

International Variables Affecting US Foreign Policy Towards North Korea After 2017

Niran Muhammad Ali Zaki¹, Khudhir Abbas Atwan²

Abstract

The international landscape has significantly affected U.S. policy, particularly in the East Asia region. Since 2017, this environment has rapidly evolved, marked by the intensifying Ukrainian crisis, ongoing tensions surrounding Taiwan, and the far-reaching consequences of the COVID-19 pandemic. These developments, along with the impactful rise of President Donald Trump and other pivotal factors, have continuously influenced U.S. policy, especially concerning North Korea. This paper will thoughtfully explore these international dynamics, with specific examples discussed in the following sections.

Keywords: North Korea, Russia, United Nations.

Introduction

First Section: Russia

Second Section: International Organizations: The United Nations

Research Importance

The importance of the current paper is deeply embedded in understanding the international variables that have obviously and undoubtedly affected U.S. foreign policy towards North Korea since 2017. This encapsulates intensifying military tensions, ongoing diplomatic shifts, and indefinitely intensifying geopolitical competitions with China and Russia. The research meticulously examines how these factors unswervingly impacted U.S. strategies for addressing North Korea's nuclear threats and meaningfully guided future policies aimed at ensuring regional and international security.

Research Problem

The problem is best represented in “how Russia and international organizations, especially the UN, affect the international policy towards North Korea after 2017. Did these effects obviously contribute to enhancing or undoubtedly undermining stability on the Korean Peninsula?”

Research Hypothesis

Russia has an essential role in international policy towards North Korea by indefinitely providing economic and diplomatic support. It also seeks to use the Korean crisis to enhance its international standing and compete with the United States in influencing East Asia. Meanwhile, the United Nations aims to achieve balance through international pressure and sanctions to maintain regional stability and prevent nuclear escalation.

¹ Department of International Politics, College of Political Science, University of Al-Nahrain, Email: neeran.mip22@ced.nahrainuniv.edu.iq

² Department of International Politics, College of Political Science, University of Al-Nahrain, Email: dr.khudhir@nahrainuniv.edu.iq

Research Methodology

The descriptive analytical method was used to analyze international stances through events and policies adopted by Russia and the United Nations towards North Korea since 2017, with a focus on studying Security Council resolutions.

Research Structure

The research includes two sections as follows:

First Section: Russia

Second Section: International Organizations

First Section: Russia

This section addresses Russia's economic and military capabilities, U.S.-Russia relations, Russia-North Korea ties, and Russia's stance on North Korea's nuclear issue.

First: Economic Capabilities

The economic factor was a key element that led to the collapse of the former Soviet Union. However, the current president, Vladimir Putin, has a critical role in revitalizing the Russian economy since taking office in 2000. He has managed to restore the gaps in the Russian economy by focusing on two main sectors for generating significant state revenue: the energy sector, which constitutes 55% of Russia's income, and the arms sector, which makes up 30% of its global exports. Putin worked to reclaim state control over these sectors by increasing government investments, achieving success in revitalizing the economy. From 2003, Russia's economic growth rates reached 7%, but the 2008 global financial crisis caused a slowdown, reducing growth to 3.4%. By 2012, the economy had rebounded slightly, with a growth rate of 3.5%. However, the 2015 oil price decline crisis once again impacted economic growth, reducing it to 0.4%, a situation that affected all oil-producing countries. (Salim,)

In August 2017, economic contraction recorded a historic figure of 0.54% earlier in modern Russian history. One of the most significant events that contributed to advancing the Russian economy was the successful extension of the oil production cut spending until the end of 2018, due to its positive effects on the global market balance and support for prices that benefit Russia as a major oil-producing country. Putin succeeded in reestablishing Russia as an influential power on the international stage, working to revitalize the economy and free it from bureaucratic constraints while encouraging investments based on the understanding that developing the internal economic, political, and administrative conditions would have a decisive impact on Russian foreign policy. (Kettin, 2001)

Russia's economic recovery from the downturn experienced in 2022 is heavily reliant on state-funded arms and ammunition production, which continues to expand amid the ongoing Russia-Ukraine war. This focus on military production, however, conceals the challenges that hinder the improvement of living standards for the Russian people.

Second: Military Capabilities

Russia inherited a highly advanced military industry from the Soviet Union, which, while smaller compared to the United States' industrial capabilities, remains competitive. The primary source of threat posed by Russia to the U.S. and the rest of the globe is its nuclear arsenal. Studies indicate that Russia's military power has notably increased during Putin's era. For example, Russia possesses 15,398 tanks, approximately two-thirds of what the U.S. has and 37 times more than the United Kingdom. The Russian army also has three times more self-propelled artillery than the U.S. military and 67 times more than the British army. Furthermore, Russia has 3,793 rocket launchers, three times the number held by the U.S. and 90 times more

than the UK. Russia's armed forces include 766,000 soldiers and officers, with an additional 2.5 million reservists. Its military spending reached \$83.3 billion in 2023, making it the second-strongest military power after the United States. Russia continuously invests in military modernization and development programs, ensuring it remains a formidable military force on the global stage. (Ismael,)

Third: U.S.-Russia Relations

After the collapse of the bipolar structure in 1991 and the dominance of the US and its expanding impact on the international phase, the relationship between the US and Russia became unequal due to the Russian Federation's adoption of new policies aimed at transforming its relationship with the West, which acted as a partnership rather than a confrontational power. It is believed that the nature of this partnership will enable Russia to escape the economic difficulties it faces. After the arms race with the United States, Russia's position changed. The post-conflict ties between the US and Russia has been the focal point of the bilateral relationship since the early 1990s until the beginning of this century. The relationship between the two countries has consistently maintained a close cooperative relationship rather than one of conflict. (Al-Tai'I, 2010)

After the events of September 11, 2001, Russia initially leveraged these incidents to strengthen ties with the United States. However, the U.S. invasion of Iraq in 2003 and its visible military presence in Asia led Russia to reconsider its ties with the U.S., especially as Russia's position in the international system was rising. The policies of Vladimir Putin and Dmitry Medvedev aimed to enhance Russia's power in the global balance of power and restore equilibrium with the U.S., while firmly opposing any attempts to interfere in Russia's internal affairs. Simultaneously, Russia sought to improve relations with China and eventually India, which has historically enjoyed good ties with Russia. (Al-Tai'I, 2010)

The study of U.S.-Russia relations holds great importance in international relations research, as the international system is shaped by the interactions and influences of major actors, including the U.S. and Russia. The effects of these relationships, alongside key principles, help define the system's structure. In particular, the dynamics between the U.S. and Russia have a significant impact on global stability. Russia is considered a major power for several reasons:

- Politically: Russia is a permanent member of the UN Security Council.
- Militarily: It possesses both significant conventional and unconventional military capabilities, with the capability to project power beyond its borders.
- Economically: Its GDP in 2021 was around \$1.77 trillion, and it held gold reserves totaling 2,299 tons.

The Russia-Ukraine war, which erupted in 2022, has strained U.S.-Russia relations. Although tensions have increased, they have not escalated to the point of direct armed clash between the U.S. and Russia. Both sides understand the immense costs that could arise from further escalation. (Atwaan, 2023).

U.S. policy focuses on obstructing any potential Russian rapprochement with its allied or non-allied countries around the world. This is due to the conventional and unconventional military capabilities of Russia, which enable it to regain its strategic weight and emerge as a major power that poses a threat to American hegemony globally. The tie between the US and Russia was proceeding smoothly as a result of the strategy employed by the Obama administration, which managed to communicate with Russia on issues concerning both countries, such as nuclear disarmament and counterterrorism. This feature was a prominent aspect during Barack Obama's presidency. However, during the presidency of Donald Trump, following his election victory, discussions began about Russian involvement and its interference in the U.S. elections to assist Trump in winning, in order to facilitate rapprochement between them ahead of the presidential campaign. Additionally, the Democratic Party was hostile. The Russians wanted to do things their own way. This interference was different from previous instances on two levels: the first level pertains

to the nature and scope of the interference, while the second level relates to the tools and means used. The Russian intervention in the elections was shocking not only to Americans but also to many around the world. (Atwaan, 2023).

Fourth: Russia-North Korea Relations and Russia's Stance on North Korea's Nuclear Issue

Since the Cold War, both superpowers (the U.S. and the Soviet Union) have considered the Korean Peninsula to be of strategic importance. The U.S. views the region as the farthest point in East Asia, occupying a strategically crucial position. It borders China to the north, Russia to the northeast, and Japan to the south, placing it in a unique location to spread liberal values and contain the rising communist influence in East Asia. For the former Soviet Union, and now Russia, the peninsula represents a region where they can resist U.S. expansionist ambitions. Russia's approach to dealing with the Korean Peninsula aligns with its broader interests in countering the West and the U.S., though it faces pressures to involve bilaterally with both Koreas. Although South Korea and China are key markets for trade and investment, South Korea is under increasing pressure to engage in bilateral relations with both North Korea and Russia. This complicates the development of these relationships, as South Korea wants to maintain strong ties with its global allies while navigating the dynamics with its northern neighbor and other powers. (Abdulbaqi & Mohamed, 2019)

Due to the interrelated issues arising in the region, including Korean unification, the North Korean nuclear file, and economic relations, there is a complex interplay of major powers engaging with these matters and the nature of polarization they undertake to safeguard their interests. Both Russia and China are the primary sources of economic and military assistance for North Korea, while at simultaneously, they do not wish to forfeit the economic benefits of their relationships with South Korea. (Abdulbaqi & Mohamed, 2019)

After the first nuclear test by North Korea on Oct, 12, 2006, a phone call made between Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov and U.S. Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice. The two officials discussed several international issues, focusing particularly on the potential actions the United Nations Security Council might take in response to North Korea's nuclear declaration. Both parties agreed to continue their communications on this matter, both bilaterally and multilaterally. (www.mid.ru.)

Russia expressed deep concern over North Korea's nuclear test and its potential impact on nuclear proliferation in Asia. Russian President Vladimir Putin and then-German Chancellor Angela Merkel urged the international community to collaborate in curbing North Korea's nuclear ambitions. While both leaders condemned North Korea's nuclear test, they emphasized the prominence of maintaining dialogue with Pyongyang. They called for political and diplomatic measures, with Putin stressing that the international response should be proportional to the situation. He also expressed hope that North Korea would return to negotiations, instructing the Russian Foreign Ministry to hold consultations with the UN Security Council.

After the tests conducted by North Korea in 2009, Russia deplored the nuclear test and also denounced the launch of long-range missiles. Subsequently, Russia condemned all the experiments conducted by North Korea. The Russian Federation has been and continues to be one of the tools of the international community to exert pressure on North Korea regarding the nuclear issue. On the other hand, strengthening Russia's ties with North Korea is an attempt to bolster its negotiating position with the US. (Al-Hariri,)

In summary, as a global supremacy and a permanent member of the UN Security Council, Russia has a significant role in shaping U.S. foreign policy toward North Korea. Due to its historical and geographical ties with North Korea, Moscow can balance U.S. impact in the region by strengthening its diplomatic and economic ties with Pyongyang. Russia capitalizes on tensions between the U.S. and North Korea to enhance its regional position and impact security matters in East Asia. At times, Russia can undermine the effectiveness of U.S. pressure by opposing strict sanctions on North Korea in the UN or advocating for the easing of sanctions. Therefore, Russia remains an influential international factor that the U.S. ought to consider when formulating its policy to North Korea.

Section Two: International Organizations

International organizations provide a structured environment for international relations, serving as a framework for multiple actors and a platform for conflict resolution mechanisms. In this section, we will examine the UN as a case study, being one of the most important organizations involved in the North Korean issue. We will also explore its influence on U.S. policy toward North Korea.

The United Nations

After the failure of the League of Nations and outbreaking World War II in 1939, the international community realized the need to establish a new international organization. There were several reasons that emphasized the necessity for multiple international organizations. (Salih, 2019). On April 25, 1945, the San Francisco Conference was held at the invitation of the United States. After extensive discussions and amendments to the proposed drafts, the United Nations Charter was finalized. The Charter consists of a preamble and 111 articles, as well as the statute of the International Court of Justice, which is attached and comprises 70 articles. The Charter became effective on October 24, 1945, marking the establishment of a global organization aimed at reshaping international relations between states, especially after the devastation caused by the war. The international community witnessed the founding of the largest global and comprehensive organization with clear goals and principles. (Na'fa,) The key objective of the UN is to preserve global peace and security through collective measures and by addressing threats to peace. The headquarters of the organization is in New York City, with major offices also located in Geneva, Nairobi, Vienna, and The Hague. The main objectives of the UN, which it has strived to achieve despite the challenges and obstacles it has faced over more than seven decades since its establishment, are:

Maintaining Global Peace and Security

The most important goal of the UN is the preservice of Global peace and security. The Charter assigns this responsibility to the executive body of the organization, represented by the Security Council. Article 24 of the Charter stipulates that the organization must act swiftly and effectively to keep peace and security, which includes the prevention of the use or threat of force in international ties. The United Nations also works to make the required political, economic, and social conditions to prevent the threat of war or the use of force. (Al-A'li, 2023)

Strengthening Friendly Relations Among Nations

Strengthening relations between nations is centred on the principle of equality among peoples and nations. Every nation has the right to self-determination and to take the necessary steps to protect peace, security, and its rights.

Solving International Economic and Social Problems

International cooperation should be founded on the upgrade of human rights, the right to self-determination, and fundamental freedoms for all with no discrimination. The UN Charter emphasizes in Article 1, Paragraph 3, the significance of achieving global cooperation in resolving economic, social, cultural, and humanitarian issues and promoting respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all, without discrimination as to race, gender, language, or religion. However, the UN has not fully succeeded in achieving global balance, which has led to the dominance of major powers over essential resources, depriving others. (Al-Al'i, 2023)

4. Acting as a Forum for Nations to Coordinate and Achieve Common Goals :

The United Nations should serve as a venue for countries to consult and reach joint solutions on international matters and other issues that help achieve its objectives. As a structured organization, it guarantees the continuation of international cooperation aimed at fulfilling its mission. (Fayiq, 1998)

The Key Principles of the UN.

- Sovereign Equality Among All Members : All member states are considered equal in sovereignty.
- Good Faith in Fulfilling Charter Obligations: Member states must act in good faith to meet their obligations under the UN Charter.
- Peaceful Settlement of Disputes: Member states are required to resolve their disputes peacefully.
- Prevention of Using Force in International Ties : The use of force is prohibited in dealings between states.
- Commitment of Member States to Aid the Organization : Member states must assist the UN in its missions and refrain from aiding states that are under sanctions.
- Respect for Non-Member States : The UN promotes respect for states that are not members.

This brief overview highlights the key goals and principles of the UN, focusing on maintaining international peace and stability. These principles play an exceptionally vital role in thoroughly understanding the UN's influence on the North Korean situation. The issue of North Korea has consistently posed a threat to global peace and security since the Cold War, prompting the UN to promptly include it on its agenda. The organization has actively issued numerous resolutions to address the North Korean crisis, especially following North Korea's provocative nuclear tests.

Key UN Resolutions on North Korea:

Resolution 1695 (2006)

Adopted during the 5,490th session of the Security Council on July 15, 2006, the resolution clearly emphasized:

Carefully monitoring the issue and thoughtfully considering further actions if necessary.

Urging the DPRK to promptly get back to the Six-Party Talks, while calling for their early resumption. It strongly encourages all members to diligently maximize their efforts toward the full application of the Joint Statement dated September 19, 2005, aiming to achieve a verifiable denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula through entirely peaceful means..

Resolution 1718 (2006)

After North Korea refused to re-communicate on this matter by stopping the six-party talks and conducting nuclear tests on the 9th of Oct, 2006, the Security Council adopted Resolution 1718 under Chapter VII of the UN Charter (sanctions, art. 41).

Strongly condemning the nuclear test as an undeniable menace to global peace and security.

Strictly preventing North Korea from making further nuclear tests or ballistic missiles launches.

Demanding that North Korea instantaneously retract its withdrawal from the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT).

Suspending entire activities relevant to its ballistic missile program.

Requiring North Korea to abandon all nuclear weapons and programs in a complete, verifiable, and irreversible manner, and to provide transparency measures, including access to individuals, documents, equipment, and facilities as deemed necessary by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA).

Banning the import and export of goods, technology, and services to and from North Korea related to its nuclear program.

Freezing financial assets and economic resources related to North Korea's programs.

The resolution indicates that the Council acted under Chapter VII of the UN Charter, which allows for a broad range of actions, including military options. This was emphasized by the United States. However, China insisted on including Article 41, which encompasses economic and trade measures without the use of military force, thereby framing the sanctions in diplomatic terms. Consequently, amendments were made to the resolution before its issuance, aligning with the preferences of the permanent members of the Security Council (China and Russia). China objected to the clause regarding the inspection of cargo, deeming it provocative, while Russia insisted on avoiding military force and stipulated that the sanctions be time-bound. Thus, Resolution 1718 could be seen as a compromise between China and the US. (Kamil, 2009)

Resolution 1874 (2009)

This resolution, adopted by the Security Council during its 6141st session on June 12, 2009, reaffirmed North Korea's 2nd nuclear test, violating Resolution 1718 (2006). Under Chapter VII of the UN Charter and based on Article 41, the Security Council condemned the test made by North Korea. The resolution included the following provisions:

The DPRK (North Korea) shall end all activities relevant to its missile program, following a demand that North Korea not make any further nuclear tests or missile launching.

North Korea is required to completely, verifiably, and irreversibly eliminate all nuclear weapons and programs and cease all related activities.

The measures imposed by Resolution 1718 (2006) shall apply strictly, without exemption, to all arms and relevant materials, as well as to any financial transaction, technical training, or services related to the provision, manufacture, maintenance, or use of such arms.

All states are called upon to exercise extreme vigilance and caution regarding supplies of arms.

Calls upon the DPRK, in the strongest terms, to retract immediately its announcement of withdrawal from the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

Also calls on the DPRK urgently to get back instantaneously to the NPT and to cooperate fully with the IAEA, in accordance with the rights and obligations of States Parties to the NPT, and reaffirming that all States Parties to the NPT have the obligation to comply fully with their Treaty commitments.

All States are called upon to take the necessary steps to inspect all cargo to and from North Korea within their territories if there is information that provides reasonable grounds to believe the cargo contains items prohibited by paragraph 8

The matter remains under active consideration, reaffirming that additional decisions may be required if further measures are necessary.

A panel of experts, consisting of seven members, is established to efficiently assist the committee implementing Resolution 1718..

Resolution 1928 (2010)

The Security Council took the significant step of adopting this resolution during its 6333rd meeting on June 7, 2010. The resolution makes it clear that the spread of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons, along with their delivery systems, remains a serious danger to global peace and security. In response, the Council, exercising its authority under Article 41 of Chapter VII of the UN Charter:

The Council decisively decides to make an extension for the mandate of the experts panel established in paragraph 26 of Resolution 1874 (2009) until June 12, 2011, and requests the Secretary-General to adopt the required administrative measures promptly in this regard.

It formally requests the Expert Panel to submit a midterm report on its activities to the Council by no later than November 12, 2010. Additionally, it asks the Panel to provide a comprehensive final report to the Council, including its results and recommendations, no later than thirty days before the expiration of its mandate.

The Council urgently urges all countries, relevant UN bodies, and other interested parties to fully collaborate with the Committee created under Resolution 1718(2006) and the Experts Panel, particularly by providing any available data regarding the effective application of the measures taken under Resolutions 1718 (2006) and 1874 (2009). Furthermore, it decides to keep the matter actively under consideration.

Resolution 1985 (2011)

This resolution was adopted during the 6553rd summit on June 10, 2011. The Council:

- The Council decisively decides to make an extension for the mandate of the panel of experts, as outlined in paragraph 26 of Resolution 1874(2009), until June 12, 2012, and requests the Secretary-General to promptly take the necessary administrative measures for this purpose.
- It formally requests the panel of experts to submit a detailed work program to the committee within 30 days of their appointment. The Council encourages the committee to regularly hold debates on this program and requests the experts to provide timely updates related to the work program.
- The Council urgently urges entire countries, relevant UN bodies, and other interested ones to fully collaborate with the committee made pursuant to Resolution 1718(2006) and with the panel of experts, particularly by making any available data regarding the effective application of the measures taken under Resolutions 1718 (2006) and 1874 (2009).
- It decides to actively keep the matter under its ongoing consideration.

Resolution 2050 (2021)

This resolution was adopted by the Security Council during its 6783rd meeting on June 12, 2012, which states that the Council, acting under Article 41 of Chapter VII of the UN Charter:

- extending the mandate of the panel of experts until July 12, 2013, as stated in paragraph 26 of Resolution 1874 (2009). The Council expresses its intention to review this mandate and take appropriate measures regarding its extension by no later than June 12, 2013, and requests the Secretary-General to adopt the essential administrative measures.
- Requests the panel of experts to submit to the committee a work program outlining its planned activities within thirty days of the panel's reappointment. The Council encourages the committee to hold regular debates regarding this program and to regularly involve with the panel regarding its effort. The Council decides to keep the matter under its active consideration.

Resolution 2087 (2013)

On December 12, 2012, North Korea conducted a missile launch using ballistic missile technology, violating the provisions of Resolutions 1718(2006) and 1874(2009). On January 22, 2013, the Security Council condemned this action, reiterating the same points made in the aforementioned resolutions. The Council:

- Reaffirms its desire to reach a peaceful, diplomatic, and political solution to the ongoing situation and welcomes the efforts made by Council members and other states to facilitate a comprehensive peaceful resolution through dialogue.
- Emphasizes the necessity of refraining from any actions that would increase tensions.
- Underlines that measures adopted under Resolutions 1718 and 1874 are not meant to have adverse humanitarian repercussions for the civilian of the DPRK.

Resolution 2094 (2013)

On the 12th of Feb, 2013, North Korea made a nuclear test, violating Resolutions 1718, 1874, and 2087, which led to a strong condemnation of all its nuclear activities. Resolution 2094 was unanimously adopted by the Security Council:

Strongly condemned the nuclear test made by North Korea.

Imposed new sanctions in accordance with Chapter VII of the UN Charter.

Stressed that the severity and depth of these sanctions would increase the costs of North Korea's nuclear program and limit its ability to continue funding its nuclear program and obtaining materials and technology for its ballistic missile programs, and its conventional and nuclear weapons capabilities.

Resolution 2141 (2014)

This resolution was adopted by the Council during its 7126th meeting on the 5th of March, 2014. It states that the Council, acting under Article 41 of Chapter VII of the UN Charter:

- Shall extend until April 5, 2015, the mandate of the Panel of Experts outlined in paragraph 26 of Resolution 1878 (2009) and amended by paragraph 29 of Resolution 2094 (2013), and to express its intention to review the mandate and take appropriate action concerning an additional extension of the mandate by no later than March 5, 2015. It requests the Secretary-General to adopt the obligatory administrative measures for this purpose.
- It requests the Panel of Experts to submit a interim report on its activities to the Committee by no later than August 5, 2014. Additionally, it requests that the panel, after consulting with the Committee, submit its midterm report to the Council by September 5, 2014. The Panel must submit a final report to the Committee by February 5, 2015, after discussing its conclusions and recommendations with the Committee.
- The Panel of Experts is required to submit a work program to the Committee within thirty days of its reappointment. The Committee should regularly discuss this program and maintain open communication with the panel. The panel must also provide updates on the work program.
- The Council intends to closely monitor the panel's activities and will keep the matter under its consideration.

Resolution 2207 (2013)

This resolution warmly welcomes the endeavors made by the Secretariat to significantly extend and enhance the roster of experts within the subsidiary organs branch and to firmly operate under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter. It decides significantly extending the mandate of the Panel of Experts until April 5, 2016, and clearly expresses its intent to carefully review the mandate and take appropriate action regarding a further extension by April 7, 2016. It strongly requests the Secretary-General to swiftly adopt the urgent administrative measures and urgently requests the Panel of Experts to promptly submit a work program outlining its intended activities to the Committee. It also strongly requests the panel to immediately inform the Committee of any upgrades related to the work program.

Resolutions 2270 (2016), 2276 (2016), and 2321 (2016)

In reply to North Korea's 4th and 5th nuclear tests, the Security Council took decisive action by imposing far-reaching economic and trade sanctions. These sanctions included a total ban on North Korean coal, iron, gold, and other metals, severe restrictions on fuel, petroleum products, and aircraft sales, and tightened controls on vessels suspected of carrying prohibited materials. Additionally, the Council imposed restrictions on financial and banking transactions with North Korea, limited North Korean financial transactions, prohibited the expansion of North Korean labor forces abroad, and emphasized monitoring ship and cargo movements to and from Korea.

The resolution reaffirms the significance of preserving peace and stability on the Korean Peninsula and in Northeast Asia as a whole. It expresses commitment to achieving a peaceful, diplomatic, and political solution to the situation, welcomes the efforts of Council members, and reaffirms support for the Six-Party Talks, continuously reviewing North Korea's actions. It underscores readiness to enhance, adjust, suspend, or lift measures, emphasizing that significant actions will be taken if North Korea undertakes any provocative action.

The Council decided extending the Panel of Experts' mandate until April 24, 2017, with requirements for the panel to submit an interim report of work and a final report on February 1, 2017, including conclusions and recommendations, expressing intent to continue following up with the committee. It urged all countries and UN agencies to support the committee and commit to actively reviewing the issue. It was decided by the council that all countries must take measures to reduce the number of North Korean bank accounts and consulates. Furthermore, all member states are to prevent their citizens from purchasing shipping and aircraft services from North Korea, prohibiting North Korea from providing, marketing, or selling shipping and aircraft services directly or indirectly for the transport of coal, iron, and iron ore from its territory or via vessels or aircraft. All states must necessarily refrain from purchasing such materials from North Korea. These resolutions aim to highly pressurize North Korea to abandon its nuclear and missile programs and return to the negotiating table.

Resolution 2356 (2017)

It directly concerns the repeated breaches by the DPRK (North Korea) of relevant Security Council resolutions, including continued launching and attempted launching of missiles. That is very worrying, since it not only raises the region's and the world's tensions significantly but also results from North Korea's continuing nuclear activities. It is strong against the nuclear tests and ballistic missile launches North Korea has carried out with a view to tighten the international sanctions it has been subjected to and adding more names to its sanctions list. It encompasses some of the stringent measures: asset freeze and travel bans on individuals engaged with North Korea's nuclear and missile programs. Besides, the resolution significantly reinforces control over the movement of commercial commodities in and out of North Korea as an effective way of preventing smuggling of banned materials and increases restrictions on financial transactions to cripple the funding of North Korea's nuclear and missile programs. The resolution vehemently underlines that diplomacy is of essence and calls upon the resumption of negotiations and diplomatic dialogues in order for the nuclear crisis on the Korean Peninsula to be de-escalated. It reflects

the nonceasant commitment of the global community to counter nuclear threats, ensuring regional and global security and stability.

Resolutions 2371 and 2375 (2017)

In reply to the repeated ballistic missile tests by the DPRK between July 3 and 28, 2017, and another test on August 2, 2017, the Security Council, under Chapter VII of the UN Charter, took a decision: measures not requiring the usage of armed force; it condemns the nuclear tests of North Korea, under Article 41. The resolutions in essence condemn the ballistic missile tests made by the DPRK in violation of previous UN resolutions and posing a threat to global peace and security. The global community is gravely concerned with the defiant pursuit by the Republic of North Korea of nuclear and missile potentialities. Furthermore, the resolutions also imposed more restrictions on North Korea because it "has gone on to progress its nuclear and missile capabilities". Key actions include economic sanctions, which prevent North Korean exports of coal, iron, lead, and seafood; these have reduced both its exports and revenues. New investments and joint ventures in North Korea are banned. Financial curbs preclude member states from increasing the employment of North Korean workers on their territories, since these workers contribute to the funding of the regime. Many North Korean companies and financial assets are frozen, with enhanced monitoring of shipments. Member states are also prohibited from issuing work permits to North Korean laborers and are allowed to inspect vessels suspected of transporting prohibited materials to or from North Korea. These resolutions aim to put high pressure on North Korea to swiftly abandon its nuclear and missile programs by limiting its economic capabilities and reducing its financial resources.

Resolution 2397 (2017)

The UN Security Council resolution imposed stringent novel sanctions on North Korea's energy, import, and export sectors. It empowered new naval forces to help prevent illegal smuggling activities in response to North Korea's intercontinental ballistic missile launch on the 29th of Nov. Security Resolution 2397 references Resolution 2375 (2017), which includes the most severe sanctions taken against North Korea to date, alongside previous resolutions. Acting under Chapter VII of the UN Charter takes measures under Article 41. It condemns in the strongest terms the Democratic People's Republic of Korea's launch of ballistic missiles on the 28th Nov, 2017, as a flagrant violation of and disregard for Security Council resolutions.

It reiterates that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea shall not make any decisions, directly or indirectly, regarding supplying, selling, or transferring of all types of crude oil within the territory or area of the People's Republic of China. It decides that entire member countries should prohibit supplying, selling, or transferring of all types of crude oil to the Democratic Republic of Korea, directly or indirectly, through their territories or by their citizens. North Korea does not supply food and agricultural products, emphasizing that it will continuously review the measures of the Democratic Republic of Korea and will keep the matter under consideration.

After 2017, the international environment changed significantly with Donald Trump's rise to power, leading to a reassessment of North Korea's nuclear file and U.S. relations with its East Asian allies. Trump opened up to mediation efforts from the Philippines and Singapore, resulting in three rounds of talks between 2018 and 2019, during which tensions relatively eased and nuclear issues were deprioritized. In 2018, the first summit between President Trump and Kim Jong-un was in Singapore, shadowed by a second summit in the Philippines in 2019, and a third in North Korea later that year. Despite these diplomatic attempts, the efforts did not yield any definitive results regarding North Korea's nuclear disarmament. In 2020, global conditions worsened due to the COVID-19 pandemic, significantly impacting many countries, including North Korea. Under these challenging circumstances, U.S. President Joe Biden, in collaboration with the South Korean president, offered assistance to North Korea. However, Washington received no response from the North Korean leader, reflecting ongoing tensions between the parties involved. Economic and health challenges have increased in North Korea, with the Korean people suffering from food shortages and a lack of medical resources. Even though the international community repeatedly offered assistance, North Korea went on developing its nuclear program, raising global concerns. China and Russia, major regional powers, attempted to mediate a solution, but progress was slow. The United Nations imposed

sanctions on North Korea to pressure it to abandon its nuclear program and advocated for dialogue to resolve the issue. In 2021, the Biden administration shifted U.S. policy toward North Korea by launching a quadrilateral dialogue to address North Korea's nuclear threat and protect U.S. allies. This impacted the security setting in East Asia as the U.S. strengthened its alliances to counter potential threats. After 2017, the UN imposed multiple resolutions on North Korea, citing violations of previous decisions. These resolutions were justified as follows:

Resolution 2407 (2018)

On March 21, 2018, the Security Council issued Resolution 2407 to tighten sanctions on North Korea. This move aimed to force North Korea to give up its nuclear and missile programs. Key points of the resolution include:

Renewal of Sanctions: The resolution newly re-issued some of the sanctions taken previously by the Security Council previously, which included banning travelling and freezing asset on individuals and entities related to the nuclear and missile programs of North Korea.

Restriction Enhancement: It strongly reinforced the ban on the export and import of weapons to and from North Korea, along with restrictions on fuel imports.

Expanded Inspection Powers: UN member states were granted expanded inspection powers of vessels moving to and from North Korea in efforts to prevent smuggling of banned materials.

Economic Pressure: The member states were called on to impose additional financial and economic pressures by blocking funding that could support North Korea's nuclear and missile programs.

Monitoring Compliance: It established mechanisms for monitoring compliance with the sanctions imposed, including experts to present regular reports to the Security Council about the implementation and adherence to the sanctions.

Resolution 2407 was among a series of decisions reached by the Security Council in the effort to turn the screw further on the North Koreans to get back to negotiations and abandon its nuclear and missile programs in line with international requirements.

Resolution 2515 (2020)

On March 30, 2020, Resolution 2515 was adopted by UN, acting under Article 41 of Chapter VII of the UN Charter. The Council unequivocally decided to make an extension for the mandate of the Panel of Experts until April 30, 2021, as stated in paragraph 26 of Resolution 1874 (2009) and amended in paragraph 29 of Resolution 2094 (2013). This mandate also applies to the measures taken against in previous resolutions. The resolution requests the Panel of Experts to submit a mid-term report on its activities to the Committee by August 3, 2020, as required in paragraph 43 of Resolution 2321 (2016). Additionally, the Panel is asked to present the same mid-term report to the Council by September 4, 2020, following discussions with the Committee. The Panel is also tasked with providing a final report to the Committee after further discussions, while keeping the matter under active consideration.

Resolution 2569 (2021)

In 2021, Resolution 2569 concerning North Korea was adopted by UN. The primary objective of this resolution was to extend the mandate of the Panel of Experts aiding the Sanctions Committee related to North Korea (known as the 1718 Committee) until April 30, 2022. The resolution provides for monitoring and assessing the application of the sanctions imposed on the Democratic People's Republic of Korea because of its nuclear and missile programs. No new sanctions against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea were presented in 2021, whereas Resolution 2569 was within continuous efforts of the Security Council to supervise the application of existing sanctions and enhance their efficiency.

Resolution 2627 (2022)

The 2022 Security Council resolution refers, in particular, to extending the mandate of the Panel of Experts regarding North Korea, adopted on February 25, 2022. The resolution officially extends mandating the Panel-a steadfast helper of the Sanctions Committee on North Korea-until April 30, 2023. Going even further, it actively continues to supervise the application of the sanctions imposed on North Korea for its nuclear and missile programs. The Panel shall submit periodic reports at least every ninety days after the adoption of this resolution to the Security Council on its work in monitoring the application of sanctions and compliance. The present resolution is an integral part of the continuous contribution of the Security Council toward the effective enforcement of sanctions against North Korea, in accordance with its resolutions, and to closely monitor its activities in nuclear and missiles.

Resolution 2680 (2023)

UNSC Resolution 2023, adopted on March 23, 2023, specifically refers to extending the mandate of the Panel of Experts concerning North Korea. The resolution officially extends the Panel's mandate to effectively support the Sanctions Committee of North Korea until April 30, 2024. It underlines very strongly the need for the Panel to make independent and evidence-based assessments while providing objective analysis and recommendations without prejudice. It further calls on the Panel to address the Committee, within 30 days of its reappointment, with a proposed work plan, to present a midterm statement by the 8th of Sep, and then a final report, no later than the 2nd of Feb 2024, which shall be referred promptly to the Security Council by March 8, 2024. Conclusion The UN has always acted as one of the international forces pressuring North Korea, and U.S. political actions have strategically been in tandem with UN initiatives with a view to mediating the security threat that the country imposes.

Conclusion

Finally, we unequivocally recognize that the international variables realized in the year 2017 have indeed done much to change the scene of East Asia, marked by crises like the war in Ukraine, which has easily led Russia to hasten its solidarity with countries that are hostile towards the United States. Moreover, with concurrent international transformations, it can be boldly stated that North Korea relations have indeed seen significant transformations both from regional and global variables. Russia has been playing a focused role in adding to its geopolitical significance by proactive support for North Korea both economically and diplomatically to act as a counterbalancing force to American influence in the region. The United Nations has been vigorously pursuing a diplomatic settlement of the crisis by imposing a series of sanctions and attempting to restrain the nuclear ambition of North Korea. It has, however, been saddled with serious setbacks, including the growing divergence of positions in the Security Council by the big powers, which unfortunately weakened the impact of the sanctions to render less effective those international efforts. This study clearly shows how the North Korean problem can be responded to effectively through an integrated approach by the international community and a united front to bring regional stability and preclude military escalation.

Results

- Russia has increasingly become influential in setting international policy towards North Korea, using the current crisis to reinforce its position in East Asia and to counterbalance US dominance in this part of the world. In order to strengthen its economic and political relations, Russia has also used historical ties with North Korea to its advantage to an extent that has considerably weakened the impact of international sanctions against Pyongyang.
- While multiple sanctions were issued starting from 2017, effectiveness in changing North Korea's behavior has always been persistently limited. That is partly because Russia and China have implicitly supported North Korea, with Russia providing critical economic and diplomatic aid in a manner that has ably enabled North Korea to dodge some of the ramifications of the sanctions.

- The findings indicate that the UN faces the challenge of developing global consensus on the manner of engagement with North Korea. The core determinant of this was the sharp divisions within permanent Security Council members, particularly between the US on one part and Russia and China on another, which only served to weaken international resolutions on North Korea.
- The policies being pursued vis-à-vis the North, including the use of sanctions and diplomacy, urgently need review and updating. What is called for now is the construction of a new set of policies that will take careful consideration of new regional dynamics and international actors like Russia, focusing on increasing dialogue and direct contact with North Korea to achieve stability and security.

References

- Abdul-Baqi, A., & Muhammad, F. (2019). *Relations between the Koreas and the interests of great powers* (1st ed.). Arab Publishing and Distribution.
- Al-A'li, S. S. R. (2023). *The United Nations and the challenges of building peace in the twenty-first century* (Doctoral dissertation). Al-Nahrain University, Faculty of Political Science, Iraq.
- Al-Hariri, J. Y. (n.d.). *The repercussions of North Korea's nuclear experiment regionally and internationally*. International Observatory, Center for International Studies, University of Baghdad, Baghdad.
- Attwan, K. A. (n.d.). *U.S.-Russian relations after the Ukrainian war*. Iraqi Journal of Political Science, Al-Nahrain University, Faculty of Political Science.
- Danoon Al-Ta'i, T. M. (n.d.). *U.S.-Russian relations after the Cold War* (1st ed.). Hammurabi Center for Research and Strategic Studies.
- Fayiq, M. S. (n.d.). *Human rights in the framework of the United Nations*. In *Human rights* (pp. XX-XX). Dar Al-Ilm for Publishing and Distribution.
- Ismail, M. S. (n.d.). *The Russian experience: Putin's national security strategy* (1st ed.). Arab Publishing and Distribution.
- Kamil, A. (n.d.). *Developments in the North Korean nuclear program and the U.S. position on it*. Political File, Center for International Studies, University of Baghdad, Baghdad.
- Kettin, G. S. (2001). *Russian-Arab relations in the twentieth century and their prospects*. Emirates Center for Strategic Studies and Research, Strategic Studies, (53). Abu Dhabi.
- Saleh, M. S. (n.d.). *The role of the United Nations in applying the principle of international humanitarian intervention* (1st ed.). Zain Legal Publications.
- Na'fa, H. (n.d.). *The United Nations in half a century: A study of the evolution of international organization since 1945* (1st ed.). National Council for Culture, Arts, and Letters.
- United Nations Security Council. (2006). S/RES/1695.
- United Nations Security Council. (2009). S/RES/1874.
- United Nations Security Council. (2010). S/RES/1928.
- United Nations Security Council. (2011). S/RES/1985.
- United Nations Security Council. (2012). S/RES/2050.
- United Nations Security Council. (2013). S/RES/2087.
- United Nations Security Council. (2014). S/RES/2141.
- United Nations Security Council. (2015). S/RES/2207.
- United Nations Security Council. (2016). S/RES/2270, 2276, 2321.
- RT Arabic. (n.d.). *Russian economy events*. Retrieved from <https://arabic.rt.com/business/917238>
- Al Jazeera. (2024, May 18). *Russia's economy grows*. Retrieved from <https://www.aljazeera.net/ebusiness/2024/5/18>
- United Nations News. (2020, March). *The United Nations and sanctions*. Retrieved from <https://news.un.org/en/story/2020/03/1058981>
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation. (2006, October 13). *Russian Minister of Foreign Affairs Sergey Lavrov speaks to U.S. Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice by telephone [Press release]*. Retrieved from www.mid.ru.