

Received : 03 February 2024, Accepted: 07 March 2024

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33282/rr.vx9i2.33>

Level of Analysis and Inter-Korean Relations: Unraveling Complex Dynamics

Ghulam Murtaza¹, Dr. Tayba Anwar², Dr. Sidra karamat³, Muhammad Waleed Mazhar⁴,
Dr. Ghulam Mustafa⁵,

1. M.Phil. Scholar, Department of International Relations, Government College University Faisalabad.

2. Lecturer, Department of Political science and International Relations, Government College Women University Faisalabad, Punjab, Pakistan

3. Visiting lecturer, Department of Political science and International Relations, Government College Women University Faisalabad.

4. BS Scholar, Department of International Relations, Government College University Faisalabad

5. Associate Professor, Department of International Relations, Government College University Faisalabad.

Correspondence: ghulammustafa@gcuf.edu.pk

Abstract

Historical, political, and sociocultural forces have long moulded the complex dynamics that characterise interactions between Koreas. The complexity of these relationships is examined in this research through the use of a level of analysis approach. In order to provide a thorough knowledge of the dynamics impacting inter-Korean relationships, this study applies many levels of analysis, including the individual, state, and systemic levels. The article examines how influential figures, both individually and collectively, shape inter-Korean policies and efforts. At the state level, the study looks at how internal politics in North and South Korea affect relations between the two Koreas. The study examines the larger regional and global framework that inter-Korean interactions function within on a systemic level. It takes into account the dynamics of regional security, including the existence of nuclear weapons on the Korean Peninsula, as well as the impact of nearby nations like China, Japan, and the United States.

Key Words: Level of Analysis Approach, Inter- Korean Relations, USA

Introduction

This research aims to provide a nuanced view of the complexity inherent in inter-Korean relations by utilising a level of analysis methodology. It draws attention to the way that internal politics, international dynamics, and individual agency combine to shape the course of North-South relations. The study's ultimate goal is to offer knowledge that can help develop more potent plans for advancing harmony, stability, and peace on the Korean Peninsula. This research takes a gander at the level of analysis approach and Inter-Korea relations, another way to deal with clarifying the bewildering conduct of Korean Politics. The model demonstrates that South Korea's collusion strategies are driven by two causal factors. To start with, North Korea is a prompting power for South Korea to stay as a solid US cooperation accomplice. This urges Seoul to keep up participation with Washington in far reaching cooperation undertakings. Second, South Korea's arrangements are probably going to mirror the way the country sees how helpful China is in subduing North Korea. The apparent helpfulness of China makes Seoul suit China and lessening collaboration with the USA. This may strain the association with the USA should South Korea sidestep cooperation missions that may run in opposition to China's security advantages.

The main purpose and objective of this research study is to analyze the role of US in the Politics of Korean Politics. Another objective of this study is to analyze the impact of changing relations on the regional apparatus. It will also be helpful for searching policy guidelines for US to improve their relations and to maintain security and peace in Korean Peninsula.

The first part of this research deals with the brief information about the issue. It also throws light on the need of the research, Objectives of the research. Research Questions also has been elucidated in this section. Keeping in view of Trump's policy towards Korean Peninsula it becomes vital to elaborate United States Relations with South and North Korea during his period. This study would give some suggestions in this regard to policy makers. The Geo-Political significance of Republic of Korea in Asia-Pacific region shall reaffirm the alliance between the two countries. The Second section deals with literature review. The data that was collected and reviewed had some limitations. It provided scant information regarding the topic.

But these data sources were also useful in the conduct of research according to the research objectives and research questions. The next and main section is related to the conceptual framework. Level of analysis approach has been applied on Inter-Korean relations. The last section consists of research findings, analysis and recommendations. There cannot be sudden explanation behind close coordination to be focused against a regional nation, such relations would give a level of preparedness in an adequate manner to react to the rise of dangers notwithstanding their cause. A cooperation on interest based exhaustive relationship together may establish the framework for participation with similar nations on missions that serve same interests, both inside and past Northeast Asia.

Research Question

How do the Individual, State and system factors affect the relations of the two Koreas?

Research Methodology

As the topic deals with an historic explanation in the arena of politics, so descriptive research methods are used along with alternate sources to have a larger and compendious picture of the relations among US and Korean Peninsula states. The research has been followed through on the set approaches of social sciences, Descriptive research to precede with, progress to arrive at the conclusion. For this purpose, qualitative method has been used. Reviews of existing literature, availability of secondary data has been consulted to get a broader perspective on this topic to get better result and overview. In order to get secondary data different institutions has been visited like libraries of different universities and public libraries and books have been consulted and all related articles.

Developing a theoretical framework regarding the U.S. role in South and North Korean politics involves considering various perspectives, historical contexts, and geopolitical dynamics.

Here's a framework that takes into account key factors shaping the U.S. role in the Korean Peninsula:

Inter-State Relations and the Level of Analysis Approach

From the Greek Aristotle to the Florentine Machiavelli inter-state relations have occupied the minds of philosophers and scholars alike and the debate still continues among the academics and practitioners of statecraft. Some scholars view the harmonious relations among state as the natural course while the contrary opinion is that conflict is inevitable for a number of reasons. Human nature has been singled out by some writers as the *casus belli* for the antagonistic relations among states. Other contributes it to the nature of states while for others the ordering principle is the prevalent anarchy of the global politics. It is still ongoing debate among scholars and where Morton Kaplan emphasizes the centrality of state, Waltz puts premium on the system level approach. Consequently this chapter explores the nature of this theoretical debate to provide a template for this research.

Inter-state relations have been the subject of debate among scholars of IR with the avowed premise to explain and predict their interactions for better or worse. Realists endeavor to explicate the underlying sources of frictions and hostilities among and between nations by locating the causes of explanation and to offer solutions for improving matters and ushering an era of peaceful and harmonious relations among them. These scholars assign priority to the matters of security, survival and power considerations. They argue that nation-states are central actors and they pursue national self-interests with the objective to maximize their share of world power in anarchic surroundings. Power considerations in an anarchic world lies at the core of the realist school of thought. The central tenet of their argument is that states compete with each

other for power which most often leads to conflictual relations among them. However, there is shade of differences among realists which is characterized by classical realism and neo-realism. Classical realism accords primary role to human nature for explaining frictions and conflicts among nations, structural realism emphasizes the role of systemic factors for the same. The main exponent of structural realism, Kenneth Waltz investigates and explains the nature and causes of conflicts and wars among states in his celebrated book, *Man, the State and War*, by analyzing it at three levels. Elaborating his theoretical framework through the concept of structural realism, which according to Waltz constraints state behavior and the states that can survive are those whose outcomes fall within an expected range¹. Structural realism or neorealism in a sense can be likened to the microeconomic principle that stipulates that the prices set by firms are determined by the market and the behavior of other market players². Waltz has emphasized that neorealism is a departure from the old principles of classical realism because of the systemic image which in a way explains the anarchical and reproductive nature of international relations in a more definite sense. While he emphasizes the international level for explaining the causes of conflict he does not dismiss the other two levels out of hand. In rhetorical tone Waltz asks, “Where are the major causes of war to be found?” and then answers, “within man, within the structure of the separate states, within the system.”³ He calls them the three images of international relations and argues that collectively these images provide a venue for understanding the interactions of states.

¹ Kenneth Waltz, *Theory of International Politics* (United States of America: Waveland Press, 1979)

² Robert H. Frank, *Microeconomics and Behavior*, 5th Ed., (Princeton University Press, 2002)

³ Kenneth Waltz, *Man, the State and War*, (New York: Columbia University Press, 2001), 12.

Human sufferings and afflictions are undoubtedly caused by human nature which according to some philosophers is inherently wicked and selfish. Man is the combination of both reason and passion and most often passion gets the better of him with tragic consequences. As everything is first conceived inside man's mind so as the aggressive designs and the occurrences of war and conflicts are the outcome of man's malicious intentions and hostile tendencies. In Waltz's view the writings of Reinhold Niebuhr, St. Augustine, Spinoza and Hans Morgenthau reflect the basic underlying assumption that political process are the outcome of man's nature. "Spinoza's explanation of political and social ills is," Waltz quotes, "based on the conflict he detects between reason and passion," while for Niebuhr the fountainhead of conflict and war lies in 'dark, unconscious sources in the human psyche.'⁴ Reasoning on the same lines Morgenthau also observes that "the ubiquity of evil in human action is driven by man's lust for power which transforms churches into political organizations...revolutions into dictatorships...love for country into imperialism."⁵ This statement conveys the underlined logic that frictions and conflicts can be attributed to the vanity and villainy of human nature. Agreeing with the aforementioned four scholars Waltz infers that historical narrative cannot be separated from the humans who set these events in motion.

Political machinations, governmental intrigues and the necessity to orchestrate balances of power are the outcome of man's contrivances. In similar vein Kennan remarks about the business of government as a "sorry chore...devolving upon civilized society, most unfortunately, as a result of man's irrational nature, his selfishness, his obstinacy, his tendency to violence."⁶

⁴ Ibid., 24-25.

⁵ Hans Morgenthau, *Scientific Man*, pp. 194-195, he further asserts: "The test of political success is the degree to which one is able to maintain, to increase, or to demonstrate one's power over others."

⁶ George Kennan, *Realities of American Foreign Policy* (New York: Norton, 1954) 48.

The evil nature of man is the *raison d'être* of the sorry state of affairs. The vicious and incessant drive for power and prestige are embedded in human character and temperament. The analysis of first-image proponents, according to Waltz, is that for them the “cause of political arrangements and acts are found in the nature and behavior of man.”⁷ However, for Waltz only human nature is an insufficient explanation for the occurrences of conflicts and wars among nations. He attempted in his work to give a new direction to the realist tradition of such scholars as Niebuhr and Morgenthau. Accordingly he rejected the notion that the “fixed nature of man” is the sole cause for inter-state conflicts. Thus, he faulted the arguments of both Niebuhr and Morgenthau who argued that all the conflicts originate from the evil nature of man. Waltz’s reasoning is in tune with that of Durkheim and upholds the view that human nature alone cannot be the mono-causal explanation when it is employed to elucidate a host of political marvels.⁸ In his view, ‘human nature may in some sense have been the cause of war in 1914, but by the same token it was the cause of peace in 1910.’⁹ Thus, reductionist reasoning is inconclusive for plausible explanation. He, then, proceeds to evaluate the role of states in the world politics. As states are primary actors in the international system it is their interaction which affects the question of war and peace.

Inter-State Relations and the Second Level Approach

Selfish or selfless, human actions occur within the confines of specific social and political settings. Such frameworks have a defining impact on the unfolding of political events. In other words, political structures determine the directions and nature of man’s undertakings and

⁷ Waltz, *Man, the State and War*, 42.

⁸ Emile Durkheim. *Rules of Sociological Method*. (London: Macmillan, 1982).

⁹ Waltz, *Man, the State and War*, 28.

endeavors. At other times statesmen strive to seek an external scaffolding to prop up internal structure. To overcome internal challenges rulers resort to external strategies and undertake the enterprises of war and conflict.¹⁰ The underscored assumption is that the internal structure of state determines its external behavior. This results in the concept of good and bad states, a theme which raises considerable debate and disagreements among scholars and experts.¹¹ They predicate cooperative and harmonious relations among state on the prescription to reform the internal structures of states. This view of global politics is the *sine qua non* of the liberal tradition in the field of IR. However, liberals do believe that states are the main protagonists on the world stage with the responsibilities to provide for the defense of its citizens and territorial integrity. States resort to war to remedy wrongs and uphold the cause of justice.

Paradoxically states wage wars to arrive at peace and thus peace become the cause of war. “Liberalism, which is preeminently the philosophy of tolerance, of humanity, and of doubt,” in Waltz’s view, “develops a hubris of its own.”¹² Consequently, the notions of peace and war are the results of both good and bad states, Waltz argues. Driven by the pursuit of national interests and power maximization states wage wars and sue for peace. Because of the anarchical international system, states are compelled to resort to force in their quest for security and self-preservation. Mutual suspicion and the lack of a supreme universal authority also make the pursuit of self-help absolutely imperative. Consequently, the international system, Hans

¹⁰ For instance Bodin argues that faced by internal strife, states seek war to bring about internal peace, he writes, “the best way of preserving a state, and guaranteeing against sedition, rebellion, and civil war is to keep the subjects in amity one with other, and to this end, to find an enemy against whom they can make common cause,” *Six Books of the Commonwealth*, tr. Tooley, p. 168.

¹¹ For instance for Karl Marx the epithet ‘good’ is related with the ownership of the means of production, for Immanuel Kant it represents the abstract principles of right while Woodrow Wilson views it in terms of self-determination and democratic organizations.

¹² Quoting R. H. Tawney, he writes, “Either war is a crusade, or it is a crime. There is no half-way house,” *Man, the State and War*, 111.

Morgenthau concludes is a persistent state of “struggle for power.”¹³ But for Waltz it is the ideological factor which plays a paramount role in giving direction to the policies of the state. Liberalism and Marxism become the two dominant focal point of his critique. But relying on ideology as the source of explanation for state behavior has serious limitations where the sole objective of state is to ensure its survival by seeking security through power maximization. He contends that the parallel existence of liberal and illiberal states ultimately frustrates the objective to arrive at the peaceful utopia. The collusion between the Imperialist and Marxists during WW I and II renders their ideals moot. In Waltz’s opinion the realization of these ideologies require a global consensus which is highly improbable. For, “adherence to principle invites defeat at the hands of the unprincipled”.¹⁴ Thus, finding the first two images inadequate for explaining the underlying causes of inter-state conflicts, he proceeds to critically evaluate and asses the third image.

Inter-State Relations and the Third Level Approach

Evidently security lies at the core of states objective, a concept which is the central argument of Waltz’s thesis and explained by his third level of analysis. His analysis of the third or systemic level is borne out of an analysis of the nature of theory. In contrast to laws, theories provide a good description of the associations that characterize how a system operates. It therefore explains why the systemic approach is the most ideal way to understanding the complex structure of the international order of states¹⁵. The systemic level therefore enhances a

¹³ Hans Morgenthau, *Politics among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace* (New York: Alfred A Knopf, 1982), 31.

¹⁴ Campbell Craig, *Glimmer of a New Leviathan* (New York: Columbia University Press 2013), 46.

¹⁵ Ibid.

better connection between the individual variables and the principal whole¹⁶. The state's primacy as a major actor in the anarchical system is well explained by the level of analysis. Some critics have however denounced Waltz's theoretical approach for being too narrow, ahistorical and conservative in its scope.

The fundamental definitive element in the anarchical system, Waltz says "security is the highest end" of the state¹⁷. The prevailing sense of anarchy in the collective system is the outcome of uncertainty and lack of order amongst states, which gives rise to the self-preservation through self-help. But the trouble with the self-help mechanism is that it does nothing in real terms to mitigate the central problem of uncertainty which reproduces insecurity amongst other actors within the system. Balance of power is therefore enacted in response to addressing this sense of security dilemma that dogs the international community of states.

Kenneth Waltz cites pacts like the Allied Powers and the Concert of Europe as good examples of how alliances driven by mutual interests can be transient. Alliances, after they have run their full course will have to dissolve and states are left with the only option of relying on self-help because of a return to the climate of uncertainty. As the actions of Nazi Germany in 1939 amply proves, states will be driven by their security needs to embark on unilateral actions. The Soviet Union embarked on a similar unilateral move to sweep through much of Eastern Europe in response to similar American moves throughout the Cold War period. The system analysis therefore sets these actions in perspective as deeply rooted in realism.

¹⁶ Ewan Harrison, "Waltz, Kant and systemic approaches to international relations," *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 28, No. 1 (January 2002): 143-162.

¹⁷ . Waltz, *Theory of International politics*, 105.

Liberal scholars like Ken Booth, in a related argument contend that there is “security in anarchy.¹⁸” The crust of his argument is that the international state of anarchy regulates the mistrust that Waltz so forcefully asserts¹⁹. Liberals also point to global governance as structural construction of institutions, laws and procedures that facilitates interdependence. For interdependence to be given life, trust cannot be overlooked, which takes Waltz to task for overlooking in his systemic analysis.

Waltz’s analysis according to liberals, completely presents a limited ontology of the state. States, in the mind of Waltz are driven by the same interests irrespective of their ideological underpinnings. A state’s ideological orientation will not in any way limit its decision to resort to force in the pursuit of its security²⁰. The internal composition of a state does not materially impact how the big system functions, according to Waltz.

Besides, by the tenets of the Westphalian doctrine “the monopoly of the legitimate use of force within a given territory” is the exclusive preserve of the state²¹. The state according to Frederick Northedge is largely an abstraction that is wedded to a territory and the capacity to enforce sovereignty and authority within that space, is yet one of the core distinctive features of a state²². From the sociological perspective, a state is largely administrative in its disposition and

¹⁸ Ken Booth, ‘Security in Anarchy: Utopian Realism in Theory and Practice’, *International Affairs*, Vol. 67, No. 3 (1991): 527-545.

¹⁹ Hedley Bull, *The Anarchical Society A Study of Order in World Politics*, London: Macmillan, 1977).

²⁰ Timothy Dunne, ‘Realism’, in Centre for Defence & Strategic Studies 1.2.1. Theories of International Relations Reader, Deakin University, Geelong, 114-116, argues statism is central to Realism Paul Viotti & Mark Kauppi, *International Relations Theory Realism, Pluralism, Globalism, and Beyond*, Allyn & Bacon, Boston, 1999, pp.84-85, claims the state is the Centre piece of Realism.

²¹ Ibid.

²² Frederick Northedge, *Foreign Policies of the Powers* (New York: The Free Press,1974)

less of territorial²³. The role of non-state actors in the calculation of state security has been enormously downplayed by Waltz's system analysis which liberals find very troubling. In the wake of this perceived shortcoming, Fred Halliday calls for a revision of the definition of a state,²⁴ because of what he believes to be a wholesale acceptance of Frederick Northedge's definition by most realist scholars of international relations.

Other liberal critics have decried the binary survival/security approach to international relations, which they claim is a major Westphalian conceptual weakness. This weakness, they charge amounts to a convenient disregard of the competing and often times overlapping centers of authority within a particular territorial area²⁵. Other agitators recommend a sociological approach to addressing the ontological questions of statehood in the systemic structure²⁶. For Barry Buzan, the Westphalian concept has outlived its usefulness in the post-Cold War dispensation²⁷. Ultimately, the liberalists scholarship cited in the preceding sections all have a single goal of providing a different description of how states are viewed within the systemic level of analysis espoused by neorealists and realists.

How states are organized domestically has also been cited as one of the core challenges of the systemic analysis. Suffice to cite the views of the liberal democratic peace theory school of thought to advance my point here. At the heart of their thesis is a strong belief that liberal

²³ Theda Skocpol, *States and Social Revolutions* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979)

²⁴ Fred Halliday (1994), *Rethinking International Relations* (London: Macmillan, 1994), 78.

²⁵ Darel Paul, "Sovereignty, survival and the Westphalian Blind Alley in International Relations", *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 25, No. 2, (1999): 217-231.

²⁶ John .M. Hobson "The 'second state debate' in International Relations: theory turned upside-down", *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 27, No. 3, (2001):395-414.

²⁷ Barry Buzan, & Richard Little, "Beyond Westphalia? Capitalism after the Fall", *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 25, (December 1999): 89-104 in *The End of the World As We Know It Reader*, Deakin University, Geelong.

democratic states never engage each other in military aggression. Bruce Russett, one of its leading proponents, confidently asserts that there is little evidence of wars between liberal democratic states since 1815²⁸. Similarly, Michael Doyle posits that when liberal democracies are compelled to choose sides in any conflict are often more inclined to fight against undemocratic states as opposed to the other way round²⁹ which Jack Levy concurs by definitively concluding that this thesis is “as close as anything we have to an empirical law in international relations.”³⁰

This statement in many ways leans credence to the importance of the internal organization of states and how they impact the international system as opposed to their outright dismissal by realist scholar Kenneth Waltz. A basic reductionist inference of this theory thus suggests that it is highly conceivable that a day is coming when wars will be utterly eliminated from the world and the human experience by extension. By getting more states to be organized internally along the lines of liberal democracies then we will be well on our way to transforming the radical anarchical international system into a peaceable enclave of goodwill. To which Waltz says “if the democratic peace thesis is right, structural realist theory is wrong.”³¹

²⁸ Bruce Russett (1996) “The Fact of Liberal democratic Peace” & ‘Why the Liberal Peace?’ in Brown, M. Lynn-Jones, S.M. & Miller, S (eds), *Debating the Democratic Peace*, MIT, 1996. Information from Richard Shapcott, ‘The World As We Know It: A War System?’, in *The End of the World As We Know It Study Guide*, Deakin University, Geelong, p.6.

²⁹ Michael Doyle, “Liberalism and World Politics”, *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 80, No. 4, (1986): 1152.

³⁰ Jack Levy, ‘The Causes of War: A Review of Theories and Evidence’, in Philip Tetlock et al (eds), *Behaviour, Society, and Nuclear War*, Vol. 1, Oxford University Press, New York, 1989, p.270. Information from Charles Kegley, *Controversies in International Relations Theory: Realism and the Neoliberal Challenge*, (New York: St Martins Press, 1995) 10.

³¹ Kenneth Waltz, “Structural Realism after the Cold War”, *International Security*, Vol. 25, No. 1, (Summer 2000): 5-41

Thus said, Waltz has raised three principal difficulties with this sacrosanct democratic peace theory thesis. He is quick to remind readers that at the conclusion of every war lies the strong desire for peace which often times manifests itself into groundless utopianism. He also takes issue with the monochromatic definition of what constitutes democracy as the adherents of the peace theory would have us believe. The case of Wilhelmine Germany as democracy comes to mind. Did the France and Britain of post-1914 consider Germany as such or not? Leading Waltz to conclude that democracy is a product of perception—one that is determined by strong states. The United States for the most part of the Cold War actively and covertly intervened in the domestic activities of other states including the Dominican Republic and Chile, which were democracies in the classical sense.

Finally, liberal democratic states continue to engage non democratic states in wars, such as American military intervention in Vietnam, Iraq and Korea. It stands to reason that power is the basic denominator of the democratic peace thesis as opposed to the misleading reference to democracy. Evidently, the two most powerful states in the world over the last couple of centuries have been Britain and the United States, which are both liberal democracies and therefore discredits the democratic peace theory.

There is yet another school of thought that economic factors are the key elements that define the national interests of states. Therefore the collective interests of all states makes it absolutely imperative for them to cooperate which leads to economic interdependence and by extension reducing the motivation for conflicts. But this overly simplistic analysis overlooks a deeper concern about the inclination of states to pursue their economic interests to the detriment of other states through forms such as beggar they neighbor policies. Economic interdependence

also puts less powerful states at the mercy of the more powerful states, because of the inherently unequal nature of economic relations amongst states. The less powerful state thus becomes vulnerable and uncertain about the nature of the interdependence which thus feeds into the security dilemma with its possibility of going down the path of confrontation.

A system analysis approach therefore provides a more holistic account of these seemingly naive conceptions of security as espoused by liberalist scholars, chief of which are the proponents of the democratic peace theory. Interdependence and the clustered concept of democracy are rather viewed as elements of domination by the powerful against the weak under a self-delusional position of universal truths.

Suffice to revisit what the first image analysis says about the causes of conflict and war. It contends strongly that human nature is the primary sources of war by pointing to all the various human shortcomings. For Thucydides “it is a general and necessary law of nature to rule whatever one can;”³² which leads to the conclusion that power is the driver of the behavior of human beings. In the same breadth Hans Morgenthau concedes that it is the absence of morality and the primacy of power that defines the relations between states on the international stage. Arguably, human nature therefore makes war the very essence of our being, is how Morgenthau concludes. The role of individuals and for that matter, statesmen, in shaping international relations is not accepted within the systemic analysis theory. For instance Kenneth Waltz contends that “the balance of power is not so much imposed by statesmen on events as it is imposed by events on statesmen.” The first image analysis is therefore seen as very metaphysical

³² Ibid.

in the eyes of Kenneth Waltz. In other words, regardless of how the individual nature is formed, the international system functions all the same.

Interaction of State and System Level

Finally, as has been explained all through this section, the systemic analysis with its roots firmly in the neorealism is able to offer a more general account of the complex interconnected strands of the international system. Yet, it remains very vulnerable to criticism because of the extent to which it downplays important variables such as those at the unit level. As this section has explained, this is further expressed in how it conceives the state and its functions in the international system. It assigns minimal role to the domestic organization of states in influencing outcomes on the international stage.

Relations between the two Koreas and US can be comprehended by investigating them at both the state and system level. These two factors are playing pivotal roles as the change at the level of leadership has not affected the nature of their relations in any substantial way. The internal organization of both North and South Korea is making it difficult for both states to overcome their mutual suspicions. Examining the different political structures of both North and South Korea is crucial for untangling the antagonistic relations between the two states.

Seeking security is the paramount objective of any state in the anarchic global system and the states under study are no exception to the rule. Ensuring its survival through enhanced security is vigorously pursued by North Korea. Systemic level constraints are driving the security policies of both states. These internal and external factors have been investigated and analyzed in detail to grasp their role in the bilateral relation of these countries.

Conclusion

To sum up, the level of analysis technique provides a useful framework for comprehending the intricacies of connections between Koreas. Through an analysis of interactions at the individual, state, and systemic levels, we are able to make sense of the complex variables that affect diplomatic ties on the Korean Peninsula. Important decision-makers and leaders play a crucial role in influencing inter-Korean policies on an individual basis. Comprehending their histories, convictions, and driving forces aids in clarifying the reasoning for diplomatic attempts and the likelihood of peace. At the state level, internal politics are a major factor in determining inter-Korean ties. North and South Korea's aims and plans are influenced by elements such national interests, ideological inclination, and regime stability. Furthermore, the two Koreas' economic relations underscore the intricate relationship between politics and economy by fostering both collaboration and conflict. Inter-Korean ties are further complicated at the systemic level by regional and global events. The chances of peace and stability on the Korean Peninsula are greatly impacted by the influence of surrounding nations, especially China, Japan, and the United States, as well as more general security concerns such nuclear proliferation. Overall, the level of analysis method highlights how different elements influencing inter-Korean ties are interrelated. Through the examination of many levels of interaction, analysts and policymakers can formulate more sophisticated approaches aimed at fostering communication, collaboration, and ultimately, peace between North and South Korea. Nonetheless, it's critical to acknowledge the inherent difficulties and unknowns involved in navigating this intricate geopolitical environment, highlighting the necessity of persistent diplomatic efforts and global collaboration in resolving the protracted tensions on the Korean Peninsula.