

International Conference on Peace and Conflict Management
25th August 2017 at Galle Face Hotel, Colombo, Sri Lanka

“Nuclear as Part of Peace Process in Korea”

Written by: Jeanne Francoise, Bachelor of Humanities, Master of Defense
Indonesia Defense University

“By concerning 50 millions people having forced migration today because of conflicts, there is no humanitarian intervention, the rational one is political intervention.”

– Antonio Guterres

Abstract:

This paper that would be presented on International Conference on Peace and Conflict Management, 25th August 2017 at Galle Face Hotel, Colombo, Sri Lanka, has an academic hypothesis that in the United Nations new leadership under Secretary General Antonio Guterres and United States new presidency under Donald John Trump, South and North Korea are still in the negative peace, while they have proven a cold war since Korean War 1953. Besides of the modernisation and higher mobility among their citizens to inbound or outbound, both North and South Korean government remains unpredictable of their politics, including their nuclear programs.

Thus, this paper is aimed to give some objectives of analysis about nuclear program in South Korea, based on field research in South Korea in June 2014, as part of obligatory course under full scholarship of Indonesia Defense University, as well as to show an academic hypothesis about the future of unification or remaining-disintegration of South and North Korea.

To analyze the problems, this paper uses the theory of historiography by March Bloch and concept of peace and conflict resolution by Johan Galtung. This paper is highly assumed to be an eye opener for UN Security Council to do some real actions to prevent such conflict and in the more wider scope, this paper is hoped to be a blueprint for Indonesian government to facilitate the power of diplomacy among Indonesians who love Korean culture, music, and culinary, so that they understand at what stake level is the Korean defense system.

Keywords: Korea, Nuclear, United Nations

“Nuclear as Part of Peace Process in Korea”

Historical Background

Former Secretary General of the United Nations Kofi Annan said South Korea has transformed itself from a country that receives the greatest support, now has become a major donor countries (Annan, 2012, p.248). South Korea has managed to rebuild infrastructure and social order of the country for 60 years after the Korean War.

The Korean War was a war extension of the two great powers during the Cold War. Dimensions existing military during the Korean War to justify that the Korean War was not just a civil war and was the first military action of the Cold War. Korean Peninsula, which originally controlled by Japan, became the stage power of the two camps.

These two camps then conflicting and *politica naturalist*, divide Korea into two. Similarly, the southern region which is capitalist backed the United States and the northern region of the ideology of the communists supported the Soviet Union and China (excerpted from the book Prihantono, 2013, "Korean War: Conflict of Two Brothers ").

Until now, the two Koreas are still "cold war" and North Korea still commit acts of provocation, both military and non-military to provoke a war between the two countries. The truce that binds the two countries is not a guarantee of both countries will be at peace. So how binoculars future of South Korea? This study is a brief observation the author was carrying out fieldwork Foreign Affairs in Seoul and found interesting observations regarding the future direction of South Korea, through the approach of historiography.

Method of Analysis

This paper uses historiographical approach to capture the vivid moments and the critical stages of South Korea and North Korea history by defining themselves and defining each-other. Historiographical approach is the most appropriate method to recognize both the Korean nation is the history of mentalities. The history of mentalities (*L'histoire de la mentalité*), as part of historiographical approach, aims to understand the nations for at least 30 years by watching the events of a remarkable history and events of everyday of experienced people (Bloch, 1988).

This paper also uses the concept of peace and conflict resolution by Johan Galtung. It is said between peace scientists that Hugo Grotius is the first man who defines what is conflict. He said that the peace is the absence of war nor direct violence (1625 on

Dobrosielski, 1987). On the other hand, Raymond Aron (1966 on Barash, 1999) states the peace as “a condition of more or less lasting suspension of violent modes of rivalry between political units” and Burton added that conflict happens because the unsatisfied of human needs¹.

In the basic assumptions of peace and conflict, peace scientists believe that conflict always exists because the basic identity of humanity is being different, so that there is no long-lasting peace, as well as we can not end conflict, what we can do is to manage conflict. In this conflict, there is a concept of competitive-victimhood, whereas each conflict actor does anything to be seen as the worst-hatred-miserable victim than the other.

In the modern time, peace becomes one interesting study subject on the universities and one of the most prominent scholar in peace studies is Johan Galtung that said structural violence happened when the richness of state, groups, or individuals coming from sources, works, other groups, and other people that could make them in poor way (Monez, 1973)².

In the relation of violence itself, there are 2 (two) types of violences; Physical/Direct violence: organized dan unorganized (Birgit Brock Utne, 1989) and Structural Violence. The second is more related to government-people or state-non-state actors relationship. This cross-cutting concept has created positive peace and negative peace, while negative peace means there is no war, but yet human rights have been fulfilled.

Analysis

Seoul was the capital of South Korea. Seoul City can be said to be an industrial city, there must be 100 meters tall buildings, cafes, and shopping centers. No one ever wonder earlier that the city was never collapsed and was destroyed during the 1950-1953 Korean War. In the city of Seoul itself, is the most appropriate path to analyze the history of the mentality of both the Korean nation. "Historical Events" is the first Seoul during the Korean War.

In the minds of the people from both Korea, Seoul is a city that can not be forgotten in history because the city is one of the two countries' military defense base in the Korean War. During the three years of that war, Seoul became silent witness to the murder of millions of victims of non-combatants and combatants millions of victims of war anyway. Infrastructure and the central government collapsed. Seoul, at that time, there is no hope.

Seoul became mental identity and create a collective memory of the dark people of both Korea, both North Korea, and South Korea, because it has been embedded in the heart,

¹ Restracted from the teaching materials of Dr. Ichsan Malik, Indonesia Defense University, 2013.

² Restracted from the teaching materials of Dr. Ichsan Malik, Indonesia Defense University, 2013.

that the central government was able to be destroyed. Seoul is also evidence of two sisters in the same language and culture can be fighting and killing each other.

The second historical event was the attempted murder of South Korean President Park Chung Hee, who then killed the first lady of the country in 1974 (excerpted from the book Oberdorfer, 2014, "The Two Koreas: A Contemporary History"). President Park then finally murdered a few years later.

Associated with it, Gen. Douglas MacArthur once said, "If I kill the Emperor of Japan, the revenge will grow in the chests of the Japanese youth to hate the United States because the Emperor was a symbol of their unity". Similarly, the assassination of President Park, South Koreans at that time was doing a period of mourning for weeks and then up to now the unsuspecting on North Korea.

The third historical events are acts of provocation from North Korea, starting from the abandon character of North Korea from nuclear treaty that the nuclear states not to attack other countries. However, throughout the 1990s, it is a decade of military actions by North Korea's most prominent history. Until now, North Korea kept an eye on South Korea, including at the demilitarized zone (Demilitarized Zone) and the joint security area (Joint Security Area) in Panmunjeom (excerpted from the book Michishita, 2010, "North Korea's Military-Diplomatic Campaigns 1966-2008").

South Korea begins its nuclear³ program in the early of 1970s and it was ended since South Korea signed Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT) in 1975. In several literature of nuclear proliferation, South Korea is stated as US ally in nuclear for the sake of US security assurance. Furthermore, the NPT itself, has not been an effective deterrent to non-nuclear weapons states since it cannot act as a legally binding international instrument (Yang, 2011).

Recently became, Asan Institute for Policy Studies in Seoul, an independent research institute, says that 41 South Koreans show preferences to have nuclear weapons, than redeploying US "conditional nuclear rearmement" to South Korea. The survey also shows

³ In the era of Cold War, nuclear arms race is competition between United States, Soviet Union, and their allies. Nowadays, nuclear availability divides countries like stated below:

1. Nuclear-Weapon States:
China (240 total warheads), France (fewer than 300 operational warheads), Russia (1,512 strategic warheads), United Kingdom (fewer than 160 deployed strategic warheads, total stockpile of up to 225), United States (4,804 nuclear warheads as of September 2013).
2. Non-NPT Nuclear Weapons Possessors:
India (up to 100 nuclear warheads), Israel (between 75 to 200 nuclear warheads), Pakistan (90 to 110 nuclear warheads).
3. States of Immediate Proliferation Concern: Iran, North Korea, Syria
4. States That Had Nuclear Weapons or Nuclear Weapons Programs at One Time: Belarus, Kazakhstan, Ukraine

(Source: <https://www.armscontrol.org/factsheets/Nuclearweaponswhohaswhat>)

that 68.6 % of respondents are for the development of an independent nuclear weapons program while just 28.9 % were against. Concerning “conditional nuclear rearmament,” 67.3 % of respondents were in support while the other 30.1 % opposed it (Yang, 2011).

Regarding the U.S. argument that it will provide extended nuclear deterrence through non-nuclear elements such as a conventional presence in the South and effective theater ballistic missile defenses, the South Korean government has expressed its concern that conventional military capabilities are insufficient to deter North Korean nuclear weapons program in a sense that South Korea is not participating in the missile defense plan. From the perspective of South Korea, renewed U.S. commitments to provide extended nuclear deterrence to South Korea lack substantial action plans for implementation, which has resulted in the establishment of the “Extended Deterrence Policy Committee” in March 2011 (Yang, 2011).

In 2010, North Korea did a series of military provocations and its third nuclear test which makes South Korea and the United States held a security meeting to discuss the destiny of Korean Peninsula. In 2014, South Korean military officials says publicly that North Korea assumed to do underground nuclear test. Boundary role person of Ministry of Defense of South Korea, Kim Min-seok, says that that assumption based on the augmentation of operations in nuclear test area in Punggye-ri, North Korea. Since, 2006, then 2009, and 2013, North Korea did nuclear test, which were also abandoned UN Security Council resolutions.

Regarding the feeling of surveillance between both Koreas about each-other nuclear program, during a visit to the author KIDA (Korean Institute of Defense Analysis), Kinu (Korean Institute of National Unification), and South Korea's Defense Ministry, the author captures that unification is still in the middle road of peace between the two Koreas. However, according to the author, the unification is not the best solution based on the following analysis.

The first analysis is the fact the history of the mentality of both the Korean nation. These three historical events described in the preceding paragraph has divided Korea, not only geographically, but mentally. Each side feels the victim, so that unification is not easy being reunited from various aspects. According to the writer, unification will only lead to a new conflict. In line with this, the Commanding General of the First Division Army Jang said, "North Korea will continue to oversee South Korea and the unification of the military aspect is not easy".

The second analysis was for political reasons. North Korea too imposing ideology and violates the cease nuclear weapons and South Korea are also too imposing peaceful diplomacy. "Trust-building process" that brought President Park recently, perhaps only touching the realm of culture and education, not politics. Like the statement of KIDA that "Although unification occurs, South Korea lacked stamina strong state to bring the unification" (excerpted from the journal KIDA, 2014, p.13).

The third analysis was for economic reasons. Learning from the unification of Germany and Vietnam, a country that does reintegration will experience a massive economic restructuring for at least 10 years. The important question here is whether a community mentality South Korea are already living in a comfort zone, ready to share with the people of North Korea are in fact its poorer and require greater tax intake. In South Korea alone, as long as the author's observation, hardly any youth movement, or the movement from below that is oriented towards unification itself. Society tends to cool and work hard just for himself alone.

In accordance with the title of this paper, "Nuclear as Part of Peace Process in Korea", the author does not mean to defend South or North Korean nuclear program, but the locus of research in Seoul, so the author looked at the observation conflict of Seoul. Then what future for South Korea? The author has three (3) recommendation peace. The following analysis.

The first recommendation is the removal of chosen trauma. It can be started from school children with effective teaching peace that South Korea is not a state of war, but the state of peace. Teaching peace can also be started from telling about the stories of fighters the two Koreas, as in the books Jeong, "Folk Tales From Korea", which frees the reader from the camp "North" and a stronghold of the "South", but brings together the history of collective two nations in terms of universal moral. By eliminating chosen trauma, Korean society is made aware that there are no fundamental differences with North Korea have a similar mentality, culture, history, language, and cuisine.

The second recommendation is the politics of diplomacy for the democratization of North Korea. Although North Korea continues to threaten and take military action, South Korea should be, a priori, said North Korea, if not changed will be the nation non-grata and offer continued democratization. In terms of realism, that North Korea could be a friend of the entire nation, if democratization occurs. If South Korea did keep it and do not impose unification, the two countries will not suffer any losses.

The third recommendation is the strengthening of Kyeosong Industrial Complex. If the established cooperation and mutual economic dependence, the two countries will

naturally begin to open up. Thus science diplomacy findings of Hans Morgenthau, in his book "Politics Among Nations". Kyeosong Industrial Complex into an area that has the potential to bring together both citizens of North Korea and South Korea. The exchange of information will start to happen and the democratization process can be started from the economic aspect.

Conclusion

During the field research trip, the author founded at least three (3) events of historical importance that shaped the history of the mentality of the people North and South Korea, there are; the Korean War (in this case the city of Seoul), the assassination of President Park, and acts of North Korean provocations.

Coming up from those three events, the author understood that unification is not the best solution for both the Korean peace. Glasses, once fell though glued still cracked, broken heart, although there has been reconciliation, still have the scars. Similarly, the history of the conflict that had divided Korea. Although the cease-fire and peaceful action done many times, the hurts within each of the two Koreas remains scars inside each Korean people's heart and mind.

Therefore, the author offers three (3) recommendation peace the most realistic and reasonable, the cultural approach, the democratization of North Korea, and strengthening Kyeosong Industrial Complex. The author hopes that the third of these recommendations would bring peace to both countries and became friends back in international relations. We said that "becoming friendship back, it is not meant to be reunited".

Interviews

KIDA - Korean Institute of Defense Analysis

Kinu - Korean Institute of National Unification

South Korea's Defense Ministry

Bibliography

Annan, Kofi. (2012). *Interventions: A Life in War and Peace*. USA: Penguin Books.

Bloch, Marc. (1998). *Méthodologie Historique*. Paris: Hachette.

Chinoy, Mike. (2008). *Meltdown: The Inside Story of the North Korean Nuclear Crisis*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Jeong, In-seop. (2013). *Folk Tales From Korea: Revised Edition*. Seoul: Hollym.

- Korea Institute for Defense Analyses. (Maret 2014). *The Korean Journal of Defense Analysis*, Volume 26, Number 1. Seoul: KIDA.
- Michishita, Narushige. (2010). *North Korea's Military-Diplomatic Campaigns 1966-2008*. England: Routledge.
- Prihantono, Djati. (2013). *Perang Korea: Konflik Dua Saudara*. Jogjakarta: Mata Padi.
- Oberdorfer, Don dan Robert Carlin. (2014). *The Two Koreas: A Contemporary History*. New York: Basic Books.