Responses to North Korea’s nuclear programme and missile threat have involved heated rhetoric between Kim Jong-un and Donald Trump.

70 years on, the historic partition of British-ruled India and the decades-long enmity between the two nations has left lasting scars.

With three national elections in one month, the complexities of politics in Sub-Saharan Africa are considered.

Project DOTA supports discipleship training for pastors in three countries in Asia.

## Responding to North Korea’s Missile Threat

*By Andrew Richards*

US Secretary of State Rex Tillerson on Monday [7 August] ruled out a quick return to dialogue with North Korea, as he said new UN sanctions showed the world had run out of patience with Pyongyang’s nuclear weapons ambitions. Speaking to reporters at a security forum in the Philippine capital, Tillerson said Washington would only consider talks if Pyongyang halted its ballistic missile programme — something the North has insisted it has no intention of doing. Tillerson’s remarks followed a rare exchange on Sunday between the foreign ministers of the two Koreas on the side-lines of the Manila forum, during which the North’s Ri Yong-Ho showed no signs his nation had been intimidated by the latest rounds of sanctions. (Associated Press)

### Why nuclear weapons?

Why would North Korea want nuclear weapons in the first place? Analysts have drawn a comparison between Kim Jong-un and the late Libyan leader Muammar Gaddafi. In December 2003, Gaddafi announced his country’s disarmament relating to all weapons of mass destruction (WMDs), including chemical weapons and ballistic missiles. The 2011 toppling of the Gaddafi regime and his subsequent murder is perceived to be a direct result of his decision to disarm the country. The Jong-Un regime believes that the US wanted to remove Gaddafi from power, but was unable (or unwilling) to do so because of the country’s WMD capabilities that would lead to the possible deaths of countless civilians. Once Gaddafi disarmed his country, there was nothing standing in the way of his removal. Kim Jong-Un may be convinced that the same fate awaits him if he gives in to the pressure of disarming. If North Korea possessed ballistic missiles capable of delivering nuclear warheads to the US and elsewhere, the belief is that world leaders would think twice before trying to remove the North Korean leader.

**Sanctions**

Sanctions against North Korea are nothing new, and the latest round could be interpreted as just that: nothing new. However, US President Donald Trump has made a point of trying to leverage the support of Chinese President Xi Jinping to help restrain its neighbour. So just how much are sanctions really hurting North Korea? It’s interesting to note that every time sanctions were placed on North Korea, the more determined they became, and the more they succeeded in their nuclear ambitions, to the point where they are now considered an existential threat to US allies, South Korea and Japan, as well as the US itself.

According to the Arms Control Association, faced with North Korea’s announced intention in 1994 to withdraw from the nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty (NPT), the US and North Korea signed the ‘Agreed Framework’ that involved Pyongyang committing to freezing its illicit plutonium weapons programme in exchange for aid. Following the collapse of this agreement in 2002, North Korea withdrew from the NPT in January 2003 and once again began operating its nuclear facilities. The second major diplomatic effort was the ‘Six-Party Talks’ initiated in August 2003, which involved China, Japan, North Korea, Russia, South Korea and the US. In between periods of stalemate and crisis, those talks reached a critical breakthrough in 2005, when North Korea pledged to freeze its nuclear weapons programme. Following the collapse of this agreement in 2005, North Korea was willing to remove the US nuclear weapons programme and return to the NPT. In 2007, the parties agreed on a series of steps to implement that agreement in 2009. Negotiations, however, broke down in 2009 following disagreements over verification and an internationally-condemned North Korean rocket launch. Pyongyang has since stated that it would never return to the talks and is no longer bound by their former agreements.

**Evading sanctions**

North Korea has cunningly evaded sanctions for years, allowing its economy to continue and increasing its nuclear capabilities to the point where world powers are now saying ‘enough is enough’. How does North Korea do it? China’s unwillingness...
Indian and Chinese military forces are reported to be preparing for the possibility of an armed conflict over a disputed area in the Himalayas should a peaceful solution not be found. The standoff began two months ago when Indian troops confronted Chinese forces working on a road over the Doklam Plateau, a strategically important area which both China and Bhutan (an ally of India) lay claim to.

Even though a pre-emptive strike against North Korean nuclear facilities would guarantee thousands of artillery rounds being fired at Seoul, resulting in mass casualties, the Trump administration has said it would consider a military solution if North Korea does not halt its testing of ballistic missiles.

FROM A CHRISTIAN PERSPECTIVE
When we look at the world in chaos, or a nuclear threat from North Korea, the automatic response is to ask God to intervene. In Matthew 14:16, the disciples came to Jesus saying there were 5,000 people that needed feeding. Jesus answered them: “You give them something to eat”. What if, when we ask God to intervene in conflict around the world, He responds by saying: “You intervene”?

PRAY > For Godly wisdom in seeking alternative solutions to the ongoing tension > For China to make a breakthrough in their dealings with NK > For an outpouring of the Spirit upon the people of NK, leading many coming to Christ

INDIA–PAKISTAN: 70 YEARS AFTER PARTITION

National flags were hawked at traffic lights and the Indian parliament was illuminated as India prepared to celebrate the 70th anniversary of its independence. Above Pakistan’s capital, Islamabad, this weekend, air force jets left a multicoloured trail as they reharced for the largest air show in the country’s history on Monday, when it celebrated its own creation in 1947. Indian prime minister Narendra Modi led the celebrations in India on Tuesday with a traditional speech from the Red Fort in Delhi, where the country’s first leader, Jawaharlal Nehru, oversaw the lowering of the Union Jack 70 years ago at the stroke of midnight on 15 August. The new prime minister of Pakistan, Shahid Khaqan Abbasi, also oversaw a flag-hoisting ceremony at the country’s parliament followed by a military parade and a 31-gun salute. (The Guardian)

The historic partition
70 years on, the partition of British-ruled India into two countries (Pakistan was ‘created’ on 14 August 1947, and India received independence from Britain at midnight on the 15th) has left lasting scars that are still felt today. Shashi Tharoor, author and chair of India’s Foreign Affairs Committee, described the partition as follows: “Friendships were destroyed, families ruined, geography hacked, history misread, tradition denied, minds and hearts torn apart.”

How did it all happen? For more than two centuries, Britain had a controlling presence in India. In 1857, India came under direct British rule, and during the era of the ‘Raj’ it was considered to be “the jewel in Britain’s imperial crown”. For many years, Indians protested British rule, and Mahatma Gandhi (leader of the Indian National Congress) became famous for leading a non-violent campaign for independence. In 1942, the arrest of Gandhi and other leaders prompted mass demonstrations and violent protests against the British.

Two years earlier, in 1940, Muhammad Ali Jinnah (leader of the Muslim League) had endorsed the creation of a separate state for India’s Muslim minority (30% of the population), claiming that they faced opposition and persecution by the Hindu majority. After WWII ended, Britain was exhausted on various levels, and when sectarian riots and violence broke out in India, the Raj unravelled quickly. The decision to partition India was made in haste, as were the dividing lines that were drawn (by Cyril Radcliffe, a British judge who knew nothing of India’s history or society). Almost overnight, Britain withdrew from India and the Muslim nation of Pakistan was created (divided into West and East Pakistan, which were separated by more than 1,500km of Indian territory).

Martin Luther King once said: “Wars are poor chisels for carving out peaceful tomorrows.” But if military intervention is not an option, what is the Christian alternative?

Ron Sider, an influential voice for Christ-based nonviolence, said the following in a speech at the Mennonite World Conference in 1984: “Unless we are prepared to risk injury and death in nonviolent opposition to the injustice our societies foster, we don’t dare even whisper another word about pacifism to our sisters and brothers in those desperate lands. Unless we are ready to die developing new, nonviolent attempts to reduce international conflict, we should confess that we never really meant the cross was an alternative to the sword. Unless the majority of our people in nuclear nations are ready as congregations to risk social disapproval and government harassment in a clear call to live without nuclear weapons, we should sadly acknowledge that we have betrayed our peacemaking heritage. Making peace is as costly as waging war. Unless we are prepared to pay the cost of peace-making, we have no right to claim the label or preach the message.”
Rejoicing was widespread but short-lived. The lines of the new borders were not revealed until two days after independence, and millions of Muslims, Hindus and Sikhs rushed to be on the ‘right sides’ in a panicked mass migration. Violence – carried out by both Muslims and Hindus – was devastating: between 500,000 and one million people were killed (other estimates place the death toll as high as two million), between 12 and 15 million were displaced from their homes, and billions of rupees worth of property was destroyed. This messy, bloody and violent split cast a shadow on the two nations that is still felt today.

The ripple effects
Since partition, war has broken out between India and Pakistan a number of times. Much of the conflict has centred around the state of Kashmir, which is claimed by both countries. In 1971, violent conflict resulted in East Pakistan becoming a new country, Bangladesh. Even between wars, tensions between India and Pakistan have been high. Analysts in The Economist say that there is “a pattern in [the] mutual harassment: whenever politicians on both sides inch towards peace, something nasty seems to happen”.

Both countries possess more than 100 nuclear warheads each, as well as the missiles needed to deliver them. But while neither seems likely to pay the price of a nuclear war, there have been other costs from the decades-long enmity. The Economist writes that “Pakistan has suffered culturally; barred from its natural subcontinental hinterland [remote regions], it has opened instead to the Arab world, and to the influence of less syncretic and tolerant forms of Islam.” In India’s case, “enmity with Pakistan has fostered a tilt away from secular values towards a more strident identity [nationalist] politics.”

Democracy in Africa—A Work in Progress

Kenya was plunged into political turmoil as the opposition rejected the declaration of President Uhuru Kenyatta as the winner of [the 8 August] election and protests erupted in the capital, Nairobi, and an opposition stronghold in the west. Kenyatta, 55, won about 54 percent of the vote, while his main rival, Raila Odinga, 72, garnered almost 45 percent. The opposition, which boycotted the announcement of the results alleging they were rigged, said the commission flouted counting procedures and failed to provide documents to back up its tallies. 

(Bloomberg)

‘Election month’
With three elections in one month, the complexities of politics in sub-Saharan Africa are on full display this August. Again, the question of whether democracy in Africa is possible (or workable) is being debated, given that many supposedly-democratic African countries are characterised by abysmal human rights abuses, ethnic conflicts, lifelong presidents and economic chaos. But this is not the whole picture in Africa.

Two of the elections (in Rwanda and Kenya) have already been decided, while Angola’s elections are scheduled for 23 August. In Rwanda, there was little doubt that the 59-year-old president Paul Kagame would retain leadership of the nation that he has ruled since the end of the 1994 genocide. On 5 August, Mr Kagame celebrated a third-term victory, after a constitutional amendment referendum permitted Mr Kagame to run for a third, fourth and possibly fifth term (potentially seeing him rule until 2034). Voter turnout was 96.42%, with a resounding 98.63% of votes in favour of Mr Kagame. He is credited (both locally and internationally) with a remarkable turnaround in the shattered nation, which boasts annual economic growth of about 7%; it is safe, clean and has little corruption. Rwanda also has the highest number of female lawmakers in the world. Some rights groups, however, accuse Mr Kagame of ruling through fear and relying on systematic repression of the opposition, free speech and the media.

Although Angola’s long-time leader, President Eduardo dos Santos, has called an end to his 38-year term victory, after a

A 62-year-old Canadian pastor, Hyeon Soo Lim, held in a North Korean prison for more than 2 1/2 years said he was forced to dig holes in frozen ground for two winters.

Nigerian protesters in Lagos and Abuja are demanding President Muhammadu Buhari either resume his job as president or resign, after more than 90 days of absence. He has been undergoing medical treatment in London, for an undisclosed illness. His absences and lack of information have caused tensions in Africa’s most populous nation.
leadership, analysts predict that Angola’s elections will follow a similar pattern to that of Rwanda. Both nations carry recent memories of civil war and failed multi-party democratic processes, and are thus reticent to repeat past failures. President dos Santos’ close ally and successor, defence minister João de Matos Moura Lourenço, is expected to win convincingly on election day.

Failed ‘experiment’ or work-in-progress?
Terence McNamee, Deputy Director of The Brenthurst Foundation, writes: “If the number of competitive elections alone was a yardstick for democratic progress, Africa would be thriving.” During the 1980s, only three African countries held elections, whereas between 1990 and 1994, the first multi-party elections in over a generation were conducted in 29 out of 47 states in sub-Saharan Africa. Today, elections are the norm. And while elections alone are insufficient for democracy, they are nevertheless a prerequisite. This is because they promote political participation and competition, which is needed for democracy. Another important development has been the limiting of presidential terms, which were almost non-existent in Africa three decades ago. More than two-thirds of the new constitutions enacted since then have included term limits. McNamee asserts that “peaceful transfers of power through the ballot box are becoming more common.”

Besides elections and limitations on presidential terms, other defining components of democracy include: checks on executive power, civilian control of the military, civil rights and due process, an independent media and an active civil society. The Economist Intelligence Unit’s ‘democracy index’ identifies four categories of regime: full democracy, flawed democracy, hybrid and authoritarian. Despite the fact that, in 2015, the index only awarded full democracy status to Mauritius (among African states), there have been heartening signs of healthy political development in Africa. Freedom House’s 2016 ‘Freedom in the World’ report named Nigeria, Liberia and Ivory Coast among the countries with the biggest improvements in political rights and civil liberties. Botswana, Ghana, Cape Verde and Benin were also lauded as democratic examples.

President Kagame has frequently made the point that the Western model of democracy is not right for Africa, emphasising the need for Africans to redefine democracy in accordance with the continent’s unique history and needs. To date, many African nations have ‘failed’ in their quest for democracy, but that does not mean that a form of democracy is not possible. William Gurnade, in his essay on African-style democracy, draws the following conclusion: “Clearly, well-developed, indigenous African society organisations, combined with active citizens are crucial for building quality African democracies, but also for fostering new generations of democratic African leadership, which will pursue more substantive definitions of democracy, rather than the limited African-style ones (still common across numerous African nations today)”.

FROM A CHRISTIAN PERSPECTIVE
The Church (both mainline and independent) across Africa has played a significant role in the development of more democratic systems through recent decades. From the early days of emancipation to statehood – and in the subsequent decades of flux as nations wrestled with various forms of leadership – the Church has been a voice, sometimes of correction, at other times prophetic, and many times challenging those in authority to govern responsibly. In his book, Evangelical Christianity and Democracy in Africa, Terence Ranger points out: “If Western scholars want to join in African discussions of democracy, it will be necessary to make religion central to the analysis.”

The Church in Africa will continue to play a role in developing a robust, and truly African, style of democracy, but the ongoing challenge will be striking the balance between being change-facilitators, peace-makers and bridge-builders. For example, the Church in Kenya (despite its shortcomings and varied denominations), is still perceived by many as the national ‘institution’ capable of transcending ethnic boundaries, seeking reconciliation and developing long term solutions.

PRAY > For righteous African leaders who will lead their people well  > For the Church to lead by example and believers to be change-facilitators, peace-makers, and bridge-builders

KNOWLEDGE TO ACTION

PROJECT DOTA
Supporting Discipleship Training in South Asia

The Church in South Asia is growing at a phenomenal rate, but as the Church is growing, the need for adequate training is becoming greater.

There are opportunities to provide this vital training in three countries in this impoverished region. This project aims to cover participant costs for pastors attending DOTA* training sessions (including travel, food and accommodation, and study materials).

To support this project, please make use of the INcontext bank details and use DOTA together with your email address (as much as possible of it) as reference.

If you have any questions about this project, please contact our project department (gustav@incontextministries.org) or CLICK HERE to visit the website.