

Kim Jong-un Responds to Trump

By [Kim Petersen](#)

Global Research, September 24, 2017

Region: [Asia](#)

Theme: [US NATO War Agenda](#)

In-depth Report: [NORTH KOREA](#), [Nuclear War](#)

An [AP report](#) described as “a rare if not unprecedented move,” a purported statement [1] by **Kim Jong-un**, the chairman of the State Affairs Commission of the Democratic Republic of Korea, in response to United States president Donald [Trump’s bullying speech](#) to the United Nations earlier this week. The response was relayed by DPRK’s state news agency KCNA.

Of Trump’s speech, Kim said,

“[F]ar from making remarks of any persuasive power that can be viewed to be helpful to defusing tension, he made unprecedented rude nonsense one has never heard from any of his predecessors.”

Kim smartly identified “defusing tension” as a goal and criticized Trump’s “unprecedented rude nonsense.” He also took umbrage at Trump’s insulting his person and his country “in front of the eyes of the world.”

Kim offered,

“I’d like to advise Trump to exercise prudence in selecting words.”

Yet Kim described Trump as a “political layman,” “political heretic,” “a rogue and a gangster fond of playing with fire,” and a “mentally deranged US dotard.” Was this exercising prudence in selecting words? Was it helpful in defusing tension?

Do such remarks have “any persuasive power that can be viewed to be helpful to defusing tension”?

In closing, Kim said,

“As a man representing the DPRK and on behalf of the dignity and honor of my state and people and on my own, I will make the man holding the prerogative of the supreme command in the U.S. pay dearly for his speech calling for totally destroying the DPRK.”

A colleague informed me that at first blink he considered Kim’s response “intelligent.” I demurred. Trump’s words were indeed undiplomatic, foolish, and uninformed. Nevertheless, in this case fighting fire with fire is the wrong response.

Kim Jong-un would have been better served by taking the high road to defuse tension. One should not respond to Trump's undiplomatic insanity with additional undiplomatic words.

In this vein, I humbly submit a proposed response to defuse tensions, improve the DPRK's standing in the eyes of the world's people, and lay the foundations for a peace treaty.

The following "alternative response" was drafted by author Kim Petersen

Dear **President Trump**, world leaders, and peoples of the world:

Much has been said and written about myself, the Democratic Republic of Korea, and threats to the world. Insults about myself, I can let slide. My primary concern and responsibility is the safety and well-being of the people of the DPRK.

Let me make crystal clear that what DPRK seeks is peace. The DPRK considers this an imminently reasonable request, a request that is in line with being a non-threatening, peace-loving nation. Yet the United States refuses this request. Why? Why is the DPRK construed as a threat when it asks for a peace treaty? How should the DPRK view the US refusal of such an overture?

The DPRK is led to conclude that given the fact that the US desires to maintain a state of war, given that the US continues to conduct war maneuvers with "decapitation" as a goal, given that the US is nuclear armed and has used nuclear weapons, given that the US refuses its obligations as outlined under Article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons to "undertake to pursue good-faith negotiations on effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race, to nuclear disarmament, and to general and complete disarmament," given the destruction the US has historically wreaked on the DPRK (although the DPRK has never attacked the US), given that the US destroyed fundamentally disarmed states such as Iraq and Libya in which the leaders were executed in macabre fashion, and given that the US split the Korean peninsula ... then the only prudent action the DPRK could take is to provide itself with a deterrent for the protection of the Korean populace.

This is the solemn duty of any responsible government and any responsible leader anywhere. It is one I must not shirk from.

The DPRK does not seek confrontation with the US or with the American people. The DPRK seeks peace. Therefore, I call upon president Trump to enter a fair, respectful, good-faith dialogue committed to the establishment of peaceful relations between the DPRK and the US.

I also implore our brothers and sisters in the Republic of Korea to help defuse tensions. Should the US government insist on maintaining a state of war, then there is no reason why Koreans should be pitted against Koreans. We must never again fight each other. We sincerely call upon our brothers and sisters in the ROK to deescalate tensions and enter into a new era of peaceful cooperation and prosperity.

A faithful servant of the people of the Democratic Republic of Korea,

Kim Jong-un

Kim Petersen is a former co-editor of the *Dissident Voice* newsletter. He can be reached at: kimohp@gmail.com. Twitter: [@kimpetersen](https://twitter.com/kimpetersen).

Note

1. Corporate media reporting of statements made by political leaders from states demonized in the West must be regarded with [extreme skepticism](#) until verified.

Towards a World War III Scenario: The Dangers of Nuclear War

By Michel Chossudovsky



List Price: \$15.95

Special Price: \$10.25

[Order directly from Global Research](#)

The US has embarked on a military adventure, “a long war”, which threatens the future of humanity. US-NATO weapons of mass destruction are portrayed as instruments of peace. Mini-nukes are said to be “harmless to the surrounding civilian population”. Pre-emptive nuclear war is portrayed as a “humanitarian undertaking”.

While one can conceptualize the loss of life and destruction resulting from present-day wars including Iraq and Afghanistan, it is impossible to fully comprehend the devastation which might result from a Third World War, using “new technologies” and advanced weapons, until it occurs and becomes a reality. The international community has endorsed nuclear war in the name of world peace. “Making the world safer” is the justification for launching a military operation which could potentially result in a nuclear holocaust.

Nuclear war has become a multibillion dollar undertaking, which fills the pockets of US defense contractors. What is at stake is the outright “privatization of nuclear war”. (Excerpt from Preface)

“This book is a ‘must’ resource – a richly documented and systematic diagnosis of the supremely pathological geo-strategic planning of US wars since ‘9-11’ against non-nuclear countries to seize their oil fields and resources under cover of ‘freedom and democracy’.”

-John McMurtry, Professor of Philosophy, Guelph University

“In a world where engineered, pre-emptive, or more fashionably “humanitarian” wars of aggression have become the norm, this challenging book may be our final wake-up call.”

-Denis Halliday, Former Assistant Secretary General of the United Nations

Michel Chossudovsky exposes the insanity of our privatized war machine. Iran is being targeted with nuclear weapons as part of a war agenda built on distortions and lies for the purpose of private profit. The real aims are oil, financial hegemony and global control. The price could be nuclear holocaust. When weapons become the hottest export of the world’s only superpower, and diplomats work as salesmen for the defense industry, the whole world is recklessly endangered. If we must have a military, it belongs entirely in the public sector.

No one should profit from mass death and destruction.

-Ellen Brown, author of 'Web of Debt' and president of the Public Banking Institute

The original source of this article is Global Research

Copyright © [Kim Petersen](#), Global Research, 2017

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Kim Petersen](#)

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca

www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca