



ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Atoms and Geography: The Paradox of North Korea's Security

Baruna Kumar Behera^{1*}, Shri Ritesh Kumar Pradhan²¹Assistant Professor of Political Science, Khallikote Unitary University, Berhampur, Odisha, India²Assistant Professor of Political Science, S.B.R Govt. Women's College, Berhampur, Odisha, India

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 29-03-2026

Accepted 19-06-2026

Published 06-10-2026

* Corresponding author.

Baruna Kumar Behera

pupun_21_1@yahoo.co.in<https://doi.org/10.53989/jcp.v5i3.26.32>

ABSTRACT

The relationship between geography and nuclear weapons remains insufficiently explored within contemporary security studies. While technological advancements have transformed the nature of warfare, geography continues to shape states' perceptions of vulnerability, strategic options and security behaviour. This article examines the nexus between geographical constraints and nuclear deterrence through the case of North Korea. Drawing upon geopolitical thought, realist and neo-realist theories of international relations and contemporary scholarship on nuclear deterrence, the study develops the concept of the "Geo-Deterrence Paradox." The concept posits that geography indirectly influences nuclearization by generating perceptions of strategic vulnerability, which encourage states to pursue nuclear weapons as instruments of survival. However, while nuclear capabilities may enhance security for individual states, their proliferation contributes to broader systemic instability. Using qualitative analysis and a case study approach, the article argues that North Korea's nuclear programme is best understood not as an irrational expression of ideological aggression but as a strategic response to a challenging geopolitical environment characterized by limited strategic depth, powerful neighbouring states and persistent external threats. The findings suggest that geographically constrained states are more likely to view nuclear deterrence as a rational security strategy. The study contributes to contemporary debates on nuclear proliferation by demonstrating that geography remains a critical variable in understanding state behaviour in the nuclear age and continues to shape the balance between deterrence and insecurity in global politics.

Keywords: Nuclear Deterrence, Geopolitics, North Korea, Security Dilemma, Geo-Deterrence Paradox, Strategic Vulnerability

© 2026 Published by Bangalore University.
This is an open access article under the CC
BY license
(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

INTRODUCTION

The emergence of nuclear weapons fundamentally altered the character of international politics, yet it did not eliminate the influence of geography on state behaviour. Since the dawn of the nuclear age, scholars have debated whether technological advancements have reduced the strategic importance of geographical factors. While nuclear weapons possess the ability to transcend traditional geographical barriers, the strategic calculations that underpin their acquisition and deployment continue to be shaped by geography. Location, territorial depth, access to maritime routes, proximity to rivals and the broader regional security environment remain critical determinants of state security perceptions and foreign policy choices. Classical geopolitical thinkers such as Halford Mackinder

and Nicholas Spykman emphasized that geographical realities impose enduring constraints on political behaviour¹. More recently, Tim Marshall has argued that geography continues to shape state conduct despite technological progress because political leaders must still operate within the limitations imposed by physical space². Geography does not directly determine political outcomes, but it influences the opportunities and vulnerabilities that states face within the international system³. The relationship between geography and nuclear weapons, however, is neither straightforward nor deterministic. Geography does not automatically produce nuclear arsenals. Rather, it shapes the strategic environment within which states formulate security policies. States located in



geopolitically vulnerable regions, lacking strategic depth or facing persistent external threats, are more likely to perceive insecurity and seek deterrence-based solutions. Nuclear weapons emerge as one such solution because they provide an asymmetric means of compensating for conventional military disadvantages.

North Korea represents one of the most compelling contemporary examples of this dynamic. The country occupies a geographically constrained position on the Korean Peninsula, bordered by China and Russia while facing South Korea and the military presence of the United States. Throughout its modern history, North Korea has experienced invasion, occupation and military confrontation. These historical experiences, combined with its limited territorial depth and relative economic weakness, have reinforced perceptions of existential vulnerability. Consequently, the pursuit of nuclear weapons has become central to the regime's security strategy. Existing studies on North Korea's nuclear programme have primarily focused on regime survival, domestic legitimacy, deterrence and great-power politics⁴. While these explanations are valuable, they often underestimate the role of geography in shaping strategic decision-making. The present study seeks to address this gap by examining how geographical constraints contribute to the emergence of nuclear deterrence strategies.

To achieve this objective, the article introduces the concept of the "Geo-Deterrence Paradox." The concept suggests that geography generates strategic vulnerability, which encourages states to pursue nuclear capabilities as a means of survival. However, while nuclearization may strengthen the security of individual states, it simultaneously contributes to broader regional and international insecurity by intensifying arms competition, mistrust and strategic instability. The central argument of this article is that geography influences nuclear behaviour indirectly through the production of strategic vulnerability. Using North Korea as a case study, the article demonstrates how geographical constraints shape security perceptions and encourage the adoption of nuclear deterrence strategies. In doing so, the study contributes to contemporary debates on nuclear proliferation by highlighting the continuing relevance of geography in the nuclear age.

Theoretical Framework:

The relationship between geography and security has occupied a central place in international relations for more than a century. Classical geo-politicians argued that geographical location shapes the distribution of power and influences the strategic behaviour of states. Mackinder's Heartland Theory emphasized the significance of territorial control, while Spykman's Rimland Theory highlighted the strategic importance of coastal regions and maritime access. Although developed in an earlier era, these

perspectives continue to offer valuable insights into the contemporary security dynamics. Geography affects security through several mechanisms. First, it influences strategic depth. States possessing large territories can absorb military pressure and relocate strategic assets, whereas geographically constrained states face greater vulnerability. Second, geography shapes access to resources, trade routes and military mobility. Third, proximity to rival powers often intensifies security concerns and threat perceptions. These geographical realities become particularly significant within the framework of realism and neo-realism. Classical realism assumes that states operate in a competitive environment where survival is the primary objective⁵. Neo-realism extends this argument by emphasizing the anarchic structure of the international system, which compels states to rely on self-help strategies for security⁶. In the absence of a central authority capable of guaranteeing protection, states seek to maximize their security through military capabilities and deterrence.

Nuclear deterrence represents one of the most powerful manifestations of this logic. According to deterrence theory, the possession of nuclear weapons discourages potential adversaries from launching attacks because the costs of retaliation become prohibitively high⁷. For weaker states, nuclear weapons provide a means of compensating for deficiencies in conventional military power. The interaction between geography and deterrence can therefore be conceptualized as a causal chain. Geography shapes perceptions of vulnerability. These perceptions generate insecurity. Insecurity encourages deterrence strategies. Nuclear weapons emerge as the most effective deterrence mechanism available to vulnerable states. This process forms the foundation of the Geo-Deterrence Paradox. The paradox arises because measures taken to enhance national security often undermine international security. As more states pursue nuclear capabilities in response to geographical vulnerabilities, the risks of arms races, miscalculation and escalation increase. Thus, geography indirectly contributes not only to national security strategies but also to broader patterns of global instability.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study adopts a qualitative research design based on analytical and interpretive methods. The objective is not to measure statistical relationships but to explain the mechanisms through which geography influences nuclear behaviour. The research relies primarily on secondary sources, including academic books, peer-reviewed journal articles, policy reports and institutional publications relating to geopolitics, nuclear deterrence, international relations theory and North Korean security policy.



A case study approach has been employed because it allows for an in-depth examination of the relationship between geographical constraints and nuclearization. North Korea serves as an illustrative case due to its unique combination of strategic vulnerability, geopolitical significance and nuclear capability. The country's security environment provides valuable insights into how geography influences state behaviour under conditions of international anarchy. The study integrates three analytical perspectives. First, geopolitical analysis is used to examine the role of location, territorial depth and regional strategic dynamics. Second, realist and neo-realist theories provide a framework for understanding how states respond to insecurity within an anarchic international system. Third, deterrence theory is employed to explain the strategic logic underlying nuclear weapons acquisition. By combining these perspectives, the article develops a conceptual framework capable of explaining the interaction between geography, insecurity and nuclearization. This approach facilitates a deeper understanding of why geographically vulnerable states may view nuclear deterrence as a rational security strategy and how such choices affect broader patterns of international stability.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Geography and Strategic Vulnerability:

The central argument of this study is that geography influences nuclear behaviour indirectly through the production of strategic vulnerability. Geography itself does not compel states to acquire nuclear weapons; rather, it shapes security perceptions that may encourage nuclearization under certain conditions. North Korea provides a compelling example of this relationship because its geographical position generates multiple forms of vulnerability that have significantly influenced its security strategy. Situated on the Korean Peninsula, North Korea occupies a strategically sensitive location in Northeast Asia. It shares borders with China and Russia while facing South Korea, which maintains a close military alliance with the United States. This position places North Korea at the intersection of major regional and global power rivalries. Unlike geographically insulated states protected by oceans or vast territories, North Korea operates within a highly contested security environment characterized by military competition and strategic uncertainty⁸.

One of the most significant geographical limitations faced by North Korea is its lack of strategic depth. Strategic depth refers to the capacity of a state to absorb military pressure while maintaining the ability to continue political and military operations. Large territorial powers such as Russia, China and the United States possess considerable strategic depth, allowing them to disperse military assets and absorb potential attacks. North Korea, by contrast, possesses a relatively narrow territorial space. Critical

political, economic and military centres remain vulnerable to external attack due to their proximity to potential adversaries. The country's maritime geography further contributes to its vulnerability. Although North Korea possesses access to the Sea of Japan and the Yellow Sea, its maritime routes remain heavily monitored and strategically constrained. Unlike maritime powers that enjoy open access to global trade routes and naval projection capabilities, North Korea's geographical position limits both economic opportunities and strategic flexibility. These limitations reinforce a perception of encirclement and insecurity.

Historical experiences further magnify these geographical concerns. The Korean Peninsula has long served as a battleground for regional powers. The Japanese occupation of Korea, the Korean War (1950 - 1953), and the continued military presence of foreign forces in the region have contributed to North Korea's perception that its security remains perpetually threatened. Geography and history therefore interact to create a persistent sense of vulnerability. From a geopolitical perspective, North Korea's security concerns are not entirely unique. States located in strategically contested regions frequently exhibit heightened threat perceptions. The geopolitical literature demonstrates that proximity to rival powers often increases the likelihood of security competition because states must continuously evaluate potential threats from neighbouring actors⁹. In North Korea's case, the combination of limited strategic depth, proximity to major powers and historical experiences of conflict creates a security environment in which vulnerability becomes a defining feature of state behaviour. Consequently, geography serves not merely as a physical condition but as a strategic variable that shapes national security calculations. The perception of vulnerability generated by geographical realities provides the foundation upon which North Korea's nuclear strategy has been constructed.

From Strategic Vulnerability to Nuclearization:

The next analytical question concerns how geographical vulnerability translates into nuclear behaviour. The argument advanced here is that geography influences nuclearization indirectly through its impact on security perceptions. When states perceive their conventional military capabilities as insufficient to address external threats, they may seek alternative forms of deterrence. Realist and neo-realist theories provide a useful framework for understanding this process. According to Waltz, the anarchic nature of the international system compels states to rely upon self-help mechanisms because no higher authority can guarantee their security. Under such conditions, states must continuously assess threats and develop strategies to ensure survival. For North Korea, conventional military modernization alone has been insufficient to offset perceived strategic disadvantages. The



country faces economically and technologically superior adversaries while possessing limited resources to sustain long-term conventional competition. As a result, nuclear weapons have emerged as a relatively cost-effective mechanism for enhancing deterrence¹⁰.

Deterrence theory suggests that the effectiveness of military capability depends not only on its size but also on its ability to impose unacceptable costs upon adversaries¹¹. Nuclear weapons dramatically increase those costs. Even a relatively small nuclear arsenal can create substantial uncertainty for potential attackers because the consequences of escalation become catastrophic. North Korea's nuclear programme therefore represents a strategic adaptation to perceived vulnerability rather than an irrational pursuit of military prestige. Nuclear weapons enable the regime to compensate for conventional weaknesses while simultaneously increasing the costs of external intervention. This logic helps explain why nuclear capability has remained a central component of North Korean security policy despite economic sanctions and international pressure. Importantly, the decision to pursue nuclear weapons cannot be understood solely through domestic political considerations. While regime survival remains a significant factor, geographical constraints help explain why nuclear deterrence emerged as the preferred solution. Geography shapes threat perceptions, threat perceptions generate insecurity and insecurity encourages deterrence-based responses. The relationship between geography and nuclearization is therefore causal rather than merely co-relational. Geography does not directly produce nuclear weapons, but it creates the conditions under which nuclear deterrence becomes strategically attractive.

North Korea as a Case of the Geo-Deterrence Paradox:

The concept of the Geo-Deterrence Paradox offers a framework for understanding the broader implications of this relationship. The paradox consists of three interconnected stages. The first stage involves the production of strategic vulnerability through geography. States located in contested regions, lacking strategic depth or facing hostile security environments, develop heightened perceptions of insecurity. Geography functions as the initial source of strategic concern. The second stage involves nuclearization as a response to vulnerability. Faced with persistent insecurity, states pursue nuclear capabilities to enhance deterrence and reduce the likelihood of external attack. Nuclear weapons appear rational because they compensate for conventional military limitations and provide powerful tools of coercion and defence. The third stage involves the unintended consequences of nuclearization. While nuclear weapons may improve the security of individual states, they simultaneously generate insecurity for others. Rival states

respond by strengthening their own military capabilities, expanding alliance commitments or pursuing advanced deterrence strategies. Consequently, regional tensions intensify and strategic competition deepens.

North Korea illustrates each stage of this paradox. Geography contributes to insecurity. Insecurity encourages nuclearization. Nuclearization subsequently increases regional tensions involving South Korea, Japan, China, Russia and the United States. The paradox highlights a fundamental contradiction within international politics. Actions designed to enhance national security often undermine collective security. This dynamic closely resembles the security dilemma identified by realist scholars. As Jervis argued, measures taken by one state to increase its security frequently reduce the security of others, producing cycles of competition and mistrust. The Geo-Deterrence Paradox extends this logic by identifying geography as an important underlying source of insecurity. Rather than viewing nuclear proliferation solely as a consequence of political ideology or technological ambition, the concept emphasizes the role of structural geographical conditions in shaping state behaviour.

Strategic Implications for Contemporary Global Politics:

The findings of this study extend beyond the North Korean case and offer broader insights into contemporary international security. In an era characterized by renewed great-power competition, geographical factors continue to influence strategic behaviour despite advances in military technology. First, the analysis suggests that geographically vulnerable states are more likely to pursue deterrence-oriented security strategies. States facing territorial constraints, regional isolation or persistent external threats may increasingly view advanced military capabilities as essential components of national survival. Second, the study highlights the continued relevance of geography within international relations theory. Predictions that globalization and technological innovation would diminish the importance of geography have not been fully realized. Contemporary conflicts in Eastern Europe, the South China Sea, the Middle East and the Korean Peninsula demonstrate that territorial location, strategic access points and regional balances of power remain central to security calculations. Third, the Geo-Deterrence Paradox raises important questions regarding nuclear non-proliferation. Traditional non-proliferation policies often focus on restricting technological access and imposing economic sanctions. While such measures may slow proliferation, they do not address the underlying security concerns that motivate states to seek nuclear capabilities. If geographical vulnerability contributes to nuclearization, then sustainable non-proliferation strategies must also address the security dilemmas faced by vulnerable states. Finally, the study highlights the importance of diplomacy and



confidence-building measures. Because geographical realities cannot be changed, efforts to reduce insecurity must focus on managing perceptions of threat. Regional security arrangements, arms control initiatives and diplomatic engagements remain essential tools for mitigating the destabilizing effects of the Geo-Deterrence Paradox.

In this sense, the challenge facing contemporary international politics is not simply preventing the spread of nuclear weapons but addressing the structural conditions that make nuclear deterrence appear necessary. Failure to address these underlying dynamics may encourage additional states to view nuclear capability as the most reliable guarantee of survival in an increasingly uncertain world.

CONCLUSION

The analysis undertaken in this study demonstrates that geography remains a critical determinant of state behaviour in the nuclear age. Contrary to assumptions that technological advancements have diminished the strategic relevance of physical geography, the findings suggest that geographical factors continue to shape security perceptions, strategic choices and deterrence policies. Nuclear weapons may have transformed the character of warfare, but they have not eliminated the influence of location, territorial depth, proximity to rivals and access to strategic spaces. Instead, geography and nuclear capability operate in a mutually reinforcing relationship that continues to influence contemporary international politics.

The case of North Korea illustrates this relationship with particular clarity. The country's geographical position on the Korean Peninsula, its limited strategic depth, proximity to major powers, constrained maritime access and historical experiences of conflict have collectively generated enduring perceptions of vulnerability. These conditions have contributed to a security environment in which nuclear deterrence is viewed not merely as an instrument of power but as an essential mechanism of regime survival. From this perspective, North Korea's nuclear programme cannot be adequately explained solely through ideological motivations, domestic politics or leadership preferences. Rather, it must also be understood as a strategic response to the structural constraints imposed by geography and the anarchic nature of the international system.

Building upon this analysis, the article introduced the concept of the Geo-Deterrence Paradox. The concept provides a framework for understanding how geography indirectly influences nuclear behaviour through the production of strategic vulnerability. States that perceive themselves as geographically exposed or strategically disadvantaged are more likely to seek deterrence-based

security solutions. Nuclear weapons offer a means of compensating for conventional military weaknesses and reducing the risks associated with external coercion or intervention. However, while such capabilities may enhance the security of individual states, they simultaneously contribute to wider patterns of regional and international insecurity. Thus, efforts to strengthen national security often generate new forms of collective insecurity.

This paradox is particularly relevant in the contemporary international environment. Rising geopolitical competition, declining trust among major powers and the persistence of regional conflicts have reinforced the importance of deterrence in security policy. From Eastern Europe to the Indo-Pacific, states continue to respond to perceived vulnerabilities by strengthening military capabilities and seeking strategic advantages. The North Korean case therefore reflects a broader pattern in international politics rather than an isolated exception. It highlights how structural conditions, especially geographical realities, continue to shape security behaviour despite the transformative effects of modern technology. The findings of this study also carry important implications for nuclear non-proliferation and international security governance. Policies aimed solely at restricting technological access or imposing economic sanctions may prove insufficient if they fail to address the underlying security concerns that motivate states to pursue nuclear capabilities. Sustainable non-proliferation efforts require a broader approach that recognizes the role of geographical vulnerability, threat perception and regional security dynamics. Confidence-building measures, diplomatic engagement, arms control initiatives and inclusive security arrangements are essential for reducing the incentives that drive nuclearization.

Ultimately, the study argues that the relationship between "atoms" and "geography" lies at the heart of contemporary security politics. Geography creates vulnerabilities; vulnerabilities generate insecurity; insecurity encourages deterrence and deterrence, in turn, produces new forms of instability. This cycle constitutes the Geo-Deterrence Paradox. Understanding this relationship is essential not only for explaining North Korea's nuclear behaviour but also for analysing broader patterns of strategic competition in the twenty-first century. The future of global security will depend upon the ability of states to manage this delicate balance between deterrence and stability, ensuring that the pursuit of national security does not inadvertently undermine international peace and security.

REFERENCES

1. Mackinder HJ. The Geographical Pivot of History. *The Geographical Journal*. 1904; 23 (4) :421 . Available from: <https://doi.org/10.2307/1775498>



2. Marshall T. (2015). *Prisoners of geography: Ten maps that tell you everything you need to know about global politics*. Elliott & Thompson
3. Spykman NJ. (1942). *America's strategy in world politics: The United States and the balance of power*. Harcourt, Brace and Company.
4. Cha VD. (2012). *The impossible state: North Korea, past and future*. Ecco
5. Morgenthau HJ. (1948). *Politics among nations: The struggle for power and peace*. Alfred A. Knopf.
6. Waltz KN. (1979). *Theory of international politics*. Addison-Wesley.
7. Schelling TC. (1966). *Arms and influence*. Yale University Press.
8. Lankov A. (2015). *The real North Korea: Life and politics in the failed Stalinist utopia*. Oxford University Press.
9. Cohen SB. (2015). *Geopolitics: The geography of international relations (3rd ed.)*. Rowman & Littlefield.
10. Sagan SD, Waltz KN. (2012). *The spread of nuclear weapons: An enduring debate (3rd ed.)*. W. W. Norton & Company.
11. Schelling TC. (1966). *Arms and influence*. Yale University Press.

