

**North Korea:
Predictive Analysis of Nuclear Proliferation in North Korea
And the Response of the United States and South Korea**

Michael McHenry

Analytics I (INTL504)
Dr. Jonathan S. Lockwood

American Military University
May 2010

“Today, the real test of power is not capacity to make war but capacity to prevent it.”
~ Anne O'Hare McCormick, UNESCO representative

Introduction

No one likes a bully. Throughout world history, the world has been involved in numerous acts concerning bullies from all occupations and lifestyles. Bear in mind that bullies do not always fight for evil but sometimes they perceive themselves as martyrs for peace or reconciliation. Look at English folklore and the stories of Robin Hood, who took from the wealthy oppressors and gave the money to the poor. Even though celebrated as a hero for the poor, he was a bully to others. On April 16 2007, the United States saw a piece of history evolve into a record for the nation when Virginia Tech University student, Seung-Hui Cho, killed 32 people and wounded several others. This incident was “the deadliest peacetime shooting

incident by a single gunman in United States history, on or off a school campus.” (Kim 2008) According to interviews with those closely involved with his life, Cho did these acts because he wanted to be a “savior” for those that are less fortunate. (Kaine 2007, 86) Like Robin Hood, Cho was a bully who targeted those he felt oppressed from and retaliated in an effort to make changes in his life and the society he lived in.

Bullies are also not just local individuals in a given community, but also include organizations such as the Animal Liberation Front (ALF), Ku Klux Klan (KKK), and even the Mafia. Bullies can very well include much larger entities such as terrorist organizations (al Qaeda, Hezbollah, etc.) and nations of the world. Bullies on a national level closely resemble jingoism that the Oxford English Dictionary defines as “extreme patriotism in the form of aggressive foreign policy.” (Soanes 2006, 546) Jingoism is clearly an extreme form of nationalism, in which patriots of a particular country see their own country as superior to all others.

With this background of information in mind, analysts can reasonably argue that North Korea is acting like an international bully. Is North Korea a terrorist network, attempting to scare the international community by pursuing a nuclear program and possibly firing a preemptive strike against enemy nations? North Korea has seemed to stay at the top of the problem list for several decades now due to its stance on initiating a nuclear program for its military and country’s defense. This is directly due to its own paranoid feeling that Western influences are targeting this poverty-stricken country. Every few years, North Korea begins testing bombs and long-range missiles again in an effort to show the world that it is serious about its place in the region. After long peace talks and several international sanctions by numerous countries, North Korea always backs down just enough to accept financial help, supplies, medical aid, and food in return

for the dismantling and/or stopping the process of gathering materials to build more bombs. The purpose of this LAMP study is to compare and contrast the foreign policies and attitudes of the United States, North Korea, and South Korea should North Korea continue to pursue proliferation of nuclear arms.

As Lockwood clearly states in his writings about the LAMP method: (Lockwood 1993, 97)

The LAMP obviously will not grant the gift of prophecy to its users, nor will it foretell the future with infallible accuracy. With judicious application, however, the LAMP does offer a logical method for illuminating the future's many possible paths.

Events in the near future will assuredly change the nature of not only this report and its findings, but also all of the ones written from henceforth. This LAMP predictive analysis is not the crystal ball of accurate prediction. LAMP is quite simply an effective method to show a very good detail of what to expect; it does not predict the future, but gives great advice.

Literature Review

Subject matter regarding North Korea's stance on nuclear proliferation is extensive, especially in recent years. North Korea needs accountability for its actions, which reflects in numerous scholarly sources. North Korea poses a clear and present danger to the international community and a serious and sincere procedure should be in place when dealing with this issue. Below are the primary sources by which the issue to be discussed will be taken from and discussed. Each of the authors below have made a significant contribution to the North Korean Nuclear Proliferation subject and have given unique and highly detailed accounts of historical data, current events, and future solutions based on factual information with little to zero biases and prejudices.

Alini (2009) elaborates on how much is North Korea worth if it should be reunified with South Korea again, which happens to be a priority for both countries. Alini also claims that it may be more of a hindrance for South Korea due to its recent financial meltdowns and economical problems, which appear to be gradually getting better. The thought remains that if this “reunification” process should come to fruition, then it would be immensely beneficial to the United States, which is a solid ally of South Korea.

Dujarric (2001) gives a very enlightening approach to how the international community, specifically the U.S., South Korea, and Japan, “engage” the foreign policy problem with North Korea. Engagement, according to Dujarric, is not only a military conflict but also how we have a productive, continued existence with this communist nation. Dujarric further elaborates on the idea that North Korea has been labeled a “rogue nation” versus the more politically correct term he labels as “communist totalitarian.” The term “rogue” is very fluid in nature and usually applies to those countries that have no regard for human rights. Dujarric somewhat defends North Korea as a textbook communist nation rather than a rogue state or acting “irrationally” and even gives examples of how some of the U.S. allies condone even harsher human rights violations than North Korea. Dujarric, one of the most influential resources on this issue, gives a no-nonsense approach about this situation and ideas to alleviate the problems. Dujarric perhaps gives the most interesting discussion about North Korea. Dujarric does not defend the nation but rather gives a unique point-of-view on what the country strives for while maintaining what it will cost for North Korea to integrate into the international community.

Niksich (2006) gives a detailed background summary of the negotiation process between the international community (most notably China, South Korea, Russia, Japan, the United States,

and North Korea) between 1980 and 2005. Nicksch also explains what the Six-Party Talks dealt with as well as the Bush Administration strategy for working with North Korea. North Korea's counter-strategy is also available in the report. The 1994 Agreed Framework shows how much effort was in the negotiation process among the main actors of the Six-Party Talks. The Agreed Framework referenced in several other areas is still being the primary policy background for future mitigation of North Korea's economic assistance, military presence, and nuclear proliferation tactics. The Agreed Framework also lists the potential benefits to North Korea should it enter back into diplomatic talks with the international community and continue to dismantle its adverse nuclear program and concentrate solely on a "peaceful" nuclear program for its citizens. I feel that Nikesch gives a good report on the history of the negotiation talks between the main players of the international community. Nikesch shows an accurate portrayal of North Korea's needs and ambitions as a totalitarian communist regime based on factual history and what costs it has taken to make it this far without nuclear war.

Scobell (2005) goes into considerable detail as to the frame of mind in the North Korean leadership. Scobell states that North Korea faces numerous political problems that senior officials fear would be the downfall of the country and its position in the region, possibly in the world. Scobell mentions clearly that probably the most important dilemma North Korea faces is the idea of reformation. Scobell approaches the issue of North Korean gradual acceptance into the international community on factually based beliefs with no apparent biases. I strongly feel that Scobell gives a fresh, new approach to the North Korean "engagement policy" from the international community by delivering new ideas and theories on how to pinpoint the problem

and provide an accurate and effective response based on the needs of the regime with comparison to the primary national actors involved.

Research Design

The purpose of this study, as stated earlier, is to perform a strategic response from particular actors within the international community if North Korea were to improve its efforts in nuclear proliferation. This study cannot be explained in quantitative methods. Therefore, the predictive analytical method used in this study is the Lockwood Analytical Method for Prediction (LAMP). The LAMP method focuses primarily on “relative probability” rather than the “quantitative probability.” The purpose of this paper is to list potential futures of the actors and establish a list of potential responses. The focus is not on how likely each scenario will happen, as in a quantitative model. The 12 steps of the LAMP method are:

1. Determine the issue for which you are trying to predict the most likely future.
2. Specify the national “actors” involved.
3. Perform an in-depth study of how each national actor perceives the issue in question.
4. Specify all possible courses of action for each actor.
5. Determine the major scenarios within which you will compare the alternate futures.
6. Calculate the total number of permutations of possible “alternate futures” for each scenario.
7. Perform a “pair wise comparison” of all alternate futures to determine their relative probability.
8. Rank the alternate futures for each scenario from highest relative probability to the lowest based on the number of “votes” received.
9. Assuming that each future occurs, analyze each alternate future in terms of its consequences for the issue in question.
10. State the potential of a given alternate future to “transpose” into another alternate future.
11. Determine the “focal events” that must occur in our present in order to bring about a given alternate future.

12. Develop indicators for the focal events.

No single model should pave the way for a particular study. Every method used in general research and field observations are subject to bias and marginal errors. LAMP is a highly structured model, and Lockwood & Lockwood state clearly that LAMP organizes “all available information based on the perceptions of the national actors and using it to make relevant predictions about which alternate futures is most likely to occur at a given moment in time.” (Lockwood, 1993, p 27) Again, the LAMP method is not about stating *how likely* something will happen; it is more about giving a list of potential outcomes. It is necessary to remember that the most important aspect in a LAMP study is the analyst and how gifted he/she is in arranging the information for the audience to see the true nature and significance of the LAMP technique and the outcomes proposed.

Specify the national “actors” involved

The importance of this issue clearly involves more than just three countries of the international community. It is important to understand that any setbacks or progress that involves these actors indirectly affects the world as a whole, especially if the setbacks involve North Korea’s arms race to produce nuclear weapons. Of course, on the same coin, the progress that develops between these nations and policies that are established would greatly assist each nation involved, as well as bordering and trade nations. To focus this study on a specific nature, the three major actors involved in the negotiation process involve North Korea, the United States, and South Korea, with each nation having a major contribution to the avenues by which

some agreement would evolve, whether it is peace talks, dismantling of North Korea's nuclear program, or war.

**Perform an in-depth study of how each
national actor perceives the issue in question**

North Korea

North Korea, or the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK), is the centerpiece of the international community and even more appropriately concerned in its respective region of Asia. (Appendix A) Kim Jong II, documented to suffer from multiple mental and social problems, rules North Korea. Is this as a problem for other leaders of the world to have to negotiate with a ruler who suffers from these disorders? What would happen if President Obama suffered from the same problems? Would he be fit to run a country, moreover, an international superpower and access to a military and a nuclear arsenal? Kim Jong II does not feel that the world takes him or his country's needs very seriously. On the contrary, the world is more concerned with this ruler strictly because of his position to allied countries and his pursuance of nuclear weapons.

The Korean War, from 1950-1953, shows that the former leader of North Korea, Kim Il Sung, attempted to reunite South Korea and North Korea as one country with two states. Unable to break the South from the U.S. alliance, North Korea decided to institute a "self-reliance" position in the world. The idea was that it would not pursue relations, trade, or peace with anyone outside of the country, with the exception of its major ally and supporter, Russia, and show the world that it did not need the outside influence of other nations. (CIA 2010) North Korea's economy has suffered since the Korean War. Most of the country's budget supports the military to ensure

that the nation's defense is a top priority, even at the cost of near-starvation of the citizens, poor economical outlook in trade, and government controlled farming practices.

North Korea has a solid fear of an attack from the United States, which defines why they hold true to a large military and why the country directs funding to a nuclear program. Not only does North Korea benefit from the production of these weapons for its defense, but also allows the country to sell some of this equipment, parts, and resources to countries who pay top dollar for it. This would also allow North Korea to build loose, but ongoing connections and support from other "black-listed" countries.

United States

The United States, being directly associated with South Korea as a major ally, has a somewhat biased and different approach to the problem. The United States wants to ensure that its ally, South Korea, is protected from any attack from the North. Dujarric notes that the U.S. needs to pursue an aggressive engagement policy with North Korea and assist in reunification of the Korean peninsula as one country. This would not only help the country itself with its economic problems, starvation, and reduce human rights violations, but it would certainly ensure that the U.S. does not lose South Korea as an ally in the region.

Dujarric makes an excellent point with reference to the U.S. being an ally to South Korea. He explains that all forms of aid, including that of a humanitarian approach, go through Seoul. The reasoning for this is that North Korea and South Korea need to work on their own peace efforts with as much help from outside assistance as possible. If the North had to negotiate directly with the South for humanitarian aid, food, oil, and other resources, it would have a greater impact on future foreign policy. The only interest that the United States has in North Korea is the

protection of its ally, South Korea, and to ensure that the entire northeastern region of Asia, including China and Japan, is protected from a nuclear presence in North Korea. (Dujarric 2001, 477)

South Korea

Dujarric explains that South Korea or the Republic of Korea (ROK) has two primary objectives when dealing with North Korea: avoid war and prevent North Korea from a “sudden collapse.” (Dujarric 2001, 472) War may be inevitable with the current trend in North Korea’s attitude to Western influence. Should war ever come to fruition, the South will suffer more in the short-term than the North. When looking at the geographical disadvantage of South Korea and comparing it with the military advantage of North Korea, the South is already in trouble. (Appendix B) The capitol of South Korea, Seoul, has a population of over 10 million people. Also located in Seoul are the major businesses, corporations, universities, and other infrastructure for the entire country. The location of the capitol is only 40 kilometers away from the demarcation line (Appendix C). Dujarric further explains that if the North decided to send a barrage of artillery and even a couple of WMD’s, it would be devastating for the South. (Dujarric 2001, 469-470) Time would be the enemy because retaliation from South Korea and even its greatest ally, the United States, would be too late. Secondly, should the North’s regime suddenly collapse, it would be the responsibility of the South to ensure that the citizens are taken care of and provided for, both economically, militarily, and most importantly, humanely. The problem with a “sudden collapse” of North Korea is the thought that South Korea would be overrun with an influx of citizens. The strategy of the South at this point would be to rely on its ally, the U.S., and whatever humanitarian needs that North Korea needs.

South Korea is also in full favor of reunification of the two Koreas into one solid country but it would be a challenging task. The North has been living under strict control for over five decades; resulting in government controlled lives, food, and all resources. The economy has been in a downward spiral since the Korean War with numerous acts of human rights violations reported, including human trafficking. South Korea, on the other hand, has been on the other side of the coin. The lives of most young adults reflect that of a democratic society, with good access to outside influences, education, economic liberalism, and trade. Dujarric states, “Absorbing the North would be extremely arduous because it will entail merging two entirely dissimilar societies.” (Dujarric 2001, 471)

Specify all possible courses of action for each actor

It is important to understand what avenues each actor can choose based on the given issue. With the three actors involved in the situation with North Korea, it can be argued that there are only two possible courses of action for each actor should North Korea make certain decisions: a proactive (peaceful) response or a reactive (aggressive) response.

North Korea

Proactive: North Korea will continue with diplomatic negotiations and pursue a peaceful, non-nuclear program for energy and receive humanitarian aid in return for a cease in its nuclear weapon program and building of installations that would provide for WMD's.

Reactive: North Korea feels pressured by outside influences and decides to pursue a nuclear program and build WMD's for defending itself from outside attack with possible preemptive strikes against enemy nations.

United States

Proactive: The U.S. continues to provide humanitarian aid and other valuable resources to North Korea as well as pursue a peaceful negotiation to stop nuclear proliferation within North Korea.

Reactive: The U.S. aggressively protects its ally, South Korea, under its nuclear umbrella and assists in additional economic and aid sanctions going to North Korea

South Korea

Proactive: South Korea continues to pursue diplomatic relations with the North and ensures that humanitarian aid, resources, and continued growth between the two nation's progress in a mutual understanding that sanctions be relieved and relations improve as long as the North dismantles its nuclear programs.

Reactive: South Korea stops all aid and continues to be aggressive in diplomatic talks, requesting assistance from its allies and the United Nations in continued economic sanctions.

Determine the major scenarios within which you will compare the alternate futures

There may be just two possible major scenarios when looking at the future of North Korea.

These two scenarios collectively gather two completely opposing schools of thought.

1. North Korea will dismantle its nuclear program and decide to pursue diplomatic negotiations with the international community in return for humanitarian aid, resources

for its country to improve its energy and economic crisis, and food to ensure that starvation of its citizens is not a reality.

2. North Korea will continue to isolate itself from the international community, disregard diplomatic negotiations, and pursue nuclear proliferation so that it can be readily armed and tactically ready for any assault on North Korean soil or possibly to make an effective preemptive strike on an enemy.

Calculate the total number of permutations of possible “alternate futures” for each scenario

Lockwood & Lockwood state that according to LAMP, the formula for calculating the possible scenarios is directly proportionate to the number of actors and decision available to each actor.

(Lockwood 1993, 38)

$$X^Y = Z$$

Where X equals the number of courses of action open to each actor, and Y equals the number of national actors involved (assuming that each actor has the same number of courses of action open to it), Z will equal the total number of alternate futures to be compared.

For the purpose of this study, the total number of courses of action open to each actor (X) equals two. The total number of national actors (Y) directly referenced in this case equals three (North Korea, United States, and South Korea). The total number of alternate futures to be compared (Z) equals eight. The LAMP formula for this predictive analysis is $2^3 = 8$ per scenario resulting in 16 possible alternative futures. This is why Lockwood & Lockwood emphasize limiting one's research question to the needs of the analyst is imperative, otherwise the study will become too broad in nature and leave the analyst, as well as the reader, with entirely too much information to

sift through and will bog down the project. The table below (Table 1) shows the list of possible outcomes for both scenarios which are not ranked in any order.

Table 1
List of Alternate Futures

Future #	North Korea	South Korea	United States
1	Proactive	Proactive	Proactive
2	Proactive	Proactive	Reactive
3	Proactive	Reactive	Proactive
4	Proactive	Reactive	Reactive
5	Reactive	Reactive	Reactive
6	Reactive	Proactive	Proactive
7	Reactive	Proactive	Reactive
8	Reactive	Reactive	Proactive

Perform a “pair-wise comparison” of all alternate futures within the scenario to determine their relative probability

This step in the LAMP process is essential to creating the ranked list of potential outcomes in the next step. Each step compares to the next and given a single vote until all steps compare with each other for a final tally. For example, Future 1 compares with Future 2 and then with Future 3 until it compares with all other potential futures. After Future 1 then Future 2 compares to all of the others. With each comparison, only two futures compare at a time and the vote rests with the analyst’s idea that at that specific moment, it is the most appropriate future to come to fruition. The formula below is the method for calculating the pair wise permutations and final vote count. (Lockwood 1993, 40)

Where n equals the total number of alternate futures to be analyzed, and X equals the total number of pair-wise comparisons that must be performed

$$X = (n-1) + (n-2) \dots + (n-n)$$

As Lockwood describes, the number of national actors that increase also increases the number of open courses of action open to each of them, which ultimately increases the magnitude of the problem. “The problem can become unmanageable without either computer support or a prior decision on the part of the analyst to limit the scope of his analysis.” (Lockwood 1993, 41)

Rank the alternate futures for each scenario from highest relative probability to the lowest based on the number of “votes” received

Table 2

Scenario #1: North Korea Pursues Non-Aggressive Diplomacy

Future #	North Korea	South Korea	United State	Total Votes
1	Proactive	Proactive	Proactive	7
2	Proactive	Proactive	Reactive	6
3	Proactive	Reactive	Proactive	5
4	Proactive	Reactive	Reactive	4
6	Reactive	Proactive	Proactive	3
8	Reactive	Reactive	Proactive	2
7	Reactive	Proactive	Reactive	1
5	Reactive	Reactive	Reactive	0

Table 3

Scenario #2: North Korea Pursues Nuclear Proliferation

Future #	North Korea	South Korea	United State	Total Votes
7	Reactive	Proactive	Reactive	7
8	Reactive	Reactive	Proactive	6
5	Reactive	Reactive	Reactive	5
6	Reactive	Proactive	Proactive	4
3	Proactive	Reactive	Proactive	3
4	Proactive	Reactive	Reactive	2
2	Proactive	Proactive	Reactive	1
1	Proactive	Proactive	Proactive	0

Assuming that each future occurs, analyze each alternate future in terms of its consequences for the issue in question

A thorough review of each major scenario in this study will enhance the analyst's attempts to predict the most accurate outcome of a particular alternate future from the tables above. The major scenarios reviewed will only include the top four futures from each table above. When reviewing the data, certain futures will not pertain to the given scenario because they reflect opposite actions from the given scenario, which contradict each other.

The first major scenario reflects that of North Korea and active attempts to reestablish itself within the international community without the pursuance of a nuclear proliferation program. This act is a proactive measure by North Korea in return for humanitarian aid, energy assistance, food, lifting of economic sanctions, and international diplomacy.

Future #1

North Korea would request assistance from other countries as well as go back to negotiating possible avenues in which the country could turn around its economical problems and pursue peaceful energy programs without the need for nuclear weapons. The United States would assist its ally, South Korea, in its efforts to return peace to northeastern Asia. The United States would also continue to send over humanitarian aid in the form of oil, food, and other assistance to help the country deal with inner turmoil (starvation, migration of citizens, etc.). All countries involved, as well as their neighbors, are fully aware of the potential problems that they would face should North Korea pursue its nuclear programs. The international community would try to assist in every way to help the country make better use of its resources so that North Korea could be more humane to its citizens.

Future #2

North Korea would go back to peaceful negotiations with the international community in return for much needed aid for its citizens and country to survive. The United States would aggressively reiterate the fact that it would protect its ally, South Korea, from all unprovoked attacks from the communist nation and remind North Korea of its protective nuclear umbrella initiative. The U.S. would ensure that any aid funnels through South Korea so that North Korea would be more willing to cooperate with its neighbor in exchange for this aid. South Korea would ensure that peaceful negotiations, as well as non-military aggression along the demarcation line and surrounding naval areas, would benefit both countries and reduce tension.

Future #3

North Korea attempts to renegotiate its position within the international community by dismantling its nuclear programs and showing the world that it is serious for the future. North Korea knows completely that any further use of nuclear technology for testing, both underground and aerial, would prove to be potentially disastrous to its survival as a regime. North Korea feels strongly it is not being dealt with properly by other national actors and is willing to step up its position peacefully. South Korea demands that North Korea dismantle its programs first, as an act of dedication to peace and progress. The South refuses to lift sanctions until the North shows acts of peace. The United States, South Korea's greatest ally, attempts to ease the burden of negotiation with humanitarian aid to North Korea. The U.S. continues to use diplomatic relations and dedication to peaceful energy solutions for the North to embark upon.

Future #4

North Korea feels threatened by its neighbors and the rest of the world. North Korea decides to stop all progress of its nuclear facilities and requests the sanctions lift in order for more trade and economical pressures to ease. North Korea fully understands the repercussions of its aggressive actions and further agrees to embark on peaceful talks with other nations. South Korea is willing to listen but does not want any sanctions lifted due to past actions by North Korea, most notably unwillingness to cooperate with nuclear inspection teams. South Korea agrees to assist North Korea in return for serious and committed acts of peace, most importantly the dismantling of its nuclear program, inspections teams to go these sites for verification, and returning to diplomatic talks about peaceful energy solutions for North Korea. The United States feels pressured by its ally, South Korea, and decides to make the same decision, while also making the North fully aware of its protective efforts to the South. The U.S. makes headway with aggressive negotiations and diplomatic processes to ensure that North Korea understands its position.

The second major scenario befalling this situation shows that North Korea would continue to pursue nuclear testing, both underground and openly. Deceitful talks about potential “satellite” rockets would continue to show that peace talks are failing and not an option for the North. The North continues to disregard human rights within its borders and gives no headway to peaceful negotiations about nuclear weapon production facilities.

Future #7

North Korea continues to test nuclear weapons underground and abroad while adamantly stating it is using these weapons to protect itself from outside invasions. North Korea further isolates itself from the world and is willing to sell its technology to “black-listed” countries in

return for other favors. North Korea continues to use its navy as a deterrent against any invasion. South Korea continues to be diplomatic and ensures that the international community is not targeting the North. The South is willing to negotiate with the North in return for dismantling its nuclear programs. The U.S. is aggressively negotiating for the North to dismantle its facilities and fervently requests inspection teams to verify the situation in North Korea. The U.S. shows no support for the North's military actions and publicly condemns the nation for its hostilities, especially its underground testing and aerial rockets over Japan.

Future #8

North Korea increases its testing of nuclear weapons and technology within its borders. The North shows no remorse for its public display of international uncooperativeness. The North begins production of more technology and weapons. South Korea publicly condemns the North for its use and production of these weapons due to its groundless assumptions that it is a target of international pressure. The South continues to withhold humanitarian aid and resources due to the North's resilience. The United States publicly defends its ally, South Korea, for its actions against the North and requests the assistance of other nations to help turn the tide for North Korea to see its problematic actions. The U.S. further shows that they are willing to go back to negotiations should the North make adequate changes in its nuclear programs

Future #5

Surprisingly, being the most aggressive action on the table, this future is third on the list. North Korea openly tests all weapons without any attempt to negotiate for its survival as a regime. The North continues to buy/sell technology to other countries that would benefit its nuclear programs. North Korea prepares to test more rockets and firepower to ensure the world

sees what it is capable of and hopes it is a deterrent to an attack. North Korea continues to withdraw from all communication and diplomatic relations with the international community. South Korea publicly condemns the actions of the North and ensures that any attack upon its soil is retaliated in full force. South Korea urgently requests other nations to hinder the North's capabilities of transporting nuclear weapons, technology, and financial avenues to show that the world cannot stand idly by while a communist nation builds an arsenal of nuclear weapons. The United States makes public condemnations as well against the North and aggressively reiterates its position in the region. The U.S. sends more troops to South Korea and neighboring countries in hopes that the increased military presence will turn North Korea around. The U.S. ensures South Korea that any attack from the North will be retaliated as well. The U.S. also asks for other nations of the world to assist in peacetime efforts and for North Korea to stop its nuclear programs immediately. The U.S. and South Korea threaten possible covert and overt military actions against the facilities in hopes that they will stop attempts of gathering nuclear arms.

Future #6

North Korea continues to amass technology and needed resources for its nuclear program. The North makes promises to the world that it has the right to protect itself from any attack from other countries at whatever means necessary. South Korea continues to plead for peaceful negotiations and to return to the table for international assistance. South Korea publicly announces that they will assist North Korea in other humanitarian aid once they stop building weapons and testing them on the border. The United States also publicly requests other nations to assist in peaceful talks with North Korea in return for them to dismantle any nuclear

technology and facilities they have amassed thus far. North Korea receives humanitarian aid to encourage them to return to peaceful negotiations. No threats from other nations are instituted except sanctions and withdrawing of financial assistance.

**State the potential of a given alternate future to
“transpose” into another alternate future**

Any actions by any country can be the winds for change for this situation. North Korea could be fervently amassing nuclear technology and materials in hopes to build weapons of mass destruction and at the right moment could be plagued with a different situation that seriously hinders its ability to remain as a regime (civil war, financial doomsday, biological attack, etc). This unforeseen future could be the catalyst for a serious change within the borders of North Korea. Ultimately, South Korea could also be part of the collateral damage done to North Korea should any of these events occur due to its geographical attachment. The United States, being a strong ally of the South, would step in and assist in this situation, even if it helped the North. The international community would also be willing to assist in efforts to relive the problems plagues by any nations in this region. This is a massive step of praise on the behalf of North Korea’s adamant nature to never change. All of these events, and many more unlisted, could be the key to change within this region and finally solve the problem of North Korea’s arms race.

**Determine the “focal events” that must occur in our
present in order to bring about a given alternate future;
Develop indicators for the focal events**

The final sections of the LAMP model are to determine what focal events and indicators that establish the occurrence of a particular alternate future. According to Lockwood & Lockwood, a

focal event is “an occurrence of sufficient magnitude that it changes the relative probability of the universe of alternate futures.” Leading up to the focal event is what Lockwood & Lockwood describe as “indicators,” incidents showing that a particular focal event has occurred or is about to. (Lockwood 1993, 55-56) Each focal event will have a set of indicators associated with it, which helps show the analyst which alternate future is most likely to occur based on the given situation. Ideally, the alternate futures that get the most votes will have the fewest focal events and indicators because they will most likely happen with fewer incidents leading up to the future. On the contrary, the futures with the least votes will have more focal events and indicators leading up to them because they will require much more incidents to happen before they are set in motion and come to realization. Each major scenario listed below has the top five alternate futures that received the most votes in the above tables of information.

Scenario 1: North Korea will dismantle its nuclear program and decide to pursue diplomatic negotiations with the international community in return for humanitarian aid, resources for its country to improve its energy and economic crisis, and food to ensure that starvation of its citizens is not a reality.

Future #1

Focal Event - North Korea resumes peaceful talks with the international community

Indicators:

- North Korea begins dismantling nuclear facilities
- Withdrawal of troops from the demarcation line
- North Korea requests inspection teams to confirm validity of concerns and progress

- North Korea requests for delegates to meet about positive future of North Korea and its place in the world

Future #2

Focal Event – North Korea allows South Korean officials to inspect facilities showing that no production of nuclear materials is in progress in return for lifting of sanctions

Indicators:

- U.S. stops all humanitarian aid to North Korea
- South Korea agrees to lifting sanctions once North Korea shows attitudes for change
- U.S. publicly condemns North Korea for its behavior for anti-peaceful efforts
- North Korea

Future #3

Focal Event – North Korea seeks outside assistance from other countries for humanitarian aid and resources in return for it to return to peaceful talks

Indicators:

- U.S. supports North Korea's steps to peaceful negotiations by providing humanitarian aid and resources
- South Korea refuses to assist until North Korea shows strides in peaceful behavior
- North Korea stops production of needed materials for making nuclear weapons

Future #4

Focal Event – North Korea stops all production of its nuclear facilities and materials

Indicators:

- U.S. refuses to lift sanctions and demands that North Korea make efforts towards peace
- South Korea stops all humanitarian aid and economical assistance until North Korea shows that it wants to return to peaceful negotiations
- North Korea understands that it is crumbling and, in order to survive, must make positive efforts to receive aid and assistance from the international community

Scenario 2: North Korea will continue to isolate itself from the international community, disregard diplomatic negotiations, and pursue nuclear proliferation so that it can be readily armed and tactically ready for any assault on North Korean soil or possibly to make an effective preemptive strike on an enemy.

Future #7

Focal Event – North Korea continues to isolate itself from the world and show that it is determined for nuclear dependence and defense

Indicators:

- North Korea continues to build nuclear facilities and maintain materials needed for nuclear weapons
- U.S. aggressively defends its stance on a peaceful Asia and increases support for international sanctions against North Korea
- South Korea continues to plead for North Korea return to peaceful negotiations and maintains humanitarian aid across the border

Future #8

Focal Event – North Korea continues to test fire short and long-range missiles across Japan and shows South Korea that Seoul may be the next target should it interfere with its nuclear proliferation

Indicators:

- South Korea increases its military presence on the demarcation line and continues to ask for assistance from the international community in actions against North Korea
- U.S. reiterates its foreign policy of protecting its ally, South Korea, from any unprovoked attacks by North Korea
- North Korea feels threatened and pressured by South Korea and the U.S. and continues passive-aggressive threats to show that they are willing to engage in war if that is the end result

Future #5

Focal Event – North Korea remains adamant about nuclear proliferation and continues to threaten all enemies of North Korea or they will retaliate in full force; production of nuclear materials increases; military movements along the demarcation line increase; aerial and underground testing increase

Indicators:

- North Korea increases its production of nuclear facilities/materials; increases its troops along the demarcation line to threaten South Korea; increase testing of rockets in aerial view as well as underground

- South Korea requests harsher sanctions against North Korea as well as additional troops from other countries in the region
- U.S. increases troops in South Korea, threatens North Korea with targeted airstrikes against its facilities, and promises to retaliate if unprovoked attacks strike South Korean soil

Future #6

Focal Event – North Korea is unwilling to return to peaceful talks with other nations and continues to test, produce, and gather nuclear weapons

Indicators:

- North Korea justifies its actions because it feels threatened by outside nations and preemptive strikes; continues to amass material and technology to build up its arsenal in case of war
- South Korea fervently requests that North Korea stop all production of nuclear materials in return for aid and other needed resources
- U.S. also continues to provide aid and other support for North Korea and persists about peaceful negotiations and other resources

Conclusion

It is the purpose of this study to show potential outcomes should North Korea make one of two decisions sometime in the near future. First, North Korea may continue acting like a bully by showing aggressive defiance to the international community by nuclear proliferation,

buying/selling technology to “black-listed” countries for the intent to produce weapons of mass destruction, and continued high demands for humanitarian aid in return for loose and undedicated peace talks. Secondly, North Korea can decide to be a part of the team and show its neighbors, and the world, that it can survive as a poverty-stricken country but ask for help when it falls from grace. North Korea is not a terrorist nation. As mentioned before, North Korea continues to act just like what it is: a communist regime that focuses entirely on its nation’s defense with little regard for human rights and suffering.

With the continued effort of the international community and its unified position on not allowing North Korea to amass nuclear weapons, North Korea continues to have no regard for human rights within its own borders let alone any peaceful efforts for other nations. North Korea continues to threaten and deceive other nations at the right moment so that it can justify its acts of gathering and producing nuclear weapons for its defense against the enemy.

In closing, the primary actor in the North Korean problems is South Korea. Not only do these two countries share similar characteristics (customs, values, traditions, etc), but they will be neighbors for an eternity. The progress made between these two countries and the impact it will make on the world will enhance the effectiveness of any future foreign policy concerning this region. The primary issue to be at the forefront of any policymakers mind is the future of reintegration of the South with the North. As mentioned before, this act would change the world, as did the reunification of East Germany and West Germany. The Koreans, on a primarily economical standpoint, need each other to be a unified nation. This would solidify growth for not only the region, but also have an unprecedented impact on the world for generations to come.

References

- Alini, Erica (2009). How Much for One Korea? The Wall Street Journal (July15). Last accessed 04/19/2010 <http://blogs.wsj.com/economics/2009/07/15/how-much-for-one-korea/>
- CIA World Factbook. (2010). North Korea. CIA World Factbook. Last accessed 03/10/2010. <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/kn.html>.
- CIA World Factbook. (2010). South Korea. CIA World Factbook. Last accessed 03/10/2010. <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/ks.html>.
- Dujarric, Robert. (2001). North Korea: Risks and Rewards of Engagement. Journal of International Affairs vol. 54, no. 2: International Security & Counter Terrorism Reference Center. Last accessed 04/04/2010 <http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy1.apus.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=tsh&AN=4437266&site=isc-live>
- Kaine, Tim. (2007). Mass Shootings at Virginia Tech. Last accessed 05/01/2010 <http://www.governor.virginia.gov/TempContent/techPanelReport-docs/FullReport.pdf>
- Kim, Alan. (2008). "Fact File: Deadliest Shootings in the U.S.". *MSNBC*. Last accessed 04/29/2010 <http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/18140540/>
- Kimball, Daryl & Crail, Peter. (2009), Chronology of U.S.-North Korean Nuclear and Missile Diplomacy. Arms Control Association. Last accessed 04/20/2010 <http://www.armscontrol.org/factsheets/dprkchron>
- Lockwood, Jonathan S., and O'Brien Lockwood, Kathleen. (1993). The Lockwood Analytical Method for Prediction (LAMP). Joint Military Intelligence College.
- Niksch, Larry A. (2006). North Korea's Nuclear Weapons Program. Congressional Research Service Issue Brief: International Security & Counter Terrorism Reference Center. Last accessed 04/02/2010. <http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy2.apus.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=tsh&AN=20576742&site=isc-live>
- Savada, Andrea. (1993). North Korea: *A Country Study*. Federal Research Division: Library of Congress. Last accessed 04/26/2010 <http://www.country-data.com/frd/cs/kptoc.html>
- Savada, Andrea & Shaw, William. (1990). South Korea: *A Country Study*. Federal Research Division: Library of Congress. Last accessed 04/26/2010 <http://www.country-data.com/cgi-bin/query/r-12211.html>

Scobell, Andrew. (2005). North Korea's Strategic Intentions. Strategic Studies Institute: Army War College. Last accessed 03/13/2010

<http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy1.apus.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=tsh&AN=20519239&site=isc-live>

Soanes, Catherine. (2006). Compact Oxford English Dictionary for University and College Students. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Appendix A



Appendix B



Appendix C

