

The Art of the Deal for North Korea: The Unexplored Parallel between Bush and Trump Foreign Policy*

Soohoon Lee

'Make America Great Again,' has been revived while 'America First' and 'peace through strength,' have been revitalized by the Trump administration. Americans and the rest of the world were shocked by the dramatic transformation in U.S. foreign policy. In the midst of striking changes, this research analyzes the first hundred days of the Trump administration's foreign policy and aims to forecast its prospects for North Korea. In doing so, the George W. Bush administration's foreign policy creeds, 'American exceptionalism' and 'peace through strength,' are revisited and compared with that of Trump's. Beyond the similarities and differences found between the two administrations, the major finding of the analysis is that Trump's profit-oriented nature, through which he operated the Trump Organization for nearly a half century, has indeed influenced the interest-oriented nature in his operating of U.S. foreign policy. The prospects for Trump's policies on North Korea will be examined through a business-sensitive lens.

Keywords: Donald Trump, U.S Foreign Policy, North Korea, America First, Peace through Strength

Introduction

"We are so proud of our military. It was another successful event... If you look at what's happened over the eight weeks and compare that to what's happened over the last eight years, you'll see there's a tremen-

* This work was supported by a National Research Foundation of Korea Grant funded by the Korean Government (NRF-2016S1A3A2924968)..

dous difference,"¹ said Donald Trump after the 'mother of all bombs' was dropped in Nangarhar province in Afghanistan. This research aims to strategically compare foreign policies during George W. Bush's first term and Donald Trump's first hundred days as president. The rationale for comparing the two administrations is largely due to a series of bewildering policies from Trump's first hundred days that are strongly reminiscent of Bush's policies in his first term.² Although the first hundred days are not sufficient for making a forensic analysis, combining the pledges during the campaign has enlarged the scope of analysis. After all, both administrations share an 'anything but the predecessor' way of thinking after inheriting governments operated under Democratic administrations. Trump's prospective foreign policy decisions are expected to be forecasted through this research.

Throughout the presidential campaign, Trump's slogan, 'Make America Great Again,' won the hearts and minds of Americans who were sick and tired of typical Washington D.C. politics. American voters who lost their jobs, particularly those in the old Rust Belt,³ anchored their hopes to an outsider who might bring the spotlight back and create a new beginning for them. The old Rust Belt, which has been losing industries and jobs due to the relatively cheap labor in Mexico and China,⁴ was originally claimed to be Clinton's turf. However, by repeatedly pledging to take those 'stolen jobs' back to America

-
1. "Trump on Dropping 'MOAB' in Afghanistan: 'Don't Know' If It Sends Message to N. Korea," *Fox News Insider (New York)*, April 13, 2017, <<http://insider.foxnews.com/2017/04/13/donald-trump-remarks-mother-all-bombs-dropped-afghanistan>> (date accessed April 20, 2017).
 2. Marek Waśniński, "Donald Trump's Foreign Policy Stances in the Election Campaign: Unpredictability and Neo-isolationism," *PISM*, June 16, 2016, <<http://www.pism.pl/publications/bulletin/no-37-887>> (date accessed May 1, 2017).
 3. Ronald Brownstein, "How the Rustbelt Paved Trump's Road to Victory," *The Atlantic*, November 10, 2016, <<https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2016/11/trumps-road-to-victory/507203/>> (date accessed April 1, 2017).
 4. Richard C. Longworth, "Disaffected rust belt voters embraced Trump. They had no other hope," *The Guardian*, November 21, 2016, <<https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2016/nov/21/disaffected-rust-belt-voters-embraced-donald-trump-midwestern-obama>> (date accessed April 15, 2017).

during the campaign, Trump was able to win votes from those in the old Rust Belt.

Due to multiple preternominal factors, Trump won the 2017 Presidential Election and left public polls and media outlets stunned. The unexpected outcome of the election has also frustrated other nations' policies regarding the most powerful nation in the world. Many experts predicted that the Trump administration would discontinue the 'pivot to Asia' which originated from, and was actively propelled by, former President Obama and Secretary of State Clinton. In particular, dynamic views exist in both academia and policy circles on North Korea. There is a view that South Korea should take the lead in solving the North Korean problem due to lack of experts in the Trump administration.⁵ On the other hand, some argue that the Trump administration is, in general, heading for a soft landing.⁶ Meanwhile, Trump's unfounded but repeated claims about South Korea freeriding on the U.S. defense system indirectly revealed his forthcoming policies on Asia. His very first official decision in the Oval Office, to scrap the TPP (Trans-Pacific Partnership),⁷ immediately shocked one of America's closest allies in the world, Japan.

Bombing Syria was also an unexpected course of action. Bashar al-Assad attacking children with sarin gas in the Idlib province had a "big impact on me [Trump] – big impact,"⁸ said Trump. Assad's barbar-

-
5. Bonhak Koo, "South Korean Government Should Act, Trump Administration Lacks Policy on North Korea," *JoongAng Ilbo*, January 31, 2017, <<http://news.joins.com/article/21191341>> (accessed June 9, 2017). [In Korean].
 6. "[The First Month of Trump Administration] How Experts See the First Month of Trump Administration," *Yonhap News*, February 19, 2017, <<http://www.yonhapnews.co.kr/bulletin/2017/02/17/0200000000AKR20170217173300014.HTML?input=1195m>> (accessed June 9, 2017). [In Korean].
 7. Peter Baker, "Trump Abandons Trans-Pacific Partnership, Obama's Signature Trade Deal," *The New York Times*, January 23, 2017, <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/01/23/us/politics/tpp-trump-trade-nafta.html?_r=0> (date accessed March 15, 2017).
 8. Trump administration, "Syria chemical attack has changed my view of Assad, says Trump," *The Guardian*, April 6, 2017, <<https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2017/apr/05/syria-chemical-gas-attack-donald-trump-nikki-haley-assad>> (accessed April 19, 2017).

ic attack dramatically changed his view on Syria and resulted in 59 Tomahawk missiles targeting the Shayrat air base. This was also a startling reversal from his stance several years ago. In 2013 he tweeted, "We should stay the hell out of Syria, the 'rebels' are just as bad as the current regime."⁹ The drastic shift of his stance on Syria from non-intervention to intervention has not only shown his attention and responsiveness on human rights issues but eventually revealed his hawkish and globalist aspects as well. His brief statement about Syria, which ended with the phrase, "Good night, and God Bless America, and the entire world,"¹⁰ particularly, sounded more like that of a globalist than the non-interventionist that he originally claimed to be.

The Trump administration's first hundred days presented several changes from his predecessor, including changes in executive orders. They are namely, withdrawal from the TPP, border security (plan for building the wall), and Travel Ban 2.0.¹¹ They are derived from the 'America First' slogan, which is known to be "isolationist."¹² However, the bombing of Syria implies the Trump administration's latent hawkishness and interventionism in his foreign policy. Against this backdrop, the puzzle of this research claims the following questions. Can this unpredictable Trump administration's foreign policy be framed by comparing and contrasting with the Bush administration's foreign policy? Furthermore, does his business-oriented nature, regardless of any notion in international relations, explain the policy output thus far?

The analysis will begin by comparing the similar propensities found between Bush's American exceptionalism and Trump's 'America First' policy. Apparently, they are both driven from the belief and

9. "Donald J. Trump," (Tweet, June 15, 2013), *Tweeter*, <<https://twitter.com/realdonaldtrump/status/346063000056254464?lang=en>>. (date accessed April 1, 2017).

10. "Transcript and Video: Trump Speaks About Strikes in Syria," *The New York Times*, April 6, 2017, <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/04/06/world/middleeast/transcript-video-trump-airstrikes-syria.html?_r=0> (date accessed April 12, 2017).

11. "What executive actions has Trump taken?" *BBC News*, April 12, 2017, <<http://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-38695593>> (date accessed April 20, 2017).

12. Susan Dunn, "Trump's 'America First' has ugly echoes from U.S. history," *CNN*, April 28, 2016, <<http://edition.cnn.com/2016/04/27/opinions/trump-america-first-ugly-echoes-dunn/>> (date accessed May 1, 2017).

confidence in the power and greatness of America. The two administrations' common denominator, 'peace through strength,' will also be assessed in this regard. Second, game changers that sway the foreign policies of these administrations will be identified and analyzed. In this account, the assumption is that the occurrence of game-changing variables that motivate military action, such as the war on terror by Bush's administration, tends to be true for Trump's administration. In other words, when American *raison d'état* is at risk, it would not be odd for America to once again take the role of the world's policeman under the Trump administration. Lastly, Trump's way of designing and conducting foreign policy has been undeniably derived from his way of conducting business for nearly half a century and such traits will be analyzed and employed to forecast Trump's prospective stance on North Korea.

Foreign Policy of the Bush Administration

Creed

The foreign policy of Bush's first term was based on two pillars, namely, American exceptionalism and 'peace through strength.'¹³ These values are historically and philosophically rooted in neoconservatism and became intertwined in the war on terror. The origin of neoconservatism dates back to the 1930s when Trotskyites Irving Kristol, Daniel Bell and Nathan Glazer, turned into anticommunists. Along the Cold War and post-Cold War era, the second generation, namely William Kristol and Robert Kagan, and Straussians, such as Albert Wohlstetter and Paul Wolfowitz, became what are now called neocons. Neocons in the Bush administration planned and initiated the war on terror after the tragedy of 9/11.¹⁴

13. Alex Soohoon Lee, "The Neoconservative Approach to North Korea: Its Prospects under the next US Administration," *Korean Journal of Defense Analysis*, vol. 27, no. 4 (2015), p. 435.

14. Alex Soohoon Lee, "Neoconservatism: Its Status and Prospects," *Journal of*

American Exceptionalism

According to Stephen M. Walt, while the uniqueness of America's history, political system, and civil society may be worthy of universal admiration and may imply America's positive role in the world, "it is mostly a myth."¹⁵ He argues that whenever American leaders claim this unique role of the U.S. in the world, they are simply setting up the U.S. with a larger burden. Then, what is American exceptionalism? Coined by Alexis de Tocqueville,¹⁶ American exceptionalism can be interpreted in two ways. One is based on the external and internal evaluation of America as a nation. Founding a nation based on the equality of people, as Seymour Martin Lipset mentioned, makes the U.S. fundamentally exceptional. In describing American exceptionalism, he adds,

It [US] is the most religious, optimistic, patriotic, rights-oriented, and individualistic. ... It is the leader in upward mobility into professional and other high-status and elite occupations, but the least egalitarian among developed nations with respect to income distribution, at the bottom as a provider of welfare benefits, the lowest in savings, the least taxed, close to the top in terms of commitment to work rather than leisure.¹⁷

The uniqueness of the U.S. that Lipset promoted is the first interpretation of American exceptionalism. There is no doubt that the U.S. is, in military, economic, and geographical terms, the most powerful nation in the world. Daniel Bell went even further by stating that what makes the U.S. more exceptional is its exemplarity.¹⁸ As stated, American

International Politics, vol. 20, no. 2 (2015), p. 166.

15. Stephen M. Walt, "The Myth of American Exceptionalism," *Foreign Policy*, no. 189, (2011), P. 72.
16. Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America* (New York, Doubleday, 1696), pp.36-37.
17. Michael Lind, "The American Creed: Does It Matter? Should It Change?" *Foreign Affairs*, vol. 75, no. 2 (1996), p. 135.
18. Daniel Bell, "The 'Hegelian secret': civil society and American exceptionalism," in *Is America Different? A New Look at American Exceptionalism*, ed. Byron E Shafer

exceptionalism is truly defined in its own terms.

Another interpretation of American exceptionalism is the motivation mentioned by Walt. The leitmotif of American leadership on its special role as the world's policeman, maintaining peace in the world, is arguably that of American exceptionalism. Under such a creed, Bush's foreign policy circle, the neocons, initiated the Global War on Terror (GWOT). American exceptionalism, combined with American nationalism, had transformed into American military strength and eventually bypassed the UNSC order. This was seen as a unilateral and dogmatic action that crossed the red line drawn by the international community.

Si vis pacem, para bellum

Promoting democracy worldwide through strength, 'peace through strength', implies that peace can be achieved through military means if needed. President Reagan fought against communism and eventually reached the end of the Cold War. A year before his world-famous 'Tear down this wall' speech, he addressed the national security mantra in front of the nation. He stated, "We know that peace is the condition under which mankind was meant to flourish. Yet peace does not exist of its own will. It depends on us, on our courage to build it and guard it and pass it on to future generations," and added George Washington's famous quote, "To be prepared for war... is one of the most effective means of preserving peace."¹⁹

Likewise, in response to the 9/11 terror attack, Bush and the neocons fully retaliated against the enemy in the name of a war on terror. Presuming U.S. military superiority, 'peace through strength' truly took action. By calling Reagan's accomplishment a 'great democratic movement,' Bush proclaimed, "We've reached another turning point—and the resolve we show will shape the next stage of the world demo-

(Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), pp. 50-51.

19. Ronald Reagan, "Address to the Nation on National Security," (speech, Washington D.C., February 26, 1986), Reagan2020. US, <http://reagan2020.us/speeches/address_on_national_security.asp>.

cratic movement."²⁰ Neoconservatism, the cornerstone of Bush's motivation for democratic worldwide movement, associated fighting terrorism with promoting democracy.

Foreign Policy in the Middle East after 9/11

As illustrated, the Bush administration designed its foreign policy after 9/11 based on the creeds of American exceptionalism and 'peace through strength.' In this section, Bush's foreign policy output during his first term, specifically after 9/11, and how it was carried out will be analyzed. Moreover, after the discussion of the game changer, different types of engagement in wars under 'peace through strength' will be examined.

The Game Changer

The 9/11 terror attack opened a whole new chapter of world history since the end of the Cold War. A relatively peaceful decade following the Cold War ended after the tragedy on September 11th, 2001. The attack claimed almost 3,000 people's lives where "2,753 people were killed in New York, 184 people were killed at the Pentagon, and 40 people were killed on Flight 93."²¹ Not only the U.S. but the whole world was immensely shocked by the coordinated attacks on American soil. It was a point in time when U.S. homeland security helplessly collapsed.

Bush, from his first presidential campaign until the 9/11 incident, was known as a "traditional national-interest conservative"²² who

20. George W. Bush, "Remarks by President George W. Bush at the 20th Anniversary of the National Endowment for Democracy," (speech, Washington D.C., November 6, 2003), National Endowment for Democracy, <<http://www.ned.org/remarks-by-president-george-w-bush-at-the-20th-anniversary/>>.

21. "FAQ about 9/11," *9/11 Memorial*, <www.911memorial.org> (date accessed April 1, 2017).

22. Max Boot, "Think Again: Neocons," *Foreign Policy*, January/February 2009. p. 5. <<http://www.cfr.org/united-states/think-again-neocons/p7592>>.

was interested in great power politics. Throughout the campaign, he criticized Bill Clinton's human rights policies and nation building. It was 9/11 that brought enormous changes in the direction and intensity of his foreign policy. In describing the situation, Max Boot argued, "a cabal of neoconservatives has hijacked the Bush administration's foreign policy and transformed the world's sole superpower into a unilateral monster."²³ He added that Bush "realized the United States no longer could afford a 'humble' foreign policy."²⁴

This sharp shift in the Bush administration's stance was clearly reflected in the 2002 National Security Strategy (NSS). The cause, 9/11 being the game changer, and the effect, the war on terror, were well organized in the 2002 NSS. As the cause was stated, "The events of September 11, 2001, taught us that weak states, like Afghanistan, can pose as great a danger to our national interests as strong states. Yet poverty, weak institutions, and corruption can make weak states vulnerable to terrorist networks and drug cartels within their borders,"²⁵ and the effect reads, "The United States will use this moment of opportunity to extend the benefits of freedom across the globe. We will actively work to bring the hope of democracy, development, free markets, and free trade to every corner of the world."²⁶

The War on Terror in action

The 9/11 attack was definitely the game changer which not only turned a traditional conservative administration into a proactive neo-conservative one but also led to expansive changes in the Middle East. Following the attack, one of the neocons in the policy circle, Paul Wolfowitz, then the Deputy Secretary of Defense, immediately accused Al Qaeda as a suspect. Then the war on terror, Afghanistan in 2001 and Iraq in 2003, lasted for almost a decade. The outcomes were disastrous.

23. Ibid.

24. Ibid.

25. U.S. "The National Security Strategy of the United States 2002," <<http://nssarchive.us/national-security-strategy-2002/>> (date accessed March 1, 2017).

26. Ibid.

Bush's 'mission accomplished' speech²⁷ actually referred to the beginning of a disaster. Many claimed the war as a "grand strategic failure."²⁸ As the war dragged on, criticism from both inside and outside of the U.S. continued. Towards the end, new mutant terrorist organizations like ISIS (Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant) were formed and arose as a new threat to the international community. Against this backdrop, the Bush administration's engagement of the WOT left multiple questions.

Preemptive or Preventive War?

The war on Iraq can be labeled a preventive war. The factor determining whether a war is preventive or preemptive is how immediate the threat is. If the threat is immediate, then one declares a preemptive strike but when the threat is steps way, then one may engage in a preventive war. Neocons, the true adherents of the promotion of democracy and 'peace through strength,' are likely to engage in one of the two options when facing threats. The capability of the U.S. for declaring such a war is totally proven by its economic and military strength. In this regard, "it is hard to eliminate the possibility that neoconservatism will be revived if the security of the U.S. mainland is seriously threatened"²⁹ and Trump is no exception.

27. George W. Bush, "Bush makes historic speech aboard warship," *CNN International*, May 2, 2003, <<http://edition.cnn.com/2003/US/05/01/bush.transcript/>> (date accessed March 1, 2017).

28. G. John Ikenberry, "The End of Neo-Conservative Moment," *Survival*, vol. 46, no. 1 (2004), p. 10.

29. Alex Soohoon Lee, "The Neoconservative Approach to North Korea: Its Prospects under the next US Administration," *Korean Journal of Defense Analysis*, vol. 27, no. 4 (2015), p. 438.

Foreign Policy of the Trump Administration: The First 100 Days

Creed

Thus far, the Trump administration's foreign policy has not shown its clear-cut direction or is still in the process of setting a direction. At least, the following is officially stated on the White House website:

The Trump Administration is committed to a foreign policy focused on American interests and American national security. 'Peace through strength' will be at the center of that foreign policy. This principle will make possible a stable, more peaceful world with less conflict and more common ground.³⁰

The analysis of Trump's foreign policy creed in this section is based on the speeches, debates, and social network services during his campaign and after the inauguration. It is well known that his tweets played a critical role both in his campaign and his presidency thus far. Twitter "has worked very well for him so far, and there is no reason for him to stop until forced to do so by events. Trump has demonstrated he understands the power of public opinion and how to shame opponents..."³¹ In this section, Trump's tweets will frequently be used as references.

'America First': Neo-isolationist?

After being elected as the Republican nominee, Trump tweeted, "I will work hard and never let you down! America First!"³² What he meant by 'America First' was that the U.S. will not be "ripped off anymore. We're

30. "America First," *The White House*, <<https://www.whitehouse.gov/america-first-foreign-policy>> (date accessed April 28, 2017).

31. Jonathan Tobin, "The Power of a Trump Tweet," *Commentary*, January 4, 2017, <<https://www.commentarymagazine.com/politics-ideas/power-trump-tweet/>> (date accessed April 20, 2017).

32. Donald J. Trump, (Tweet, July 19, 2016), *Tweeter*, <<https://twitter.com/realdonald-trump/status/755551039244341253?lang=en>> (date accessed April 5, 2017).

going to be friendly with everybody, but we're not going to be taken advantage of by anybody."³³ Many had believed Trump's 'America First' principle is devoid of America's role in the world; instead, his focus is on checking whether or not others are taking advantage of the U.S. He specifically mentioned China taking advantage of the trade deals with the U.S. He even insisted that South Korea and Japan pay for their own defense. 'America First' prioritizes American values first instead of seeking shared values between America and other nations.

The historical notion of 'America First' holds a negative connotation. The 'America First' Committee (AFC), established in 1940, opposed U.S. involvement in World War II. Like Trump's idea of protecting American interests from outside forces, the AFC was also against "any U.S. involvement in World War II and was harshly critical of the Roosevelt administration, which it accused of pressing the U.S. toward war."³⁴ In particular, when Charles Lindbergh, the AFC's spokesperson, suggested that Jews must oppose the war, he was labeled as "pro-Nazi."³⁵ However, the 'America First' catchphrase, thus far, seemed solely focused on finding and preserving American *raison d'état*. Does this imply that Trump would be against any type of intervention? At least, the recent actions regarding Syria would suggest that this is not the case.

Peace Through Strength

"America will be great again through a strong military and econo-

33. Election 2016, "Transcript: Donald Trump Expounds on His Foreign Policy Views," *The New York Times*, March 26, 2016, <https://www.nytimes.com/2016/03/27/us/politics/donald-trump-transcript.html?_r=1> (date accessed April 2, 2017).

34. Krishnadev Calamur, "A Short History of 'America First,'" *The Atlantic*, January 21, 2017 <<https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2017/01/trump-america-first/514037/>> (date accessed March 2, 2017).

35. Scott Campbell, "Where did Donald Trump's 'America First' slogan come from? Sinister history of President's buzz phrase is revealed," *Mirror*, January 30, 2017, <<http://www.mirror.co.uk/news/world-news/donald-trumps-america-first-slogan-9718899>> (accessed March 3, 2017).

my,”³⁶ said Trump. What he meant by military and economy implies the strength of America. Considering the aging nuclear arsenal, Trump “has vowed to rapidly build up the nuclear arsenal as part of policies he has called ‘peace through strength’”³⁷ which parallels Reagan’s statement in the 1980s that a strong military is important for preserving world peace.

The term ‘peace through strength’ could be interpreted in multiple folds, from the U.S. bombing Syria to the U.S. democratizing Iraq. Put simply, through the means of ‘peace through strength,’ the U.S. exercises its power to spread democratic values. The 2017 defense budget explains that a “10% boost to the military comes at the expense of deep cuts to non-defense spending at the State Department...”³⁸ How Trump ought to utilize such a budget for ‘peace through strength’ is clear and it is certain that his ‘America First’ creed is also gradually tilting toward an interventionist approach.

Foreign Policy: The First Hundred Days

Evaluating Trump’s foreign policy may not be timely, yet discussing its prospects, based on its operation thus far, is necessary at this point. In this section, Trump’s hitherto policies of foreign and national security are discussed. Some may contain legitimate implications to the future of his foreign policy while others are lacking. Withdrawing from the TPP immediately after the inauguration shocked the world and especially Prime Minister Shinzo Abe, who visited President Trump prior to the event. Moreover, Trump’s initial conversation with

36. Peter Navarro, “The Trump Doctrine: ‘peace through strength,’” *The National Interest*, March 31, 2016, <<http://nationalinterest.org/feature/the-trump-doctrine-peace-through-strength-15631>> (date accessed March 3, 2017).

37. Bill Gertz, “Trump administration: “America First” and “peace through strength” national security policies,” *The Washington Times*, February 14, 2017, <<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2017/feb/14/trump-administration-america-first-and-peace-throu/>> (accessed March 1, 2017).

38. Zachary Cohen, “Trump proposes \$54 billion defense spending hike,” *CNN*, March 16, 2017, <<http://edition.cnn.com/2017/03/16/politics/donald-trump-defense-budget-blueprint/>> (date accessed March 31, 2017).

President Tsai Ing-wen of Taiwan also shocked China at the time, (although he later compensated by reaffirming the 'one China' policy to President Xi Jin Ping during their first summit meeting in Florida). Above all, Trump's policy carried out on Syrian forces was highly unexpected and puzzled the world, especially Northeast Asia.

The Opening Gambits: Upending the TPP and Shaking the 'One China' Policy

Trump's very first pen stroke abandoned the bipartisan trade deal, the Trans-Pacific Partnership, which Obama initiated. According to him, the TPP would have benefited others while hurting the U.S. economy since companies in the U.S. would have relocated to other nations due to the TPP. Instead, if the U.S. signs a trade policy with individual nations in a bilateral environment, according to Trump, "a lot of companies come back to our country."³⁹ Quite the contrary, Shinzo Abe had felt that the TPP without the U.S. "has no meaning."⁴⁰ The TPP is fundamentally an important issue for Japan since, without the U.S. in the TPP, China will step in to expand the Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership (RCEP) using every means possible and this would signal a drawback for Japan.

Between the election and inauguration, in an interview with Fox, Trump said, "I fully understand the 'One China' policy, but I don't know why we have to be bound by a 'One China' policy unless we make a deal with China having to do with other things, including trade."⁴¹ No other former presidents of the U.S. have ever made such

39. Peter Baker, "Trump Abandons Trans-Pacific Partnership, Obama's Signature Trade Deal," *The New York Times*, January 23, 2017, <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/01/23/us/politics/tpp-trump-trade-nafta.html?_r=0> (date accessed March 31, 2017).

40. Robin Harding, "Trade deal 'has no meaning' without US, says Abe: TPP," *Financial Times*, November 23, 2016, <<https://www.ft.com/content/59972c38-b058-11e6-a37c-f4a01f1b0fa1>> (accessed March 29, 2017).

41. Caren Bohan and David Brunnstrom, "Trump says U.S. not necessarily bound by 'one China' policy," *Reuters*, December 12, 2016, <<http://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-trump-china-idUSKBN1400TY>> (date accessed March 20, 2017).

comment nor have talked to the Taiwanese president promptly after being elected. This immediately shocked Beijing. Wang Yi, the foreign minister of China, commented that “no matter whether the Tsai Ing-wen authority, any other person in the world, or any other force, if they try and damage the ‘One China’ principle and harm China’s core interests, in the end they are lifting a rock only to drop it on their feet.”⁴² This fierce tone reflects China’s negative stance on Trump. Upending the TPP and shaking the ‘One China’ policy are closely related to the U.S. economy. The ex-real estate mogul seemed to be utilizing his business tactics while others were trying to find a way through the shadow of uncertainty Trump has been leaving.

Syria: The Game Changer?

The recent bombing of Syria has relentlessly demonstrated America’s muscle. Comparing Trump’s ideas regarding Syria before and after his election is shocking in its contrast. Before being elected, he condemned Obama for his policy on Syria. Trump tweeted, “What will we get for bombing Syria besides more debt and a possible long term conflict?”⁴³ This clearly illustrated his attention and preference for the national economy over other nations or any type of humanitarian intervention. Another tweet contradicts his recent military order on Syria. In 2013, he tweeted, “we should stay the hell out of Syria, the ‘rebels’ are just as bad as the current regime.”⁴⁴ But when Assad attacked rebellion forces with sarin gas, he decided to execute the order. “Tonight I ordered a targeted military strike on the airfield in Syria from where the chemical

42. Tom Phillips, “China ‘seriously concerned’ after Trump questions Taiwan policy,” *The Guardian*, December 12, 2016, <<https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2016/dec/12/donald-trump-questions-us-commitment-to-one-china-policy>> (date accessed March 28, 2017).

43. Donald J. Trump, (Tweet, Aug 30, 2013), Tweeter, <<https://twitter.com/realdonald-trump/status/373146637184401408?lang=en>> (date accessed March 20, 2017).

44. Donald J. Trump, (Tweet, Jun 16, 2013), Tweeter, <<https://twitter.com/realdonald-trump/status/373146637184401408?lang=en>> (date accessed March 26, 2017).

attack was launched."⁴⁵ Trump's policy has shifted from one end to the other. In this respect, Syria was the game changer which re-conceptualized the 'America First' creed. Although the U.S. military action in Syria was not critically condemned by the international community since using sarin gas on children is fundamentally against the international norm, Trump revealed the U.S.'s possible use of its military without prior notice to the world.

Exploring the Parallels

Given the explanations of each administration thus far, the parallels between the two are easily found. While their foreign policy output may be different, their credos seem similar, and are growing more similar. Based on the abovementioned analyses, the similarities found are: 'peace through strength,' engaging in interventionist policies, and transforming from nationalist to a globalist.

'Peace through strength': Preemptive or Preventive?

'Peace through strength' has been headlining the Republican Party platform every four years since 1980. Every Republican president had pursued 'peace through strength' in one way or another. Reagan had engaged in a series of nuclear races with the Soviet Union. George H. W. Bush had gone through the first Gulf war where he pushed, with a strong military, Saddam Hussein out of Kuwait. Later, his son, George W. Bush, toppled the Hussein regime with a full-scale invasion. Trump, according to his aide during the campaign, had "emphasized the need to improve and modernize [the U.S.] deterrent capability as a vital way to pursue 'peace through strength'"⁴⁶ for containing rogue

45. "Transcript and Video: Trump Speaks about Strikes in Syria," *The New York Times*, April 6, 2017, <<https://www.nytimes.com/2017/04/06/world/middleeast/transcript-video-trump-airstrikes-syria.html>> (accessed April 10, 2017).

46. Kingston Reif, "Trump Nuclear Tweet Sparks Controversy," *Arms Control Today*, January 11, 2017, <https://www.armscontrol.org/ACT/2017_01/News/Trump-

nuclear states.

Beyond interventionist strategy, the Trump administration announced plans for modernizing and using its military forces. His assistants, Alexander Gray and Peter Navarro, wrote during the campaign, "Trump will steadfastly pursue a strategy of 'peace through strength,' an axiom of Ronald Reagan that was abandoned under the Obama administration."⁴⁷ Trump did in fact engage in a military exercise in Syria. In his first hundred days as president of the U.S., Trump has definitely shown off U.S. strength and muscle. How Bush responded to 9/11 in his first year may be prescriptive to Trump. As for Afghanistan, Bush's goal was to retaliate, where his mission was to find and punish Al Qaeda and bin Laden.

For the war on Iraq, Bush came up with several rationales. One motive was to find weapons of mass destruction (WMD) and another was to topple the current regime. However, the questions still remain: What did the U.S. get from this war? Was this a necessary preventive or preemptive action? Trump's recent policies reflect Bush's approach and indicate the next steps in his foreign policy. 'Peace through strength' is an approach that requires a strong military and strong leadership. It has been adopted by several leaders of America. After the relatively stable bipolarity of the Cold War, America had more opportunities to seek and more roles to play in the unipolar order. Trump's era is also experiencing a rapid phase of globalization. With 'peace through strength' motive and spirit, Trump's America is likely to engage in both preemptive and preventive actions.

Intervention vs Non-intervention

George W. Bush started as a traditional national-interest conservative

Nuclear-Tweet-Sparks-Controversy> (date accessed April 1, 2017).

47. Alexander Gray and Peter Navarro, "Donald Trump's 'peace through strength' Vision for the Asia-Pacific," *Foreign Policy*, November 7, 2016, <http://foreignpolicy.com/2016/11/07/donald-trumps-peace-through-strength-vision-for-the-asia-pacific/?utm_content=bufferd5350&utm_medium=social&utm_source=twitter.com&utm_campaign=buffer> (date accessed April 1, 2017).

but later adopted neoconservative principles after the 9/11 attacks. The attacks on American soil, especially the heart of the nation, New York and Washington DC, left few options for Bush but to find Al Qaeda and Osama bin Laden and retaliate on behalf of the 3,000 American lives. President Bush made a call and the war on Afghanistan began. The same action may have been taken by Democratic administrations like Clinton's and Obama's. President Bush went even further by declaring Iraq, Iran, and North Korea as, the 'Axis of Evil.' Breaching the UN Charter by invading Iraq not only incurred resentment from the international community but, more importantly, cost several thousand lives of U.S. soldiers. Democratization in the midst of the unforeseen conflict between Sunnis and Shiites dragged on and eventually resulted in more deaths.

The recent bombing of Syria appears to repeat Bush's path. While Trump previously condemned any interventionist approaches on Syria, he did not hesitate to use military force and ordered strikes in Syria within his first hundred days. The point is not how Trump ordered the bombings but how he changed his national security stance toward Syria. This also resembles Bush's change in his stance toward neoconservatism after 9/11. Trump seems to be open to intervention if needed. Overall, 'America First' may secure its foundation of prioritizing America but his first hundred days in office proved that intervention seems more likely than generally expected.

From Nationalist to Globalist

Another parallel found between the Bush and Trump administrations, thus far, is that they started out as nationalist but turned out to be globalist. Globalism, including interventionism, follows the trend of globalization, which often turns out to be anti-Westphalian. Nationalism focuses on protecting and preserving national values and assets. Bush eventually transformed into a globalist when he adopted the neoconservative credo. In his first presidential debate in 2000, he argued, "If we don't do something quickly...if we don't stop extending our troops all around the world in nation-building missions, then we're going to

have a serious problem coming down the road.”⁴⁸ This was upended two years later. The 2002 National Security Strategy states, “Throughout history, freedom has been threatened by war and terror... The United States welcomes our responsibility to lead in this great mission.”⁴⁹ The neoconservative creed ‘peace through strength’ and democratization turned nationalist Bush into a globalist.

Trump’s pledges and plans during the campaign such as immigration, foreign policy, and trade displayed his nationalist tendencies. However, his young presidency has naturally illustrated his prospects as a globalist. ‘Make America Great Again,’ though first used by Reagan in his 1980 presidential campaign,⁵⁰ has been Trump’s slogan in his presidential campaign after buying every right to it by signing “an application with the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, in which he asked for exclusive rights to use “Make America Great Again” ... He enclosed a \$325 registration fee.”⁵¹

The bombs dropped on Syria jeopardized the whole situation. Obviously, this shocked Russia and President Vladimir Putin. He commented, “This [attack on Syria] resembles very much the situation of 2003 and the war in Iraq.”⁵² Even others, besides Russia, were shocked by Trump’s stance shift since “he won the Republican nomination last

48. Rebecca Leung, “Bush Sought ‘Way’ To Invade Iraq?: O’Neill Tells ‘60 Minutes’ Iraq Was ‘Topic A’ 8 Months Before 9-11,” *CBS News*, January 9, 2004, <<http://www.cbsnews.com/news/bush-sought-way-to-invade-iraq/>> (date accessed April 5, 2017).

49. U.S. “The National Security Strategy of the United States 2002,” <<http://nssarchive.us/national-security-strategy-2002/>> (date accessed March 1, 2017).

50. Emma Margolin, “Make America Great Again—Who Said It First?” *NBC News*, September 9, 2016, <<http://www.nbcnews.com/politics/2016-election/make-america-great-again-who-said-it-first-n645716>> (date accessed March 20, 2017).

51. Kevin Tumulty, “How Donald Trump came up with ‘Make America Great Again,’” *The Washington Post*, January 18, 2017, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/how-donald-trump-came-up-with-make-america-great-again/2017/01/17/fb6acf5e-dbf7-11e6-ad42-f3375f271c9c_story.html?utm_term=.04eb120947b8> (date accessed March 20, 2017).

52. Mark Hensch, “Putin compares Syria strike to US invasion of Iraq,” *The Hill*, April 11, 2017, <<http://thehill.com/policy/international/russia/328254-putin-syria-strikes-like-second-iraq-war>> (date accessed April 12, 2017).

year by campaigning against both George W. Bush's war in Iraq and Barack Obama's war in Libya."⁵³ Moreover, as cited earlier, his closing remarks regarding bombing Syria, "God bless America and the entire world," may be the first globalist comment he had made. Also his recent tweet about France, "Another terrorist attack in Paris. The people of France will not take much more of this. Will have a big effect on presidential election,"⁵⁴ shows his close attention to global matters.

Trump seems to follow Bush's globalist path. The wars in Afghanistan and Iraq had been motivated by the 9/11 attack where Bush was highly reactive and responsive to the cause of the attack. Nonetheless, Syria was not a threat that should be responded to in preemptive or preventive manners. While Trump's approach to Syria is neither preemptive nor preventive, at least it unmasked the globalist nature of Trump.

Although a clear trend has yet to be found, based on this comparative case analysis, Trump's foreign policy in his honeymoon period, despite the low popularity rating, can be summarized as follows. Trump believes in peace through strength and will intervene in other nations but a cost and benefit analysis will likely come first. His potential for becoming globalist and expanding the American sphere of influence will also largely depend on the figures of the balance sheet. In sum, Trump's foreign policy will be constructed in an entrepreneurial manner; in other words, his art of the deal.

Trump on North Korea: The Art of the Deal

The parallels found indicate that Trump's foreign policy is moving in the direction of a globalist, rather than an isolationist approach, and his

53. Eli Lake, "Trump Said No to Troops in Syria. His Aides Aren't So Sure," *Bloomberg*, April 14, 2017, <<https://www.bloomberg.com/view/articles/2017-04-13/trump-said-no-to-troops-in-syria-his-aides-aren-t-so-sure>> (date accessed April 18, 2017).

54. Donald J. Trump, (Tweet, Apr 21, 2017), Tweeter, <<https://twitter.com/realdonald-trump/status/855368516920332289?lang=en>> (date accessed April 30, 2017) Trump tweeted about France on 7:32 PM - 21 Apr 2017.

business background gradually seems to play an influencing role in making foreign policy. 'You're fired!' in the late TV show *The Apprentice* has created Trump's straightforward, decisive, and definitive entrepreneurial image. Against this backdrop, Trump's approach toward North Korea is expected to be more decisive and more profit oriented than any former president in U.S. history.

Review: Bush on North Korea: 'Axis of Evil'

In the 2002 State of the Union Address, Bush stated, "North Korea is a regime arming with missiles and weapons of mass destruction, while starving its citizens... States like these, and their terrorist allies, constitute an axis of evil, arming to threaten the peace of the world."⁵⁵ Along with Iran and Iraq, North Korea was categorized as the target and enemy by the Bush administration. Bush witnessed North Korea's nuclear and missile tests during his term in 2006. In the beginning of his term, Bush terminated the supply of fuel and oil, freezing the nuclear program in North Korea. In response, North Korea kicked out the UN inspectors and continued developing nuclear weapons, finally conducted the "first nuclear test in 2006."⁵⁶

Although this test was considered a failure, "American officials pushed for tough sanctions, calling for a block on all imports of military equipment to North Korea."⁵⁷ The former secretary of defense,

55. The United States Capitol, "The President's State of the Union Address," Washington, D.C., January 29, 2002, <<https://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2002/01/20020129-11.html>> (date accessed March 20, 2017).

56. Glenn Kessler, "The facile claim that Obama's Iran negotiator was 'the architect of the North Korean nuclear deal'," *The Washington Post*, April 24, 2017, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/fact-checker/wp/2017/04/24/the-facile-claim-that-the-iran-negotiator-was-the-architect-of-the-north-korean-nuclear-deal/?utm_term=.acf243b935a6> (date accessed April 28, 2017).

57. Amanda Erickson, "A timeline of North Korea's five nuclear tests and how the U.S. has responded," *The Washington Post*, April 14, 2017, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/worldviews/wp/2017/04/14/a-timeline-of-north-koreas-five-nuclear-tests-and-how-the-u-s-has-responded/?utm_term=.c8af22ba3dcf> (date accessed April 28, 2017).

William Perry, in his Washington Post article, wrote, “Our government’s inattention has allowed North Korea to establish a new and dangerous threat to the Asia-Pacific region,”⁵⁸ condemning the Bush administration. He also criticized Bush for not setting a proper boundary for nuclear tests. Regardless of the ‘Axis of Evil’ label and follow-up sanctions, North Korea continued their tests in 2013 and 2016. Bush may have had enough guts and power to freeze the nuclear programs but, lacking vision, ultimately failed in dismantling North Korea’s nuclear program. One lesson found here is that American exceptionalism and ‘peace through strength’ would only remain as motives unless put into action.

Ex-business mogul’s approach to North Korea

Considering his business career, leading the Trump Organization for nearly a half-century, Trump is accustomed to a competitive bargaining environment where the maximization of profit has always been the priority. His foreign policy operation can be understood and speculated on in this regard. Moreover, this is the point where the parallels between Trump and Bush diverge. However, the situation concerning North Korea did not get better over the last decade and, “under Donald Trump’s administration, the ‘axis of evil’ is back, though in somewhat altered form.”⁵⁹ His views and engagement on North Korea are analyzed in this section.

North Korea for Trump?

“I wouldn’t go there [North Korea]... If he [Kim Jong un] came here, I’d accept him, but I wouldn’t give him a state dinner... We should be

58. William J. Perry, “In Search of a North Korea Policy,” *The Washington Post*, October 11, 2006, <<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/10/10/AR2006101001285.html>>, (date accessed April 29, 2017).

59. Aaron David Miller, “The ‘axis of evil’ is back,” *CNN*, April 26, 2017. <<http://edition.cnn.com/2017/04/26/opinions/axis-of-evil-is-back-miller-sokolsky/>> (date accessed April 28, 2017).

eating a hamburger on a conference table,"⁶⁰ said Trump. After these remarks in Atlanta during the campaign, various observations and translations were plastered all over the media. Two points are easily deduced from his speech. First, he is willing to talk to Kim even if the chance of talking him out of continuing his nuclear weapons operation is low. Second, the part that he would treat Kim to hamburgers instead of a big state dinner contains the message of hierarchy. Some of the media's wishful thinking that Trump is making an effort to comfort Kim in a casual manner is naïve, rather he is looking down on Kim. He considers hamburgers with Kim as nothing more than opening a dialogue which results from a 'better than nothing' way of thinking. In other words, there is hardly any reason for Trump to engage North Korea in a proactive or cautious manner during his campaign.

How seriously is the U.S. exposed to a North Korean nuclear attack? Americans have gone through the tragedy of 9/11 where homeland security became one of the top national security agendas. In this regard, questions like, 'Is North Korea threatening the U.S.?' and if so, 'How imminent is the threat?' seem necessary to be investigated. Former assistant secretary of defense, Philip E. Coyle, said, North Korea's ICBMs (Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles) are known to be incapable of reaching California and they "can't even reach Hawaii."⁶¹ He added that North Korea's ICBMs are not a current threat, but rather a looming threat. Although Kim continues his nuclear development program and may become a serious threat in the future, Trump's concerns over North Korea are not immediate at this point.

The entry of CVN-70, known as the USS Carl Vinson aircraft carrier, in the East Sea was a warning to North Korea. However, the 230,000 Americans residing in South Korea and the unidentified weapons of

60. Nick Gass, "Trump: I'll meet with Kim Jong Un in the U.S.," *Politico*, June 15, 2016, <<http://www.politico.com/story/2016/06/donald-trump-north-korea-nukes-224385>> (date accessed April 26).

61. Anna Fifield, "Will North Korea fire a missile capable of hitting the U.S. mainland? Probably," April 5, 2017, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/world-views/wp/2017/04/05/will-north-korea-fire-a-missile-capable-of-hitting-the-u-s-mainland-probably/?utm_term=.26aa3dd32793> (date accessed April 27, 2017).

North Korea would likely hold Trump's military action down. One thing for sure is that, for Trump, whether preemptive or preventive, what was done in Syria will not likely be repeated on North Korea.

Alliance

Then, suppose Trump does not consider North Korea an imminent threat and military action is not an option, does he not take North Korea seriously? His comments regarding North Korea during the campaign seemed reckless, yet his tone became more serious and definite after his inauguration. In the face of 15 United Nations Security Council representatives visiting the Oval Office, he openly criticized the work of the UN on Syria and North Korea. As for North Korea, he said, "The status quo in North Korea is also unacceptable, and the Council must be prepared to impose additional and stronger sanctions on North Korean nuclear and ballistic missile programs."⁶² Calling North Korea a big world problem, Trump surely has intentions of solving the denuclearization issue.

Since the U.S. is not within the range of North Korea's missile threats, the U.S. may stay out of the North Korean issue. However, the traditional hub-and-spoke alliance of Korea and Japan would matter for Trump. A group of U.S. politicians visited Korea and Japan in April to discuss the future of the U.S. and the alliance's relationship. Republican Kathleen Rice noted that no other nations in the world are as close to the threat as Korea and Japan are.⁶³ While her interview with the media was meant to criticize Trump's recent inattentive and igno-

62. "President Trump Meeting with U.N. Security Council Ambassadors," *C-SPAN*, April 24, 2017, <<https://www.google.co.kr/url?sa=t&rc=tj&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=7&ved=0ahUKewjls7q9iMnTAhVIU7wKHaLNC6UQFgg3MAY&url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.c-span.org%2Fvideo%2F%3F427447-1%2Fpresident-trump-meets-un-security-council-ambassadors&usg=AFQjCNFZqBTvxxXMkIQ3pI8hHhAZ1gG82A&sig2=V8sx1ZnqHJDr dumbzfcRXQ>> (date accessed April 30, 2017).

63. Jim Acosta and Ryan Browne, "Official: White House, Pentagon miscommunicated on aircraft carrier's location," *CNN*, April 29, 2017, <<http://edition.cnn.com/2017/04/18/politics/carl-vinson-korea-trump/>> (date accessed April 30, 2017).

rant manner,⁶⁴ Rice firmly reemphasized the importance of these allies. Although Trump's 'burden sharing' comments have been repeated, it may not transcend the significance of the alliance's common goal: denuclearization of North Korea.

Utilizing China in the North Korean Issue

Engaging North Korea and restricting its nuclear weapon development has been carried out in various ways. Multiple UN resolutions have been passed, sanctions imposed, and multilateral dialogues held, like the Six Party Talks, bringing North Korea to the bargaining table. Various forms of aid have been provided by not only states but also non-state actors. Even bilateral talks, specifically the two previous summit meetings, took place. Regardless of such efforts, North Korea is still developing nuclear weapons. Alternative ways of dealing with them seem necessary at this point.

One of the methods can be utilizing China. Two mysterious gestures from Trump to China seem either careless or strategic. First, after his inauguration, Trump's initial conversation with Taiwan President Tsai Ing-wen appeared to shake the 'One China' policy. He became the first U.S. president to have faced such an issue but soon agreed to honor 'One China' by holding the summit meeting with President Xi. Second, the reason for informing President Xi of the Syria strikes over a "beautiful piece of chocolate cake"⁶⁵ at the Mar-a-Lago summit is also mystifying. This stick and carrot, or tug-of-war type of diplomacy, not only puzzled China and relevant nations, Korea and Japan, but also highlighted the fact that Trump was a businessman and a negotiator.

Furthermore, the considerations, or variables, that Trump created complicate the equation. Korea and the U.S.'s agreement to deploy

64. Trump made unclear comments about the direction of CVN-70.

65. Scott Snyder, "Can China Meet President Trump's Expectations On North Korea?" *Forbes*, May 2, 2017, <<https://www.forbes.com/sites/scottasnryder/2017/05/02/can-china-meet-president-trumps-expectations-on-north-korea/#679f566e7181>> (date accessed May 4, 2017).

THAAD (Terminal High Altitude Area Defense Missile) has complicated the situation for China. While China is highly sensitive about the THAAD stationed on the Korean peninsula, Trump took this issue even further and more seriously by mentioning the cost of deployment. This has certainly jeopardized Korea. After the summit meeting with Xi, Trump's ignorant comment that Korea was part of China in the past left Koreans stunned. As this incorrect information was assumed to have come from Xi, the heated atmosphere between Korea and China grew even worse and left President Xi as a target of criticism. In the end, hatred between the two nations, Korea and China, has intensified after Trump's inauguration.

Overall, the Trump administration's foreign policy regarding North Korea seems to be solidifying with a creed of globalism while intervention is not an option on the table. Instead, Trump wants to utilize China for containing North Korea, without getting his hands dirty. After the Mar-a-Lago summit, Trump tweeted, "I explained to the President of China that a trade deal with the U.S. will be far better for them if they solve the North Korean problem!"⁶⁶ The maximization of profit is the one and the only goal in business and it is well reflected by Trump's foreign policy on North Korea. In this regard, Trump's entrepreneurial way of conducting foreign policy is certainly quite different from his predecessors.

Conclusion: The Art of War

One of the lessons learned in *The Art of War*, by Sun Tzu, is that "If you know the enemy and know yourself, you need not fear the result of hundred battles."⁶⁷ This is what Korea needs to ruminate on concerning the Trump administration. This research was motivated by academic curiosity that has repeatedly been triggered whenever

66. Ibid.

67. Erik Jackson, "Sun Tzu's 31 Best Pieces of Leadership Advice," *Forbes*, May 23, 2014, <<https://www.forbes.com/sites/ericjackson/2014/05/23/sun-tzus-33-best-pieces-of-leadership-advice/#7586b10a5e5e>> (date accessed May 5, 2017).

Trump announces or tweets unexpected comments. They were reminiscent of the Bush administration after the 9/11 attack. In this regard, the two administrations were compared and some similar traits were found.

The expectations for Trump's North Korea policies become clearer when another lens, the so-called business-sensitive lens,⁶⁸ was put on for analysis. Through this lens, Trump's level of engagement on North Korea and utilizing China for handling North Korea can be investigated. Having stated this, how Korea should deal with this distinguished businessman, who led a corporation relatively successfully for nearly fifty years, should be discussed. As mentioned, knowing Trump well is critical for Korea-U.S. bilateral relations at this time. Acknowledging and accepting Trump as a cold-minded businessman mostly striving for the U.S.'s own national interests should be the starting point for examining Korea-U.S. relations.

In this light, South Korea must fulfill two tasks. First, Korea must lead the Korea-U.S. alliance to be value-based rather than interest-based.⁶⁹ The Korean government should patiently explain to Trump, an interest-oriented business mogul, about the shared history and values between the two nations. Democracy is the foundation on which the two nations firmly stand. Korea is a nation that adopted democracy from the U.S. and has operated it in a very similar manner. Countless values are shared between the two nations and Trump may not be aware of them. Informing the White House of the precious values shared between the two nations will be the first step toward strengthening this value-based alliance.

Moreover, South Korea must play the orchestrating role in regard to North Korean issues. Although Trump's lack of understanding regarding Northeast Asia and the Korean peninsula have resulted in

68. Like a gender-sensitive lens used in the study of gender, a business-sensitive lens allows people to focus on business (in this case, Trump's business tactics and strategies).

69. In this article, a value-based alliance considers the history shared between the two nations, South Korea and the U.S.; whereas, an interest-based alliance illustrates Trump's business-oriented way of conducting foreign policy.

careless statements about China and Korea, Korea needs to strike a balance in the region. Korea should constantly engage its neighboring countries as well as the U.S. to avoid being left out. In particular, President Trump should never be left to decide on policy regarding North Korea without consulting South Korea first.⁷⁰ Overall, active communication between the Blue House and the White House is not only inevitable but extremely essential at this time.

■ Article Received: 5/15 ■ Reviewed: 5/17 ■ Revised: 6/9 ■ Accepted: 6/18

70. Trump's unpredictable and abrupt decisions and actions have jeopardized international orders such as the TPP and Paris Agreement. To prevent this, the South Korean government will have to keep a close eye on Washington politics.

Bibliography

- Acosta, Jim and Ryan Browne, "Official: White House, Pentagon miscommunicated on aircraft carrier's location." *CNN*, April 29, 2017, <<http://edition.cnn.com/2017/04/18/politics/carl-vinson-korea-trump/>>. (date accessed April 30, 2017).
- Alexander, Gray and Peter Navarro. "Donald Trump's 'peace through strength' Vision for the Asia-Pacific," *Foreign Policy*, November 7, 2016, <http://foreign-policy.com/2016/11/07/donald-trumps-peace-through-strength-vision-for-the-asia-pacific/?utm_content=bufferd5350&utm_medium=social&utm_source=twitter.com&utm_campaign=buffer>. (date accessed April 1, 2017).
- Baker, Peter. "Trump Abandons Trans-Pacific Partnership, Obama's Signature Trade Deal." *The New York Times*, January 23, 2017, <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/01/23/us/politics/tpp-trump-trade-nafta.html?_r=0>. (date accessed March 15, 2017).
- BBC News (US & Canada). "What executive actions has Trump taken?" *BBC News*, April 12, 2017, <<http://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-38695593>>. (date accessed April 20, 2017).
- Bell, Daniel. "The 'Hegelian secret': civil society and American exceptionalism." in *Is America Different? A New Look at American Exceptionalism*, edited by Byron E Shafer. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Bohan, Caren and David Brunnstrom. "Trump says U.S. not necessarily bound by 'one China' policy." *Reuters*, December 12, 2016, <<http://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-trump-china-idUSKBN1400TY>>. (date accessed March 20, 2017).
- Boot, Max. "Think Again: Neocons." *Foreign Policy*, January/February 2009. <<http://www.cfr.org/united-states/think-again-neocons/p7592>>. (date accessed March 20, 2017).
- Brownstein, Ronald. "How the Rustbelt Paved Trump's Road to Victory." *The Atlantic*, November 10, 2016, <<https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2016/11/trumps-road-to-victory/507203/>>. (date accessed April 1, 2017).
- Bush, George W. "Bush makes historic speech aboard warship," *CNN International*, May 2, 2003, <<http://edition.cnn.com/2003/US/05/01/bush.transcript/>>. (date accessed March 1, 2017).
- Bush, George W. "Remarks by President George W. Bush at the 20th Anniversary of the National Endowment for Democracy." speech, Washington D.C., November 6, 2003, National Endowment for Democracy. <<http://www.ned.org/remarks-by-president-george-w-bush-at-the-20th-anniversary/>>.

- Bush, George W. "The President's State of the Union Address." speech, Washington, D.C., January 29, 2002, <<https://georgewbushwhitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2002/01/20020129-11.html>>.
- Calamur, Krishnadev. "A Short History of 'America First.'" *The Atlantic*, January 21, 2017, <<https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2017/01/trump-america-first/514037/>>. (date accessed March 2, 2017).
- Campbell, Scott. "Where did Donald Trump's 'America First' slogan come from? Sinister history of President's buzz phrase is revealed." *Mirror*, January 30, 2017, <<http://www.mirror.co.uk/news/world-news/donald-trumps-america-first-slogan-9718899>>. (date accessed March 3, 2017).
- Cohen, Zachary. "Trump proposes \$54 billion defense spending hike." *CNN*, March 16, 2017, <<http://edition.cnn.com/2017/03/16/politics/donald-trump-defense-budget-blueprint/>>. (date accessed March 31, 2017).
- C-SPAN. "President Trump Meeting with U.N. Security Council Ambassadors." *C-SPAN*, April 24, 2017, <<https://www.c-span.org/video/?427447-1/president-trump-meets-un-security-council-ambassadors>>. (date accessed April 30, 2017).
- Dunn, Susan. "Trump's 'America First' has ugly echoes from U.S. history." *CNN*, April 28, 2016, <<http://edition.cnn.com/2016/04/27/opinions/trump-america-first-ugly-echoes-dunn/>>. (date accessed May 1, 2017).
- Election 2016, "Transcript: Donald Trump Expounds on His Foreign Policy Views." *The New York Times*, March 26, 2016, <https://www.nytimes.com/2016/03/27/us/politics/donald-trump-transcript.html?_r=1>. (date accessed April 2, 2017).
- Erickson, Amanda. "A timeline of North Korea's five nuclear tests and how the U.S. has responded." *The Washington Post*, April 14, 2017, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/worldviews/wp/2017/04/14/a-timeline-of-north-koreas-five-nuclear-tests-and-how-the-u-s-has-responded/?utm_term=.c8af22ba3dcf>. (date accessed April 28, 2017).
- Fifield, Anna. "Will North Korea fire a missile capable of hitting the U.S. mainland? Probably." April 5, 2017, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/worldviews/wp/2017/04/05/will-north-korea-fire-a-missile-capable-of-hitting-the-u-s-mainland-probably/?utm_term=.26aa3dd32793>. (date accessed April 27, 2017).
- Fox News Insider. "Trump on Dropping 'MOAB' in Afghanistan: 'Don't Know' If It Sends Message to N. Korea," *Fox News Insider*, April 13, 2017, <<http://insider.foxnews.com/2017/04/13/donald-trump-remarks-mother-all-bombs-dropped>>.

- afghanistan>. (date accessed April 20, 2017).
- Gass, Nick. "Trump: I'll meet with Kim Jong Un in the U.S." *Politico*, June 15, 2016, <<http://www.politico.com/story/2016/06/donald-trump-north-korea-nukes-224385>>. (date accessed April 26).
- Gertz, Bill. "Trump administration: 'America First' and 'peace through strength' national security policies." *The Washington Times*, February 14, 2017, <<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2017/feb/14/trump-administration-america-first-and-peace-throu/>>. (date accessed March 1, 2017).
- Harding, Robin. "Trade deal 'has no meaning' without US, says Abe: TPP." *Financial Times*, November 23, 2016, <<https://www.ft.com/content/59972c38-b058-11e6-a37c-f4a01f1b0fa1>>. (date accessed March 29, 2017).
- Hensch, Mark. "Putin compares Syria strike to US invasion of Iraq." *The Hill*, April 11, 2017, <<http://thehill.com/policy/international/russia/328254-putin-syria-strikes-like-second-iraq-war>>. (date accessed April 12, 2017).
- Ikenberry, G. John. "The End of Neo-Conservative Moment." *Survival*, vol. 46, no. 1 (2004): 7-22.
- Jackson, Erik. "Sun Tzu's 31 Best Pieces of Leadership Advice." *Forbes*, May 23, 2014, <<https://www.forbes.com/sites/ericjackson/2014/05/23/sun-tzus-33-best-pieces-of-leadership-advice/#7586b10a5e5e>>. (date accessed May 5, 2017).
- Kessler, Glenn. "The facile claim that Obama's Iran negotiator was 'the architect of the North Korean nuclear deal'." *The Washington Post*, April 24, 2017, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/fact-checker/wp/2017/04/24/the-facile-claim-that-the-iran-negotiator-was-the-architect-of-the-north-korean-nuclear-deal/?utm_term=.acf243b935a6>. (date accessed April 28, 2017).
- Koo, Bonhak, "South Korean Government Should Act, Trump Administration Lacks Policy on North Korea," *JoongAng Ilbo*, January 31, 2017, <<http://news.joins.com/article/21191341>>. (date accessed June 9, 2017) [In Korean].
- Lake, Eli. "Trump Said No to Troops in Syria. His Aides Aren't So Sure." *Bloomberg*, April 14, 2017, <<https://www.bloomberg.com/view/articles/2017-04-13/trump-said-no-to-troops-in-syria-his-aides-aren-t-so-sure>>. (date accessed April 18, 2017).
- Lee, Alex Soohoon and Sung-han Kim. "The Neoconservative Approach to North Korea: Its Prospects under the next US Administration," *Korean Journal of Defense Analysis*, vol. 27, no. 4 (2015): 435-452.
- Lee, Alex Soohoon. "Neoconservatism: Its Status and Prospects," *Journal of International*

- Politics*, vol. 20, no. 2 (2015): 163-193.
- Leung, Rebecca. "Bush Sought 'Way' To Invade Iraq?: O'Neill Tells '60 Minutes' Iraq Was 'Topic A' 8 Months Before 9-11." *CBS News*, January 9, 2004, <<http://www.cbsnews.com/news/bush-sought-way-to-invade-iraq/>>. (date accessed April 5, 2017).
- Lind, Michael. "The American Creed: Does It Matter? Should It Change?" *Foreign Affairs*, vol. 75, no. 2, (1996): 135-139.
- Longworth, Richard C. "Disaffected rust belt voters embraced Trump. They had no other hope." *The Guardian*, November 21, 2016, <<https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2016/nov/21/disaffected-rust-belt-voters-embraced-donald-trump-midwestern-obama>>. (date accessed April 15, 2017).
- Margolin, Emma. "Make America Great Again—Who Said It First?" *NBC News*, September 9, 2016, <<http://www.nbcnews.com/politics/2016-election/make-america-great-again-who-said-it-first-n645716>>. (date accessed March 20, 2017).
- Miller, Aaron David. "The 'axis of evil' is back." *CNN*, April 26, 2017. <<http://edition.cnn.com/2017/04/26/opinions/axis-of-evil-is-back-miller-sokolsky/>>. (date accessed April 28, 2017).
- Navarro, Peter. "The Trump Doctrine: 'peace through strength'." *The National Interest*, March 31, 2016, <<http://nationalinterest.org/feature/the-trump-doctrine-peace-through-strength-15631>>. (date accessed March 3, 2017).
- Perry, William J. "In Search of a North Korea Policy." *The Washington Post*, October 11, 2006, <<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/10/10/AR2006101001285.html>>. (date accessed April 29, 2017).
- Phillips, Tom. "China 'seriously concerned' after Trump questions Taiwan policy." *The Guardian*, December 12, 2016, <<https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2016/dec/12/donald-trump-questions-us-commitment-to-one-china-policy>>. (date accessed March 28, 2017).
- Reagan, Ronald. "Address to the Nation on National Security." *speech*, Washington D.C., February 26, 1986. Reagan 2020.US, <http://reagan2020.us/speeches/address_on_national_security.asp>.
- Reif, Kingston. "Trump Nuclear Tweet Sparks Controversy." *Arms Control Today*, January 11, 2017, <https://www.armscontrol.org/ACT/2017_01/News/Trump-Nuclear-Tweet-Sparks-Controversy>. (date accessed April 1, 2017).
- Snyder, Scott. "Can China Meet President Trump's Expectations On North Korea?"

Forbes, May 2, 2017, <<https://www.forbes.com/sites/scottasnyder/2017/05/02/can-china-meet-president-trumps-expectations-on-north-korea/#679f566e7181>>. (date accessed May 4, 2017).

The Guardian (US). "Syria chemical attack has changed my view of Assad, says Trump." *The Guardian* (US). April 6, 2017, <<https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2017/apr/05/syria-chemical-gas-attack-donald-trump-nikki-haley-assad>>. (date accessed April 19, 2017).

The New York Times (Washington). "Transcript and Video: Trump Speaks about Strikes in Syria." *The New York Times* (Washington). April 6, 2017 <<https://www.nytimes.com/2017/04/06/world/middleeast/transcript-video-trump-airstrikes-syria.html?mcubz=1>>. (date accessed April 12, 2017).

The White House, "America First." Washington D.C. <<https://www.whitehouse.gov/america-first-foreign-policy>> (date accessed April 28, 2017).

Tobin, Jonathan. "The Power of a Trump Tweet." *Commentary*, January 4, 2017, <<https://www.commentarymagazine.com/politics-ideas/power-trump-tweet/>>. (date accessed April 20, 2017).

Tocqueville, Alexis de. *Democracy in America*. New York, Doubleday, 1696.

Tweeter. "Donald Trump." <<https://twitter.com/realdonaldtrump/>> (date accessed March 20, 2017).

Tumulty, Kevin. "How Donald Trump came up with 'Make America Great Again'." *The Washington Post*, January 18, 2017, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/how-donald-trump-came-up-with-make-america-great-again/2017/01/17/fb6acf5e-dbf7-11e6-ad42-f3375f271c9c_story.html?utm_term=.04eb120947b8>. (date accessed March 20, 2017).

United States of America. *The National Security Strategy of the United States 2002*. <<http://nssarchive.us/national-security-strategy-2002/>> (date accessed March 1, 2017).

Walt, Stephen M. "The Myth of American Exceptionalism." *Foreign policy*, October 11, 2011, <<http://foreignpolicy.com/2011/10/11/the-myth-of-american-exceptionalism/>>. (date accessed April 20, 2017).

Wasiński, Marek. "Donald Trump's Foreign Policy Stances in the Election Campaign: Unpredictability and Neo-isolationism." *PISM*, June 16, 2016, <<http://www.pism.pl/publications/bulletin/no-37-887>>. (date accessed May 1, 2017).

Yonhap News, "[The First Month of Trump Administration] How Experts see the first month of Trump Administration," *Yonhap News*, February 19, 2017, <<http://www.yonhapnews.co.kr/bulletin/2017/02/17/0200000000AKR20170217173>>

300014.HTML?input=1195m>. (date accessed June 9, 2017) [In Korean].

9/11 Memorial, "FAQ about 9/11," <www.911memorial.org> (date accessed April 1, 2017).