationships?

According to a 72-year-old woman, “By getting close with them, perhaps we can move their mind in the right direction in order to have official summits.”

According to a 21-year-old man, “I think it can improve relationships. Above anything else, I think it is important to remember that dialogue can help to change minds little by little.”

According to a 51-year-old man, “I think dialogue, short or long term is good for developing relationships. However, if officials are going to meet just to meet [and not develop relationships] than it will not be of help.”

According to a 41-year-old woman, “I don’t have hope that this will happen.”

According to a 25-year-old man, “It would help if there were long-term dialogue with North Korean party members. In addition, what is more important is to understand North Korea’s method of conducting foreign policy. In the case of North Korea, the people who work on foreign policy have no other job and continue in the same position while creating a strategic foreign policy. At the same time, they are rearing their future replacements. However, in the U.S. and South Korea systems, these people are replaced when a new party is elected, and promises made with North Korea are not kept.... Therefore, there is an immediate need to have consistency in foreign policy in order to improve relations with North Korea.”
**Analysis:** The above question and answers, similar to the previous ones given, show that good open dialogue, which provides avenues for direct high-quality contact may help change North Korea. It also shows that North Korean foreign policy analysts have a huge advantage over democracies since they are in constantly in the same job. Long-term professionals working on building relations with North Korea in a positive way can bring about change.

**Question:** When asked, “What type of effect could such things as sports, cultural, art and people exchanges have on improving relationships with North Korea,” over 72% responded that this would have a positive effect on relations.

According to a 56-year-old woman, “This type of civil engagement would serve to benefit changing the minds of those involved in the change even more than improving relationships. Therefore, even if it is just a few people, I believe that it would be of help.”

According to a 25-year-old man, “Of course this would be of help, especially for unification between North and South Korea, where these people could help push it in that direction. Also, more than the U.S. government doing this directly, the role of civilian groups [engagement] is very important.”

According to a 32-year-old woman, “This would be of tremendous help. Through such meetings peoples’ minds can be moved, politics can be resolved, and it will help lift up other things and act as a road for different types of communication.”

According to a 45-year-old woman, “I could see how this might help lead to some [positive] momentum.”
**Analysis:** The above question and answers given show that value of civil engagement and exchange, which would provide an additional way to have direct and indirect high quality contact. It also shows that this is a necessary step in order to break down the walls of autistic hostility and think of future unification with South Korea.

**Question:** When asked, “Do you believe that the foreign tourist industry works to support the North Korean regime,” over 90% responded yes. However, when further asked, “What do North Koreans think when they see foreign tourist in their country,” over 50% responded that they believe it has a positive effect on North Koreans.

According to a 51-year-old man, “I think by foreign tourist visiting it helps by providing needed foreign currency for people.” Of course, North Koreans see foreigners when they visit. Therefore, it is not impossible for them to develop hope [desire] from this.”

According to a 56-year-old woman, “When foreigners visit North Korea, they can directly see the real situation and then inform the world, which will help harm the power of the regime. However, since North Koreans don’t see them often, it would probably not change them.”

According to a 26-year-old woman, “I think tourisms helps. However, North Koreans are more likely to desire change when they see other Asians; especially Chinese, Japanese, and South Koreans as they look like them, who are living better and have more confidence in life. Therefore they will want change.”
According to a 45-year-old woman, “I think tourists help provide the tourist industry with money for the regime so it helps the government. However, it can also be a strong method to provide fruit for change. The reason is because when North Koreans see foreigners, it brings great curiosity and people are amazed.”

**Analysis:** The above question and answers given show that although tourism supports the regime, it also supports individual North Koreans and therefore, the benefits outweigh the risks.

**Question:** When asked, “What do you think of the former six-party talks,” approximately half thought that they were not productive.

According to a 51-year-old man, “For those parties involved, it is a good starting point for them to develop and have positive relationships, but it does not help resolve the nuclear and missile issues.”

According to a 32-year-old woman, “The six-party talks were just merely a chess game between the various parties involved and did nothing to resolve the issues on the Korean Peninsula.”

According to a 45-year-old woman, “I think it is a useless game of words. It only benefits North Korea by allowing them to gain recognition and continue with their dictatorship.”

According to a 41-year-old woman, “I think it is a useless use of time and public officials.”
According to a 46 year old woman, “If you are going to show North Korea a slice of internationalism [through the six-party talks], than internationalism must be shown by having just one single voice.”

**Analysis:** The above question and answers given reflect the research done on the six-party talks early in this paper. They have little utility in resolving the conflict with North Korea, especially when there is not one unified voice during these talks.

**Question:** When asked, “Can North Korean diaspora help with changing North Korea,” more than 40% responded that they could help explain to the world what is really going on. Another 8% believed diaspora can help with providing information into North Korea, and another 8% thought they could help by providing financial support.

According to a 41-year-old woman, “They should be telling the each country in the world about what is really going on in North Korea and above all else, be working for human rights for the lives of North Koreans.”

According to a 51-year-old man, “I think it is extremely important for the North Korean refugees living abroad to have the will [intent] to try and help change North Korea. It must first be done by helping North Koreans solve their economic problems. If this is done, than it will also help North Korean want change to occur. In addition, they can help explain to the world about the suffering of North Koreans.”

According to a 21-year-old man, “I am not sure how they can help. But I would like to add that even though a lot of people around the world have interest in North Korea
I think there is so much they really do not know. I think the same can be said about North Koreans. First, let us learn about North Korea and then have them learn about us, and by doing so, it will create curiosity in the people, which will leave the North Korean government by itself. I think, in order for that to happen, North Koreans must have the ability and space to have a livelihood.”

According to a 26-year-old woman, “I think it is important that diaspora, through action more than words, can help by sending financial support. By doing this, they will give them the confidence they need in order to create a clash for change.”

According to a 25-year-old man, “North Korean refugees need to increase their skills, and have a sense of duty in order to help North Korea change. They need to have confidence and tell the outside about their experiences. They should never lie because when they do, they are just helping North Korea create a new image. As we move towards reunification, this is probably the largest danger.”

According to a 32-year-old woman, “It can help change a part of [North Korean] society by providing funds and communication. Also, it can serve a large role by providing a means of information about society in the outside world.”

**Analysis:** The above question and answers given show the value of using diaspora to help change North Korea. The diaspora has the power method to persuade in the most culturally appropriate ways. The information and funds that are sent into North Korea has a secondary and tertiary effect on the greater North Korean society. This group’s full potential should be used, and select diaspora should also be prepared to be leaders in
eventual unification process. Finally, their potential to provide key thoughts and recommendations, as demonstrated by these interviews, should also be further used.

**Question**: The final question presented caught almost every person off guard: “what is your dream?” To my surprise almost no one seemed to know how to answer that question. In fact, they seemed a bit baffled. When I asked why, most said that they had never been asked that question before nor been able really to think about it. Despite this, more than 50% responded that they wanted to be part of reunification or see reunification happen.

**Section Three: Final Summary and Recommendations for Future Research**

**Summary**

Key findings show even in a controlled interview environment, North Korean Refugees can change how they think, interact, and receive information, based on direct HQC and the positive repositioning of self and other. In addition, many of those interviewed had families or loved ones already in South Korea, and the vast majority have relatives still living in North Korea. Many also had sustained contact with their loved ones still living in the North, and provide them with aid. Most North Koreans interviewed had received indirect and or direct information about the outside world when they had lived in North Korea including such things as listening to radio, watching movies or drama and receiving aid, which had a positive effect on them.

North Koreans interviewed stated that hard power alone will not change the North Korean Regime or force it to give up nuclear weapons, and that a multidimensional approach is needed. This approach should include indirect and direct HQC as it plays a
major role in how North Koreans think about the outside world. While most North Koreans (still in the north) do not believe in religion, it can be an effective tool for change. The regime has continued for so long due to the structural violence and deprivation it has over society. Finally, local markets in North Korea play a key role in changing the lives of North Koreans and that North Korean diaspora can help change North Korea.

From the analysis and discussions of the empirical findings of these interviews, it is clear that the U.S. could benefit by changing the way it conducts foreign policy with a goal toward transforming and resolving this conflict. It is also clear that there are multiple important roles for conflict resolution specialists. The former North Korean refugees interviewed gave myriad good answers and suggestions, which also support the earlier research and chapters on North Korea and foreign policy. It is also clear that in the future we could do more to use this unique group of people, who have the expertise and desire to make change, and more importantly, have the methods to do so.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

Conducting these interviews was both a pleasure and an honor. It gave direct real feedback to questions about how to change North Korea, and supported the earlier analysis contained in this paper. However, these interviews were conducted at great personal cost since research and research funding for use with North Korea is almost non-existent. Furthermore, most of these former North Koreans had to take personal time off their jobs to provide time for these interviews. Although I tried to compensate them for their time by buying them dinner, nothing can replace a day’s wages for a group that
already has very little money and are typically ostracized in South Korean society. Yet, none asked for money or complained about providing time for these interviews, as they seemed to want to help.

Finally, much more time, similar to an anthropological case study is needed to fully understand the hearts and minds of this unique group by living with them for an extended period of time. It is recommended that funding be created to work with this group and that further research continues to be conducted on the individuals. In addition, I believe that to supplement information provided by this group that trips to North Korea and the border region with China are necessary if we are going to really try to help understand and change North Korea. As conflict analysis practitioners, the danger of working in these areas should not override our goals of helping end this and other conflicts.
Chapter 10: Recommendations: The Role of Conflict Resolution in Foreign Policy

High Quality Contact and Repositioning

The most pressing issues preventing North Korea from changing are its cultural differences (Y. H. Kim, 2014). These cultural differences also directly affect our desire and ability to positively reposition ourselves at all levels of society, and to have both direct and indirect high quality contact. To overcome these cultural differences, we should try to understand this diverse country and its people. As discovered through the comments of the former North Korean refugees, there are many ways to provide direct and indirect high quality contact. Those recommendations are contained in the complex and dynamic intervention design below.

Intervention Design

In order to understand what interventions may work best, I used John Paul Lederach’s pyramid model as a framework to help inform and guide diverse multi-dimensional intervention efforts. This model is used to “develop an analytical framework for describing the levels of an affected population” along with interventions that may be appropriate at each level of conflict (Lederach, 1998). Although this pyramid model was originally designed to explain conflict dynamics and CAR-centered interventions, it also
is well suited for showing how many FP tools can be successfully integrated with CAR and help to positively affect various conflicts and international relations in general.

The three levels in Lederach’s pyramid are as follows:

- Level 1—top leadership, which deals with such stakeholders as major military, political, and some religious leaders, and falls under the term Track 1 diplomacy (hard power);
- Level 2—middle-range, which deals with such stakeholders as respective sector leaders, small and medium businesses, and intellectuals; and
- Level 3—grassroots, which deals with such stakeholders as local leaders, NGOs, community developers, health officials and local citizens.

Both levels 2 and 3 would use a type of Track 2 diplomacy and other forms of Soft power including grassroots civil engagement, that latter of which does not fall under the control of state sponsored public diplomacy. An illustration of this model adapted from Lederach for this paper is provided below.
As indicated in the above illustration, if the conflict is addressed at each level, it can increase the contact and communication of the various stakeholders directly involved in the conflict, and foster civil society and a democratic culture (Almond & Verba, 1989; Barber, 2003; L. Davies, 2004). In the case of North Korea as discussed earlier, U.S. efforts have been primarily limited to the top level using hard power, normally only through the auspice of bilateral or multilateral efforts such as the six-party talks, which have been for the most part ineffective at resolving the conflict. New, diverse, and multiple dynamic efforts would likely prove substantially more effective.

---

32 By democratic culture, I am referring more to a participatory form of participation and not institution building as is the Western thought of democracy.
Lederach’s pyramid model clearly demonstrates the need to work with all levels of society and that the efforts should increase in proportion to the people affected. However, when it comes to U.S. FP towards North Korea, what remains constant is that the efforts are inverted. This has been shown in chapters five and six by how the U.S. FP efforts have been conducted over the past 60 years, and reflected in many of the interviewees’ comments. Instead of working at all levels and increasing efforts at the mid and grassroots levels of society, the U.S. focuses almost exclusively at the top tier participants. A visual example of this inverted FP effort is provided below:

![Figure 4: Inverted Pyramid](image-url)
Since it has been argued from a conflict resolution perspective that conflicts should be resolved with the help of all those affected, the current U.S. FP towards North Korea seems to be ineffective at creating positive and sustained change.

**Recommended Interventions for Sustained Change**

In keeping with the theme of multiple dynamic efforts to help resolve this conflict, several CAR tools that have been successfully used in the past can be implemented at each level of the conflict for sustained positive change. Some of these tools have been used to some extent with North Korea, but have not been consistently applied over an extended period of time. The difference though, is that they will be used in combination with other efforts at multiple levels of society to reap their full effectiveness and help evoke critical change.\(^3^3\) In other words, they will become multi-dimensional. Starting with the top-level, these efforts will also rely heavily on “smart diplomatic initiatives,” which include sustained contact and neutral third-party assistance. However, foreign policy objectives are often oblique and undefined. Therefore, before creating the intervention, it is important to first establish and define goals and objectives for any FP and CAR initiatives, and doing so for North Korea is no exception.

For the purpose of this paper, a goal is defined as the desired long-term end state solution. However, there can be, and often are, several mid-term sub-goals, although normally there should only be one primary overall end stated goal. The end stated goal and mid-term sub-goals are part of the overall strategic policy structure for the successful implementation of interventions.

\(^{33}\) This is also referred to as evoking the critical yeast of change.
solution of any set of issues. Objectives can be referred to as “goal enablers” that are more achievable in a shorter period of time, and are necessary to achieve the desired goal(s).

There are often many objectives necessary for achievement of the goal(s). Many times, objectives and sub-goals are interdependent, which supports overall success and enhances effectiveness of the foreign policy. Within objectives, there are primary objectives, which support the tactical transition into the stated goals, and foundational objectives, which are operational and support the overall base and execution of the overall structure, plan, or policy. Sub-goals and objectives should not be fixed, but rather have the flexibility to be modified based on the on-going results and changing needs of the environment, and they should be culturally appropriate. Finally, objectives and sub-goals are like building blocks, each one providing support for the overall structure, yet the success of individual objectives and sub-goals do not have to be achieved in a specific or ordained order. An example of this structure is contained below:
A Binary Multi-Dimensional FP Effort

The U.S. FP has, for the most part, been singular in its approach to North Korea. It has tried to mold, shape and change the regime and its actions based primarily on state lead, designed and initiated hard power diplomacy. Based on the interviews and research, it is recommended that a binary FP effort be constructed and conducted over a sustained period of time. This binary FP multi-dimensional effort would consist of: 1) continued strong measures to deal with North Korea’s belligerent acts and threats to international security, which would target the top (elite) and mid-level tiers of society; and 2) a sustained vigorous civil engagement program. The civil engagement would target...
primarily the grassroots level and some mid-level tiers of society, which would eventually affect the country’s top-tier leadership.

**Continued Strong Measures**

Hard power-centered FP effort toward North Korea is an important part of an overall effort to engage North Korea. However, the current efforts seem to be too narrow in focus and limited in scope. As part of the official state FP approach to North Korea, there should be sustained official contact.

**Sustained Contact**

Over the past 60+ years, the United States has had little direct contact with North Korea; what contact it has had was not sustained and it has been primarily state sponsored and lead based on conditions. Sustained contact, which also has to be constructive, is vital to help diminish anxiety and allow North Korea and the United States to feel comfortable with each other. As part of this regular contact, embassies or cultural exchange missions are needed in each country, similar to the ones we had in the FSU and China during the Cold War. This official contact should also be mutually supportive of other unique unofficial contact, track 2 and people-to-people civil engagement efforts.

**Third-party Participation**

Third-party participation and mediation can be effective in dealing with closed societies such as North Korea. In the past, the United States has primarily relied on the UN and its allies both in and outside the region to contact and assist in limited engagement with North Korea. For the most part, these efforts have been ineffective.
However, if the United States were to ask a country neutral to this conflict, such as a former communist state like Bulgaria, to approach North Korea, it could have many positive effects. The country could perhaps even suggest such things as formal and informal mediation, interactive and reflective problem-solving workshops, people-to-people dialogue, and public diplomacy courses, this could dramatically open up new doors and assist in breaking down the walls of division and mistrust. The next section introduces several tools that can be used at the mid-level of the conflict.

**Interactive and Reflective Problem-solving Workshops**

Interactive and reflective problem-solving workshops began to be developed in the 1960’s and 1970’s by such scholars as John Burton and Herbert Kelman, who were two of the first pioneers to use this format to help resolve conflicts (Burton 1969; Kelman and Cohen 1976; Hill 1982). In the book *Conflict Resolution Theory and Practice: Integration and Application* Chris Mitchell reminds us that these workshops are widely used in the CAR field to look at and help address protracted and deep rooted conflicts (Sandole, 1993, p. 78).34

Interactive and reflective problem-solving workshops have been effectively used around the world such as the Kashmir conflict, where it helped create the People’s Bus; and the Greek-Cypriot and Turkish-Cypriot communities, where it helped to open up new

---

34 He also states that, “a third party [practitioner] brings conflicting parties together in a neutral and unthreatening setting to help them analyze the deeply rooted or underlying causes of their conflict; to facilitate unhampered communication between them; and to encourage creative thinking about possible solutions…” (Avruch 1998, 85).
space (Nan, Mampilly, & Bartoli, 2011; Kelman 1999). Workshops, by their nature, are designed to break down barriers, change the focus and framing of the problem(s), and promote trust and openness in communication for an atmosphere in which creative problem solving becomes possible (Deutsch 1974; Kelman and Cohen 1976, 80; R. Fisher, Ury, and Patton 2011).

Workshops for North Korea might consist of such diverse subjects as CAR, traditional peacebuilding, agriculture, environmental, and even cultural and historical issues. The workshops should occur in an informal academic relaxed environment and be located in a neutral place. CAR practitioners should work with all participants to devise reasonable expectations (Stern & Druckman, 2000, p. 42). The expected outcomes should include increased mutual understanding by participants along with improved attitudes. It is also hoped that the workshops will trigger new insights, ideas and options to help in the overall peace process. Finally, this vital tool can help positively effect change, especially, but not limited to the mid-level. The next tool to discuss involves educational and cultural exchanges.

35 Lederach suggest, “middle-range leaders (who are often the heads of; or closely connected to, extensive networks... can... play an instrumental role in working through the conflicts” (Lederach 1998, 51).
36 These workshops should also serve to emphasize the conflict’s human, social, historical, cultural and economic dimensions and help to produce change in the participants' attitudes, perceptions, images, and ideas about the conflict and “the other.”
37 The workshops should also give the participants freedom and opportunity to express, explore and examine their issues an ideas, reassess and revise their attitudes and perceptions, and engage in a process of creative [and reflective] problem solving” (Kelman and Cohen 1976, 83).
**Educational and Cultural Exchanges**

Educational and cultural exchanges are, by far, some of the best ways to reach diverse groups of people. Exchanges such as those conducted under the Fulbright Program, a traditional PD tool, and by private universities, are excellent ways to bring two countries, their cultures, and their citizens closer together. These exchanges have been used successfully in the past, such as at the height of the Cold War with the FSU.

Peacebuilding and CAR study abroad programs are also being successfully implemented in such countries as Ecuador, where they are helping to create a bridge of cross-cultural interaction and long-term effective peace networks (Pugh, 2013). There have been smaller non-governmental educational exchanges conducted with North Korea, including one with Stanford University, and others both in The United States and in England (K. J. Lee & Shin, 2011). Although it typically takes a long period of time to reap the benefits of these types of efforts, the changes that can happen are both positive and dramatic and is an excellent form of direct HQC. This change is even more dramatic when education is used in unison with fine arts, sports and other types of exchanges and study abroad programs.

A decade ago China began opening Confucius Institutes abroad as part of their soft power foreign policy and has spent more than $278m annually, which equals about $100,000-200,000 per institute (Staff Writer, 2014b). As part of this robust program, Chinese language, history and culture are being successfully taught. Although some are
concerned about the scope of this program, it can serve as a blueprint for future exchanges with North Korea (Tiezzi, 2014).

The education exchange, like other types of exchange should not just be for North Korean, but also for former North Koreans living abroad. The need for HQC through education will lead to better adjustment and understanding similar to the People for a Successful Corean Reunification being run in South Korea (York, 2011)

**Fine Arts and Sports Diplomacy**

Fine arts and sports diplomacy are excellent tools that have been used successfully in conjunction with other efforts to interact with other countries. Such things as art, music, and sports transcend hatred and extreme differences, as those who participate connect through a universal language. With the current popularity of the Korean Wave and K-Pop, things ranging from sports and music to culinary exchanges can help bring about positive change.

One such exchange program is the Asia Pacific Performance Exchange (APPEX). It is an educationally based international exchange artist residency program, which supports and promotes cross-cultural and interdisciplinary understanding and collaboration. The APPEX has successfully brought artists together from such countries as Bangladesh, Cambodia, China, India, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Malaysia, Myanmar, Philippines, Vietnam and the United States. In music, it was the late renowned U.S. pianist Van Cliburn who captured the hearts and minds of Soviet Citizens with his musical diplomacy during the 1950s (McLellan, 2013b). It was also the New York
Philharmonic who played “Arirang” in Pyongyang, which, for a moment in time, captured the hearts and minds of the North Korean audience (Wakin, 2008).

Sports, like fine arts can be very effective at breaking down the cultural walls of mistrust. In 1995, just one year after the fall of the apartheid regime, President Mandela and South Africa hosted the rugby World Cup. Not only did South Africa win the tournament, but successfully used the sporting event as “a mechanism employed to move toward the reconciliation and integration of a divided nation” (Nygård & Gates, 2013). In 1972, it was ping-pong diplomacy with China that helped eventually thaw relations with the United States (DeVoss, 2002b).

Although Dennis Rodman’s trip to North Korea was problematic on multiple fronts, this trip should have served as a wake-up call to the U.S. (and others) that it’s not using all the available PD tools (DeHart, 2013). However, the wake-up call was not received, as the United States continues to solely focus its efforts on sending signals to North Korea that it is well capable of defending its allies and interests in the region, which alone, only further increases tensions and the possibility of escalation. Sports diplomacy if used properly can be a true mechanism or pathway for “image-building; building a platform for dialogue; trustbuilding; and reconciliation, integration and anti-racism” (Nygård & Gates, 2013, pp. 238–240).

Sustained, official, public and private support for fine arts and sports diplomacy can help. The primary funders of these efforts could be think tanks, foundations and even businesses that could reap the benefit of better relations in an open North Korea or
unified peninsula. Next, I will introduce several tools that can be used at the grassroots level of the conflict. These efforts consist of such things as news and information flow, and NGO support.

**News and Information Flow**

There is little doubt that news broadcasts can help provide listeners in hard-to-access countries with a voice from the outside world. Despite the difficulties of pushing broadcasts into North Korea and the harsh penalty for those who listen to these broadcasts, research has shown that about 27% of North Koreans listen to such broadcasts as Voice of America (VOA) and Radio Free Asia (RFA, 2011; VOA, 2012). Indeed, many former refugees also state that they have listened to various forms of U.S. and South Korean media. These stations offer reports on such diverse subjects as the North Korean government’s corruption, human rights abuses, health and nutrition crises, and a variety of other cultural issues. It also helps inform North Koreans about what life is really like abroad. This is a powerful Soft power tool that needs to be increased and fully supported, not just at government-run media outlets, but those run by Christian organizations and other NGOs.

DVDs, USBs and other forms of portable media “constitute an important psychological impact point” for many North Koreans and are increasingly effective Soft power tools for reaching into the country (Kretchun & Kim, 2012). “North Korean’s knowledge and belief about the outside world are most affected by the greater quantity of information through outside radio and TV News. However, South Korean and other
foreign films and drama have a much higher production values..., and provide viewers in North Korea with the exposure to a powerful and easily comprehensible reality that is beyond North Korea” (Kretchun & Kim, 2012). Movies, dramas and shows are not seen as propaganda and are credible in the eyes of North Koreans.

TV shows and movies with the right context can provide valuable cultural information and a visual of the outside world. Despite regime efforts to keep these visual aids out of the hands of North Koreans, the population is increasingly watching them (Telegraph, 2012; J. Lee, Ahn, & Jackson-Han, 2005). According to a recent report, many North Koreans watch smuggled South Korean soap operas and American films like Superman Returns and Titanic (Cain, 2009). Starting in the 1940s, the United States, in cooperation with Hollywood, made films that were meant to increase domestic support, and provide foreign audiences with a new view of the United States (Staff Writer, 2012; Lee 2008). Recently though, Hollywood has actually exacerbated foreign relations with North Korea by producing antagonistic movies such as Olympus Has Fallen, Red Dawn, Zero Dark Thirty and The Interview that paints an ugly picture of the other (Greenwald, 2015). The United States should engage Hollywood and independent directors to produce more films that can show the best face of America and the West for others to see. The delivery of these types of portable media can be conducted via third-parties who have access to North Korea, the underground railroad where goods and information flows into North Korea and via such controversial ways as balloon drops (Lloyd & Halvorssen, 2014).
NGO Support

Non-government organizations (NGOs) play a vital role in helping countries and their citizens around the world, many times, at great personal risk and sacrifice. There are a number of NGOs from around the world active in North Korea. These NGOs offer such things as medical assistance and vaccinations, intellectual training and exchanges, and programs on agriculture, health, water and sanitation, some limited food aid, and seed improvement (M. A. Taylor & Manyin, 2011, p. 7). Many NGOs are working at the grassroots levels of society and “have sought to increase the quality and quantity of contact… in order to gain a clearer understanding and to communicate their goodwill directly to ‘ordinary North Koreans’” (S. C. Kim, 2009, p. 212).

Some NGOs launch balloons into North Korea, have radio broadcasts, or are attempting to sponsor informal communications between outsiders, North Koreans and the North Korean government (IBID, 10). The grassroots level work along with the attempts to make up for the lack of direct contact between key stakeholders shows the true value of these NGOs and peacemakers, many of whom remain anonymous and work with very little funding.

In addition, humanitarian aid and economic assistance that NGOs provide are great humanitarian weapons of change, as with the flow of aid comes the flow of information into the country. The regime is “worried about two kinds of winds: the wind from the west and the wind from the south” (Glaser, Snyder, & Park, 2008, p. 16). Even though the North Korean regime is worried about the flow of information into its country,
it is unable to prevent completely the flow of information that comes with needed aid. Furthermore, without food aid, basic medical supplies and assistance, millions will die. North Koreans will continue to believe that the outside world does not care, and will therefore, never have the health, faculty and motivation to make rational choice decisions, such as the decision to make systems change.

However, there are problems with some NGOs in many countries. Although NGOs are supposed to be free from government influence and control, in places like China and Iran, they can only exist if part of the government (Panda, 2014; Katirai, 2005). The governments also regulate these NGOs and require them to report their activities, which limits the overall effectiveness of these programs (ICNL, 2015).

Therefore, these are the kinds of initiatives that should be given more funding and support by government and private organizations.

**Diaspora Capacity Building**

The diaspora communities are very effective people’s tools; their members, regardless of origin and location, have access and information on their former countries of residence that others do not normally have. Terrance Lyons and others have written extensively on how diaspora groups have a prominent role in framing conflict issues and can act as a possible catalyst for peace-building within violent segmented societies (Cochrane, Baser, & Swain, 2009; Lyons, 2007).
The diaspora community of North Korea is no exception. Many of these members are already providing a deep grassroots lens into North Korea along with important and valuable information. They are also one of the best and few conduits we have for providing accurate and timely information and aid back into North Korea in the form of financial assistance and knowledge on the outside world, and many are doing so on a regular basis, most without outside governmental support, recognition or assistance. Indeed, much of the money these members are able to earn and save goes directly back into North Korea to help relatives and loved ones still suffering. Their phone calls and other forms of communication provide a direct HQC way to provide hope to those who would otherwise be hopeless.

When it comes to North Korean refugees, South Korea has an excellent resettlement program that provides them with such important needs as financial, educational, and housing assistance as part of their integration program. However, aside from using these members to gain a better understanding of what is going on in North Korea, the South Koreans underutilize these refugees, with the exception of some specific cases. There are also various underlining discriminatory policies and misunderstandings coming from their South Korean brethren. Understanding and using these former North Koreans to their full potential would greatly help these new citizens become a seamless part of the South Korea society while actively helping South Korea and the United States by participating in North Korean matters.
In 2004 and 2008, the United States authorized and then reauthorized the North Korea Human Rights Act (NKHRA), which, among other things, was meant to help increase the aid and resettlement support for the North Koreans who wanted political asylum in the United States. Yet, despite the NKHRA and the endless efforts by such diverse support groups as Christian organizations, Korean-American associations and various NGOs, only a trickle of North Koreans who may want to come to the United States are able to do so. There are many technical and bureaucratic reasons for this, but the primary reason is the U.S. attitude that they are considered South Koreans, and that South Korea is the “resettlement country of choice in virtually all cases.” Therefore, the United States vastly undermines and underestimates this group’s important potential to help resolve many issues with North Korea both now and in the future along with the leadership roles these members could play.

Changing its approach to this important issue, and amending its rules and methods for accepting North Korea refugees would not be impossible for the United States to do, as has been done in the past for the Vietnamese Boat People of the 1970s and for Jews leaving the Soviet Union in the 1980s. More importantly, the United States could increase staff, staff awareness, and assistance at various consulates and embassies that are transient ports for this group.

With the current trend, many North Koreans seeking asylum to the United States are being discouraged by the lengthy waiting time (most well over six months) to be considered. This is compared with South Korea, which accepts them in as few as two
weeks. For the North Korean diaspora to be of increasing assistance with the difficult issues surrounding North Korea, the United States and other countries that support refugees would have to put more effort and emphasis into their resettlement programs. Doing so would vastly increase the local, regional, and international-level diaspora capacity, which is vital in order to have a positive long-term effect on North Korea.

**New Pyramid and Building Block Model**

Using the above examples, an illustration of this new conceptual model of CAR driven interventions adapted from Lederach is provided below with the original tools highlighted in red.

![Figure 6: Adapted Lederach’s Pyramid](image-url)
As illustrated in the diagram above, these are some of the efforts and tools that can be used at different levels of society. The tactics in red, hard power efforts, are ones that should be used with caution. In addition, no levels and efforts should be targeted in isolation. Each level should be well coordinated, both vertically and horizontally for durable and inclusive solutions to the conflict (Richmond, 2001; Kriesberg, 1997, p. 69).

Based on the conceptual model above, if initiatives like the ones recommended here were applied to our objectives and goals building block model discussed earlier, the resulting structure would look something like the following:
Notice, unlike the current system where negotiations, either in a bilateral or multilateral format, are foremost, this building block model uses some of the recommended initiatives discussed earlier by the interviewees in order to achieve the foundational objectives, which allows for more difficult and complex objectives to be worked on progressively. Importantly, negotiations do not start until some of these foundational objectives are achieved, which works to build a surplus of understanding and strategic trust.
In addition, achieving some of the most difficult objectives, such as eliminating all WMD, are supported by success from the earlier initiatives. However, multiple objectives are initiated at the same time in order to build momentum. In addition, under goals, this model does not discuss changing or removing the current North Korean regime. The objectives undertaken along with the sub-goals will provide the enablers needed for change to take place by North Koreans, which is “setting the conditions for internal democratic change,” based on the wants, desires, and needs of all stakeholders. In other words, it is up to North Koreans to want and make changes to their society.

The Need to “People” Critical Foreign Policy and Conflict Discussions

Often, decisions such as foreign policy are made at the top or elite levels of society without taking into consideration or asking what is needed or desired by those most affected by the results—the grassroots stakeholders: the North Korean citizens. In order for comprehensive objectives and goals to be built, along with the correct tools needed to assist in accomplishing them, those engaged in CAR, diplomacy and international relations would likely have more success with alternative ideas, opinions, and analyses.

A key part of this process is to seek the unique perspectives, opinions, needs and desires of North Koreans by interviewing former North Korean refugees from the diverse range of diaspora living abroad. The significance of this is in understanding and evaluating where CAR and other unique opportunities lie by promoting the need to “people” critical foreign policy, international relations and conflict discussions. By
understanding the North Korean’s potential as catalyzers for change, we can highlight their unique insights, and discover new ideas, methods and tools which offer the potential for looking at the settlement or amelioration of grievances in this PSC while making positive change over time.

**Challenges to New Interventions of Engagement and Exchange**

The exact implementation of the recommendations discussed here, along with the specific CAR tools and building block model are foreign policy processes that are beyond the scope of this paper, but something we all should come together to help address. While these initial recommendations along with the format discussed here today may seem difficult given the regime’s isolation and the current animosity, there is good precedent for these actions amid such tension and distance. These tactics have been effective in dealing with many countries such as FSU, China, and India, to name a few. More importantly, even though these efforts will take time and initially be met with much distrust, suspicion, and rejection on all sides, they offer some of the best options for avoiding the devastating and destructive wrath of war, and eventually achieving mutual understanding, positive change and peace for the Korean Peninsula and stability in the greater region.

As we have learned, hard power positioned U.S. FP, supported by UN resolutions and sanctions, have been somewhat effective at slowing down North Korea’s progress on developing and proliferating WMD. However, in the end, it is not capable of completely preventing North Korea from obtaining nuclear weapons or committing further
asymmetric provocations. In addition, this FP course has had very little effect on the overall actions and the survival of the regime and its elite. Paradoxically, these same hard power positioned foreign policies supporting resolutions and sanctions have in many cases unintentionally exacerbated the conditions of the same vulnerable group of North Koreans that is suffering from deprivation, malnutrition, disease and starvation. The same group various NGOs, humanitarian groups and others are trying so desperately to assist, support and influence. It has also been used by the North Korean regime to instill more hate and fear of foreigners into the minds of North Koreans.

As in many other parts of the world including Iran and Syria, outside of all-out war, the North Korean case should serve as a harsh and stark reminder of the difficulties in trying to influence or change the actions of another state through almost exclusive isolation, external force and coercion. This is particularly true of a recalcitrant dynastic dictatorship who holds onto power by defying international norms and forcefully controlling its citizens by means of extreme structural violence and human rights violations (Wilson 2013; 2013a). The bottom line, resolutions and sanctions, and threats of force and coercion are not very effective stand-alone foreign policy tools. Hard power in itself, or when used with limited Track 1, Track 1.5 and Track 2 diplomacy, just does not work. It only reinforces the status quo.

A foreign government can’t successfully change or alter the political makeup, leadership or military posture of another nation. The only ones who can successfully make changes to the North Korean regime are the North Korean citizens. Many wonder
how North Koreans can think of alternate forms of government or actions to take when
the outside world, for the most part, is ignoring their needs and not providing them with
the tools that will help them learn about freedom and want and make future change.
These are the kinds of tools that have been discussed here today—the kinds of tools that
can be provided through the CAR-centered efforts. Finally, the cost of doing nothing
both in terms of direct and indirect costs along with the loss of life greatly outweighs the
cost of working with alternative and diverse tools toward positive change and peace.
Therefore, a foreign policy that recognizes and uses the principles, insights, methods,
practices, and tools of CAR has a better chance of achieving the desired results
peacefully by fully understanding the potential of this conflict’s catalyzers for change,
and by helping to evoke policy makers’ moral imagination.

In the past, a soft power initiative by South Korea called the Korean Sunshine
Policy was constructed and implemented to help thaw relations between Seoul and
Pyongyang, build trust, and create conditions for gradual change in the North’s political
and economic systems, which could eventually lead to peaceful unification on the Korean
Peninsula (Levin & Han, 2002). This foreign policy ran for 10 years during the
to the first and second summit meetings between Kim Jong-il and President Kim, and
Kim Jong-il and President Roh, respectively.

This foreign policy centered on the use of soft power and did use some PD tools
including limited dialogue and engagement, economic incentives, and humanitarian
assistance in a way to warm relations. Although by many accounts, the Sunshine Policy did help ease, at least on the surface, tensions between North and South Korea, and help lead to the opening of Mount Kumgang tourist region and the Kaesong Industrial Park; it was at a great financial expense to South Korea costing approximately $4.5 billion over a ten-year period.

Moreover, the Sunshine Policy and various efforts did not seem to change the overall behavior of North Korea. This was evident by the many North Korean provocations over this ten-year period including East Sea naval confrontations, Northern Limit Line (NLL) violations, a nuclear test, and various other DMZ incidents and incursions. In addition, this FP approach was not based on true reciprocity as North Korea gave very little in return for the masses amount of infrastructure, road and rail assistance, and food aid and financial support provided directly to the Kim Regime. More importantly, similar to the aid efforts of the 1990’s, these various forms of assistance did not seem to make it down to the North Korean people who needed it the most.

Many argue that North Korea in essence, very effectively used the Sunshine Policy to take advantage of South Korea’s window of goodwill during extreme economic hard times. They would also argue that this was done for the single purpose of sustaining, rebuilding and hardening the North Korean regime after the collapse of the Soviet Union and various natural disasters of the 1990’s. Thus, North Korea’s leadership effectively used and modified a strategic policy cycle towards South Korea based on negotiations
and dialogue for incentives, followed by provocations, which worked well during the Sunshine Policy years, and has continued unfettered today, regardless of the successions in the North (M. Lee & Wilson, 2014).

The Sunshine Policy was not very effective because the soft power foreign policy initiatives were primarily conducted at the state-to-state level. However, the diverse soft power proposals in this study are based on true civil engagement at the people-to-peoples level, and therefore, are less likely to have the problems associated with the Sunshine Policy.
Conclusion

This dissertation examined the nexus between U.S. Foreign Policy and conflict resolution or protraction in North Korea. This study focused on key foreign policy efforts, which have shown that, for the most part, efforts have been too narrow, too few, and not inclusive enough, while relying almost completely on hard power. This study also examined the thoughts, ideas, and opinions of former North Korean Refugees, which provided a personal focus on how we might change the dynamics of this conflict. Furthermore, it discussed the complexity of conflicts and the need for well-coordinated multiple levels of intervention. It culminated with dynamic and holistic recommendations based on building blocks that use the strengths of conflict analysis and resolution. Although it is recognized that much more research, understanding, and efforts are needed, this author believes that the recommendations provided here are important initial steps in positively dealing with the North Korea, and positively affecting both foreign policy to make it more preventive vice preventive.

The Korean War is the last and longest remnant of the Cold War era. It is a war that remains unresolved for 65 years without a peace treaty, and is at times violent and unpredictable. It is estimated that as many as 4 million people (most of whom were civilians) lost their lives directly due to this war (Trueman, 2015). Still, more continue to die due to confrontations between the two Koreas and the repression and starvation going on in North Korea. In addition, it is estimated that about 10 million families remain separated due to the division created not just by the Korean War, but by a foreign policy
in 1945 that forcefully separated them at the 38th parallel at the end of World War II (N. Kim, 2011).

The Korean War situation remains a powder keg that could reignite at any moment, with 75 million Koreans facing each other, separated only by a slim 3km border. Countless trillions of dollars in weapons and defense have been and continue to be spent by all sides involved in this conflict, in a region that has the potential to lead the world economically in the 21st century.

Yet, we seem to lack real and lasting foreign policy or conflict resolution efforts. Even signing a peace treaty could act as a catalyst for change between these two proud nations. Instead, the rhetoric, positions, and hard power used by all sides continue, and if left unchecked, could lead to a resumption of open war, or even a larger world conflict. Moreover, these same hard power centered policies have only worked to strengthen the power of the North Korean regime by acting as an ideological tool, which reinforces the regime’s position that the world does not care about North Koreans (S. Smith, 2015).

In closing, it is recognized that there are no simple solutions to this or other protracted conflicts, and that a strong U.S. military presence and hard power are indeed necessary to defend freedom, national interests and allies in the region. However, this should not usurp other efforts including diverse CAR-centered efforts. Moreover, with a young relatively inexperienced Kim Jong-un leading North Korea, this is indeed the time that the outside world should be trying to affect and influence his thinking before those in his inner circle guide him to a point beyond the possibility of engagement. The United
States and others can show true international leadership and initiative by considering alternative and multiple methods to positively engage North Korea. With such engagement, the future can be much brighter than the past six decades of confrontation, military build-up, and suffering by all Korean citizens.

The hope of this study and research is that it can put renewed focus on these issues, and lead to peace. This is just a small start in fully understanding the complexity of this conflict, and that much more research is needed.
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