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THE HUFFINGTON POST

North Korea’s Nuclear Program
By Nick Visser and Jesselyn Cook
3 September 2017

Since the ascension of Kim Jong Un as North Korea’s leader in 2011, the country has posed an ongoing diplomatic challenge for the United States. Pyongyang has ramped up work on its nuclear program and claims it is capable of launching a nuclear-armed missile that would reach the continental U.S.

The reclusive nation carried out its sixth and most powerful nuclear test early Sunday morning, which North Korean state television swiftly described as a “perfect success.”

The regime claims it detonated a hydrogen bomb, and although analysts have expressed skepticism about that, Japan’s Chief Cabinet Secretary, Yoshihide Suga, said Tokyo could not yet dismiss the possibility that it was indeed an H-bomb — a device much more powerful than the atomic bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki during World War II.

Pyongyang successfully conducted its first two intercontinental ballistic missile tests in July — a feat U.S. President Donald Trump had called an impossibility shortly before his inauguration in January. The launches triggered international alarm and condemnation, and sparked a battle of escalating threats between the Trump administration and the North Korean regime.

Former President Barack Obama had warned Trump that a nuclear North Korea would likely be the most pressing issue faced by the new administration.

Despite assurances from Trump that a North Korea that can hit the U.S. with nuclear weapons “won’t happen,” some experts believe such a capability may be within Kim’s grasp. Here are the components of North Korea’s developing nuclear program, and the West’s efforts to stop it.

KCNA KCNA/REUTERS
An undated photo released by North Korea’s Central News Agency gives a view of the test-fire of Pukguksong-2.

Nuclear Weapons

North Korea has been working to acquire a functional, deliverable nuclear weapon for decades. Those aspirations began during the rule of former Supreme Leader Kim Il Sung at the close of World War II and began to take shape under the reign of his son, Kim Jong II, who first tested a nuclear weapon in 2006.

As New York Times reporter David Sanger explained in an interview with NPR’s Dave Davies in late March:
“Kim Il Sung remembers that General [Douglas] MacArthur, during the Korean War, wanted to use nuclear weapons against North Korea and China. He was stopped from doing this. But it made a very big impression on Mr. Kim, and he knew that North Korea, to survive and deter attack, needed to have this capability itself. And he’s the one, the grandfather of the current North Korean leader, who started down this path.”

The North was able to purchase much of its initial nuclear technology from one of the founders of Pakistan’s nuclear program and bought centrifuges to enrich uranium from Libya.

The North is in possession of up to 20 nuclear warheads, according to an annual report released this week by the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute.

KCNA KCNA/REUTERS
An undated photo released by the official news agency shows North Korea’s annual central report meeting.

Nuclear Tests

North Korea has so far conducted six nuclear weapons tests, all at an underground test site in the country’s northeast called Punggye-ri. Those blasts, which began in 2006, have only gotten stronger over the past decade as the North hones its weapons program.

As The New York Times noted, the first such test, conducted by current leader’s father, Kim Jong Il, had a yield of less than 1 kiloton, or the equivalent of 1,000 tons of TNT. The second, conducted three years later, clocked in at 2.35 kilotons. The North’s most recent test was the strongest ever. It caused a shallow magnitude 6.3 earthquake, and was estimated to be at least five to six times” stronger than the previous test last September.

The explosive power of Sunday’s purported H-bomb is adjustable from tens of kilotons to hundreds of kilotons, according to a North Korean report cited by The Times.

Comparatively, “the Little Boy” bomb dropped by the United States on Hiroshima held 15 kilotons of energy. The College of Arts and Letters at the Stevens Institute of Technology released a series of maps in 2015 that show just how damaging such weapons would be to cities around the world.

South Korean Defense Minister Han Min-koo said Wednesday that in light of the North’s recent ICBM launch, he believes there is “a high chance” Pyongyang will soon conduct a sixth nuclear test.

The Missiles

Alongside nuclear development, North Korea has undertaken an active and at times successful campaign to launch ballistic missiles, with an ultimate goal of crafting an ICBM capable of delivering a nuclear warhead to U.S. soil. ICBMs have a minimum range of about 3,400 miles.

Shortly after the first ICBM launch, North Korean state TV claimed the long-range missile was capable of reaching “anywhere in the world” and could carry “a large, heavy nuclear warhead.” This has not been verified.

The North has displayed two types of ICBMs at military parades since 2012, the BBC pointed out, but both remain untested.

The Musudan, another North Korean ballistic missile, is thought to be capable of reaching the U.S. territory of Guam. It was tested eight times in 2016, only partly succeeding once.

In May of 2016, U.S. and South Korean intelligence officials announced the North has the ability to attach a small nuclear warhead on top of missiles capable of reaching much of South Korea and Japan. Experts have varied
greatly in the past couple of months about North Korea’s ability to strike the U.S.

**Missile Tests**

Kim has personally overseen the test launches of several ballistic missiles. While the tests are meant to fine-tune the North Korean arsenal, they also serve a political purpose.

Several of the recent tests have been timed to coincide with important strategic moments for the region. The one in February coincided with Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo Abe’s meeting with Trump at Mar-a-Lago. Another one, in April, was timed ahead of Chinese President Xi Jinping’s visit to the U.S. Yet another launch in March was conducted in retaliation for joint U.S.-South Korean military drills. The July 3rd missile test — Pyongyang’s 11th this year — was launched on the eve of U.S. Independence Day, and days before the G-20 summit in Europe. Kim dubbed it “a gift for the American bastards.” Three weeks later, the July 28 test came a day after the North Korean holiday “Day of Victory,” which marks the 1953 ceasefire in the Korean War.

The North also launched three short-range missiles into the sea off its east coast on Aug. 25, intensifying the harsh rhetoric between the regime and Trump. And on Aug. 28, it fired an intermediate range missile over northern Japan.

Pyongyang is flexing muscles that experts say are getting bigger.

**What North Korea Wants**

North Korea’s nuclear aspirations, experts say, hinge on Kim’s desire to retain control of the isolated nation.

“Above all else, North Korea’s nuclear program is about security,” John Delury, a professor at Yonsei University in Seoul, told the BBC last September. “It is, by their estimation, the only reliable guarantee of the country’s basic sovereignty, of the Communist regime’s control, and of the rule of Kim Jong-un.”

Sanger, the Times reporter, echoed that view on “Fresh Air”:

“If you consider your objectives to be to assure regime survival, to make sure that North Korea remains the Kim family’s personal fiefdom, then they’ve pursued a pretty rational strategy, one in which loyalty is above all, in which even members of the family who challenge the leadership end up getting executed. And under that structure, the North Koreans, for an unstable, irrational regime have played a pretty good game since 1953.”

**International Response**

Kim has continued weapons tests despite increasingly strict condemnations from the international community. In January, the United Nations imposed its “toughest ever” sanctions on the country in an attempt to stifle the program. It issued its latest round of sanctions restricting foreign trade and exports of certain goods on Aug. 5, after the second ICBM test.

But such actions have failed in the past. Last September, former U.N. Secretary General Ban Ki-moon said the North’s actions in recent years had led to an unprecedented state of turmoil in the region.

“Never in the past have I ever seen such kind of heightened tensions on the Korean Peninsula,” Ban said.
In light of Sunday’s test, South Korea has called for the “strongest possible” response from the international community, including new sanctions to “completely isolate” Pyongyang. Trump tweeted Sunday morning that the hermit kingdom’s “words and actions continue to be very hostile and dangerous to the United States.” He also continued his criticism of China’s role in the defusing the situation, tweeting Beijing is “trying to help but with little success.”

Trump’s Conundrum

Despite condemnation from the U.N. and the West, Kim has shown no willingness to halt his country’s weapons program. Trump promised on the campaign trail to rein in the hermit nation, but faces few good options to do so.

Observers looked at the first meeting between Trump and Xi in early April for possible signs of the administration’s North Korea strategy.

China could play a significant role in motivating Pyongyang to reverse course. The country has continued to trade with North
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Korea, and Chinese companies provide up to 40 percent of the foreign currency the North uses to trade internationally.

The Trump administration had ramped up its rhetoric ahead of the meeting, with Trump even threatening direct intervention.

“If China is not going to solve North Korea, we will,” Trump told the Financial Times in April. “That is all that I am telling you.”

In a series of tweets in July, the president expressed his frustration at China’s apparently insufficient efforts to exert its influence over the North.

“Perhaps China will put a heavy move on North Korea and end this nonsense once and for all!” he wrote, later adding: “Trade between China and North Korea grew almost 40% in the first quarter. So much for China working with us — but we had to give it a try!”

In a statement soon after, chief Pentagon spokesperson Dana White announced that the U.S. remained “prepared to defend ourselves and our allies and to use the full range of capabilities at our disposal against the growing threat from North Korea.”

“The United States seeks only the peaceful denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula. Our commitment to the defense of our allies, the Republic of Korea and Japan, in the face of these threats, remains ironclad,” she added.

Her statement marked a significant escalation of the U.S. response. Shortly after the North’s missile test in March, Tillerson had a simple reaction: “The policy of strategic patience is over.”

Pyongyang’s ICBM launches and claims that it has the ability to strike the continental U.S. sparked a heated war of words between Kim and Trump, with the threatening in August “fire and fury” for North Korea.

Direct action presents major difficulties as the South Korean capital, Seoul, lies just 35 miles from the North’s border and within easy striking distance of the country’s non-nuclear artillery. Were Trump to act, Kim could set his sights on a city of 12 million people that has long been a friend to the West.

It’s also unclear whether strikes could effectively target the North’s program, as infrastructure is spread across the country and in some cases lies underground.

For now, only time will tell how the Trump administration will handle a country set on pursuing a nuclear arsenal at any cost.
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The Atlantic

How the U.S. and China Differ on North Korea

They are at odds over the nature of the threat posed by Pyongyang.

Krishnadev Calamur
28 November 2017

North Korean leader Kim Jong Un meets scientists and technicians KCNA via Reuters

Last week, President Trump named North Korea a state sponsor of terrorism, tagging the communist country with the label almost a decade after the Bush administration removed it. “In addition to threatening the world by nuclear devastation, North Korea has repeatedly supported acts of international terrorism, including assassinations on foreign soil,” Trump said last Monday, adding that the “North Korean regime must be lawful. It must end its unlawful nuclear and ballistic missile development, and cease all support for international terrorism, which it is not doing.” The next day, the U.S. Treasury Department slapped sanctions on individuals and entities with links to North Korean financial institutions, including three Chinese companies. North Korea responded by calling the U.S. designation a “serious provocation and violent infringement.”

For Washington, the road to a diplomatic solution with North Korea goes through Beijing. But despite public statements to the contrary, the United States and China are quite divided on some key questions, including why North Korea pursues nuclear weapons in the first place, and on the reasons why previous agreements to halt its illicit activities failed. Unless they can bridge these gaps, any lasting resolution of the North Korean crisis is unlikely.

The Trump administration has said that its goal is to isolate North Korea, in the hope that pressure through sanctions will compel it to renounce its nuclear and ballistic-missile programs and seek dialogue with the United States. But China, North Korea’s largest trading partner and chief political benefactor, dismisses that idea. Beijing believes that for Washington to convince Kim Jong Un to come to the negotiating table, it must assure him that regime
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change is off the table. On several occasions, U.S. Secretary of State Rex Tillerson has said precisely that, but contradictory messaging from the White House has sent conflicting signals to North Korea—and China—about America’s intentions.

In a recent meeting with a group of U.S. reporters in Beijing, Tong Zhao, a fellow at the Carnegie-Tsinghua Center for Global Policy said that, if backed into a corner, the North Korean regime isn’t going to back down. “It is more likely to enhance its military threats because for North Korea this is basically a game of risk-taking between Pyongyang and Washington,” he said.

North Korea has a long history of provocation in the face of what it regards as threats from the United States and South Korea. It has warned of a “merciless strike” in retaliation against their joint military exercises, and said it would accelerate its nuclear-weapons program in response to the deployment in South Korea of the Terminal High Altitude Thermal Defense System, a U.S. anti-missile defense network. It has also warned that it would strike the U.S. territory of Guam after Trump vowed to bring “fire and fury” against North Korea if it threatened America or its allies. But within these threats, Chinese analysts said, lies a fundamental disagreement between the United States and China over the nature of the threat posed by North Korea.

Chinese experts believe North Korea’s leaders pursue nuclear weapons because they feel genuinely threatened by the United States and South Korea. In a Brookings Institution strategy paper published in May 2017, Fu Ying, a retired diplomat who represented China in multilateral talks on North Korea’s nuclear weapons, wrote that in the early 1990s, Pyongyang felt especially vulnerable following the collapse of the Soviet Union, its main diplomatic and financial benefactor during the Cold War. Around the same time, China opened diplomatic relations with South Korea, the North’s nemesis, while the United States and the South continued their military exercises, which the North viewed as a provocation. Feeling isolated, North Korea began its pursuit of nuclear weapons in earnest.

The view from Washington is quite different. Government officials and experts alike believe North Korea’s pursuit of nuclear weapons has aggressive and offensive objectives. Pyongyang, they believe, will use its nuclear weapons to push U.S. forces out of South Korea and then force reunification of the Korean Peninsula on its terms. Trump administration officials said that North Korea must first commit to giving up its existing nuclear weapons (experts estimate the country has enough fissile material to build 20 such weapons). That position is a nonstarter in Pyongyang, and Beijing is sympathetic to its view.

“For the Chinese, we feel we can tolerate a nuclear-armed North Korea in the foreseeable future while we work out the long-term disarmament strategy,” Zhao said. “But for the Americans, they are less likely to even accept a nuclear-armed North Korea for the near-term future.”

The U.S. position can be better understood through the lens of a pair of earlier failed agreements with North Korea—failures caused, in Washington’s view, by Pyongyang. The United States pulled out of 1994’s Agreed Framework, under which then-leader Kim Jong II agreed to freeze his country’s nuclear program in exchange for certain concessions, because it believed the North had secretly restarted a uranium-enrichment program. The 2012 Leap Day deal, under which the North agreed to suspend work on its uranium-enrichment program in exchange for U.S. food aid, collapsed because the North launched a satellite into space—a violation of the agreement, the Obama administration said. Both agreements hinted at what could be achieved through diplomacy. Alternately: They also served as cautionary tales of the perils of negotiating with an untrustworthy partner.

China interpreted these failures differently. As Chinese experts explained, Beijing contended
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that Pyongyang’s secret uranium-enrichment program did not violate the Agreed Framework because that deal prohibited only plutonium enrichment. Additionally, opposition to the agreement in the U.S. Congress sent mixed signals to Pyongyang about U.S. intentions, they said. The experts argued that this forced it to develop its clandestine uranium program as a hedge in the event the United States reneged on its commitment to the deal.

As for the Leap Day agreement: China believed there was never an agreement between the United States and North Korea to begin with, because they disagreed over whether a satellite launch constituted a ballistic-missile test. (Washington equated satellite launches with ballistic-missile testing; Pyongyang did not.) Consequently, the Leap Day agreement died when Pyongyang launched a satellite soon after it was signed.

“The Chinese interpretation of North Korea’s behavior was [that] they, by and large, are still trustworthy partners,” Zhao said. “They wanted to implement their commitment—they’re not evil cheaters who want to take advantage of every agreement. So that really affects how China drafts its North Korea policy."

So what does China want? Its plan to resolve the crisis is the so-called “freeze-for-freeze” proposal, in which North Korea would halt its missile and nuclear programs in exchange for the United States and South Korea suspending their joint military exercises—a nonstarter for Washington, which prefers to increase pressure on North Korea while holding open the offer of dialogue.

Unless China adopts America’s approach, at least in part (or vice versa), the crisis is unlikely to diminish. “Even though at the surface level they appear cooperative, deep down their approaches of dealing with North Korea are fundamentally different,” Zhao said. Ultimately, Zhao said, the nature of the disagreements between Washington and Beijing ensures that the crisis of North Korea’s nuclear and missile programs will remain unresolved for some time to come.
North Korea Nuclear Situation Could Become 'Apocalyptic,' Top Russian Diplomat Warns

By John Haltiwanger
27 November 2017

The tense situation surrounding North Korea's nuclear program could evolve into an "apocalyptic" scenario, a top Russian diplomat warned on Monday.

The world "cannot turn [a] blind eye" to such a situation, Russian Deputy Foreign Minister Igor Morgulov said at the opening of the eighth annual Asian Conference of the Valdai Discussion Club, which is being held in Seoul, South Korea, CNBC reports.

"I hope that a common sense, pragmatism and an instinct of self-preservation would prevail among our partners," Morgulov added.

Despite international pressure, Kim Jong Un's regime refuses to cease its nuclear program. Getty Images

The Russian diplomat's remarks come amid global concerns over North Korean leader Kim Jong Un's refusal to abandon his nuclear ambitions despite mounting international pressure. North Korea has conducted a record number of long-range missile tests this year, and in early September it carried out its sixth and most powerful nuclear test.

The tensions have deepened as Kim and President Donald Trump have traded numerous threats and insults. Over the summer, Trump warned Pyongyang it would be met with "fire and fury" if it didn't stop threatening the U.S. In late September, while addressing the United Nations for the first time, he threatened to "totally destroy" North Korea if it forced the U.S. to defend itself or its allies.

As Trump traveled across Asia during the first half of November, North Korea was at the top of his agenda. In a speech to South Korea's National Assembly, he denounced Kim's regime but also offered the erratic leader a path to peace if he agreed to cease long-range missile tests and move toward denuclearization. North Korea rejected his offer and said the president had "begged" for nuclear war during his Asia trip. Shortly after returning from his trip,
Trump placed North Korea back on the list of state sponsors of terrorism on November 20.

China, which is North Korea’s top trading partner and most important ally, has tried to pressure Pyongyang to change its stance. But a recent visit from a senior Chinese envoy to the North Korean capital appears to have been unsuccessful.

Correspondingly, China recently shut down the main road connecting it with North Korea, and the state-owned airline Air China suspended flights from Beijing to the reclusive nation.

What's more, South Korea accused North Korea on Monday of violating the armistice agreement between the countries when a North Korean soldier was wounded by gunfire as he ran across the border and defected in mid-November.

In this context, Russia, which shares a border with North Korea, seems to be quite concerned about what might happen moving forward.

On November 24, Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov accused the U.S. of attempting to provoke a war with North Korea.

"We are alarmed that in the last two months when North Korea conducted no tests or rocket launches, it seemed that Washington was not happy about that and tried to do things that would irritate and provoke Pyongyang," Lavrov said. "It’s as if [U.S. officials] are hoping that [North Korea] will lash out again, and then it would be possible to engage in military options."
UN United Nations condemns DPRK ballistic missile launch; stresses country cease such activities

Secretary-General António Guterres. UN Photo/Violaine Martin

15 September 2017 – Condemning the launch of yet another ballistic missile by the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea (DPRK), United Nations Secretary-General António Guterres and the Security Council called on the country’s leadership to halt such activities and explore resumption of sincere dialogue on denuclearisation.

In a statement attributable to his spokesperson, the Secretary-General called on the DPRK leadership “to cease further testing, comply with the relevant Security Council resolutions, and allow space to explore the resumption of sincere dialogue on denuclearisation.”

The latest launch, which the statement referred to as a “manifest violation” of Security Council resolutions comes less than two weeks after the DPRK conducted a test of a nuclear device on 3 September and only three days after the Security Council unanimously adopted fresh sanctions against the country.

The statement also noted that Mr. Guterres will be discussing the situation on the Korean Peninsula with all concerned parties in the margins of the upcoming high level week of the UN General Assembly.

Also today, holding urgent consultations over the ballistic missile launch, the Security Council expressed its grave concern that the DPRK is, by conducting such a launch over Japan as well as its recent actions and public statements, deliberately undermining regional peace and stability and causing grave security concerns around the world.

Terming the ballistic missile launch as “highly provocative,” the Council members condemned further the DPRK for its outrageous actions, and demanded that the [the country] immediately cease all such actions.”

“The Security Council stressed that these DPRK actions are not just a threat to the region, but to all UN Member States,” noted a press statement issued by the Council after the consultations, adding that all UN Member States must “fully, comprehensively, and
immediately implement” all relevant Security Council resolutions, in particular 2375 (2017) and 2371 (2017).

The 15-member Security Council also emphasized the vital importance of the DPRK immediately showing sincere commitment to denuclearization through concrete action and stressed the importance of working to reduce tensions in the Korean Peninsula and beyond.

It also demanded that the DPRK comply with the relevant Security Council resolutions as well as the statements of its President by suspending all activities related to its ballistic missile programme and, in that context, re-establish its pre-existing commitments to a moratorium on missile launches.

The Security Council also reiterated the importance of maintaining peace and stability on the Korean Peninsula and in north-east Asia at large, and expressed its commitment to a peaceful, diplomatic and political solution to the situation, welcoming efforts by Council members, as well as other States, to facilitate a peaceful and comprehensive solution through dialogue.
UN Security Council Resolutions on North Korea

by Kelsey Davenport, Director for Nonproliferation Policy,
Updated: October 2017

The United Nations Security Council has adopted eight major sanctions resolutions on North Korea in response to the country’s nuclear and missile activities since 2006.

The first two resolutions were passed shortly after North Korea conducted nuclear tests in 2006 and 2009. The third came a month after North Korea successfully launched a satellite in December 2012. The fourth was passed after North Korea’s nuclear test in February 2013. The fifth and sixth resolutions were adopted in 2016 following nuclear tests and the seventh in August 2017 following two intercontinental ballistic missile tests. The eighth resolution was adopted in response to North Korea's sixth nuclear test in September 2017. Each resolution condemns North Korea’s latest nuclear and ballistic missile activity and calls on North Korea to cease its illicit activity, which violates previous UN Security Council resolutions.

All eight resolutions were unanimously adopted by the Security Council and all but Resolution 2087 (January 2013) contain references to acting under Chapter VII, Article 41 of the United Nations Charter.

In addition to imposing sanctions, the resolutions give UN member states the authority to interdict and inspect North Korean cargo within their territory, and subsequently seize and dispose of illicit shipments.

The resolutions also call upon North Korea to rejoin the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), which it acceded to in 1985 but withdrew from in 2003 after U.S. allegations that the country was pursuing an illegal uranium enrichment program. The Security Council also has called for North Korea to return to negotiations in the Six-Party Talks, which include South Korea, North Korea, China, Japan, Russia and the United States. The Six-Party talks, which took place from 2003-2009, resulted in a joint statement on denuclearization. North Korea also dismantled its plutonium-producing reactor as part of the process, although it has subsequently restarted the reactor. For more on the Six-Party talks, click here.


Prior to passing the first sanctions resolution in 2006, the Security Council passed several resolutions condemning North Korea’s nuclear and missile activities. In response to North Korea’s announcement of intent to withdraw
from the NPT in 1993, the Security Council passed Resolution 825, urging North Korea to remain party to the NPT and to honor its nonproliferation obligations under the treaty. Resolution 1695 was passed in 2006 in response to ballistic missile launches in July, and calls on North Korea to suspend activities related to its ballistic missile program. Additional Security Council resolutions on North Korea serve to extend the 1718 Committee mandate. They are not included in this list, but can be found here.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UN Security Council Resolutions: Quick Links</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Security Council Resolution 1718**

Resolution 1718 was unanimously adopted by the UN Security Council on October 14, 2006, shortly after North Korea’s first nuclear test on October 9. The full text of Resolution 1718 is available above.

**Resolution 1718’s Principal Provisions**

- Demands North Korea refrain from further nuclear or missile tests.
- Demands North Korea return to the NPT.
- Decides North Korea shall suspend all ballistic missile activities.
- Decides North Korea shall abandon its nuclear program in a “complete, verifiable, and irreversible” manner.
- Decides North Korea shall abandon all WMD activities.
- Calls upon North Korea to return to the Six-Party Talks.

**Resolution 1718’s Sanctions**

- Member states are prohibited from the “direct or indirect supply, sale, or transfer” to North Korea, of:
  - Heavy weaponry, such as tanks, armored vehicles, large caliber artillery, combat aircraft, attack helicopters, warships and missile systems
  - Spare parts for the above mentioned heavy weaponry
  - Materials and technologies that could contribute to North Korea’s WMD programs and ballistic missile related activities, as set out in prior Security Council documents
  - Luxury goods
  - Member states are also required to:
    - Freeze the funds or financial assets of entities designated by the Security Council as providing support for North Korea’s nuclear, missile, and other WMD programs

**Resolution 1718’s Monitoring Mechanisms**

The resolution established a committee composed of the 15 current members of the Security Council to function as a monitoring body to review and adjust the imposed sanctions and violations of the sanctions. The body was to provide a report on the status of sanctions implementation every 90 days.

**Security Council Resolution 1874**
Resolution 1874 was unanimously adopted by the UN Security Council on June 12, 2009, shortly after North Korea’s second nuclear test, which took place May 25. The full text of Resolution 1874 is available above.

**Resolution 1874’s Principal Provisions**
The resolution reiterated a number of provisions from Resolution 1718. It also called upon North Korea to join the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty.

**Resolution 1874’s Principal Sanctions**
Sanctions in Resolution 1874 built off several measures first laid out in Resolution 1718. The resolution expanded the arms embargo by banning all imports and exports of weapons, excluding small arms (which required Security Council notification). Member states were also authorized to:

- Inspect North Korea cargo on land, air, and sea, if the state has reason to believe that it contains prohibited items and seize any prohibited materials or technologies
- Prohibit bunkering services for North Korean ships if the state has reason to believe it is carrying illicit cargo
- In addition, member states were called upon to:
  - Prohibit public financial support for trade with North Korea that would contributed to nuclear, ballistic missile, or WMD-related activities
  - Refuse new loads or credit to North Korea, except for humanitarian or development purposes

**Resolution 1874’s Monitoring Mechanisms**
Resolution 1874 set up a seven-member expert panel to assist the sanctions committee in enforcing the resolution and monitor implementation. Known as the ‘Panel of Experts,’ the group was initially given a mandate for one year and was required to report regularly to the Sanctions Committee on possible violations and recommendations for improving implementation. Later resolutions extended the mandate of the Panel of Experts.

**Security Council Resolution 2087**
The Security Council unanimously adopted Resolution 2087 on January 22, 2013 after a successful North Korean satellite launch on December 12, 2012. The launch was a violation of Resolutions 1718 (2006) and 1874 (2009), which prohibited any further development of technology applicable to North Korea’s ballistic missile programs. The full text of Resolution 2087 is available here.

**Resolution 2087’s Principal Provisions**
Resolution 2087 called for other states to “remain vigilant” in monitoring individuals and entities associated with the North Korean regime. It also directed the sanctions committee to issue an Implementation Assistance Notice if a vessel refused to allow an inspection authorized by its flag state.

**Resolution 2087’s Principal Sanctions**
Resolution 2087 built on sanctions included in Resolutions 1718 and 1874 including:

- Clarifying the catch-all provision
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- Clarifying the state’s right to seize and destroy material suspected of heading to or from North Korea
- Directing the sanctions committee to take action to designate individuals or entities that have assisted in sanctions evasion

Resolution 2087 also listed individuals subject now to the travel ban and asset freeze penalties, and entities subject to the asset freeze penalties, for violations under Resolutions 1718 and 1874.

**Resolution 2087’s Monitoring Mechanisms**
No new monitoring mechanisms were included in Resolution 2087.

**Security Council Resolution 2094**
The Security Council unanimously adopted Resolution 2094 on March 7, 2013 in response to North Korea’s third nuclear test on February 12, 2013. The full text of the resolution is available above.

**Resolution 2094’s Principal Provisions**
Unlike prior resolutions, 2094 explicitly mentioned North Korea’s uranium enrichment in its condemnation of Pyongyang’s nuclear activities. Additionally, this resolution

- Expressed concern that North Korea was abusing immunities granted to its diplomats by the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic and Consular Relations
- Welcomed the Financial Action Task Force’s new recommendation on targeted financial sanctions related to proliferation and urged member states to apply the recommendations

**Resolution 2094’s Principal Sanctions**
Resolution 2094 expands a number of sanctions measures from earlier resolutions, such as adding nuclear and missile dual-use technologies and luxury goods to the list of banned imports. Resolution 2094 also designated additional individuals and entities for asset freezes and the travel ban and expanded the designation criteria to include persons or entities suspected of acting on the behalf or controlled by any persons or entities already sanctioned.

The resolution aims to make it more difficult for North Korea to make further progress in its nuclear and ballistic missile programs by hindering its access to hard cash and technological equipment needed to build weapons and pursue uranium enrichment.

The resolution also strengthened the interdiction and oversight authorities for member states by:

- calling for states to inspect and detain any suspected cargo or shipments to or from North Korea that transit through their territory, if the cargo is suspected to contain bulk cash or material that could be used in a nuclear program.
- Directing states to enhance vigilance over North Korea’s diplomatic personnel
- New financial sanctions included in the resolution:
  - blocked the North Korea regime from bulk cash transfers
  - restricted North Korea’s ties to international banking systems

**Resolution 2094’s Monitoring Mechanisms**
The resolution expanded the panel of experts that assesses implementation of UN Security Council sanctions on North Korea to eight people.
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Security Council Resolution 2270

The Security Council unanimously adopted Resolution 2270 on March 2, 2016 after North Korea conducted a fourth nuclear test and launched a satellite for the second time. The full text of the resolution can be found above.

Resolution 2270’s Principal Provisions

- Prohibits states from providing any specialized teaching or training of North Korean nationals in disciplines which could contribute to North Korea’s proliferation.
- Emphasizes that the North Korean regime has seriously neglected to meet the needs of the North Korean people and has instead prioritized development of its nuclear weapons and ballistic missile programs.
- Decides that North Korea shall abandon all chemical and biological weapons and programs and act in accordance with the Biological Weapons Convention and the Chemical Weapons Convention.

Resolution 2270’s Principal Sanctions

Resolution 2270 builds upon sanctions measures from prior resolutions, including:

- Expanding the arms embargo to include small arms and light weapons
- Prohibiting North Korea from servicing and repairing any weaponry sold to third parties
- Prohibiting additional luxury goods
- Resolution 2270 also expands interdiction and inspection authority for member states to:
  - Mandatory inspections on cargo destined to or originating from North Korea
  - Asset freeze on all North Korean government and Worker’s Party entities associated with prohibited activities
- Resolution 2270 also designated an additional 16 individuals and 12 entities for asset freezes and travel bans.
- New financial sanctions place limits on banking activities of North Korean entities abroad including:
  - Prohibiting UN member states from hosting North Korean financial institutions that may be supporting proliferation activities in North Korea
  - Prohibiting states from opening new financial institutions or bank branches in North Korea
  - Requiring states to terminate existing joint ventures within ninety days of the adoption of the resolution
- It also requires that member states repatriate North Korean or other foreign nationals found to be working on behalf of a Security Council resolution-designated entity.
- Member states are also prohibited from:
  - Chartering or leasing vessels to North Korea, or providing crew services to North Korea or North Korean entities
  - Selling or supplying aviation fuel to North Korea so that it cannot be diverted to its ballistic missile program

Resolution 2270’s Monitoring Mechanisms

No new monitoring mechanisms were included in Resolution 2270.

Security Council Resolution 2321
The Security Council unanimously adopted Resolution 2321 on November 30, 2016, following North Korea’s fifth nuclear test on September 9. Resolution 2321 significantly expanded sanctions on North Korea. The full text of the resolution can be found above.

**Resolution 2321’s Principal Provisions**

- Calls on all members to reduce the number of staff at DPRK diplomatic missions and consular posts
- Condemns the DPRK for pursuing nuclear weapons instead of the welfare of its people
- Emphasizes, for the first time, the need for the DPRK to respect the inherent dignity of its people in its territory

**Resolution 2321’s Principal Sanctions**

Resolution 2321 imposed new sanctions that prohibit North Korea from:

- Exporting minerals, such as copper, nickel, silver, and zinc
- Selling statues
- Selling helicopters
- Selling or transferring iron and iron ore, with exceptions for livelihood purposes
- Selling or transferring coal in amounts that exceed a particular cap annually
- Member states were also directed to:
  - Limit the number of bank accounts held by diplomats and missions
  - Suspend scientific and technical cooperation with North Korea, except for medical purposes
- Resolution 2321 also added additional items to the list of prohibited dual-use technologies and designated additional individuals and entities to subject to asset freezes and the travel ban.

**Resolution 2321’s Monitoring Mechanisms**

Resolution 2321 introduced a standard notification form for coal purchases from North Korea to track imports against the cap set by the resolution. The resolution also directed the Panel of Experts to hold meetings designed to address regional concerns and build capacity to implement the measures in 2321 and other North Korea sanctions.

**Security Council Resolution 2371**

Resolution 2371 was adopted unanimously by the Security Council on August 5, 2017 in response to North Korea’s two ICBM tests in July. The United States claimed the new sanctions would prevent North Korea from earning over $1 billion each year, although some experts expressed doubt. The full text of the resolution can be found above.

**Resolution 2371’s Principle Provisions**

- Regrets North Korea’s massive diversion of its scarce resources toward its development of nuclear weapons and a number of expensive ballistic missile programs
- Reaffirms the Council's support for the Six Party Talks, calls for their resumption, reiterates its support for commitments made by the Six Parties, and reiterates the importance of maintaining peace and stability on the Korean Peninsula and in Northeast Asia
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- Decides North Korea shall not deploy or use chemical weapons and calls on North Korea to accede to the Chemical Weapons Convention and comply with its provisions

**Resolution 2371’s Principle Sanctions**

Resolution 2371 bans the export of several materials, which previous sanctions resolutions had restricted the export of, including:

- Coal
- Iron and iron ore
- Seafood
- Lead and lead ore
- The resolution also:
  - Adds new sanctions against North Korean individuals and entities, including the Foreign Trade Bank (FTB)
  - Prohibits joint ventures between North Korea and other nations
  - Allows for the Security Council to deny international port access to vessels tied to violating security council resolutions
  - Bans countries from allowing in additional North Korean laborers

**Resolution 2371’s Monitoring Mechanisms**

Resolution 2371 asks Interpol to publish Special Notices on listed North Koreans for travel bans. It also gives the UN Panel of Experts additional analytical resources to better monitor sanctions enforcement.

**Security Council Resolution 2375**

Following North Korea’s sixth nuclear test on September 3, 2017 the UN Security Council unanimously adopted UNSCR 2375 on September 11. The resolution, which primarily targeted North Korean oil imports, textile exports and overseas laborers, contained the strongest yet sanctions against North Korea, according to a U.S. press release. The full text of the resolution is available above.

**Resolution 2375’s Principle Provisions**

- Reiterates its deep concern at the grave hardship that the people in the DPRK are subjected to, condemns the DPRK for pursuing nuclear weapons and ballistic missiles instead of the welfare of its people
- Reaffirms its support for the Six Party Talks, calls for their resumption, and reiterates its support for the commitments set forth in the Joint Statement of 19 September 2005 issued by China, the DPRK, Japan, the Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation, and the United States.

**Resolution 2375’s Principle Sanctions**

- Fully bans textile exports
- Caps refined petroleum product imports at 2 million barrels per year
- Freezes the amount of crude oil imports
- Bans all natural gas and condensate imports
- Prohibits member states from providing authorizations for North Korean nationals to work in their jurisdictions, unless otherwise determined by the committee established UNSCR 1718
- Imposes asset freezes on additional North Korean entities, including the Organizational Guidance Department, the Central Military Commission and the Propagation and Agitation Department
• Directs the 1718 committee to designate vessels transporting prohibited items from North Korea
• Resolution 2375 also added additional items to the list of prohibited dual-use technologies and designated additional individuals and entities.

Resolution 2375’s Monitoring Mechanisms

• Provides further guidance for states to conduct interdictions, without the use of force, if the member states have reason to believe the vessel is carrying prohibited cargo.
• If a suspected vessel refuses inspection, the flag state must direct the ship to a port for inspection or risk being designated for an asset freeze or denied port access.
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