

Terror Crisis, and the US Anti-terrorism Approaches for Eradicating North Korean Acts Supporting Terrorism*

Hun Kyung Lee**

Department of Political Science and Diplomacy, Dong-A University, 225 Gudeok-ro, Seo-ku, Busan, Korea

Abstract

There are no exception on the targets that are a civilian population and national governments, and hence no one in the world is not free from terrorist threats. Under the circumstances, the world nations should fight against terrorism and terrorist organizations. In order to do so, they need not only anti-terrorism cooperation, accords, and acts without being restricted by politics and ideology but also the collection and exchange of information across borders. In particular, the role and efforts of the United States as a world corp and a main victim country of terrorism. In the process, the multilateral approach is desirable to curb terrorism including a state-sponsored terrorism.

North Korea is regarded a typical country as the state sponsor of terrorism. It conducted terrorist acts with the view of causing political and social chaos in the South. It also has ties with terrorists group, even providing training a variety of terrorist groups, and sold missile parts and technology to the antagonistic Middle East countries, much more nuclear cooperation with Iran. To eradicate North Korean acts supporting terrorism and preventing the expansion of mass destruction weapons, the U.S. ought to work together with international community. Such works and efforts can contribute to eradicating terrorism, maintaining public order and peace, and extending range of harmony and cooperation.

Key words: terror crisis, anti-terrorism, US strategies and efforts, North Korean terrorism

* This study was supported by Dong-A University research fund.

** Fax. +82-51-200-8606. E-mail. lawseoul77@hanmail.net

Submission & Publication Process

Received: Feb. 13, 2015 / Revised: Mar. 9, 2015 / Accepted: Mar. 20, 2015

I . Introduction

Terrorism has been caused by political, ideological, religious, social, economic, psychological and social-psychological factors. It has been occurring since the Rome era, and not discontinued up to now. Motives, means, movements, and targets of terrorism are diverse unlike the past in an interdependent world; in particular, its means has been becoming cruel increasingly, and there are no exceptions on targets. Thereby terrorism is regarded as a crime against humanity, and used to go ahead indiscriminate terror actions by the asymmetrical capability against targeted persons and organizations or the public.

Therefore, most of states are worried about, and faced with terrorism. There has been no exception to the United States that placed at a superpower position after communist countries' collapse. It had been shown as terrorism on September 11, 2001 (henceforth, 9/11), which was a world-shaking incident, destructive attack, and unprecedented and warlike, and gave the psychological impact. Although the United States responded to terrorist threats with diverse information and powerful political and military means, it could not have prevented the 9/11 terrorist attacks.

After all, it was a wake up call to the world people and nations. Right before 9/11 terrorist attacks, the security environment was formed around efforts to deal with other states, as opposed to the concept of main enemy. However, the tragic events of 9/11 has been justifying to wage war on terrorism. While such environment keeps going, terrorist organizations are being viewed as the key enemy. On the other side, states have come to face with terror crisis and asymmetrical threats.

Under certain circumstances, the world is not free from and no country is immune from terrorist threats. It means that man is not free from terror crisis. In order to get out of that, international collaboration to fight terrorism is essential in fighting terrorism. In exploring ways in eradicating the threats, the United States, China, and Russia, and many other nations would cooperate and work together. But each country tends to make an effort to check and compete with one another to advance their national interests and needs.

Above all, the worst terrorism in the world is probably a state-sponsored terrorism that is controlled by the state's intelligence agency. Over the years, the countries of North Korea, Cuba, Syria, Iran, and Sudan have been referring as the state-sponsored terrorism. From among these, Pyongyang's supporting terrorism at the national level has been becoming very serious. Obviously, its purpose is to gain a large sum of hard currency. In order to do this, Pyongyang has been

engaging in supporting terrorist acts, apart from its direct terrorist action, as providing training a variety of terrorist groups, maintaining and cooperating with terrorist groups, selling nuclear and missile parts and technology to some of antagonistic Middle East countries related to the state-sponsored terrorism. Consequently, the United States has been confronting with North Korean acts supporting terrorist groups and its proliferation of mass destruction weapons.

Considering these, this paper aims at analyzing the terrorism and its trends, the U.S. anti-terrorism strategies, North Korean acts supporting terrorism, and depicting efforts for eradicating terrorism.

II. Terrorism and Its Trends

There are a number of definitions on terrorism. Among them, according to Rourke (2008: G-12-13), terrorism is a form of political violence conducted by individuals, groups, or clandestine government agents that attempts to manipulate politics by attacking noncombatants and nonmilitary targets in order to create a climate of fear. Similarly, Sandler and Enders (2007: 288) define that terrorism is the premeditated use or threat to use violence by individuals or sub-national groups against noncombatants to obtain political or social objectives through the intimidation of a large audience, beyond that of the immediate victims. Such basic definitions along with the aim are valid until very recently.

Beyond such basic definitions other criterion can be applicable. But the definitions become politically motivated: one person's freedom fighter is another's terrorist (Goldstein and Pevehouse, 2009: 150). In order to achieve the goal, terrorists are not hesitant the use of violence as leverage to affect other actors or other parties to a conflict. And they tend to attain a demoralizing effect on a civilian population and national governments. Terrorism is, thus, usually viewed as a weapon of the weak, so it is associated with such nonstate actors as clandestine terrorist groups and insurgencies (Viotti and Kauppi, 2007: 276).

Today's terrorism is a multifaceted phenomenon involving a wide array of actors, motivation, factors, and tactics. Such a phenomenon requires equal ingenuity and flexibility on the part of those who study it or - as intelligence analysts, operators, and policy makers - deal directly with it (Viotti and Kauppi, 2007: 287). These would bring about questions in respect of terrorism of who, how, and for what in consideration of a diverse factors. In reality, political, social, economic, psychological and social-psychological factors, such as political instability, grief, frustration,

oppression and mistrust, relative deprivation caused by crime, anxiety, unemployment, and poverty, bring about terrorism.

Among them, poverty is a central factor of terrorism. Those actually living in poverty face social stigmas that facilitate isolation, humiliation, and mistrust (Choi, 2014: 141), which may lead to conduct terrorism. In effect, poverty is based on interaction of social depression, a loss of cultural identity, lack of economic perspective, a dysfunctional state and political repression (Chun and Lee, 2014: 74), and these factors may cause to induce domestic or international terrorism. Given this context, the empirical study of Seung-Whan Choi (2014: 136-159) predicts the relationship between poverty and terrorism; poverty levels are used to forecast the appearance of terrorism.

Beside, terrorism used to be caused by ethnic conflicts, internal conflict and wars, class ideology, nationalism, and regime/state collapses. Other motives of terrorism are also applicable widely. However, it is necessary to distinguish between international terrorism based on radical, mostly Islamic, fundamentalism and African domestic terrorism, which is driven by domestic circumstances (Chun and Lee, 2014: 66).

In general, terrorists would exert all possible efforts for gaining media attention. In part of the effectiveness of terrorism in capturing attention is due to the dramatic nature of the incidents, especially as shown on television news (Goldstein and Pevehouse, 2009: 150). It is thought to maximize media effect to the public. In fact, most terrorists place a high premium on the political consequences of their actions probably helps dissuade them from threatening terrorist acts that could lead to mass, indiscriminate casualties, because such a threat would alienate even those that they consider to be sympathizers among the affected public (National Intelligence Estimate, 1986: v). Nevertheless, terrorist acts for attaining and maximizing the psychological effect can be neither justified nor pardonable by any means.

Under the circumstances, man and world nations can not be free from terror threat. To be seriously worried is “suicide terrorism” which is considered as a kamikaze type suicide bombings. The main purpose of suicide terrorism is to use the threat of punishment to coerce a target government to change policy, especially to cause democratic states to withdraw forces from territory terrorists view as their homeland (Pape, 2003: 345).

Since the attack on the U.S. embassy in Beirut in April 1983, there have been *many* separate suicide terrorist attacks worldwide, in Lebanon, Israel, Sri Lanka, India, Pakistan, Afghanistan, Yemen, Turkey, Russia and the United States (Pape, 2003: 343),¹⁾ and suicide terrorism has been

1) Italics added.

consistently increasing. Analysis of the information contained therein yields some interesting clues: It is politics more than religious fanaticism²⁾ that has led terrorists to blow themselves up (Hassan, 2009). Concretely speaking, though religion can play a vital role in recruiting and motivating potential future suicide bombers, the driving force is not religion but a cocktail of motivations including politics, humiliation, revenge, retaliation and altruism (Hassan, 2009).

In a manner of speaking, world people lives in an age of unlimited terrorism, and hence no one is not free from terrorism. It may give extreme fear to people without consideration of children, old man, woman, and others. Therefore, the world nations should fight against terrorism and terrorist organizations. In order to do so, they need anti-terrorism cooperation and acts without being restricted by politics and ideology. Specially, the role and efforts of the United States as a victim country of 9/11 and a world corp are needed more and more for satisfying safety needs as well as maintaining public order and peace.

III. The U.S. Anti-terrorism Strategies

Seriously recognizing and facing with a danger of domestic and transnational terrorism after 9/11, the international community exhibited an aggressive stance toward the prevention of terrorism. Defensive element would be attached great importance “to defeat terrorist plots and to force terrorist groups to alter their plans in ways that introduce new vulnerabilities for them (Levi, 2008: 135).” In the process, the United Nations, which lead the international community, adopted a resolution to urge the countries to work together with a view to cutting an inflow of money to terrorists as well as terrorists groups, and responding to terrorism.

In complying with the United Nations, the international community’s efforts have been continuing and working assiduously to promote its capability to collect exact information to obstruct terrorism. For this, the community has been developing a system of mutual assistance to fight terrorism by improving its ability to gather information, responding together to terrorist attacks, sharing information among nations, imposing non-military sanctions and blockage, and engaging in military operations. In addition, it makes an endeavor to impose diplomatic and economic sanctions against suspicious terrorist organizations and mount immediate retaliatory

2) Pape (2003: 343) sees that suicide terrorists focus on individual motives - either religious indoctrination (especially Islamic Fundamentalism) or psychological predispositions that might drive individual suicide bombers.

attacks when terrorist attacks occur.

The United States is seeking collaboration with the international community to fight and prevent terrorism. This came from the realization that the US cannot fight terrorism alone and needs to collaborate with China, Russia, and other countries. At the same time, the US has been taking a dichotomous approach that those who actively support anti-terrorist measures are its friends and those who don't are its enemies. On this, President Bush showed a strong will that all countries should choose one side or the other - either work with the US to eradicate terrorism or support terrorism. In a nutshell, he urged that one should choose the road to peace or terrorism.

Continually, Washington has raised its guard against those who protect and support terrorists. To uproot terrorism, it is wished to act the anti-terrorism that considered any state or organization supporting terrorists to be a target of attack, making it clear that any nation proliferating biological, chemical, nuclear, and radiological mass destruction weapons that are able to be used in terrorist attacks against other nations should be held accountable. Proliferation erodes the great power's advantage relative to middle powers, and there is also a widespread fear that these weapons may fall into the hands of terrorists or other nonstate actors who would be immune from threats of retaliation (with no territory or cities to defend) (Goldstein and Pevehouse, 2009: 158). It is believed to be real. Consequently, Washington's action, considering that U.S. territory is more likely to be attacked with radiological, biological, or chemical weapons using ships, trucks, airplanes, or other means than by weapons of mass destruction from another country using its military missiles or bombers (Rourke, 2008: 319), has been manifested in its policy of non-expansion or anti-expansion of weapons of mass destruction.

Bin laden is dead, but Ayman al Zawahiri, who authored a 2008 fatwa "meticulously" justifying a violent attack of breathtaking proportion, replaced him (Tobey, 2012: 4). Under the circumstances, the US has been trying to wage war against terrorism within a new strategic framework, clear goals, and tactical flexibility. In its anti-terror policy and strategies, the US has been trying to shape the international political climate along the dimension of "terrorism vs. anti-terrorism," not "Christianity vs. Islam." Contemporary wars are not fought between the West and Islam. Rather, wars are waged between the US and radical Islamic fundamentalists. Therefore, they do not represent clashes between civilizations. The US and other nations do not want clashes between civilizations. No one, other than radical Islamic fundamentalists, wants them. The US, facing a war against terrorism, does not want it to become a tool of confrontation between "the West and the Middle East" or "Christianity vs. Islam" in the least. On the other side, radical

Islamic fundamentalists try to make it a tool of confrontation between Christianity and Islam, but most Islamic countries are sympathetic with anti-terrorism.

In pursuing its policy of anti-terrorism and responding to terrorism, the United States is trying to assert its leadership to build a mutual and close collaborative system with its allies, friendly nations, and other countries. By doing so, the US wants to prevent the expansion of weapons and technologies by lawless forces and to form an effective international solidarity. Furthermore, the US puts forth efforts to push for such measures in self-defense even if its allies are against its war against terrorism.

It needs to be pointed out that after 9/11, the US has placed a greater emphasis on self-defense than on alliance. Underlying such a stance is a value system of refusing to compromise, to which the US adheres. Therefore, if necessary, the US will not restrain from acting alone to defend itself. If Washington is forced to choose between self-defense and allies, it may choose self-defense.

IV. North Korean Supporting Terrorism and U. S. Responses

Terrorist acts by North Korea were intended to reunify the Korean Peninsula into a community society by weakening the South Korean society and system. They were committed in the form of kidnapping and bombing airplanes, bombing facilities, and assassinating influential figures. North Korea has even planned to assassinate an incumbent president. All these measures were aimed at causing political and social chaos in the South, and simultaneously making South Korea's economic instability known to the world to depress its foreign trade.

The North would engage in terrorist acts and support terrorist acts. It carried out the 1987 bombing of a Korean Air in which 115 passengers and crew were killed.³⁾ In response, the United States designated DPRK as a state supporting terrorism on January 20, 1988. The designation prevents North Korea from receiving not only U.S. economic assistance but low-interest loans from the international financial agencies influenced by Washington. Aside from these sanctions, there are a ban on arms sales according to "the US Trading with the Enemy Act," and a serious restriction from investment and trade. In spite of that, North Korea conducted a bombing in Burma in 1983 and kidnapped some Japanese.

3) It was to violate convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Civil Aviation.

Furthermore, North Korea provided training a variety of terrorist groups in the 1960's and 70's including the Palestine Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine when it conducted major aircraft hijackings and other attacks and to the Japanese Red Army (Kraft, 2008). Additionally North Korea might have given arms and probably training to the militant groups to Lebanon's Hizbulla's and Sri Lanka's Tamil Tigers (Niksich, 2010: 18-21). Its aid included instruction by North Korean trainers in the development of underground facilities for storing arms, food and medical installations (Wall Street Journal, 2007: A10).

It was also appeared North Korea's relationship with Iranian Revolutionary Guards⁴⁾ and other Iranian entities in the development of nuclear capabilities or nuclear weapons (Niksich, 2010: 22)⁵⁾ as well as ballistic missiles. The relationship certainly is financially profitable to North Korea. Of North Korea's estimated \$1.5 billion in earnings from sales and proliferation of weapons overseas (Ramstad, 2009: 3). It is to clarify that North Korea has ties with terrorists, and been cooperating with them to earn a large sum of dollar.

Nevertheless, Pyongyang continually put stress on its opposition to terrorism. In a statement from North Korea's Foreign Ministry, North Korea would: "firmly maintain consistent stand of opposing all forms of terrorism and any support to it and fulfil its responsibility and duty in the struggle against terrorism as a dignified member of the United Nations, in the future, too" (Associated Press, 2008); and "frequent terrorist acts being perpetrated in different parts of the world seriously threaten human lives, social stability and international peace and security" (Associated Press, 2008). As part of implementation process, since the early 2000s, North Korea took action in joining in "Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism" in November 2001 and "Convention against the Taking of Hostages" in October 2003.⁶⁾

4) North Korea's relationship with the 125,000 strong Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps (IRCG or Pasdaran), Tehran's arm for supporting terrorist groups, is significant and demonstrates Pyongyang's indirect support of terrorism (Maginnis, 2009). IRGC provides "material support" for the Iraqi Shia militants, Taliban, Hamas, Hizballah, and other terrorist (Maginnis, 2009).

5) The next reported stage in North Korean-Iranian nuclear cooperation, in 2003 and afterwards, appears to have been influenced by the reported joint advancement of the Nodong (Shahab) program in Iran, by North Korea's development and reported sale to Iran of the more advanced Musudan intermediate range ballistic missile (originally designed by the soviets to launch nuclear warheads), and by the reported initiation of joint development of the Taepodong long-range missile after 2000 (Niksich, 2010: 25).

6) The protocols and conventions that North Korea did not yet enter for as follows: "Protocol for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts of Violence at Airports Serving International Civil Aviation," "Protocol for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts Against the Safety of Fixed Platforms Located on the Continental Shelf," "International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism,"

In the meantime, despite remaining worries of possible North Korean terrorist acts, the United States removed DPRK from the list of the states supporting terrorism⁷⁾ on October 11, 2008. The removal came as part of a U.S.–North Korean agreement on establishing mechanisms for verifying North Korea’s declaration of elements of its plutonium nuclear program (Niksch, 2010: 1). However, implementation of the “complete and correct” declaration of nuclear programs was held up by North Korea’s unwillingness to disclose element of its plutonium program, its uranium enrichment program (Niksch, 2010: 9).

The verification plan⁸⁾ required with all the standards has been not made progressed yet. Thus, Washington regards re-certified North Korea as a country “not cooperating fully” with U.S. counterterrorism efforts pursuant to Section 40A of the Arms Export and Control Act (United States Department of State, 2014: 62). According to action to action, Pyongyang should first comply with reaching a verification protocol and dismantling its nuclear programs.

Furthermore, North Korean cooperation with Iran and Syria would be also questioned its non involvement to any terrorist acts. North Korea’s military capabilities and proliferation activities identified Iran as a past recipient of North Korean ballistic missiles and associated technology (Office of the Secretary of Defense, 2014). In addition, North Korea assisted Syria with building a nuclear reactor that may have been part of a Syrian nuclear weapons program (Kerr, Nikitin, and Hildreth, 2014: 6), of which facility was destroyed by Israeli air strike in a September 2007 (Bush, 2010: 422; Cheney, 2011: 472). Three seizures – in October 2009, November 2009, and April 2013 –

“Convention of the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings,” “Convention of the Marking of Plastic Explosives for the Purpose of Detection,” “International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorisms,” and “Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Maritime Navigation.” See Lee (2009: 140).

7) By the U.S. delisting of terrorism-sponsoring states, North Korea could have expectation of certain types of aid designated as state sponsors of terrorism, acquiring its assets frozen in the U.S, economic and trade transactions, and loans from international financial agencies, as not simply the U.S. terminating the application the "Trading with the Enemy Act" but its removing from the list of state sponsors of terrorism (Lee and Park, 2013: 99–100). The impoverished and destitute North has longed to be delisted so it can better tap into international finance, see the lifting of many trade sanctions, and use global settlement banks to send money abroad instead of relying on cash-stuffed suitcases (Herskovitz, 2008). But the U.S. sanctions against the North Korea remain in place on those related to nuclear experiment and proliferation-related activities as before. Besides, the US export of computer, software to North Korea except food and medical supplies is also maintained to be approved by the US Department of Commerce (Park, 2007: 387).

8) Bush took a gamble when he agreed to remove North Korea from the list of state sponsors of terrorism, based on spoken assurances from Pyongyang that it had agreed to a verification plan (Kessler, 2008: A22). It is not in the written agreement between the US and DPRK.

of shipments of North Korean chemical protective suits, gas indicator ampoules, and gas masks to Syria, which had an active chemical weapons program (Kerr, Nikitin, and Hildreth, 2014: 11-12). Pyongyang's continued ties of such terrorist organizations as Hezbollah and Hamas has not been also separated from link to supporting terrorism. To sum, three categories including Pyongyang's cooperation with Iran's ballistic missile programs, its assistance to Syria for constructing a nuclear reactor, and its ties of Hezbollah and Hamas are thought to be linked to any terror supporting acts.

Apart from the WMD issues linked to terror supporting acts, Pyongyang has been driven into a corner by the Sony Pictures Entertainment (SPE) hack in late November 2014. Although Pyongyang denies the hack and some specialists see other's conduct, the FBI has concluded North Korean actions. The FBI's conclusion has been supported by a result of an extensive investigation: technical analysis of the data deletion malware used in this attack revealed links to other malware that the FBI knows North Korean actors previously developed; significant overlap between the infrastructure used in this attack and other malicious cyber activity the U.S. government has previously linked directly to North Korea (FBI, 2014). Separately, the tools used in the SPE attack have similarities to a cyber attack in March of 2013 against South Korean banks and media outlets, which was carried out by North Korea (Goldsmith, 2014).

With the information, the FBI is convinced of North Korean actions, and the Obama administration accepts as North Korean cyber attack targeting the SPE. The Administration is also seen the cyber threat and attack not merely to threaten the national security and interests but to undermine business as well as the social and economic prosperity of U.S. citizens. In response, President Obama showed his will to respond proportionally to North Korean cyber attack on the SPE and Washington may considers to put North Korea onto its list of the state sponsors of terrorism. Even if the North Korean government's actions are deemed to meet the relisting criteria, the State Department is likely to weigh the prospective positive and negative consequences that re-listing would have on international diplomacy with North Korea (Manyin, 2015: 15). Re-listing is no better than a return to Washington's hawk policy, so Pyongyang may accelerate the nuclear and missile proliferation.

Nevertheless, Pyongyang wants to improve its relations with the United States, but this cannot be accomplished unless the thorny issues involving weapons of mass destruction and support of terrorism (including the cyber threat and attack) are resolved. If North Korea's relationship with the US improves, it will probably lead to North Korea's economic resurrection and participation into the international community. But if it deteriorates, it may have a negative influence on

Pyongyang's relationship with Seoul as well as the western countries. As long as North Korea remains a state that is a rogue and lack of confidence, western companies will be sure to limit in their investments in the North, causing difficulties for North Korea in implementing its plans to maintain its economy and to build special economic zones.

Since the international political outlook is murky, Seoul should try not to have this international climate cause negative effects on the North and South relations. In that respect, Seoul would pursue non-political exchanges and collaborations between the two Koreas, regardless of the international political climate. Even if political and military conflicts resume, the door for dialogue and contact is not to be closed, and mutual trust should be built through continued humanitarian aid to North Korea as well as economic, social, and cultural exchanges and collaborations.

Through such efforts of building trust and prevention of supporting terrorism, a positive image of North Korea can be forged in the international community, which may lead to prevention of proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. If this takes place, Pyongyang can seek loans from international financial organizations, and the US, Japan, and EU nations to expand investment in the North and increase their economic activities with North Korea. Thereby Pyongyang could escape from its long, dark tunnel with its economic recovery and social stability.

V. Conclusion: Efforts for Eradicating Terrorism

It is also important to lower the possibility of the success of terrorist acts. To do so, security guards and checks should be strengthened, which should also be known to terrorists. Also, terrorist acts should be prevented through the collection and exchange of information across borders.

As further steps, international accords and cooperation are absolutely necessary for curbing terrorism. For that, first of all, most of countries have to sign international accords against terrorism. Second, institutional arrangements should be made to implement these accords. Third, through international accords, terrorists should be convicted or extradited to their home countries for severe punishment. More efforts should be given to prevent terrorism. This is to curb terrorism in advance to be free from the threat of terrorism. To accomplish this goal, the world and man have to make efforts to eradicate factors that cause terrorism or be improved so that a hotbed of terrorism will not be formed. Above all, freedom from poverty is necessary as provide human basic needs.

However, the United States has encountered a great deal of difficulty in leading international collaborative efforts to fight terrorist and asymmetrical threats. China, Russia, and members of the European Union have not acted in accordance with US expectations; on the contrary, they have been alarmed by the unilateral and dogmatic approach the US has taken. Moreover, the European Union has expressed its view that if the US violates international law and disregards the opinion of international organizations, it would not be able to continue its support.

Striving to prevent terrorism does not mean that religious sacredness can be disregarded. People should not be watched and searched only because they are of Arabic descent; their liberty and human rights should not be violated. Excessive surveillance and human-rights violations, and control over the weak could cause additional episodes of terrorism.

If Washington continues its unilateral approach and disregard for the opinion of the international community, it could provoke further terrorist attacks. Therefore, the US may as well discuss and cooperate with the international community over major issues and should not take a unilateral approach that could cause confrontation. Cooperation can take any number of forms – diplomatic support for another state's counterterrorist efforts, combined military operations, intelligence sharing, law enforcement cooperation, or security assistance and training (Viotti and Kauppi, 2007: 294). In brief, in striving to prevent and eradicate terrorism, harmony and cooperation have to provide the foundation, and a multilateral approach should be taken.

In taking the multilateral approach, the United States should implement programs to help democratize countries in the Middle East and policies to develop friendly relations with them. If Washington continues to be partial to Israel, it will not be able to build friendly relations in the Middle East. Rather, it will cause the Arab region to unite and develop further anti-American sentiment.

As a way of eradicating terrorism, the international community ought to fight poverty. Before everything, satisfaction the physiological needs, most focused on solving hunger problem, is very important. Also, the community should not let the poor fall into despair but try to realize material, economic, social, and environment justice to resolve such problems. To put it another way, the focus should be placed on resolving structural problems of the world. By doing so, the world can demonstrate to those who could fall into the trap of terrorism that there is a better way.

Moreover, to eradicate North Korean acts supporting terrorism and preventing the expansion of weapons of mass destruction, Washington has to work together with international community. In particular, the role of the Six-Party Talks that involve the US, China, Russia, Japan, ROK, and DPRK is emphasized. This will bring all major players to the table exposes China and Russia to

North Korean obstinacy, enables China and Russia to exert pressure on Pyongyang, and includes Japan and South Korea who have direct interests in a peaceful resolution of the problem and are likely to be the major providers of aid to the DPRK (Nanto and Chanlett-Avery, 2009: 11). It is very important to carry out the Joint Statement in 2005 and agreements in 2007 agreed by the six nations. In the process, it is stressed to make compromise and negotiation with perseverance and endless effort rather than stick policy or one-sided pressure against North Korea.

References

- Bush, George W. 2010. *Decision Points*. New York: Crown Publishing.
- Cheney, Dick. 2011. *In My Time: A Personal and Political Memoir*. New York: Threshold Editions.
- Choi, Suung-Whan. 2014. Causes of Domestic Terrorism: Economic Sanctions as a Violence Trigger Structure. *The Korean Journal of International Studies*. 12(1): 137-159.
- Chun, Kwang Ho and Eugene Lee. 2014. Terrorism and Africa: Introducing Sustainability in Policy Approaches. *The Journal of Peace Studies*. 15(2): 65-85.
- FBI. 2014. FBI Statement: Update on Sony Investigation. FBI National Press. December 19.
- Hassan, Riaz. 2009. What Motivates the Suicide Bombers? YaleGlobal, September 3. <http://yaleglobal.yale.edu/content/what-motivates-suicide-bombers-0> (searched date: July 20).
- Herskovitz, Jon. 2008. October 12. North Korea May Resume Disablement after Deal. *Washington Post*.
- Goldsmith, Jack. 2014. December 19. The Sony Hack: Attribution Problems, and the Connection to Domestic Surveillance. *Lawfare*.
- Goldstein, Joshua S. and Jon C. Pevehouse. 2009. *International Relations*, 4th ed. New York; San Francisco; Boston; London; Toronto; Sydney; Tokyo; Singapore; Madrid; Mexico City; Munich; Paris; Cape Town; Hong Kong; Montreal: Pearson.
- Kerr, Paul K., Mary Beth D. Nikitin, and Steven A. Hidreth. 2014. Iran-North Korea-Syria Ballistic Missile and Nuclear Cooperation, April 15.
- Kessler, Glenn. 2008. December 12 N. Korea Doesn't Agree to Written Nuclear Pact. *Washington Post*.
- Kraft, Michael. 2008. Cuba, North Korea and the Terrorism List. *Counterterrorism Blog*, February

19. [http:// counterterrorismblog.org](http://counterterrorismblog.org) (searched date: December 12).
- Lee, Hun Kyung. 2009. The US Removal of North Korea from Designation of State Sponsors of Terrorism, and Diagnosis as Concerns Whether or Not Redesignation. *Journal of North-East Asian Studies*. 14(4): 131-149.
- Lee, Hun Kyung and Sung-Jo Park. 2013. US Economic Sanctions against North Korea: Situation and Impact - A Political Economy Analysis. *Unification Strategy*. 13(3): 81-126.
- Levi, Michael. 2008. Stopping Nuclear Terrorism: The Dangerous Allure of a Perfect Defense. *Foreign Affairs*. *Foreign Affairs*. 87(1): 131-140.
- Maginnis, Robert. 2009. Realist North Korea As a Terrorist Sponsor. Humn Events.com at [http://www.humanevents.com/ article.php?print=yes&id=32294](http://www.humanevents.com/article.php?print=yes&id=32294) on June 17 (searched date: September 26).
- Nanto, Dick K. and Emma Chanlett-Avery. 2009. North Korea: Economic Leverage and Policy Analysis. *CRS Report for Congress*, August 14: 1-61.
- Many, Mar E., et al. 2015. January 21. North Korea: Back on the State Sponsors of Terrorism List? *CRS Report for Congress*.
- Niksch, Larry A. 2010. North Korean: Terrorism List Removal. *CRS Report for Congress*, January 6: 1-29.
- National Intelligence Estimate. 1986. The Likelihood of Nuclear Acts by Terrorist Groups. NIE 6-86 (April).
- Office of the Secretary of Defense. 2014. Military and Security Developments Involving the Democratic People's Republic of North Korea. February 4.
- Pape, Robert A. 2003. The Strategic Logic of Suicide Terrorism. *American Political Science Review*. 97(3): 343-361.
- Park, Sung-Jo. 2007. IT Industry Development in System Transformation: The Case of North Korea. In Mica Jovanovic et al (eds.). *System Transformation in Comparative Perspective*, LIT Berlin.
- Ramstad, Evan. 2009. Leading the News: Seoul Plans Tough Action on Pyongyang. *Wall Street Journal Asia* April 14.
- Rourke, John T. 2008. *International Politics on the World Stage*, 12th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Sandler, Todd and Walter Enders. 2007. Applying Analytical Methods to Study Terrorism. *International Studies Perspective*. 8(3): 287-302.
- Tobey, William. 2012. Building a Better International Nuclear Security Standard. *USKI Working*

Paper Series (March).

United States Department of State. 2014. Country Reports on Terrorism 2013 (April).

Viotti, Paul R. and Mark V. Kauppi. 2007. *International Relations and World Politics*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

2007. Off the Terror List. *Wall Street Journal*, December 29.

2008. North Korea Reiterates Anti-terror Policy in Apparent Bid for Removal from US Blacklist. *Associated Press*. June 10.

이현경: 하와이주립대학에서 정치학 박사학위(1992년 5월)를 받고, 현재 동아대학교 정치외교학과 부교수로 재직 중이다. 한반도 통일·외교·안보가 주요 관심분야이며, 주요논문으로는 "North Korean Nuclear Armament and Perspective on Nuclear Domino in Northeast Asia (2013)", "Security Needs and Security Environment on the Korean Peninsula (2013)", "North Korean Nuclear Crisis and Further Approaches for the WMD and Missile Non-proliferation (2014)", "김정은 권력세습과 통치권력 강화: 역사적 함의와 정적 제거 (2014)" 등이 있다 (lawseoul77@hanmail.net).