

# **Global Partnership for Prevention of Armed Conflict (GPPAC)**

## **Northeast Asia**

### **Activity Report by the Seoul Committee**

**Feb.1, 2005**

#### **Table of Content**

- I. Preface
- II. Background
- III. The Activity Report and Recommendations
  1. Humanitarian assistance for North Korea and peaceful engagement.
  2. Civilian exchange activities between North and South Korea and the role of women in those exchanges.
    - 2-1. Peace Settlement and NGO Exchange
    - 2-2. Women's Exchange for Peace Building in the Korean Peninsula
  3. The response of South Korean CSOs to the North Korean nuclear issue.
    - 3-1. Efforts to Find a Peaceful Solution to the North Korean Nuclear Issue.
    - 3-2. Efforts to Build an International Coalition to Resolve the Nuclear Problem in the Korean Peninsula.
  4. The response of South Korean CSOs to the issue of distorted history.
  5. CSO opposition movement to the deployment of Korean troops to Iraq.
  6. Peace education activities for cultivating the culture of peace.
- IV. Appendix:
  - Proposed Agenda and Points for Northeast Asian Consultation on GPPAC

## **I. Preface**

The members of the GPPAC Korea committee have gathered the following information based on the activities of peace building and conflict prevention organizations in Korea. The information herein deals primarily with the activities that attempt to bring about peace, security and stability on the Korean peninsula and in Northeast Asia. The following contains information regarding Korean civil society organizations (CSOs) in the broader GPPAC Northeast Asian process.

In this report the work of Korean CSOs for peace building and conflict prevention is divided into six themes.

- Humanitarian assistance for North Korea and peaceful engagement.
- Civilian exchange activities between North and South Korea and the role of women in those exchanges.
- The response of South Korean CSOs to the North Korean nuclear issue.
- The response of South Korean CSOs to the issue of distorted history.
- CSO opposition movement to the deployment of Korean troops to Iraq.
- Peace education activities for cultivating the culture of peace.

This report serves to gather information regarding the conflict prevention activities of Korean CSOs, review and evaluate these activities, and make recommendations for the future of the GPPAC process in Northeast Asia. It is the hope of Korean CSOs that this report may contribute to introducing the peace building and conflict prevention activities of Korean CSOs to national governments and international organizations as well as building a network among CSO activists in Northeast Asia and around the world.

## **II. Background**

There are many reasons why it is complicated and difficult to bring peace into the Korean peninsula. The following information is the structurally and timely significant background to these reasons.

### **The Ongoing Cold War System in the Korea Peninsula**

In 1945, after Korea was liberated from Japan, it was divided into two. This division was made by an agreement among powerful states including the USA and the Soviet Union just before the end of the World War II. As a result of this division, a war began in the Korean peninsula in 1950. Even though more than 6 million were killed and more than 10 million families were divided as a result of the Korean war, the war ended with the same division and ideological differences in the Korean peninsula.

The Cold War system in the Korean peninsula after the war created mistrust and antagonistic policies between the South and the North as well as among their allies; the trilateral alliances of South Korea, the US and Japan and of North Korea, China and the Soviet Union. This confrontation became the core of the tension and conflict in Northeast Asia.

The alliances gradually shifted from being ideology based to being economic interest based after the end of the Cold War. South Korea normalized diplomatic relations with China and Russia, but North Korea did not normalize relations with the US and Japan. In spite of this change, the division and ideology warfare continues between North and South Korea. In particular, the historically unprecedented long-lasting armistice is a structural factor to stimulate military tension in the Korean peninsula. Korea is technically still at war. Ironically, the current division of Korea has become a source for the continuation of the cold war system in the region, which resulted from the Cold War in Northeast Asia.

However, efforts to make peace and to reduce tension never rested even in the midst of long-lasting confrontation. The summit between the two Koreas in 2000 was a historical event because it was the first big step, in transforming mistrust and hatred between the two Koreas into reconciliation and coexistence, and in dissolving the cold war system in Northeast Asia. Economic cooperation and human exchange have largely increased since the summit. It has also contributed to the decrease of military tension between the South and the North by confidence building through military talks.

Recently, North Korea has made a serious effort to reform and open up its country with new approaches including the “July 1<sup>st</sup> Measure of Economic Administration Reform”, and the establishment of the “Siniju Special Economy Zone”, and with offering an apology for the abductions of the Japanese nationals at the North Korea and Japan Summit.

### **The North Korean Nuclear Issue**

In October 1994, the Clinton administration and North Korea decreased tensions in the region by signing a deal called the Agreed Framework, encouraging the improvement of North Korean and the American relations and later on agreeing to create the Joint Communiqué between the USA and North Korea (2000). However, the Bush administration labeled North Korea as a part of the ‘Axis of Evil’ and included North Korea as a target state of nuclear preemptive strike. Furthermore, in October 2002, a second nuclear crisis emerged as the Bush administration suspected North Korea of developing the Highly Enriched Uranium Program (HEUP) and resulted the potentiality of another war on the Korean peninsula. Two controversial points in the current conflict are: the pressure placed by the US on the North through economic sanctions, and the isolation policy against North Korea; and the North Korean project to develop a nuclear deterrent. The conflicting issues over the current nuclear crisis between the US and North Korean point of view on solution is quite different. North Korea’s proposal is based on a “package solution on a simultaneous action-based” while the US insists that North Korea should, as the first step, unilaterally commit to dismantle all of its nuclear programs. Upon these limited circumstance, the Six Party Talks have not shown major progress yet.

The ongoing conflict over the North Korean nuclear problem has had a great impact on the USA, North Korea, and South Korea. The current situation will serve as grounds for strengthening the US hegemony and military restructuring in Northeast Asia. Furthermore, it slows the improvement of North and South Korean relations. It also takes the opportunity from North Korea to reform and open up its economy. More seriously it has become a greater threat to the peace, security and stability of people in the Korean peninsula and in Northeast Asia.

### **The Impact of the Restructuring of US Forces on the Korean Peninsula**

Recently, the five decade-long alliance between South Korea and the USA has been challenged. This is due to the improvements made to democracy in South Korea, the gradual dissolution of the cold war system in Northeast Asia, and the US military strategy changes after 9.11. The restructuring of US military forces overseas has become

the basis for the relocation of the US forces and bases in South Korea. The US government requires Japan and South Korea to be cooperative on this transformation. This change is to move the American forces from near the DMZ to a location where North Korean long-range artillery could not reach and in doing so strengthen the survival capability of the USFK. This also increases military pressure on the North in order to make easy use of the preemptive strike doctrine of the Bush administration.

The USA aims to expand the operational scope of South Korea/American combined command beyond the Korean peninsula to the broader Northeast Asia region. The US-South Korea alliance is transformed from a local force into a regional force. South Korean troops have deployed to Iraq due to the strong request of the US government along with over 3000 soldiers from the US forces in South Korea. This transformation of the USFK as well as the future military alliance among the US, Japan and South Korea will strengthen hostile relations, rather than creating peaceful relations, with North Korea and China. It is sad reality that the destiny of the Korean people and others in Northeast Asia is heavily dependant upon the US forces.

### **III. The Activity Report and Recommendations**

#### **1. Humanitarian assistance for North Korea and peaceful engagement**

##### **1) Background**

The flood on August 1995 made the reality of the situation of North Korea known to the World. In fact, North Korea continuously suffered from shortages of food and extreme economic crisis after the socialist world collapsed in the late 1980s. Until then, there were infrequent contact and conversation between North Korea and South Korea through the civil society window. However, South Korean civil society along with international organizations set out to actively help in the North Korean food crisis.

There were intergovernmental and international agreements for the coexistence and cooperation with North Korea followed by several treaties: Declaration of Denuclearization of the Korean Peninsular (91), South-North Basic Agreement (92) and Geneva Agreement between North Korea and the US (94). Still, a confusing and conflicted perception of North Korea was preserved in which North Korea is both a threat to security and therefore the main enemy and the closest ally because of future reunification hopes. It was a bit early to expect strong support for the treaties from all South Koreans. That is, for some people helping North Korea was an act of serving the interests of the enemy even though the purpose of these activities was based on humanitarianism and fraternity. Furthermore, the North Korean government was reluctant to tell the North Korean people that aid came from South Korea. So the North Korean people treated South Koreans, who visited with goals of to help, passively and reluctantly.

## 2) Activity

When the severe shortages of North Korea were first known to the world in 1995, the most urgent necessity was to focus on providing food to people. Due to the limited capability of civil organizations, the government was needed to give large-size food aid to North Korea. However, when the shortages of food in North Korea continued over a longer period, a more fundamental and structural approach was needed more than emergency aid which, simply supplied food. The North and South Korean Summit meeting in 2000 was the breakthrough for the South Korean government to supply food on the large-scale and civilian organizations focus on developmental assistance project. Accordingly, civilian organizations working with governments shifted to developmental assistance project by restoring agriculture, improving healthcare programs, and giving priority to the people of greatest need. Humanitarian aid prolonged over 10 years spurred the specialization and diversity of civilian organizations, which finally led to the establishment of the KNCCK (Korea NGO Council for Cooperation with North Korea) on February 2001. The KNCCK consists of 34 organizations that exchange information and cooperate with each other with respect to assistance for North Korea.

By September 2004, 34 nongovernmental organizations, approved by the government, including Red Cross took an active role in helping North Korea. The South Korean government supported these organizations by matching funds and by assisting in increasing the amount of the funds by the year. According to the official statistics between 1995 and July 2004, the accumulated amount of humanitarian aid to North Korea from South Korea was \$ 1,052,810,000. Nongovernmental aid constitutes 36% of the total amount, total \$374,520,000.

### (i) Current Humanitarian Aid to North Korea (Government, Non government)

(Unit: \$)

Year	Government	Non-government	Total Amount
95-'97	261,720,000	22,360,000	284,080,000
98-'02	272,080,000	190,720,000	462,800,000
03-'04.7	144,490,000	161,440,000	305,920,000
Total Amount	678,290,000	374,520,000	1,052,810,000

The number of visitors that traveled to North Korea to discuss humanitarian aid matter and investigate the scene of aid also increased substantially in that period. The number of South Korean NGO visitors jumped to 1670, in 2003, much higher than the 34 visitors in 1998.

(ii) Number of Visitors to North Korea for the Humanitarian Aid

(Unit: people)

Year	'98	'99	'00	'01	'02	'03	'04.7	Total Numbers
Visitors	34	49	144	384	1,715	1,320	826	4,472

The explosion at the Ryong-chun station in North Korea on April 22, 2004 caused the deaths of 161 people and the destruction of 8000 homes. To help in the recovery the "Help Ryong-chun" campaign was expanded to include all of South Korean. To restore the damage emergency aid of \$53,000,000 was given to North Korea. Support and encouragement for Ryong-Chun assistance activity finally showed the progress the South Korean civilian organizations had pursued for the past 10 years.

### 3) Evaluation

Humanitarian aid to North Korea has been dedicated to lessening the conflict and hatred which existed for the past 50 years on the Korean peninsula. Furthermore, humanitarian activities began to produce trust and peace in both countries. By now, civil society had taken a leading role in reconciling conflicts between nations and making peace on the Korean peninsula.

Civil society's humanitarian aid to North Korea can be summarized by the following four aspects:

First, there was dedication to improve the humanitarian condition in North Korea. Food shortages continue as well as the economic crisis, but the danger of collective starvation no longer exists due to humanitarian efforts.

Second, humanitarian activities contribute to the ground work to bring about policies of reconciliation and cooperation. The civil society movement for humanitarian aid to North Korea in 1997 contributed to the transformation of policy toward North Korea, by the Kim, Dae-Jung administration in 1998.

Third, safe ground work has been laid for reconciliation and cooperation without losing momentum between North and South Korea. Since the cold war tension and antagonism still prevails on the Korean peninsula, the relationship between North and South Korea is greatly influenced by political and military issues. However, continuous humanitarian aid to North Korea can play the role of safe ground despite worsening relations between the two nations.

Fourth, the contact area between the two nations has grown. Trust and cooperation followed by humanitarian assistance has led to and intensified contact and help from religions, local governments and corporations.

#### 4) Recommendations

##### (i) Civil society

- enhance the spirit of generosity and cease cold war hostile tensions by spreading humanitarianism and fraternity.
- strengthen social agreements toward the humanitarian assistance to North Korea and diversifying South-North Cooperation.
- tighten the connection between activities such as humanitarian assistance, development cooperation, and peace-making work.

##### (ii) South Korean Government

- Allocate 1% of annual government budget to South-North Cooperation Fund
- Work together with non-government organizations to prepare a 'Master Plan' for assistance to North Korea.
- Transfer 20% of government aid budget to North Korea through civil sectors.

##### (iii) North Korean Government

- Provide more information about conditions in North Korea.
- Allow supplies to be transported by land and construct supplies storage facilities within North Korea.
- Allow South Korean NGOs to set up a permanent bureau in North Korea.

##### (iv) International organization/ UN

- Avoid taking advantage of humanitarian assistance as a diplomatic tool.
- Hold international round table discussions to develop North Korean agriculture.
- Set up and supply International Development Fund to help recover in the North Korean economy.

## **2. Civilian Exchange Activities between North and South Korea and the Role of Women in Those Exchanges.**

### **2-1. Peace Settlement and NGO Exchange**

#### 1) Background

Achieving a NGO exchange between South and North Korea is the issue that the Korean government and civil society have been confronting since the division of the Korean peninsula. In 1988, the South Korea government of Rho Tae-Woo, set forth the "7.7 Special Declaration". Despite this declaration, the visits to North Korea of the Rev. Moon, Ik-Hwan in March and Lim, Soo-Kyung, a student from Hankuk University of Foreign Studies, in June 1989 were still considered illegal. At this time, South Korea stressed socio-cultural exchange and North Korea stressed political and military exchange. The visit to North Korea of Rev. Moon let North and South Korea agree upon the simultaneous exchange of the above exchange principles. Since then North Korea was able to adopt a positive attitude towards the socio-cultural change between the South and North. The visit to North Korea of the student Lim contributed to raising a national concern about the need to develop a relationship between the people of the South and North. The official and civil exchange between South and North Korea was historically realized in the field of athletics since the government approved of the unitary team taking part in the 41st World Table Tennis Championships in. At the same time the women's meeting for Japanese postwar settlement problems progressed. So the South and North meetings continued in Tokyo

and Seoul 1991, Pyongyang 1992, Tokyo and Pyongyang 1993, and Peking 1998. A North Korean delegation of fifteen people participated in Seoul and a South Korean delegation of thirty people participated in Pyongyang. Until the "6.15 Joint Declaration" in 2000, cultural exchange was restricted but after the summit meeting, cultural exchange was promoted. For the 55th anniversary of the founding of the Choson Labor party in October 2000, the civil society groups in South Korea sent a delegation to Pyongyang.

## 2) Activity

Civil society exchanges have been distinguished from government led exchanges in the areas of business cooperation, and humanitarian aid. As they have grown, civil society exchange groups have had to overcome challenges such as: building effective communication structures, building trust, normalizing exchanges, and expanding exchange areas.

In South Korea, there are three major groups in the exchange movement. The first is the conservative group, the second is the liberal group, and the third is religious groups. In the case of North Korea, the Korean Council for Reconciliation was organized by the labor party and social groups in 1998. The representative of each civil organization is a member of the North Korean Supreme Council of People's Commissars, not all civilian but the collaborative organization of civilian and government members. The exchange between South and North Korea has improved through adversity. Since 2001, exchange groups have attempted to share, internationally, a message of Korean reunification prompted by socio-cultural exchange. These exchange programs focus on minimizing cultural and social differences caused by long separation.

## 3) Evaluation

Civil exchanges between South and North Korea are important steps for healing the pains and wounds of the Korean war and transforming the hostile relationship of the South and North into an amicable one.

## 4) Recommendations

### (i) Civil Society

- The peace process in the Korean peninsula should include three steps:
  1. Building infrastructure for stable civil exchanges.
  2. Activate peace exchanges.

3. Build a socio-cultural community between North and South Korean civilians.

- Establish a committee to activate exchanges between governments and civil society organizations in order to create a synergy effect.
- Civil society organizations should work closely together in order to activate exchanges between North and South Korea and to solve the North Korean nuclear issue peacefully.

(ii) Government

- Reduce the conservative and liberal conflict in South Korea and encourage civil society unification.
  1. Encourage civil society's involvement in the public decision making process.
  2. Governments should improve a system for providing democratic ways of solving conflict through public education and participation.
- Expand flexible reunification education that changes as North and South relations change.
  1. Education should contain information to create an understanding of North Korean society, improve the ability for coexistence, and understand process of unification.
  2. Education should also include; peace education, human rights education, and cross-cultural understanding education.

## **2-2. Women's Exchange for Peace Building on the Korean Peninsula**

### 1) Background

Korean women have experienced many forms of violence in wars and during the early part of the national division. In order to prevent violent conflicts and build peace on the Korean peninsula, they have been involved in development movements to promote reunification and peace and have requested revolutionary reunification policies from Korean government since 1980s. The Korean government accepted the request of the civilian camps engaged in a reunification movement around 1990s. It also established these policies at a Nordpolitik aiming for ethnic communities. In 1991, the two Koreas joined the UN together, and the Agreement

on Reconciliation, Non-aggression, and Exchanges and Cooperation between South and North Korea was adopted in 1992. Despite great collective interest in the matters of reunification, Korean women had worked on the matters individually on various levels. It was not until the late 1990s, however, that they played a significant role in building peace on the Korean peninsula.

## 2) Activities

### (i) South Korean, North Korean and Japanese Women International Symposium- Peace in Asia and Women's role

In 1991, women from both South and North Korea found that they could open the exchange between the two Koreas by holding the International Symposium. Peace in Asia and Women's Role was attended by women representatives from the two Koreas and Japan. Even though the symposium was attended by a small number of female representatives, it was the very first exchange between South and North led by civilian women after Korean War. The symposiums were held in Tokyo in May 1991, in Seoul in November 1991(15 North delegates participated), in Pyongyang in September 1992 (30 South delegates participated), and in Tokyo again in April 1993. These women made history by stepping on the soils of both Koreas for the first time after the war as civilians through conferences in Seoul and Pyongyang. Unfortunately, however, the symposium was suspended before the fifth Seoul conference because of tensions between South and North Korea.

### (ii) Projects for the "Comfort Women"

The collaborative effort in resolving problems of comfort of women continued between South and North women even after Pyongyang conference in 1993. South and North Korean women have resumed exchanges between the two Koreas based on the problems of comfort women even with the tight political relations between North and South.

### (iii) South and North Korean Women's Discussion on Reunification in 2001

The Inter-Korea Summit in 2000 and the June 15 Joint Declaration clarified the intentions of the two states and reached an agreement based on reconciliation and cooperation. Though very limited, nongovernmental organizations from South and North Korea were permitted to celebrate the 55th anniversary of national independence and the June 15 Inter-Korean Joint

Declaration as joint programs. During the 2001 Grand Festival for National Reunification and the 55th anniversary of national independence, women held the Women's Unification Discussion Session in Pyongyang which included 22 South Korean participants.

(iv) 2002 Women's Unification Rally

From October 16th through 17th in 2002, female delegates from the South and North participated in the Women's Unification Rally for Peace and the implementation of the June 15th Joint Declaration held in Mt. Kumgang, North Korea. The delegates consisted of 350 South Koreans, 300 North Koreans and 20 Koreans from abroad. They were from labor worlds, the academic communities, women's groups and financial, political, artistic and religious circles. The rally developed to include a variety of events such as: an art and handicraft exhibition, sports, games, plays a joint banquet and joint performances, exchange of separated families, dancing, closing ceremony and adoption of statement of a resolution-including women's discussion on achievement of June 15th Joint Declaration. Every event was decided upon through deliberation by both parties, and a common flag representing the Korean peninsula was hoisted.

(v) Humanitarian Aids for North Korean Children and Pregnant Women

In early 1997, South Korean women started to aid North Korean women. In order to save starving children suffering from a severe food crisis, South Korean Women launched nationwide campaigns for raising funds for North Korean children with the foundation of WMP (Women Making Peace). In conjunction with a national coalition composed of about 90 NGOs to assist North Korean people, women delivered 26 tons of powdered dried milk to women's groups in North Korea in 1997. Ever since, they have donated clothing, food, and the necessities of life to North Korea.

When the Ryongchon Railway Station explosion took place in North Korea's North Pyeongan province on April 22 2004, women's groups who had promoted women's exchange between South and North Korean women organized 'women's action for an aid to Ryongchon'. Administrational groups for this organization are: WMP, Women 21 and Women's Committee of Reunification Coalition. Under the name of 'Hope to Ryongchon', they mounted a pan-nation campaign. With priority given to fundraising, the campaign was developed as a memory of the victims and relief efforts. A relief fund was contributed to "Ryongchon Elementary School Rehabilitation and Reconstruction Committee", a group

organized by South Korean NGOs, to support the Ryongchon Elementary School in North Korea.

### 3) Evaluation

- South and North Korean women opened a path of reconciliation and cooperation by destroying cold war orders (relationships based on conflict and hostility) in different political systems.
- Women began to cooperate for the peace on the Korean Peninsula.
- Women, who had stepped out of national security as passive figures, started to participate in constructing new visions of national security as pro-active figures.
- In order for the June 15 Inter-Korean Joint Declaration to be an irreversible reality, regularization and systemization of civil exchange and cooperation were believed to be essential.
- Women's and civil exchanges enhanced mutual understandings and confirmed the differences and similarities between two Koreas. Through this understating, the exchanges were sure to prepare for reunification as well; decrease conflicts after reunification and strengthen the basis of integration of North and South.
- In case of emergencies like North Korea's floods and the Ryongchon explosion, Korean women contributed to build trust between North and South Korean women through humanitarian aids to North Korean women and children.

### 4) Obstacles

- Women's exchange between North and South Korea has faced difficulties in continuing to collaborate through the influence of political interests and a unstable state of affairs.
- The forms of exchanges should shift from events, and representatives, centered exchanges to constant and diverse exchanges in which a great number of people can participate.
- It takes time to come to a mutual agreement between North and South Korea because of different points of view and ways of thinking caused by different systems and ideologies.
- The contents of North and South Korea women's exchanges are very limited. Therefore, it is necessary to develop a diversity of agendum. North Korea decided against a variety of agendum suggested by South Korean women. However, it is rather a reflection of a serious state of affairs in domestic and international arena and is also more related to the abilities of North Korea's women.

- Activities on support and cooperation between South and North Korean women are much more deficient than other divisions.
- There is great difficulty in promoting women's exchange due to a lack of legal and consultative systems, which could support and accelerate it.
- Because of the diversity of reunification movement women's group pursue, administration through consultation is hard to achieve.

## 5) Recommendations

### (i) Civil Society

- It is crucial to strengthen the capabilities of women's groups in developing women's exchange and women's reunification movements.
- South Korean women should structure systems of support and collaboration to aid North Korean women.
- For the viewpoint of recognition and of the equality of both sexes to be added, more aggressive and active attitude is needed to reorganize the South and North Korea relationship acts.
- In order to form stable and effective women's exchanges, it is pivotal to have an extensive research network and grope for solidarity with reunification- related women's groups in North Korea.
- It is important to strengthen publicity activities and organization activities on enhancing understanding of the general run of women about South and North Korean women's exchange.
- Networking with women's groups and peace-related groups at home and abroad is necessary to aid North Korea.
- Women should request the Korean government fulfill and monitor Security Council Resolution 1325 passed by the Security Council that addresses the impact of war on women, and women's contributions to conflict resolution and sustained peace.

### (ii) Government

- Government should reorganize the South/North Korea relationship acts to include the viewpoint of recognition and of the equality of both sexes.
- It guarantees women's participation in the mechanisms of exchange and cooperation as well as the reunification process.

- It is necessary to establish the foundations of a discussion system regarding South and North Korean women's exchange and women's reunification policy between government and non-government actors.
- It should collect and analyze integrative information and materials on North and South Korean women's exchange.
- It should institute the Security Council Resolution 1325 passed by the Security Council that addresses the impact of war on women, and women's contributions to conflict resolution and sustained peace.

(iii) UN & International Society

- It should investigate actively whether each state fulfils Security Council Resolution 1325 passed by the Security Council that addresses the impact of war on women, and women's contributions to conflict resolution and sustained peace and urge each state to institute it.
- It should establish international network with women and peace related groups that assist the exchange activities of North and South Korean women.

### **3. The Response of South Korean CSOs to the North Korean Nuclear Issue.**

#### **3-1. Efforts to Find a Peaceful Solution to the North Korean Nuclear Issue.**

[Korean Principles For Dealing With the Nuclear Crisis]

In order to keep the Korean peninsula a war free zone and to find a peaceful solution to the nuclear crisis, the following have been proposed:

*A. The nuclear crisis on the Korean peninsula must be solved through peaceful diplomatic means.*

War is never a means to peace especially in a militarily sensitive region such as Northeast Asia because war provokes even more serious division and conflicts, destructing peace and the social fabric of the world. Therefore we must continue to oppose the notion of war in the Korean peninsula and firmly speak out against destructive measures in dealing with the nuclear crisis such as the complete isolation of North Korea or any other unpeaceful means.

*B. Oppose the development, deployment, or usage of nuclear weapons on the*

### *Korean peninsula.*

Countries surrounding the Korean peninsula, as well as Korea itself, should respect and carefully observe the denuclearization of the Korean peninsula. Thus we strongly oppose the development of nuclear weapons in North Korea and the deployment of nuclear weapons by the United States. Also, the countries possessing nuclear weapons in Northeast Asia must participate in nuclear disarmament and ultimately dispose of all nuclear weapons. Particularly, the United States must stop all preemptive attacks against countries it deems as enemies.

### *C. The solution to the nuclear crisis in the Korean peninsula must be reached through comprehensive and simultaneously phased steps.*

The deep mistrust between North Korea and the United States has acted as a barrier in finding an answer to the nuclear crisis in the Korean peninsula, thus a solution should be reached through simultaneously implementing by both parties. Demands to completely abandon all activities regarding a Highly Enriched Uranium Program (HEUP) must not fuel the nuclear crisis situation and simultaneous promises should be made. North Korea must give up any nuclear development while the United States must guarantee the security of North Korea. United States must normalize relations with North Korea while aiding the North and other neighboring countries.

### *D. Policies regarding the fate of the Korean peninsula that ignore the voice of the Korean people should not be passed.*

The people most directly affected by the nuclear crisis in the Korean peninsula are the citizens of North and South Korea. The United States and International society must listen to the voices of these citizens and not pass any policies that ignore these voices as it has been shown through various events that both the North and South Koreans avidly support the two countries reaching conclusions through peaceful measures.

## 1) Background

The relationship between North Korea and the United States, which had turned fragile due to the controversial issue of conducting nuclear inspections in North Korea, was exacerbated by North Korea pulling out of the Nuclear Proliferation Treaty (NPT) in March of 1993, while the United States government began to contemplate military action against North Korea. In 1994, as the possibility of war breaking out in the Korean peninsula became greater, a meeting between

Kim Il Song and Jimmy Carter served as a positive sign to the dire conditions in the Korean peninsula by dramatically turning the situation around, ending with the signing of the 'Geneva Framework'. North Korea and the United States faced a deadlock relationship even after the Geneva Framework, but still showed interest in cooperating with one another and agreed to the Joint Communiqué in the year 2000 right after the "6.15 Joint Declaration" in 2000 between North and South Korea.

However, the inauguration of George Bush began to be a great challenge to the peace efforts that had been furthered by both Koreas. The Bush administration declared North Korea as part of the "Axis of Evil" and cornered the North by declaring that it possessed and developed weapons of mass destruction threatening preemptive strike. The peace process between North and South Korea was unwavering despite Bush's bold declaration, and on July 1, 2002 both sides tried to reach economic cooperation through a measure for economic reform and continuously tried to further economy reform. In September 2002, North Korea and Japan agreed to improve relations with one another and the Pyongyang declaration was signed.

However, in October 2002, a second nuclear crisis emerged as the Bush administration suspected North Korea of developing nuclear weapons. The United States accused North Korea of denying to admit developing HEUP and demanded that the North rid itself of all attempts to develop weapons of mass destruction. The North did not comply to the demands of the United States and the United States responded gravely by stopping all petroleum aid to the North. Eventually, the situation worsened as North Korea withdrew from the NPT and declared that it would stop all efforts to move towards denuclearization, promptly expelled all IAEA inspectors, and removed the seal from nuclear waste byproduct containers, a symbolic move.

As the relationship between North Korea and the United States worsened, the possibility of war erupting in the Korean peninsula grew and Korea's civil society began to voice their united desire for peaceful resolution. After it was discovered that during the first nuclear crisis, the United States had planned to go to war with North Korea without notifying the Koreans, civil opinion became more outraged. While the debate regarding whether or not North Korea possessed a HEUP raged on, in April 2003, three party talks were held in Beijing and three six party talks were held, but there was not much progress.

## 2) Activities

### (i) Clarified the Principles of a Peaceful Solution to the Nuclear Crisis.

Since the United States began accusing North Korea of developing nuclear weapons in October 2002, Korea's civil society organizations have continuously come together to clarify and propose a solution to the nuclear issue. They have been clear in stating that the underlying principles of any solution when dealing with the North should be peaceful, non-nuclear, and focused on reconciliation. To be more specific, these CSOs continuously suggested that the Geneva Framework be abided to and that there should be constant talks between all parties involved without any prior strings attached, and stressed the importance of cooperation from neighboring countries as well as the continuation of sending petroleum to the North.

### (ii) Suggested an Alternative Solution in Dealing with the Nuclear Crisis and Continuously Monitored all North Korean Nuclear Activities.

In search of a peaceful disarmament plan, Korea's civil society organizations have organized several international conferences and professional workshops. Through these various activities in December 2003, The Korea Peace Report was published and a web site was created to monitor the progression of nuclear talks.

### (iii) Created a Civilian-Congress Policy Council

On March 7, 2003, Korean civil society organizations created the first ever civilian-congress policy council called the "National Council for the Peaceful Korean Peninsula" to reflect the opinion of representatives from various civil groups, congressional parties, legal and academic groups. The "National Council for the Peaceful Korean Peninsula" sought to peacefully resolve tensions between North Korea and the United States and proposed various solutions to alleviate military tension in neighboring countries through nongovernmental diplomacy.

### (iv) Extensive Collective Activities

Since the suspicion of the North's nuclear activities first emerged, Korea's civil society has continuously strived to find peaceful measures in dealing with the situation while constantly taking into consideration all of the various opinions concerning the nuclear crisis. It has also been active in opposing the war in Iraq and since 2003 has organized mass campaigns to protest

the possibility of war in the Korean peninsula, urging a peaceful solution to the nuclear issue and the reconciliation of North Korea and the United States.

### 3) Evaluation

- Korea's civil society has accentuated the need of using peaceful measures in dealing with the nuclear crisis and has tried to propose and make known various peaceful solutions.
- Regardless of the fact that the Korean society holds many different opinions on the nuclear issue, the Koreans have put into consideration all of these various opinions and have continued to actively collaborate on the given issue.
- The Korean civil society has tried to raise awareness of the need to reach a peaceful solution to the nuclear issue by constantly holding open debates, campaigns, and press conferences.

### 4) Obstacles

- Tensions between North Korea and the United States make it difficult for the demands of the Korean society be heard in actual negotiations.
- It has become hard for civil society to continue to work collectively as international variables are the deciding factors of negotiations with the North.
- Although the civil-congress policy council was established there have been difficulties in maintaining this council and the national assembly has not been active enough.
- There are not enough collective activities internationally or enough nongovernmental diplomacy to raise awareness of the opinions of Korean civil society to the international society, let alone Northeast Asia.
- There is a lack of network between the Korean government and civil society and no flow of information between the two,
- North Korea's nuclear issue is not on the agenda when it comes to North/South nongovernmental exchange or cooperation.

### 5) Recommendations

(i) Civil Society

- Continue to monitor the nuclear situation in the North as well as the tension between North Korea and the United States and provide possible solutions to the problem.
- Form a mutual agreement within civil society regarding the peaceful denuclearization of the Korean peninsula.
- Strengthen international opposition towards nuclear development and nuclear threats.

(ii) Government

- Find a way to settle the nuclear crisis in the Korean peninsula and encourage settlement.
- Institutionalize a framework for civil society to participate when deciding upon policies that concern national security.
- Lead the peninsula towards becoming a nuclear free zone.
- Support and aid civil society organizations that work towards bringing about peace in the Korean peninsula.

(iii) UN & International Society

- Declare that peaceful resolution is needed to all conflicts.
- Actively provide aid and support the international society in reaching a peaceful solution to the nuclear issue in the Korean peninsula.
- Universally balance the principles of the NPT.
- Use the six party talks as a framework for creating cooperation in the Korean peninsula and in Northeast Asia.

## **3-2 Efforts to Build an International Coalition to Resolve the Nuclear Problem in the Korean Peninsula**

### **1) Background**

Since the outbreak of the second nuclear crisis in October 2002, Korean civil society has been trying to foster public opinions to dissipate the threat of war in the Korean peninsula and promote the peaceful settlement of North Korea's nuclear problem through mobilizing collective actions at an international level. These international

activities include the dissemination of the common peace statements signed by Korean CSOs, the participation in international peace conferences, and the dispatch of peace delegates to the United States. These activities reflect three approaches. First, the CSOs intend to convey to the international community that the nuclear problem is fundamentally caused by the conflict between North Korea and the United States and the prolonged state of tension caused by the division of the Korean peninsula. Second, the CSOs intend to emphasize the principle of a peaceful settlement of the nuclear crisis through Korean citizens, the Korean government, international organizations and the governments of the six countries participating in the multilateral talks in the face of unsuccessful negotiations among these governments. Third, the CSOs believe that the establishment of peace in the Korean peninsula is possible only through the simultaneous recognition of the protection of North Korea's security and the elimination of North Korea's nuclear program.

## 2) Activity

The Civil Society Organization's letter to Jimmy Carter, Former President of the United States

On November 28, 2002, more than 30 Korean CSOs, including Women Making Peace and the People's Solidarity for Participatory Democracy, sent a letter to Mr. Jimmy Carter, who received the Nobel Peace Prize for his instrumental role in dissipating the first North Korean nuclear crisis in 1994. The purpose of this letter was to urge him to take a crucial role as a negotiator in the resolution of the conflict between North Korea and United States and achieve a peaceful settlement to the second nuclear crisis.

### (i) The Dispatch of Korean Peace Delegates to the United States

With the invitation of the American Friends Service Committee (AFSC), a coalition group named the National Council for Peace in the Korean Peninsula sent seven peace delegates to the United States. These delegates visited ten major cities, including Washington, D.C. from May 31 to June 10, 2003.

There were four objectives of their visits:

1. To communicate broad concerns of the Korean National Assembly and civil society about the North Korea-United States conflict and the nuclear issue, and convey policy alternatives.
2. To deliver policy alternatives to improve the relationship between South Korea and

the United States.

3. To lobby political leaders and policy experts to resolve the nuclear crisis in the Korean peninsula.
4. To explore coalition building with American CSOs to dissipate the threat of war in the peninsula and to promote world peace.

Specific Activities Carried Out by the Delegates During the Visits:

- (1) The delegates met congressmen, who are members of the Korea Caucus and the Progressive Caucus, to convey their views on the United States' policy toward North Korea for future cooperation. They also met with Curt Weldon, a member of the House of Representatives.
- (2) The delegates met with experts, religious leaders and peace activists to explain the Korean peace issue and develop a network between Korean and American CSOs. Participating in the National Convention of the United for Peace and Justice, they also contributed to making the Korean peace issue one of major issues of the peace movement in the United States.
- (3) The delegates brought the Korean peace issue into the 2004 presidential election process. They visited New Hampshire and Iowa to meet with Christian leaders, members of CSOs, and local opinion makers, who influenced the presidential primaries. Explaining the gravity of the nuclear crisis in the Korean peninsula and proposing solutions, they appealed for the US support for the peaceful resolution of the Korean nuclear issue.
- (4) In Washington, D.C. the delegates publicized the Korean issue through local media, including at least ten interviews with American citizens.
- (5) The delegates explored the possibility of building a coalition with Korean Americans.

(ii) International Signature-Collecting Campaign

In the face of the first Six-Party Talk, in August 2003, Korean CSOs launched a signature-collecting campaign to oppose war and promote the peaceful settlement of the Korean nuclear issue. They gathered signatures from 162 organizations and 372 individuals in 42 countries and sent them to the six country's heads of the state.

(iii) Northeast Asian Networks to Support "2005 Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict"

Expecting the Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict Conference

to be held in July 2005, eighteen CSOs and many individuals formed the GPPAC Korean Preparatory Committee on April 6, 2004. This committee participated in the GPPAC Northeast Asia Regional Conference to urge Japan, Russia, China, Hong Kong, and Taiwan to adopt the Korean nuclear issue as an important regional issue and proposed alternatives for resolving the issue and establishing peace on the Korean peninsula.

(iv) Internationalization of the Nuclear Issue

To explain the views of Korean civil society on this issue, Korean CSOs attended such international meetings as Peace Boat workshops (January 2004), World Social Forum (January 2004), NPT Preparatory Meeting (April 2004), the conferences held by the United States Institute for Peace and Justice (2003), UN CSW (May 2004), and the Boston Social Forum (July 2004).

(v) International Peace Conference on Religion and the Letter to U.S. President George W. Bush

Korea Peace Forum (KPF) hosted an international peace conference on religion in Seoul from October 21 to 23, 2004. About 40 religious leaders participated in the conference held on the theme 'Building the Common House of Peace in East Asia – Peace on the Korean Peninsula as a Pivot.'

Amid the increasing tension in Northeast Asia caused by North Korea's nuclear issue and with the US Presidential election a couple of weeks away, religious leaders gathered together in order to manifest their strong commitment to the peaceful resolution of the Korean peninsula issue and discuss their role in the peace process.

The conference dealt with three sub-themes in group discussion sessions:

- 1) Common Security through Trust
- 2) Common Wellbeing through Cooperation
- 3) Korean People's Initiative on International Relations

The conference participants also announced the final statement that incorporated the suggestions made at the discussions.

In addition, the conference also decided to send a letter with a peace message to U.S. President George W. Bush with the focus being on the U.S. policy

toward North Korea. The letter undersigned by religious leaders, academics, elected officials, business people and representatives of civil society in South Korea, Europe and North America congratulated President Bush on his second term in office and suggested that he not use military means to solve the problem on the Korean peninsula, and that he resist a military option if one is presented to him. The letter was sent to the White House via the US Embassy in Seoul on January 10, 2005.

Also, in order to keep the conference participants informed about what is happening in Korea with regard to peace issues, KPF provides weekly news clipping service by email and hopes to use its website as an online forum for discussion on major current issues.

Although North Korea was not able to take part in the conference last year (2004), they are making every possible effort to attend this year's meeting to be held in the United States to manifest their firm commitment to peace on the Korean peninsula.

### 3) Evaluation

- (i) The Korean civil society publicized its views on the peaceful resolution of the nuclear issue to the international community through a signature-collecting campaign, the translation of its statements into English, and participation in international conferences.
- (ii) The peace delegates to the United States achieved the following:
  - They met with key players in resolving the nuclear crisis such as US congressmen and policy experts in major think tanks to convey to them the views and policy alternatives of Korean civil society.
  - They rectified misunderstandings about the nuclear issue in the United States through American mass media and publicized methods for its peaceful resolution in American civil society.
  - They gained cooperation and support for their activities from the American peace movement and opened a channel for mutual collaboration.
  - They opened a channel for grassroots diplomacy for the first time and learned the importance of lobbying.

#### 4) Obstacles

- (i) There is no way to share civil society's demands because national governments, the IAEA, and the UN Security Council have monopolized the discussion of the nuclear issue.
- (ii) Civil societies in Northeast Asia have been rather passive toward the nuclear issue despite its significance for the entire Northeast Asian region.
- (iii) There is no established channel for communication between the Korean government and Korean civil society for international cooperation.
- (iv) Korean civil society does not have an institutional mechanism for building international coalitions. Hampered by the considerable lack of human, financial, and technical resources, Korean civil society could not sustain its systematic efforts to communicate to the international community its views on the nuclear issue in the Korean peninsula.

#### 5) Recommendations

##### (i) Civil Society

Korean civil society needs to establish a cooperative team among grassroots organizations to sustain its efforts to resolve the nuclear issue through policy proposals, and domestic and international networking. It also needs to form an international coalition that will specialize in the production of such English materials as: booklets explaining its views and activities, films introducing collaborative activities for the reconciliation between North and South Korea, and newsletters to publicize the process of the six-party talks. Korean civil society needs to pursue various forms of diplomacy via the governments, parliaments, and civil societies of the countries involved in the six-party talks. Both internally and externally, Korean civil society needs to continue networking with parliamentary members, civil society, and policy experts. Finally, civil society needs to make active use of such international forums as GPPAC.

##### (ii) Governments

The governments involved in the six-party talks need to support grassroots diplomacy. They need to listen to the demands of Korean civil society and

form a framework to facilitate agreement between government and civil society to deal with the talks focusing on the nuclear issue.

(iii) UN & International Society

The UN and International Society need to support the peaceful resolution of the nuclear crisis. They need to contribute to the making of the international public opinion in favor of peaceful resolution and they need to facilitate collective responses among grassroots organizations in the six countries.

#### **4. The Response of South Korean CSOs to the Issue of Distorted history.**

##### 1) Background

The Role of Korea in the Building of the Northeast Asia Peace Community in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century

- In the 21<sup>st</sup> century, Northeast Asian countries continue to be effected by past violence, oppression, and invasions. From the Korean perspective Northeast Asia has not changed much since the early 20th century where colonial ideas were the norm.
- Sharing lessons of peace and mutual understanding regarding past Japanese colonialism is necessary in order to prevent neo-colonialism in Northeast Asia.

In light of this situation, Korea should take the role of mediator to create peaceful community in Northeast Asia.

- In 2001, Korean civil society organizations, in cooperation with Japanese civil society organizations, found success in their dealings with the Japanese distorted history textbook issue. This year, Korean CSOs should continue to deal with this issue in conjunction with the network of Japanese, Chinese, and Korean CSOs established in 2002.
- Recently there has been agreement among South Korean social sectors that justice and closure is needed for the victims of the Japanese colonization, and the people that cooperated with the Japanese during occupation.
- 2005 is a significant year because it is the 40th anniversary of the signing of the South Korea-Japan Treaty, the 60th anniversary of the independence of Korea from Japanese occupation, and the 100th anniversary of the signing of the Ulsa Treaty. It is important to compensate aging victims soon.

## 2) Activity

The Reality of Historical Conflict in Northeast Asia and the Response of Civil Society Organizations

(i) Distortion from Japan:

a. Regarding the Japanese Society For History Textbook Reform (JSHTR)

- Attempted to have the new textbooks adopted into 10% of schools with support from representatives from Japanese right wing groups such as, Ishihara Shintaro, the mayor of Tokyo; and Abhe Shincho, Japanese congressman.
- The JSHTR textbook does not include issues such as military sexual slaves, forced labor workers, or the Nanjing massacre but does include the Japanese involvement in the liberation of Indonesia, Myanmar and the Philippines.
- Other Japanese CSOs have formed committees to oppose the attempts of the JSHTR. In Korea, the Asia Peace and History Education Network has also actively worked against the attempts of the JSHTR.
- The Civilian Movement for Correcting Japan-distorted Textbook and other Korean CSOs actively involved in trying to bring about justice for the past in conjunction with Japanese, Chinese, North Korean CSOs.

b. The Response of Civil Society Organizations to the Distorted Textbook Issue.

- The strong network and cooperation of Japanese and S. Korean CSOs could have stopped the attempts of the JSHTR in 2001. This network should strengthen in 2005.
- The History Cognition and East Asian Peace Forum initiated by the Civilian Movement for Correcting Japan-distorted Textbook continues in Nanjing(02), Tokyo(03), and Seoul(04).
- In May, 2005 CSOs from Japan, China, and Korea have a plan to publish a history textbook in three languages in order to counter-attack the attempts of the JSHTR. In addition, a experimental history camp for youth of three countries is being planned to build a common ground in understanding history.

(ii) Distortion from China:

a. The Response of South Korea to the Distortion of the History of the Kingdom of Koguryo.

- From the fall of 2003, South Korean CSOs began to express their concerns about the attempts of distorting Koguryo history.
- The South Korean government supported the registration of the historical sites of Koguryo in North Korea as part of UNESCO's World Cultural Heritage in 2004.
- The South Korean government dispatched an official to Beijing to complain about China's "ongoing distortion of the history of Koguryo," including the removal of the kingdom's name from a Chinese Foreign Ministry web page on Korea.
- Active research continues after the establishment of the Koguryo Research Foundation.

### 3) Recommendations

(i) Directions for Solving Historical Conflict among Japan, China and Korea

1. Building a Neutral Understanding of Historical Point of View among the Three Nations.
  - The ultimate goal for solving historical conflict is to create a foundation for the neutral understanding of history. Thus it is necessary to activate exchange programs among scholars, students, youth, and NGO activities of the three countries.
  - The attitude toward dealing with historical conflict should be systematic and

prospective since the response of the public to this issue is usually instant and emotional.

## 2. The Need of a Prospective Vision

- History is not only a matter of the past, but also a matter of the present. Thus the wills of governments in the process of solving historical conflict is important.
- The instant responses of the South Korean government to the historical conflicts with China and Japan caused the absence of a holistic or comprehensive approach to dealing with this issue.

## 3. The Role of Civil Society Organizations

- CSOs from the three countries, not only governments, strive to solve historical conflict. However, there are also CSOs causing more problems due to their strong nationalistic point of view.
- South Korean CSOs should strengthen CSOs in other countries through supporting and networking in order to restrain the growth of extreme nationalist activities.

## (ii) Goals for Solving Historical Conflict among Japan, China and Korea

### 1. Short-term Goals

- Launching a joint research project or seminar to create a neutral understanding on history among Chinese, Japanese, and Korean historians and researchers.
- Establishing a network among CSOs to share information related to history and historical conflict.
- Building a system together with government, schools, and NGOs to effectively respond to distortion attempts in China and Japan.

### 2. Long-term Goals

- Combine national history and world history into one subject in the history education of South Korea in order to not create a dual perspective of history.
- Establishing a fund for the “Historical Reconciliation of Northeast Asia” which supports academic research, educational activities and exchanges resources among CSOs in order to activate the process of solving historical conflict.
- Developing a history textbook based on neutral perspective in understanding history of Northeast Asia for the next Chinese, Japanese, and Korean generations.

## **5. CSO Opposition Movement to the Deployment of Korean**

## **Troops to Iraq.**

### 1) Background

- The US preparation for the invasion of Iraq, which began in earnest in autumn 2002, and the US request to the government of South Korea to join in the war efforts in Iraq, posed a serious question of choice to the South Korean society.
- The presidential candidate, Roh Moo-hyun, a relatively young politician, succeeded in being elected on the basis of his election pledge to 'speak out what needs to be said' to the US. This happened in the midst of the massive candle-lit movement protesting the ruling of the US military court, which acquitted an American soldier implicated in a case where two junior high school girls were killed when they were run over by a armored vehicle in the winter of 2002.
- In the spring of 2003, when the US initiated the war against Iraq, there were "two Koreas" in South Korea. One was a 'pro-US' security state, which has never failed to respond positively to a US 'request' for military deployment, and another, which, as manifested in the election of a candidate who proposed to "speak what needs to be said" towards the US, tried to develop a post Cold War peace-oriented society.
- The Korean society, where the 'two identities' were beginning to come into conflict, found itself in a position of having to respond to the US request for troop deployment in Iraq, had to deal with the concern that North Korea could be next in line for US aggression after Iraq.

### 1) The Korean Government's Cooperation in the War against and the Occupation of Iraq

#### (i) Korea's Choice: The Deployment of Korean Troops

- The government of President Roh Moo-hyun, in an apparent turn-around from the assertive independent position taken during the days of his election campaign, chose to send Korean troops to help in the US war and occupation campaign in Iraq.
- The first round of troop deployment took place in May 2003. 650 detachments composed of medical corps and military engineers, were sent to Iraq. The government of President Roh Moo-hyun tabled a resolution for the deployment of troops to the National Assembly on March 20, the day after the initiation of the US aggression against Iraq. The National Assembly gave its consent to the Government's bill of

resolution on April 2, only 11 days after its tabling, with 179 votes in favor and 68 against.

- In September 2003, the Korean Government made public that it had been requested by the US to send another deployment in Iraq. It announced, on October 20, its decision to comply with that request. On December 26, 2003, the government drew up a plan to deploy an additional detachment of 3,000 troops, to contribute to the 'reconstruction' efforts in Iraq. On February 13, 2004, the National Assembly gave its consent to the second round of troops deployment, with 155 votes in favor and 50 against. The 'reconstruction' regiment, composed of combat troops drawn from the Special Operations units and the Marines, gave rise to a suspicion about their eventual role in Iraq. The government prevailed insisting that the troops would not be involved in combat or law enforcement efforts.
- The general elections for the National Assembly, taking place soon after the parliamentary consent for the second round of troop deployment in Iraq, saw the rekindling of a society-wide debate for a review of the decision to send troops to Iraq. 89 of the 299 newly elected members of the National Assembly had put their names to a document that called for a review of the decision.
- In June 2004, a Korean employee of a Christian missionary-linked company, involved in supply activities, contracted by the U.S. military, was kidnapped and killed by an armed militia group in Iraq. The newly instituted National Assembly, however, failed to discuss the deployment decision review, because of an agreement between the ruling party and the largest parliamentary opposition party.
- The Korean Government, from August to November 2004, dispatched a total of 3,500 soldiers to Erbil, in northern Iraq.

#### (ii) The Argument of the Korean Government for Troop Deployment

- President Roh Moo-hyun, who had asserted that he would "speak what needs to be said" towards the US, attempted to justify and rationalize the troop deployment by pointing to a number of grounds and causes. The rationale and argument propounded by the major parties in the National Assembly, the ruling party and the major opposition party, were similar to these.

- The Korean government argued that the troop deployment would meet national interests with the following reasons.

The troop deployment from South Korea would:

1. Prevent the breakout of a war in the Korean peninsula by reducing the US pressure on North Korea.
2. Prevent an economic and military crisis by strengthening the alliance relationship between South Korea and the US.
3. Bring economic gains through the participation in rehabilitation projects after the war.
4. Show its commitment to International Society not submitting to terrorist actions, especially following the kidnapping and the killing of Kim, Seon-il.
5. Contribute to the reconstruction efforts for people in Iraq.

## 2) Activity

The Opposition Movement to the Korean Troop Deployment to Iraq

### (i) The Campaign of the Civil Society Movement against Troop Deployment

- Activities at the time of the initial deployment decision were conducted along two tracks. A team of concerned people for peace in Iraq went to Iraq to demonstrate their opposition to war and to appeal for peace. Various civil society organizations, which opposed the deployment of Korean troops in Iraq jointly, organized a series of public rallies to pressure the government in Korea.
- When the Korean Government, in early September 2003, made public the request of the US government for Korean troop deployment in Iraq, 351 organizations throughout the country came together, on September 23, to form the broad coalition, called the People's Coalition for Action against Troop Deployment in Iraq.

### (ii) The Main Forms of Action

- a. Relay Declaration against War and Candle-light Vigils

- Candle-light Vigils: This became an effective form of public action because of its powerful appeal as a rallying point following the killing of two junior high school girls by an American soldier in 2002.
- Relay Declarations Against the War: Trade unions, civil society activists, cultural workers, lawyers, academics, and students organized a relay of anti-war declarations and press conferences.
- On-line and off-line signature collection campaigns against the war and the deployment of troops.

#### b. Activities of Korean Peace Activists in Iraq

- Iraq Peace Team: A number of people, from various parts of society including: civil society movement activists, students, medical doctors, performance artists, writers, women, and parliamentary officials, voluntarily traveled to Iraq as the US initiated its invasion.
- Occupation Watch Activities: Peace activists took part in various anti-war peace activities with local groups before the American war of aggression. With the continuation of the war and occupation, the peace volunteers turned to monitoring atrocities by occupation forces, providing local information to the anti-war movement and media in Korea. A landmark work is found in the “Fallujah Report”, made public in April, is based on extensive interviews with local people. The peace volunteers continued their monitoring work in Iraq until it became unadvisable to continue to stay in Iraq following the kidnapping and killing of a Korea national.

#### c. Policy and Legal Actions

- Policy Monitoring Work: a network of civil society movement groups, researchers, and lawyers came together to monitor the U.S. government's occupation policy, and the Korean government's troop deployment decision-making process, to provide informed analysis for lobbying the government and the National Assembly.
- Civil Society Policy Report: The policy-monitoring network produced information, documentation materials and opinion papers at critical moments to counter government policy positions. It also produced a civilian counter report when the government organized on-the-ground fact-finding mission to Iraq, to challenge its claims and report.

- Constitutional Challenge: Civil society groups opposed to the troop deployment submitted a constitutional challenge against the government's decision. The Constitutional Court, however, ruled against the submissibility of the challenge, asserting that the general citizen had no eligibility to mount a challenge and that the decision on deployment was within the discretionary realm of the government's competence.

d. Pressure Against and Cooperation with Members of the National Assembly

- Parliamentarian Group for Peace and Against the War: Regular meetings between leaders of civil society groups opposed to the war and individual members of the National Assembly gave rise to the formation of an ad hoc Parliamentarian Group for Peace and Against the War, enlisting 50 to 60 National Assembly members, leading to a close cooperation for common cause. The group cooperates with the civil society groups for its efforts within the National Assembly, and jointly produced a resolution bill calling for a review of the deployment decision.
- Blacklist of National Assembly Members Supporting Troop Deployment: Civil society movement groups, based on their monitoring of the National Assembly, produced a list of National Assembly members who had supported the troop deployment, calling on the voters in the general election to reject these people.

e. People's War Crimes Tribunal and International Cooperation

- People's War Crimes Tribunal: In the spirit of the "Jakarta Consensus", Korean civil society movement groups opposed to war in Iraq organized, in early December 2004, a People's War Crimes Tribunal against American president George Bush, British prime minister Tony Blair, and South Korean president Roh Moo-hyun. A number of citizens of the US, Iraq, and colleagues of kidnapped and killed Korean national in Iraq took part in the tribunal as witnesses, and 4,000 people joined the trial as plaintiffs.
- International Action Against the War: Korean anti-war peace movement groups joined in the Jakarta conference, actions in Mumbai, and the strategy conference held in Beirut. The movement also organized mass public rallies in major cities as a part of the March 20 International Day of Action. Korean groups also organized joint actions

with groups in countries such as: Japan and Turkey, and organized exchange of speakers for the coordinated activities.

### 3) Evaluations

- From the CSO's perspective, the arguments of the Roh Moo-hyun administration to support the deployment of South Korean troops to Iraq have failed for various reasons; such a military action of the government:
  - Violates Article 5 paragraph 1 of the constitution.
  - Ignores the ethical questions regarding the war and its effects.
  - Refuses a democratic decision making process and space for public debate.
  - Manipulates the public by distorting information or providing false information.
  - Puts nationals in danger by not developing a early warning system in the areas where troops deliver military actions.
- The peace movement fell short of preventing the troop deployment in Iraq. While the public opinion, in the course of the campaign opposing the troop deployment, remained roughly evenly balanced, the opposition sentiments were not organised effectively into successful action. This stands in contrast to the opposition to the war in Iraq, which was consistently around 90% in the public opinion polls.
- The difference in public sentiment on two related but different issues may reflect the lack of experience of the Korean people in extending solidarity across the national borders for a universal cause. Furthermore, the relatively lower level of opposition to the Korean troop deployment may have been brought about by a sense of fear of the escalation of the North Korea/US tension into war, and the concern for the possible damage that may arise from a schism in the South Korea-US alliance, which the government and the leading opinion makers had consistently stressed.
- The Cold War structures, stemming from the national division, which frame the situation of the Korean peninsula, constrain the free choice of people. As Archbishop Desmond Tutu has stated "there is a need for continued moral pre-emptive offensive for peace and against war". The efforts to uphold democracy and justice against narrow-minded self-interest and fear, which are generated by Cold War and defeatist mentality, must be sustained.

- The Korean people's movement opposing the deployment of Korean troops in Iraq revealed to everyone that a genuine peace is only possible when our concern for peace widens beyond the confines of the Korean peninsula. It was also the first ever-popular anti-war peace movement, which has given rise to the growth of a peace movement of Korean civil society that reached across borders.

#### 4) Recommendations

##### (i) Civil Society

- Strengthen international solidarity against war and for the withdraw of US forces from Iraq.
- Establish a global information network in order to bring public awareness of the immeasurable physical, material, and psychological sufferings of the Iraqi people.
- Form an international civil investigation committee to investigate cases of human rights violations in the “war against terror.”
- The media should refuse to follow attempts of the information control based on a ‘safety’ reason in unjust or illegitimate military actions.

##### (ii) Governments

- Stop information control and discrimination against foreigners based on the concept of ‘war against terror’ and abolish the Anti-Terror Law.
- Adapt the pacifist constitution that rejects any attempts to take a part in invasive military actions and make serious efforts to implement it.
- Protect the right of objection to ‘the conscription of illegitimate orders or military actions.’

##### (iii) UN & International Society

- Oppose preventive war and restrict preconditions for preemptive strikes
- Specify UN regulations on opposition of preemptive strikes and clarify steps to respond to nations that break them. Guarantee CSOs’ participation in the process of decision making on that matter.
- Put pressure on the US and its allies to withdraw from Iraq as it has become clear that they are a part of the root causes of the Iraqi conflict.
- Refuse to agree on the extension of military engagement in Iraq by joint-forces.

#### **6. Peace Education Activities for Cultivating the Culture of Peace.**

## 1) Background

People will remember the 20<sup>th</sup> Century as an era of “bloodshed” due to the largest number of casualties in human history occurred in this century. Although the Cold War era has ended and a new century has begun with much hope, the world is still suffering from various armed conflicts such as 9-11 and the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq. It seems that the culture of the new century is already being shaped by more violence than peace though the UN has proclaimed the first decade to be the International Decade for a Culture of Peace and Nonviolence for the Children.

In the Korean peninsula alone, the culture of peace is still far from being realized. Military confrontation between the North and the South as it has for more than five decades following the Korean War. Militarism is strong on both sides due to the mandatory draft system and the presence of US military bases throughout the South. Internationally, the recent conflict between North Korea and the USA over the nuclear issue is also threatening the safety of the peninsula. In the South, the rapid improvement of economy has created issues that have caused social conflicts such as antagonism between employer and employee, a top-down approach of government in the public decision making process, and a competitive culture in business and education.

In spite of international and national political obstacles to achieving peace on the Korean peninsula and in society, however, circumstances have gradually changed. The Sunshine policy has produced remarkable results in the exchange of people and resources between the North and the South, including the summit between the two Korean leaders in 2000 and Gaeseong industrial complex, an inter-Korean economic cooperation project. Furthermore, exchange activities among CSO have expanded in the past 10 years through humanitarian assistance projects and cultural events.

In this time of transition, cultivating a culture of peace in Korea is needed to overcome 50 years of heated confrontation, and to move toward a peaceful future in Northeast Asia. However, there is a very limited understanding of what it means to have a culture of peace. The attempts to establish substantial peace education to cultivate this culture of peace nationwide has also been limited. It is clear that much more effort should be put into the peace education field in order to transform the culture of violence in Korea and the Northeast Asia region.

This report will outline the peace building activities of Seoul GPPAC committee members. Hopefully, it will contribute to the establishment of sustainable peace

education programs and activities in Korea as well as in Northeast Asia.

## 2) Activity

### **Women Making Peace**

Women Making Peace (WMP), founded in 1997, is a specialized organization formed to realize the reunification of, and peace on, the Korean peninsula and to create hope for peace in Asia and the world. WMP conducts necessary research on the infrastructure and methods needed for the peaceful reunification of Korea in order to present their findings to the government, particularly from a feminist perspective.

WMP tries to promote tolerance and peace of mind as general values in the Korean society to promote citizens' peacemaking skills, and to cultivate a life-centered culture of peace for a better world. WMP carries out concrete actions to improve the social environment for reunification and peace on the Korean peninsula. In addition, WMP tries to facilitate the equal participation of women in the settlement of conflicts and disputes and tries to promote women's leadership in peacemaking at home and abroad.

#### □ School Violence Prevention

Peace education for preventing school violence and cultivating the culture of peace in schools focuses on providing elementary and high school students with methods for solving conflicts in a peaceful and constructive manner. Besides conflict resolution skills, students also explore various peace topics including human rights, anger management, non-violent communication skills, gender equality, tolerance and reconciliation for the future Korea by overcoming prejudice.

#### □ Conflict Resolution Training Program

Conflict resolution training program for trainers & facilitators is a training program for future trainers and facilitators in the conflict resolution and peace education field. After completing 15 sessions, participants can be involved in co-facilitating conflict resolution workshops at schools and other functions.

#### □ Conflict Resolution Workshop for Local NGOs

Conflict resolution capacity building workshops for local NGOs provide an opportunity for local NGOs to obtain a general understanding of conflict resolution and its application in strengthening the local capacity to deal with local conflicts such as disputes over environment, public policy-making, and conflicts based on interest among

local people.

### **Asia-Pacific Center of Education for International Understanding** **Under the Auspices of UNESCO**

Asia-Pacific Center of Education for International Understanding (APCEIU) was established in 1999 under the agreement between UNESCO Headquarters and the Korean government to carry out the mandate of promoting and developing education for international understanding (EIU) towards the culture of peace. APCEIU, coping with unsettled ethnic, cultural, and religious conflicts after the cold war and increasing militarism and terrorism, endeavors to spread and deepen the principles and issues of peace, human rights, multi-cultural understanding, sustainable development and value formation in all schools through a holistic and participatory pedagogy.

#### □ Peace Education for Teachers

APCEIU has successfully developed training programs for teachers in Asian and Pacific countries, and disseminated information about peace education and empirical models through reports and publications to international society. Programs for building the culture of peace exist for both schools and civil society.

##### (a) EIU Training Workshop for Korean Teachers

Consists of two courses, foundational and advanced, which have an annual 10-day training workshop during vacations with participants of 45 to 60 primary and secondary school teachers. Composed of in-depth understanding of the contents of EIU, acquiring pedagogy through the workshop, a group works to create a tutorial model, and evaluation with suggestions.

In addition, EIU hosts the Circuiting Training program, conducted many times a year in various regions and cities with teachers and educational administrators, and the Teachers' Meeting, a voluntary monthly study meeting of school teachers to develop an application model under the theme of understanding other cultures and peace building.

##### (b) EIU Training Workshop for Asia-Pacific Teachers

Asia-Pacific Teacher-Training Workshop is held at the Asia-Pacific Education Center in Korea for 3 or 4 weeks every summer. Teachers, teacher educators and other tertiary level educators from around 20 Asian and Pacific countries attend this workshop. The presentation of the EIU status and cases in each country is added along with the cultural exchange program.

Sub-Regional Teacher-Training Workshop takes place in various locations including Fiji, Sri Lanka, Japan, and Korea to strengthen the network for future mutual

cooperation at the sub-regional level and to develop a strategy and action plan leading to a culture of peace, human rights, and sustainable development.

### **Peace Project Network**

The Peace Project Network, founded in 2000, is a network of civilians that work to counter the war, conflict and oppression of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. They are working for peace, harmony, and freedom in the 21<sup>st</sup> century through active participation of ordinary people in peace building. The goal of the Peace Project Network is to contribute to building a culture of peace in Korean society and neighboring countries. This begins at the civil society level through publishing materials, participating in global peace exchange programs, and conducting solidarity activities with international organizations.

In addition, the Peace Project Network sponsors diverse peace education and exchange programs organized and hosted by civilians. The Peace Project Network conducts research on war crimes and organizes educational tours of symbolic historical and human rights related sites in Northeast Asia.

#### □ Global Peace Exchange Program

Global peace-exchange is an educational tour program that focuses on reviewing the injustices of the Japanese colonial period in order to establish healthy relationships and a trustful future among the Northeast Asian countries. Japanese and Korean members have an opportunity to explore historical sites and visit survivors of Japanese military occupation, including “comfort women” and the work forces mobilized under Japanese occupation.

#### □ Peace Education

Peace Project Network, in cooperation with Japanese civil organizations, conducts speaking tours in Korea and Japan to educate the public on the issue of the distorted history and human rights of war victims. Peace Project Network also works for the improvement of the rights of minorities by organizing peace education sessions for minorities including the physically disabled and the people negatively effected by the US military bases in Korea.

#### □ Researching and Publishing

Peace Project Network records the testimonies of war victims and conducts

research projects in areas where Korean laborers were forced to work under Japanese occupation. Peace Project Network also publishes books of stories, in the Korean and Japanese languages, related to the human rights of war victims and minorities.

### **Korea Anabaptist Center**

The Korea Anabaptist Center (KAC), founded in 2001, is a Christian organization working with individuals, groups and churches to actively participate in the mission of God by cultivating radical discipleship, the culture of peace and Christian community. It also develops and provides resources, education, training and relationships in the Anabaptist / Mennonite faith tradition.

KAC is a resource center for peace education with both materials and programs. There is a growing feeling of need to create a culture of peace in the Korean context and education is an essential element in bringing about that change. KAC is involved in a variety of peace-related activities ranging from hosting one-day workshops to developing curriculum through ongoing programs.

#### □ The Peacebuilders Program

The Peacebuilders program is an English conversation class with peace education content for both South and North Korean young adults. The peace education content starts from basic cross-cultural communication, and leads to more specific learning about violence and conflict in daily life and the world. Participants discuss the ways in which it is possible to learn to live together peacefully, focusing on the social reunification point of view for the future of change in Korea. The class also focuses on communication skill development, conflict resolution, awareness building, and discussion of peace and violence issues.

#### □ The Anyoung! Pyeonghwa (Youth About Peace) Program

The Anyoung! Pyeonghwa program is a participatory peace education program for elementary and middle school students. In this program students learn about various peace issues by participating in activities designed according to 10 different themes including: peace and conflict, difference and discrimination, interpersonal violence, weapons and toys, environment, and reunification.

#### □ Conflict Transformation & Peer Medication workshops

KAC conducts and co-hosts workshops on conflict transformation and peer mediation for school teachers, administrators, students, parents, and other peace workers and activists. In these workshops, the focus is placed upon conflict transformation theory and transformative mediation skills and participants discuss the potential for their implementation. Currently the workshops have expanded in focus to include transforming church conflict.

### **Korea Peace Forum**

Korea Peace Forum (KPF), a non-profit organization established in 2000 is dedicated to the peaceful re-unification of Korea through the bi-partisan support of political parties and the input and involvement of citizens. It is also committed to the establishment of a network of people throughout North East Asia working for peace.

Domestically, KPF works to provide a forum for discussion where political parties, both ruling and opposition and civil society attempt to close the gap between them and explore ways to work closely together for the national cause of peaceful reunification. It also works with world peace-loving organizations to build a network to help support KPF's peace initiative.

#### □ NGO Workshop

NGO workshop provides a platform for Northeast Asian civil organizations to network based on friendship and trust. The workshop seeks a long-term vision for Asian civil societies and helps them incorporate the vision into their own programs in each field. Participants of the workshop educate and learn at the same time and can better understand each other from the Asian perspective.

This program has so far been attended by Korean and Japanese civil activists and academics and is expected to include friends from China and other Asian countries to expand and exchange knowledge and insights necessary to pursue a Northeast Asian community.

\* NGO Workshops KPF has conducted:

#### **The 1st Korea-Japan Workshop**

*'Visions and Task of Northeast Asian Civil Societies'*

July 5 – 7, 2002, Korea Academy House, Seoul, Korea

### **The 2nd Korea-Japan Workshop**

*'East Asian Consciousness and Local Society'*

January 15 – 19, 2004, Tokyo and Yokohama, Japan

### **The 3rd Korea-Japan Workshop**

*'How to Link Local Communities to East Asia'*

August. 20 – 23, 2004, Choongnam, Hongsung, Korea

### **The 4th Korea-Japan Workshop**

*'Seeing East Asia Through the Vietnamese Perspective'*

February 26 – March 3, 2005, Hochimin, Vietnam

### **World Christian Frontiers**

World Christian Frontiers (WCF) is an independent Christian organization, started in 1993 as a small prayer group for the concerns of the world. Through the years WCF grew into an organization working with people in devastating situations such as: poverty and famine caused by war and violence. Through peace education programs and an affiliation with the UN, other NGO's and missionaries, WCF has initiated community development and reconciliation programs in various conflict areas including East Timor, Afghanistan, and Iraq. The goal of WCF is to encourage the next generation to have hope for peace in the world and to participate in the process of reconciliation.

#### □ Reconciliation and Peace Camps

From the year 2000, WCF hosted annual summer camps for children and youth raised in areas where the dreadful pains, wounds, distrusts, and retaliation caused by wars and disputes flourished. The reconciliation and peace camps places where young people from different countries including ones on the perpetrating side can demonstrate the willingness to become friends with, and to share the pain of their former enemies by living with them in areas destroyed by wars. This may bring about the courage for reconciliation and hope for the future. During the camp, the peace school teaches subjects of immediate interest and need such as reading, writing, English and computer skills, but also more detailed and essential programs are coordinated for the student's understanding of peace and reconciliation in order to help students become peace constructors rather than an peace destroyers. Reconciliation and peace camps were held in East Timor and Afghanistan with participants from more than 8 countries.

#### □ Reconstruction Projects

WCF conducts rehabilitation projects in areas devastated by violence in order to

help local people rebuild their own communities. WCF often invites young generations from opposing groups or countries to work together. Through the process of reconstruction, participants can witness dreadful scenes of victimization and can establish an objective view on reality. It can help participants to prevent future violence and to experience reconciliation between the two sides. Reconstruction projects include rebuilding destroyed houses, creating income sources for devastated communities, removing mines, building schools for war affected students and providing medical services for women and children.

### 3) Obstacles

#### (i) Cultural Aspect

- A strict and top-down approach in a public decision-making process and culture integrated throughout times of the military regimes and centralized economic development policies.
- A result-oriented uniform education system.
- Militarism infused into many aspects of society.
- Discrimination based on gender, age, race, location, wealth, and belief.
- Economic values based development and progress first concept.
- The lack of rational problem solving skills and accountability in politics.
- Violent and sensational media.

#### (ii) Structural Aspect

- The military confrontation between North and South Korea (military draft system).
- Absence of recognition and compensation for structural violence and injustice by governments including human rights abuses in the Japanese colonization and other military regimes.
- The lack of understanding and support from the government for peace education.
- Exclusion of peace education from public education system.
- Absence of institutes and schools to train peace educators.
- Ineffective communication system between the government, academic, religious organizations, and CSO.

- Inactive national and international network among peace educators.

(iii) Peace Education Content Aspect

- Difficulties for sustainable peace education:
  - Short term, event-centered, fragmented peace education.
  - Lack of systematic approaches in developing materials and dates due to limited environment and human resources.
  - Less opportunity for reeducation and training for educators.
- Poor understanding and support of the public.
- A weak historical and philosophical foundation of peace education in Korea

#### 4) Recommendations

(i) Civil Society

- Start peace education institutes, document materials, and build online systems to make these materials available to peace educators.
- Promote skills for non-violent conflict resolution in civil society.
- Facilitate cooperation between formal and informal peace education.
- Focus on the media's responsibility in promoting conflict prevention by encouraging peace journalism.
- Keep a balance between practice and research on peace education.
- Participate in an international peace education network.
- Encourage peaceful demonstrations rather than violent protests.

(ii) Governments

- Strengthen government's understanding and support for sustainable peace education.
  - Incorporate peace education as a compulsory subject in education system.
  - Train peace educators by establishing/supporting peace education research institutes.
  - Support peace education programs related to universities.
  - Recognize and assist international peace education programs.
  - Give financial support for developing various peace education contents including non-violent communication, conflict resolution, and trauma healing.

- Incorporate civil society organizations' opinions into the public decision making process.
  - Apply the conflict prevention process in the implementation of governmental led projects.
  - Establish specialized agencies for conflict resolution under government departments.
- Review competitive education system.
- Review policies that create a culture of violence.
  - Establish alternatives to military service.
  - Employ environment-friendly policies regarding industrial development projects.
  - Review policies that encourage discrimination based on gender, age, and race.
  - Encourage peaceful protests by minimizing security police forces.

(iii) Region

- Establish groups of consultants on peaceful restorative education. Establish educational institutes to promote peace education in Northeast Asia.
- Create and encourage on-going based academic seminars and study groups to share historical understandings of injustice among the peoples of Northeast Asia.
- Create a database with the goal of sharing peace education resources online.

(iv) UN & International Society

- Recommend that governments in Northeast Asia establish public peace education programs.
- Continue follow-up investigation of implementation of various international recommendations in this field.
- Support an international network for peace education resources and educators.
- Create a support system for peace education activities in areas of conflict.

## **Appendix:**

### **Proposed Agenda and Points for Northeast Asian Consultation on GPPAC**

#### **1. Key Points of the Northeast Asian Context**

The outstanding feature in Northeast Asia is that state and inter-state behaviours are dominated by rigid 'national security' and 'national history' paradigms, undermining more fundamental values in human rights and peace between people. Security policies revolve around military capability, based on the old ideas of 'balance of power' and 'mutual assured destruction.' As a consequence, military tension and arms races continue to escalate. Arms production is also increasing rapidly, while civilian control over the army is in decline.

Further, offensive military alliance is used by American leadership, and continues to reformulate itself for higher offensive capability (MD, nuclear armaments, GPR, etc.) The US-ROK and US-Japan alliances are transforming themselves into a proto-type of regional military forces, increasing tension and danger in the region. Large military budgets seriously hinder development of social welfare and provision for the basic needs of people. This in turn makes

establishing democracy difficult.

Due to the recent history of inter-state and intra-state conflicts, there is little historical understanding of the region or norms of regional interaction between countries, while nationalism in each country tends to produce narrow-versions of national and state identities. There are unresolved issues relating to the accountability of colonialism and territorial demarcation in relation to the two World Wars and Japanese colonial rule in Northeast Asia.

Civil society is not fully developed and the state often dominates civil society initiatives, sometimes with outright violence. State dominance in China and North Korea are especially worrisome. The GO-NGO partnership in conflict prevention is yet to establish itself in the region. In international or intra-region conflicts, there are few efforts for building trust, common norms or deeper historical understandings between state and civil society actors. There are few efforts by NGOs for cross-border cooperation on peace and conflict issues, mainly due to predominant social customs rooted in statism and nationalism.

## **2. Recommendations to the Civil Society Organizations (CSOs)**

CSOs should promote and take the initiative to replace the 'peace paradigm' with the existing 'security paradigm.' (*See Table 1*)

At first CSOs should challenge state monopoly or lack of democracy in interpretation and construction of 'security notions,' fostering the exchange of diverse views. Key security notions include 'state interest,' 'enemy,' 'security threat,' 'grave danger' and 'integrity of the nation.' CSOs should seek active intervention in this prohibited arena.

CSOs need to promote civilian control of the military as a way of extending democratic control and review of security related affairs.

The issues include:

1. Open-information arrangement and provision of the right to access information.
2. Social consensus on military budget and armaments.
3. The scope of state secrets.
4. Protection of whistle-blowers in the military.

5. Public monitoring of military expenditures.
6. Protection of basic rights and freedom of military personnel including the right of conscientious objection to military service and the right and obligation to disobey illegal and immoral orders.
7. Human rights education for all.
8. Community consent for military exercise and control over the impact of military facilities.

CSOs should promote the ethics in the ethics-free arena of the military and security affairs, promoting regional norms of tolerance, respect for diversity, and co-existence by advocating institutionalized regional cooperation, and discourse on ethics.

CSOs should promote the building of 'East Asian Common House' (EACH) based on common ideas of peace, justice, sustainable development, and partnership. EACH is a vision for East Asian arrangement for comprehensive cooperation on security, human rights, humanitarian aid, civil society solidarity, regional monitoring, and information sharing, as well as cultural and intellectual exchanges.

In addition to much expected security cooperation, CSOs should promote regional civil society cooperation on monitoring armaments of each country, re-interpretation of 'threats' and 'dangers', transparency in arms procurement and trade, introduction of conflict-preventive military cooperation, spreading the principle and practice of democratic civil control of the army.

CSOs should take the initiative to promote the re-writing of national histories: working for cross-border exchanges of review of the tradition of national memory and national history books and writing new regional history books as a regional civil-society endeavour.

**Table 1: Peace Paradigm and Security Paradigm**

	Security Paradigm (militarization)	Peace Paradigm (de-militarization)
Threat or Grave Danger	the Other nation, ethnic group, religion, or ideology.	exclusion, hegemony, superiority, fundamentalism
Object of Defence	national interest, resource, exclusive right to market, growth, efficiency.	human being, region and local community, civil society, ethical values.
Key Actor	men, security and military	women and men with gender

	personnel	sensitivity, all members of community
Threat Judgement	the state and government agencies	civil society groups promoting social consensus
Strategy for Peace	balance of power and terror, military alliance	mutual interdependence, common security, cooperation
Means for Peace	armament (negative peace)	prevention, cure, cooperation, assistance
Justification	domination by force	procedural justice
Criteria of Armament	absolute deterrence, absolute defence	rational sufficiency
Military Ethics	military-oriented technological development, military production, destructive power	ethics of military technology and armament
Access to Information	secrecy, control of information	limitation of secrecy, access to information for early warning
Consensus Making and Integration	terror, exclusive identity, nationalist utilitarian values	tolerance, inclusive and multiple identity, consensus with right to disobedience