

The Farewell to Mediation for the National Security in South Korea ---The Guns of May in Pyongtaek City---

KIM JIN HO*MOON YOUNG HEE**KANG BYUNG CHEOL***

I. Introduction

It has been shocking to the internal Korean society the annual military drill, the formal consensus between South Korea and United States, hindered by the a few NGOs for 50 minutes in march, 2006.¹⁾ And also, there has been doing another kind of war in peacetime among the local farmers, NGOs, the policemen and even the military for the land in Pyongtaek in three months. We, Koreans, are too much confused to be seen by these two cases. Quo va dis, Korean society? Let democracy work? How is to be done the national project under these circumstances? Right after the 6 29 'Democratization Declaration'(1987), the peoples of South Korea have been proud of accomplishing the democratization, in spite of the fact that there is no citizen revolution like the western countries, successively holding 1988 Summer Olympics. South Korea becomes the open society. In 1993, with the advent of the real civilian government, there has been suddenly roaring up the diverse groups of the eruptive participation in all respects of South Korea.

In the meanwhile, there is one exceptional spheres not to open to the civil society. This may be the common phenomenon across the continent. There is really no more mediation to solve the military chaos in "young democracy in Asia." In case of South Korea, there will be the destinations going for the democratic society. South Korea has been facing the turning points for the time-consuming national project on the construction of a nuclear dump made by a resident's referendum. One of South Korea's long-term tasks, which has been embroiled in conflict for the past 19 years, may find a solution through the first experiment, a resident's referenda. Although Aomori prefecture in Japan decided to host a nuclear waste interim storage facility, there is no referendum, or citizen's vote, in Mutsu city in the prefecture, where the facility will be constructed.

What we try to do in this paper is to review the range, the question, the aftermath of the military intervention in citizen affairs. And this paper calls attention to the central problem as to the problem-solving methods for in the case of colliding with the contracting values, peace or security.

* Professor and Head of the Department of Political Science in Cheju National University, South Korea.

** Ph. D Student of the Department of Political Science in Cheju National University, South Korea.

*** Ph. D Student of the Department of Political Science in Cheju National University, South Korea

II. Korea-US Military Relations in terms of the National Security

1. The Changing Attitudes toward the Military Alliance between the two countries

A conservative view of "benefits of the alliance". Firstly, this concept points out that although the North Korean threat has decreased, it has not completely disappeared. Especially, if we consider the possibility that North Korea has either already had, or will soon have asymmetrical forces, including nuclear weapons, it is essential for Seoul to keep its alliance with America. However, it should be noted that the North's nuclear weapons programs are partly motivated from its effort to counter its relative military weakness against the combined ROK-U.S. forces. Also, the South's own military power outstrips the North's. Considering these facts, the pro-alliance argument lacks cogency.

South Korean President Roh Moo-hyun and U.S. President George W. Bush take questions from the press during a meeting in the Whitehouse in June, 2005. A second argument states that keeping the alliance alleviates the defense costs South Korea will bear alone. In addition to the deployed U.S. troops here, it is estimated to cost some 14 billion dollars to replace the military power of USFK. If we factor into that U.S.-provided military intelligence and its nuclear umbrella protection, which will require an astronomical figure, the argument suggests that keeping the U.S. forces in Korea and maintaining the alliance will relieve the financial burden of the ROK. Yet this justification is not without its flaws in that the combined direct and indirect contributions by South Korea to host U.S. troops easily surpasses the total asset values of USFK. A third pro-argument says that we need to consider the stabilizing effect on the economy by hosting American forces. The scenario of U.S. troops leaving South Korea will discourage foreign investors, and will likely spawn economic instability, including the slide of Korea's credit standing abroad. According to a 2003 internal report by the Federation of Korean Industries(FKI), the presence of U.S. troops offers 1.2 percent of an economic stabilizing effect on the Korean economy. However, this is in essence more of a psychological factor. This concern can be eased depending on how South Korea will deal with the very uneasy feeling resulting from a U.S. troop withdrawal. On the other hand, if a peaceful regime is established by the time of a U.S. troop departure, it will dispel the same anxiety and Korea's credit standing abroad will instead rise.

Fourthly, another argument goes that the withdrawal of U.S. troops will create a power vacuum similar to the one we saw during the waning period of the Joseon Dynasty. Then, the Korean peninsula might again tumble into a battle zone for hegemony among powerful states. We need to be prepared for getting entangled into an arms race between China and Japan. If the two Koreas also follow the path to a military build-up, it will not only aggravate tensions on the Korean peninsula, but also deplete the economies of the two Koreas. However, this argument is again flawed. The arms build-up campaign between China and Japan is already present. And South Korea's overall national power and the structure of international politics in East Asia are greatly different from the ones seen in the last Chosun Dynasty,

Fifthly, the pro-alliance supporters point out that the presence of U.S. troops is desirable in order to prepare South Korea for possible territorial and maritime disputes with neighboring nations. Thus, keeping the alliance is a good way to secure sea passages. As seen in the continuing Japanese attempt to portray the Dokdo islets as a dispute zone, and also from China's recent Northeast Project to prevent the northern Manchuria region from being classified as a dispute zone, South Korea shouldn't exclude the possibility that it might become entangled into one in the future. For the ROK, which heavily depends on foreign trade for its economy and imports 100 percent of its oil from abroad, securing sea passages is a life-or-death concern. To deal with all these matters, the argument goes, the ROK-U.S. alliance is essential. If the alliance breaks up, it will naturally lead to strengthening the U.S.-Japan alliance. Then, Japan, confident of American support, might attempt to further aggravate the Dokdo issue²⁾ to declare it as a dispute zone. We also don't clearly know the full intentions of the Chinese Northeast Project. So, this argument appears to have its due merits. However, it seems a bit too far fetched to link the ROK-U.S. alliance with a view to securing seaways.

Lastly, the pro-American camp argues that maintaining the alliance is desirable for the reunification of the Korean peninsula. It states that South Korea needs American support to stably achieve reunification. Keeping the alliance with America, which doesn't have any territorial ambition on the peninsula and shares the same values of democracy and a market economy, is a way to guarantee the peninsula's security during the reunification process and afterwards. But the assumption that Washington favors the peace and reunification of the Korean peninsula has yet to be tested. On the contrary, we need to bear in mind that the fortification of the U.S.-Korea alliance might backfire and heighten the uneasiness on the part of China and allow it to prefer maintaining the status quo of the divided Korean peninsula.

In conclusion, it is true that the pro-alliance argument has its merits. However, the same argument is also based on an untested equation of "the withdrawal of U.S. troops=Security Threat." It also overlooks the fact that while the ROK-U.S. alliance contributes to the stabilization of the East Asian region, at the same time, it is also a destabilizing factor itself. More importantly, although the above mentioned pro-alliance arguments have partial credit, the benefits they claim hardly offsets the cost of the alliance.

A progressive view of "an unneeded alliance." The agenda of the 6th Korea-U.S. Security Policy Initiative meeting, held February 13-15 2006 on Guam, includes an analysis of the future vision of the Korea-U.S. alliance, the clean-up of contaminated bases that will be returned to Korea, the redeployment of the U.S forces in Korea (USFK) and the return of wartime operational control to Korean forces. This is very special, because the Korea-U.S. authorities will agree on the first draft of the future vision of the Korea-U.S. alliance. It will justify the permanent stationing of U.S. forces in Korea.³⁾

The Korea-U.S. alliance is in danger of collapsing because of the end of the Cold War and the accelerating improvement of inter-Korean relations. For this reason, the Korea-U.S. authorities are attempting to find a justification for the permanent stationing of U.S. forces on the peninsula. For example, the Korea-U.S. alliance

is said to be necessary to support such values as the market economy, improvement of democracy and human rights. They also want to expand the scope of the alliance's mission to combating terrorism and stopping the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and to extend the geographical range of the alliances operations, calling it a "regional alliance" and a "comprehensive alliance." Through these changes the U.S. will try to prolong the life of the alliance and station its forces in Korea permanently. By stationing its forces in Korea permanently, the U.S. intends to maintain control over the establishment of a peace regime on the peninsula and the reunification process.

The U.S. intends to make the Korean peninsula a staging base from which it can exercise military hegemony over the Asia-Pacific region. The USFK have seriously damaged the political-military independence of South Korea and have endangered peace on the peninsula through the threat of war with North Korea. Therefore the progressive peoples urge the authorities concerned to cancel the agreement. They are also absolutely opposed to the agreement because it violates the peace article of the Korean constitution and the Korea-U.S. Mutual Defense Treaty, and will legalize the aggressive realignment of the alliance. The Korea-U.S. military authorities have been planning the realignment of the alliance for a long time. The alliance, which was established on the basis of the cease-fire regime after the end of the Korean War, is a defensive alliance against North Korea, according to the Korea-U.S. Mutual Defense Treaty. Therefore the alliance should have been abolished after the end of the Cold War and the development of the inter-Korean relationship.

2. From 'Defense' to 'Offense' in the Alliance: US changes in the history of OPLAN(Operation Plan)-5027⁴⁾

The OPLAN-5027 was initially created to prevent and defeat an invasion by North Korea. The operational plan was prepared shortly after the end of the Korean War, and initially focused on defensive strategies to repel North Korea over the 38th parallel if it invaded South Korea. The U.S. partially changed the initial plan in 1973 by adopting the "Forward Defense" strategies allowing for the occupation of Kaesung City in North Korea when it comes to a push. However, by then, the plan did not include a strategy to occupy the entire territory of North Korea by force.

However, since the mid-1980s, the plan has been more significantly changed. The "strategies for the occupation of North Korea" has become part of the OPLAN-5027, as the U.S. introduced tactics of air assaults attacking the core territories of enemies in its military strategies. The operational plan includes the tactic that the Combined Marine Corps of the ROK. and the U.S. would conduct amphibious operations in Wonsan City in North Korea, if necessary. This tactic aims to defeat the North Korean military and besiege Pyongyang in cooperation with the Combined Army marching north.

When rumours of a war on the Korean Peninsula were circulated in February 1994 due to the stalemate of negotiations on nuclear weapons between North Korea and the U.S., several media (including Sisa Journal) reported the five steps of the OPLAN-5027-94; the Combined Force of the ROK and the U.S. defeats North Korea in response to a crisis on the Korean Peninsula and eventually occupies and unifies North Korea by force. Step 1: to enhance capabilities for deterrence, as well as prompt actions; Step 2: to resist North Korea's invasion of the north of Seoul and to destroy the civilian front of North Korea; Step 3: to completely destroy the major forces of North Korea and conduct amphibious operations in Wonsan City and other regions on a large scale; Step

In 1998, the principle of OPLAN-5027 was changed again. The plan previously supposed a possible invasion by North Korea. However, the plan adopted the strategies of "pre-emptive attacks." If "conclusive evidence" suggesting North Korea's war preparation is detected, the plan allows for a pre-emptive attack of the ROK and the U.S. alliance in order to destroy artillery battalion and missile and air force stations in North Korea. Moreover, the strategies of amphibious operations have been more concretized. According to the plan, the U.S. army, air and marine forces would conduct cooperative amphibious operations in order to attack the middle of North Korea and promptly conquer the entire territory.

The OPLAN-5027 in 2000 added a plan for a large expansion of U.S. reinforcements. The U.S. increased the number of the reinforcements from 480,000 in the early 1990's to 630,000 in the mid 1990's. In 2000, the number was expanded to 690,000. The plan also includes plans to enhance military capacity in response to North Korea's weapons of mass destruction and field artillery. Later, the operational plan was changed to the OPLAN-5027-04⁴⁾ with a new definition of "contingency."

III. The Farewell to Mediation in the National Security: Pyeongtaek as the Last Frontier

1. The Background

In December 2004 the Korean government planned to give an extra 2,851 acres to the US Army base Camp Humphreys in Kyonggi province. In December 2005 the government's Land Expropriation Committee approved the 'imminent domain' seizure of the village of Pyeongtaek, a move which made the farmers' existence on their land illegal. After a consultation led by the Ministry of National Defence, the residents of Pyeongtaek were offered a lump sum in compensation, determined on a low estimation of the value of their land. The area is reclaimed from tidal flats, meaning the land price was already low compared to other farming areas. It would be almost impossible to buy equivalent areas of land for subsistence farming with the lump sum offered.

More land freed from regulation by military. The Defense Ministry said, January 14, 2006, it would lift or ease restrictions imposed on military reservation areas, a move that would allow greater access and provide people

there greater freedom to erect new buildings. The ministry said it would withdraw its reservation program from 108 areas covering 215.16 square kilometers (53,167 acres) of land, while easing restrictions on 31 areas covering 20.46 square kilometers. In addition, it has also designated five new reservation sites. Military reservation areas were so named after a related law became effective in 1972. Their purpose has been to make military training easier and to protect key defense installations from infiltration.

With the new measures, a total of 5,214 square kilometers, or 5.2 percent of the country's total area, are classified as military reservation areas. Most of these are located near the inter-Korean border. Real estate brokers say residential and business zones in the former reservation areas, where new buildings can be constructed without needing defense ministry permission - only local command approval — are most likely to see an increase in real estate prices. Other areas where restrictions have been previously eased are seeing new buildings and extensions to existing structures after negotiation with the commanders of military installations in the areas.

Challenge is rejected to U.S. base move. The Constitutional Court, February 24, 2006, rejected a petition by Pyeongtaek residents to declare the agreements between South Korea and the United States in 2004 to relocate U.S. military installations unconstitutional. The U.S. military plans to relocate existing bases in northern Gyeonggi province and in Seoul to this city in southern Gyeonggi province. The petition was filed by about 1,000 people, most of them Pyeongtaek residents. It claimed that the move, which they said was agreed to without the concurrence of the National Assembly in violation of the Constitution, would put unreasonable burdens on Korean taxpayers. The court said the petitioners had no standing in the matter, saying that they would have had to demonstrate a direct attack on their constitutional rights, which they had not.

2. The Process

1) The First Stage: The Guns of March

Farmers Forcibly Evicted for US Army Base. Hundreds of farmers and activists clashed with riot police in a village south of Seoul, 15 march, 2006, as the Defense Ministry tried to evict farmers to allow the expansion of a U.S. military base.⁴⁾ The collision occurred when 750 government-hired construction workers tried to enter the village to pour cement on waterways, which farmers were using to grow rice. About 200 farmers and human rights activists tried to block the entrance of the village. By the afternoon, all three waterways were covered with cement by the government workers who drove heavy duty vehicles.

Several human rights activists are being detained after protesting at the forced eviction by riot police of elderly villagers in Pyongtaek, in the north west of South Korea. Their village is subject to an eviction order to allow for the expansion of a neighbouring US army base, Camp Humphreys. The residents of Pyeongtaek village, mostly farmers in their 60s and 70s, suffered bloodied noses and were pushed over while resisting the latest eviction

attempt on 15 March and during an earlier attempt to evict them on 6 March. They say the compensation offered will not be enough to buy equivalent land elsewhere and their livelihoods are at stake. "Most of these villagers are very old and it is distressing to hear of force being used against them," said Rajiv Narayan, East Asia researcher at Amnesty International.⁵⁾ "Given their age, the police should take special care to ensure they are not hurt and to allow prompt medical treatment if they are ? which does not appear to have been the case so far." Several protesters were arrested on 15 March, including prominent human rights activist Park Lae-goon of Sarangbang Group for Human Rights and Cho Baek-ki of the Catholic Human Rights Committee.⁶⁾ Park Lae-goon was arrested while sitting in front of the village school, Cho Baek-ki was trying to stop a forklift truck being used in the evictions. Both men are still detained in local police stations, charged with preventing government officials carrying out orders. "The government must release all those detained for peacefully protesting against these forced evictions," said Rajiv Narayan.⁷⁾

A mediation carried out before the eviction did not result in the farmers' concerns being taken into account, and appeared to be mainly for show, according to those protesting the eviction. Protesters have complained that the Ministry of National Defence, which initiated the request for an eviction order, acted unilaterally in deciding on an eviction deadline and was not prepared to listen to the needs of the residents. "Any eviction on the current terms would leave the farmers in an extremely vulnerable position with few opportunities to make a living," said Rajiv Narayan.⁸⁾ "We urge the government to carry out a fresh consultation. It should ensure the villagers are not left homeless and give them reasonable compensation and alternative farming land close to their new homes."⁹⁾ There were reports of at least 50 police buses being present during the forced evictions, but it was not clear how many riot police officers were deployed to evict the residents of Daechuri, who number over 1,000. Protesters requested ambulances when some of the elderly villagers were injured after being pushed to the ground, but the riot police ignored their request.

2) The Second Stage: road to confrontation

Miss out the mediation. Gyeonggi Provisional Police Agency Commissioner on april 13, 2006 said police would reject a Defense Ministry request to provide security during the fencing in of the site for a new U.S. Forces Korea headquarters in Pyeongtaek.¹⁰⁾ After plans for a ditch to keep residents and activists from farming the fields failed on April 7, the ministry said it would study setting up wire fences instead. Under the Status of Forces Agreement, the police undertake security duty at protected military facilities like American bases. But there are no legal grounds for the police to do so in areas military facilities have yet to move to since they are property of the Defense Ministry.

It is a natural police duty to guard locations against danger of destruction or violent clashes. If police can't provide security for the area because it is owned by the Defense Ministry, how come police can guard any government offices, public agencies and foreign diplomatic missions? It would have been more honest. We don't want to get involved because we can barely hope to get out in one piece. The plot of 9,405 million sq.m

around Daechuri is now held by the Defense Ministry. But it is an extraterritorial area which some residents opposed to their removal and anti-American activists claim as their own. Since the latter half of last year, when clashes intensified, Defense Ministry officials and police have been reluctant to do anything about them.

Against that background, the Defense Ministry has been dragging its feet, leaving even a land survey undone. Both the ministry and police behave like that because they are studying somebody's expression. So far, neither the president nor the ruling party have said anything definite about the question. The chief executive once said, "What's wrong with being anti-American?" His staff and the government are squabbling among themselves, suspecting even the president of betrayal. It is difficult to fathom their thoughts. Under the circumstances, it would naturally be unwise for the Defense Ministry and police to rush into action. The move of the U.S. base is a project directly related to our national security that has been agreed on between South Korea and the U.S. and ratified by the National Assembly. It bespeaks the farcical state we are in that there should be any uncertainty about its progress.

US Base Expansion Plan Gains Momentum. The stalled U.S. base relocation plan is finally getting off the ground as South Korean authorities May 4, 2006 forced activists and farmers off the land for a new U.S. military installation in Pyongtaek, Kyonggi Province. Barbed wire fencing about 29-kilometers long was erected by engineering soldiers around an area of some 9.5 million square meters, including Daechuri village bordering part of Camp Humphreys, officials at the Defense Ministry said. "This is a good step forward setting the stage for the agreed base relocation plan between the two allies," Col. Park Wang-ok of the ministry's public affairs office told The Korea Times.¹¹ The site was declared as a military protection zone with checkpoints and restrictions to public access.

The expansion of Camp Humphreys is part of an agreement that was struck between Seoul and Washington in 2004. The camp is to be trebled in size by 2008 to accommodate both the command headquarters in Yongsan, Seoul, and infantry units scattered across the country. Repositioning U.S. bases south of the Han River is significant for the two allies. Washington has been seeking to give its forces greater "strategic flexibility"¹² under its global troop realignment scheme, while Seoul wants to take over more frontline security missions against North Korea from the U.S. military. About 29,500 U.S. forces are currently stationed here as a deterrent against North Korea.

The base expansion work is scheduled to begin in October after a master plan for the construction of the consolidated U.S. base is drawn up in September. Defense Minister Yoon Kwang-ung reiterated that the relocation plan is a national project, requested by South Korea for balanced regional development and later approved by the National Assembly. "It is unacceptable that some anti-U.S. activists opposing the project are trying to take advantage of local residents by turning it into a political dispute,"¹³ Yoon said in a special statement issued earlier in the day. He said his ministry would continue open talks with farmers, not anti-U.S. protesters, over compensation.¹⁴

The massive police-military joint operation started around 4:30 a.m. About 12,000 riot police were deployed to the area to clear protesters from their barricaded makeshift headquarters inside Daechuri Elementary School, while 3,000 unarmed soldiers, including 500 military engineers, were preparing for the fence construction. Engineers started setting up the wire fence around 7:30 a.m. with the help of 15 UH-60 helicopters, ministry officials said. Riot police armed with batons and shields fought pitched battles with hundreds of locals and activists wielding bamboo sticks and hurling rocks. Some 20 policemen were injured, while some 70 protesters were hurt in the clash, they said. Police detained about 200 protesters.

Under the 2004 agreement, the United States is required to gradually hand back 170 million square meters of land _ housing 42 military bases and facilities _ across the country by 2011. In return, Seoul promised to offer 12 million square meters of land to expand Camp Humphreys and Osan Air Base in Pyongtaek, which is some 70 kilometers south of Seoul.

The government purchased 9.5 million square meters of farmland last year for the U.S. base project. Most of the villagers moved out, but others, led by the progressive group Pomdaeui, vehemently opposed the plan. One of their main tactics was to plant a new spring crop on the land. The planting of a rice crop is significant because a court ruling, in an unrelated case, could block the government from disturbing the crops once the stalks grow past four to five centimeters. The ministry argues the previous ruling might be invalid since it informed farmers in advance that the site was legally owned by the nation. The government continued efforts to stop farming but failed. Each time, government officials called off the effort in the face of scuffles between protesters and police.

3) The Third Stage: The Guns of Queen of Season

Pyongtaek Activists Face Expulsion. The government will mobilize soldiers and policemen to drive out activists and farmers refusing to vacate lands needed for a new U.S. military installation in Pyongtaek, Kyonggi Province, as early as Thursday, officials said Wednesday. The decision to send troops came as protesters failed to respond by Tuesday to the Defense Ministry's ultimatum for talks between representatives from the ministry and farmers over the expansion of Camp Humphreys.

In the ultimatum, the ministry said it would send military and other forces to the area unless farmers cease immediately any further farming on the fields and stop attempts to thwart the U.S. base relocation plan endorsed by the National Assembly last year. ``The protesters refused dialogue over the issue. Now we have no choice but to carry out administrative procedures to oust them from the state land before May 7,''¹⁵⁾ a ministry official told The Korea Times.

The official, asking not to be named, stressed the ministry had sought compromise with Pyongtaek residents, citing a total of 55 rounds of talks with them since 2004, including three last month. The government is expected to send unarmed military engineer units and civilian workers to the area, including Daechuri near the camp, and seize control of the Daechuri Primary School that protesters have turned into a makeshift headquarters, he said.¹⁶⁾ Soldiers are also setting up barbed wire fencing in certain parts of the area, he added. The fence will be some 20 kilometers long and 1.8 meters high. The government purchased 9.4 million square meters of farmland in the region last year for the U.S. military's primary compound on the Korean Peninsula to open by 2008. The base expansion is part of an agreement between Seoul and Washington struck in 2004.

Some villagers moved out but others, led by the progressive group, have opposed the plan. The ministry has kept stern on the issue, saying a further delay in the agreed deal could spark diplomatic friction between the two allies and hurt the country's international reputation. One of their main tactics was to plant a new spring crop on the land. The planting of a rice crop is significant because a court ruling in an unrelated case could block the government from disturbing the crops once the stalks grow past four to five centimeters.

The ministry argues the previous ruling might be invalid since it informed farmers in advance that the site is legally owned by the nation. On April 7, the ministry submitted an application for provisional measures to the court regarding trespassing and farming prohibitions on the site of government ownership. The government has continued efforts to stop farming but failed. Each time, government officials called off the effort in the face of scuffles between protesters and police.

Massive Force Mobilized to Evict U.S. Base Protestors. The Defense Ministry and the police have agreed to put up barbed wire fences around the site for a planned new U.S. Forces Korea headquarters to keep protestors from occupying an elementary school and working the fields there. The government plans to mobilize a huge force of some 14,000 troops to evict the resistance on Thursday, raising fears of violent clashes with residents, activists and members of the Korea Confederation of Trade Unions camped out at the Daechuri Elementary School in Pyeongtaek, Gyeonggi Province. Activists protest against a government order to vacate land needed for a new U.S. Forces Korea headquarters at the Daechuri Elementary School in Pyeongtaek, Gyeonggi Province on Wednesday.

In response to the news, protestors called on all supporters to gather at the school and make a stand. Already leaflets have compared the situation to the 1980 Gwangju Democratic Uprising, which was bloodily suppressed, and now there are slogans in the vein of, "We will unite with the workers of the North to fight against the U.S.," all of which bodes ill for the eviction.¹⁷⁾ The government in a statement Wednesday said if things proceed quickly, the eviction and demolition of the school and installation of the fence could start early on Thursday morning. Some 110 companies of police or 11,000 officers and 3,000 troops consisting of engineers and unarmed guards as well as private security firms have been mobilized for the operation.

3. The Outcomes

Violence over U.S. base, Government fences off Pyeongtaek site to keep out activists. Activist groups said hundreds of people were injured during clashes after 12000 riot police May 4, 2006 moved in around farmland near Camp Humphreys, a U.S. military base in Pyeongtaek, 70 kilometers south of Seoul. Police said nine officers were injured at time of writing. The farmland is at the center of a fiercely fought stand-off between the government and farmers and their supporters. The farmers are due to be evicted in order to facilitate the expansion of the base, scheduled to triple in size by 2008. Around 100 protesters were detained by the police. Riot police and protesters square off at Daechuri Elementary School in Pyeongtaek around farmland near Camp Humphreys. The violent clash left hundreds of people injured.¹⁸⁾

After the initial confrontation, Daechuri Elementary School, the makeshift headquarters of the farmers and activist groups became the focus of the violent struggle. Daechuri is a small village in the area. The Defense Ministry said about 3,000 riot police were sent to occupy the Daechuri Elementary School, the main base for defying civic activists and farmers, from around 6 a.m. Some 2,000 engineering and infantry troops and about 700 civilian security workers erected a barbed wire fence around the farmland land designated for the base expansion yesterday morning.

The defense ministry warned last month that the fencing off would go ahead if dialogue with the farmers resisting eviction failed to make any progress. Before the fence was erected, the Defense Ministry issued repeated warnings. "We cannot afford to let this state project drift any longer because any further delay may damage diplomatic trust with the United States. We decided to designate the area the government has purchased so far as a military facility protection zone," Defense Minister Yoon Kwang-ung said before yesterday's action. However, the civic activists and farmers harshly criticized the government's action, likening it to the Gwangju massacre¹⁹⁾ that occurred in 1980 in the city of that name in the southwest of the country. Blaming the government for the stalled talks, they said the Defense Ministry has used the dialogue attempts as a justification for pushing ahead with its forced action.

Riot police descend on Daechuri Elementary School in Pyeongtaek around farmland near Camp Humphreys. "The ministry has showed no intention to resume dialogue to peacefully resolve the issue. I don't understand why the ministry declined our suggestion that the defense minister attend the dialogue between representatives,"²⁰⁾ said Kim Ji-tae, head of the residents' ad hoc committee. Farmers have been ordered to leave the area to allow the U.S. to relocate its Yongsan Garrison in downtown Seoul and the 2nd Infantry Division near the border with North Korea to Pyeongtaek.

Following the government's latest move, the riot police, equipped with batons and shields, engaged in fierce fighting with hundreds of farmers, civic activists and anti-U.S. government student activists who threw stones and wielded long sticks. About 700 protesters had gathered in the elementary school since Wednesday night as the deadline for the government's imminent action approached.

Police succeeded in advancing to inside the elementary school around 9 a.m. Police said it will arrest all violent protesters and take legal action against them. Meanwhile, Defense Minister Yoon also reiterated his vow that the military forces will not engage in any physical conflict with the farmers and activists concerned. Around 3,000 troops were deployed May 5.²¹⁾ "The troops will be used for support construction and guarding the reserved area," Yoon said.²²⁾ While police was scuffling with the resistant in the frontline, the unarmed soldiers crossed a river flowing behind the Daechuri town to set up wire fence around the target area, according to Ahn Jung-hun, spokesman at the Defense Ministry. "It was an effort to prevent the military troops from physically colliding with farmers and activists,"²³⁾ Ahn said.

The engineering troops began erecting wire fence at around 7:30 a.m. The barbed wires were carried by 15 UH 60 helicopters and dropped from the air to the ground. On the ground infantry soldiers delivered the wires to the engineers for setting up a 1.8-meter-high wire fence around the land, a perimeter of 29 kilometers. "Even after the measures are implemented, the government is determined to continue to hold talks with the residents to prepare for all possible means for support them," the defense minister said. Last month, violent clashes occurred when around 200 farmers and human rights activists clashed with riot police as 750 government-hired security workers tried to cement over irrigation channels used to support rice crops.

4. The Issues:

1) legal status of Daechuri from "property" to "military security zone." On Monday, April 17th, 2006, the Korean Ministry of National Defense announced that it is beginning the process of changing the legal designation of Daechuri and Doduri from "property of the Defense Ministry" to a "Military Security Zone". This is apparently in response to Gyeonggido Police Commissioner, Oh Cheongsu's recent announcement that his office would refuse to assist in any further attempts by the Defense Ministry to evict the resisting farmers of Daechuri and Doduri. Commissioner Oh denied police support to the Defense Ministry because he believed that doing so might violate Korean law. Under the US-ROK Status of Forces Agreement, Korea's national police can undertake security duty at military facilities, such as American bases, but there are no legal grounds for doing so in areas where military facilities have yet to be created.

What does this mean?. This change of legal status to "Military Security Zone" means that the National Police are legally bound to assist the Defense Ministry in it's drive to forcibly evict the farmers. The Ministry will then be able to occupy the land and erect barbed wire fences, as well as possessing the manpower to repel the farmers' defence of their homes. Previously, due to the legal ambiguity in which Daechuri and Doduri existed, Defense Ministry attacks against the villages have been confined to single days, after which the police were removed and the farmers were able to repair the damage inflicted by the Ministry of Defense.

Background The Land Partnership Plan(LPP), the final agreement laying the framework for the massive base shuffle on the Korean peninsula of which the Camp Humphreys expansion is a part, was signed on March 29th, 2002 and was later ratified by the National Assembly. In what was essentially a class action lawsuit, over 1,000 Pyeongtaek residents challenged the passage of the LPP by the National Assembly as unconstitutional and the case went all the way to the Korean Supreme Court, which, on February 22, 2006, declined to even consider that the LPP²⁴⁾ might be unconstitutional. The current Roh administration, which has generally been accused by the Korean Right of being "anti-American", however, has said nothing on the eviction of the Daechuri and Doduri farmers. General Leon LaPorte, in his speech to the US Senate Appropriations Committee on April 29th, 2003, regarding the US-ROK Land Partnership Plan,²⁵⁾ says that the LPP was "ratified by the National Assembly in November 2002", and that it "has the full support of the Korean government." However, the LPP does not have the support of the Korean people, and it was developed in "high-level consultations" between the US Military and the Korean Ministry of National Defense. Throughout Korean society, the base shuffle has been controversial for reasons ranging from forced land expropriation and violent evictions to environmental concerns, to the loss of jobs in places like Dongducheon, where 20% of the local population is employed by the American base. The United States calls Korea a democracy, but the Korean people as a whole were never consulted in the scripting of the Land Partnership Plan, and the legitimate grievances of the people most affected by the plan have been sidelined and ignored. However, the Korean government is in a double bind, no matter what the people of the peninsula want, because the LPP itself "provides for repercussions should one side fail to meet its commitments."²⁶⁾

Before the Ministry of National Defense goes ahead with its plan to turn peaceful rice fields into a "militarized zone", complete with barbed wire and live ammunition, the whole of Korean society - and most importantly the people adversely affected by the changes - must have their voices heard and their concerns addressed and remedied. The people of the United States, in whose name this whole travesty is supposedly being carried out, must absolutely be informed of what is being done and ought to be involved in any discussion and subsequent decision. Have we all not had enough of "high level negotiations" and back room deals trampling the democratic ideal: "of the people, for the people, by the people"? Have Americans not had more than enough of oppression, torture, forced land expropriation and wars of greed and conquest in their name? It is more than high time we stood up and acted.

2) US Base Trespassers to Face Court-Martial. Civic group members stage a hunger strike, calling for withdrawal of soldiers deployed at the planned sites for the U.S. military base in Pyongtaek, Kyonggi Province, in front of Pyongtaek City Hall, May 8. The government plans to court-martial civilians who trespass sites allocated for the relocation of U.S. military bases, as part of bold measures against violent anti-U.S. activists. Defense Minister Yoon Kwang-ung said Monday that even civilians would be court-martialed and face imprisonment if they intrude into the military site in Pyongtaek, Kyonggi Province, where activists and villagers opposing the relocation of U.S. bases staged violent protests last week.²⁷⁾ The site is surrounded by 29 kilometers of wire fencing.

Military criminal law stipulates that those damaging or harming facilities such as railroads, wire and cables used for military purposes are subject to more than two years jail. ``Such a violent protest is in defiance of public power and harms public security order. We will protect the law and principle by properly applying military law to the case,`` Yoon said during a media briefing. About 520 demonstrators were detained and more than 210 were injured during a clash on Thursday between protestors and riot police and soldiers who evicted them at an elementary school inside the military site in Pyongtaek.

The prosecution requested arrest warrants for 37 demonstrators for wielding iron pipes and bamboo sticks against police in a bid to block their eviction. But a local court issued warrants for only 10.

Prosecutors are considering again requesting warrants for the other 27. They also sought warrants for another 23 protestors who cut the wire fence and tried to trespass the restricted site on Friday.

Yoon said the government has distributed protective equipment to soldiers, including shields and batons, for self-defense, because demonstrators attacked unarmed soldiers with pipes. But he added the government is not considering deploying armed troops there.

In the meantime, some 30 members of a coalition of 11 civic groups in Pyongtaek held a briefing yesterday and urged the government to reconsider the military base expansion plan. They also called for the resignations of Minister Yoon and Lee Taek-soon, commissioner general of the National Police Agency, for the violent clash. Sixteen members of the coalition also started a hunger strike in front of Pyongtaek city hall. The coalition plans to hold demonstrations in the afternoon and candlelight rallies after sunset in front of Pyongtaek subway station until Friday.²⁸⁾

The Democratic Labor Party also said it would urge Defense Minister Yoon to step down for deploying military personnel to violently suppress and arrest civilians. The Korean Confederation of Trade Unions called on the government to release the detainees, claiming the authorities assaulted and detained Pyongtaek residents and student activists who protested against the U.S. base relocation plan.²⁹⁾

3) The Scarcity of Mediation. On May 5, 2006, Daechu-ri, Pyeongtaek, Gyeonggi Province, the site of a massive confrontation just a day before was as tense as the cloudy weather. Sporadic clashes between police, military, and protesters continued. About 100 local residents and members of civic groups held a protest at Daechu-ri Peace and Arts Park demanding that the police release all those detained and that the minister of defense resign for the May 4 violent crackdown.

There was a scuffle between police and crowd in the process of dispersing the crowd by police which regarded the demonstration as an unreported illegal one. In addition, about 400 members of civic groups who were barred from joining the demonstration held demonstrations in Bongjeong Nonghyup, Gyeyang intersection, and Dodu-ri area. Some members that passed through the police line directly confronted soldiers on their way to Daechuri.

On the barbed wire that surrounded the rice paddies was military warning signs reading, "This area is military facility protection zone and unapproved access is prohibited."

Military guard posts were set up every 100m on the fence perimeter, and an unarmed team consisting of two soldiers is standing security duty. Furthermore, tents have been set up near every guard post. On the access road to the village, a significantly increased number of police stood guard. The local residents had to show their ID to get in and out, and outsiders were restricted from entering the area. The police commented, "Since it has been designated as a military facility protection area, about 20 companies or 2,000 police will be deployed in all times in order to guard facilities."

Some local residents showed their determination to farm until the very end. As a matter of fact, rice buds are growing in artificial ponds in Dodu-ri, and residents say they plan to plant the rice buds in about 10 days. Of the 524 that have been placed under custody in the process of carrying out court orders, only about 10 are local residents. The rest were members of anti-war and anti-American groups.

Police announced that there were 15 residents, about 250 Hanchongryun member university students, 65 from opposition groups such as the Anti-American Youth Group, 40 from the Democratic Labor Party, 15 from the Korean Confederation of Trade Unions, and 130 that were street vendors and evictees. Police plans to request arrest warrants for 10 radical protesters involved in the illegal demonstration and release the rest without detainment.

As for catholic priest Moon Jung-hyun, who held a protest on the roof of Daechu Elementary School, police told him to report to court on charges of violating laws concerning demonstrations and protests. However, it has been confirmed that none of the three key activist members that had been issued an arrest warrant, including Mr. Kim, who had his issued on April 29, are under custody. The police, who spearheaded the effort to demolish Daechu Elementary School, are concerned about negative public opinion due to the high number of casualties caused by the police's forced entry, and ordered injured police officers and riot police to post up replies to Internet postings criticizing police intervention. It has also been reported that the police has set a policy to actively respond to radical Internet postings of exaggerated or distorted reports.

Government to Evict Resistance Against U.S. Base May 2, 2006. The Defense Ministry will evict groups occupying the Daechu-ri Elementary School in Pyeongtaek, Gyeonggi Province in an effort to block the U.S. base relocation from Yongsan. The school is due for demolition to make way for the new USFK facilities. The government and protestors earlier met twice at Pyeongtaek City Hall but failed to reach agreement. A few residents and activist groups that oppose the expansion of the U.S. base there have vowed to block it to the end, making a physical confrontation practically inevitable. The resistance will be evicted from its impromptu headquarters at the school sometime before Sunday.

The head of the U.S. base relocation team in the Defense Ministry, Maj. Gen. Park Gyeong-seo, told reporters May 2, 2006 the ministry proposed to compensate residents and asked them to stop working the fields in their attempt to delay construction work. It also asked the protestors to allow the government to survey the land, "but we never got a response," Park said. "So we will proceed according to plan" and evict them. The ministry late last month told protestors of its plans to clear out the school by May 7. "If the farming is allowed to delay the project, more than US\$100 million of the taxpayer's precious money will be wasted, not to mention the damage that would be done to Korea-U.S. relations," the general said. "Therefore we can't afford to wait any longer." The activists say the ministry should drop the ultimatum and come to the negotiating table "in a sincere manner," leaving all possibilities including review of the whole relocation plan on the table. "If it goes ahead with the eviction and demolition, we will fight to the death," they added. Two days of contacts between the two sides ended Monday without narrowing the gap, with the ministry ready to discuss only compensation and the protestors focused on their call to abandon the multi-billion-dollar project, which they demanded should be discussed with a third-party mediator. It is too much late.

4) NGOs Activists Are Only Using the People of Pyeongtaek. Illegal protests and violence of the "Pan-National Committee against Expansion of USFK Base in Pyeongtaek" (PNC) have gone so extreme that they are now threatening the foundation of the nation. Members of the PNC, which consists of anti-American groups including the Korean Confederation of Trade Unions (KCTU) and the Federation of Korean University Students' Councils (FKUSC), cut the barbed wires and intruded into what will be the new USFK base in Pyeongtaek, Gyeonggi Province, destroying just any military quarters and checkpoints there. Hit by demonstrators, dozens of soldiers were injured. Whose citizens are the demonstrators, using reckless violence against soldiers with bare fists?

As if it were not enough, the PNC is calling for the release of those arrested and the resignation of the minister of defense and the commissioner-general, claiming the military and the police are responsible for the violence. This is a typical of how they shift the blame. They are also seeking to make things worse by relocating the demonstrators into the middle of downtown Seoul. Many citizens, however, are now aware of who they are and what their tactics are.

It has become clear that the PNC is a group of pro-North Korean radicals who only seek a "withdrawal of U.S. troops from Korea" while never caring about national interests in terms of national security, economy and diplomacy. Out of some 600 people arrested on May 4 and May 5 for special obstruction of justice and other charges, only about a dozen were local residents of Pyeongtaek, with the rest of them being members of anti-American groups from the outside. It also turned out that among primary subjects of custody, only one of them was a Pyeongtaek resident. The PNC advocated residents' rights to survival, but that was nothing but a lame slogan for propaganda.

It was reported that the military authorities are now belatedly considering providing soldiers with minimal equipment for self-defense, such as shields, clubs and anti-gas masks. Penalizing anti-national crimes is something state agencies are definitely obliged to do. Experiences of advanced countries show that only when they are resolute and vigilant in such things can they safeguard their democracy.

The prosecution and police announced they would seek heavy punishment against PNC members who took the lead in committing violent acts. President Roh Moo-hyun also expressed the same willingness before his visit abroad yesterday. Defending military installation protection areas is the state's responsibility that the law stipulates. The Law Relating to Assembly and Demonstration also states clearly that protests shall be prohibited near the protection areas. So far, however, the authorities have loosely enforced the law? though it might not be clear whose mind they have tried to read ? and ended up worsening the situation. The prosecution, the police and the president should never use empty threats again and let this incident go. The military, the prosecution and the police are on the touchstone of "defending the foundation of the nation." Also being tested is the identity of the Roh Moo-hyun administration.

A standoff between the Defense Ministry and protestors against the relocation of U.S. Forces Korea bases to Pyeongtaek, Gyeonggi Province looks set to culminate in a violent confrontation between the two unyielding parties. When it became clear that clashes would be inevitable, the secretary-general of the Korean Confederation of Trade Unions announced, "Workers in South and North Korea came together and resolved to stage an anti-American campaign on Labor Day" at Daechu-ri Elementary School, the impromptu headquarters of activists there. "It is the U.S. that drives this peaceful land to war and squeezes the public of its blood and sweat," he said. "Daechu-ri in Pyeongtaek has its place in our fight against the U.S."

The KCTU website, one of the 110 organizations that came together to stop the movement of U.S. Forces Korea's headquarters there, ran an article under the title, "Are we going to see another Gwangju Democratic Uprising in Pyeongtaek?" linking the protests with the bloodily suppressed democracy protests in 1980. That shows clearly that the KTCU's opposition to the relocation plan has nothing to do with protecting residents' right there, which it abuses as a weapon in its anti-American campaign. On the surface, residents in Daechu-ri and the 110 organizations are as one in their rejection of the plan, but in reality the activist are in complete control of the movement. It claims the Pyeongtaek base will be used to stage pre-emptive strikes against North Korea and that the plan is a recipe for war on the Korean Peninsula, with South Korea becoming an advance base for U.S. stratagems to invade other nations. Any claims by the activists that they are there to prevent the land being taken away from the farmers are a lie.

No wonder mediations between the government and the resistance failed to produce any tangible results. The Defense Ministry a few days ago proposed putting the issue of compensation for expropriated land on the negotiating table, but the protesters refused saying the relocation plan itself must be up for discussion. The

Defense Ministry, in other words, wants to talk about follow-up measures on the premise that the plan stands, and the protestors want the plan scrapped. Of course there could be no narrowing of the gulf between them.

The base relocation plan is a major national project approved by Seoul and Washington and ratified by the National Assembly. Our security, our future and a huge amount of taxpayer's money hang on it. We should certainly do our best to take the residents and the local community into account, but such an important project cannot be allowed to fall hostage to anti-American campaigners whose identities are unclear. That is why it is critical to separate these suspicious protestors from local people in Pyeongtaek who oppose the plan for reasons of their livelihood, and to seek a settlement only with the latter.

5) Who pays to move the base? The U.S. military's relocation project has gained a foothold, as the Korean government has expelled the villagers and activists from the area designated for the expansion in Pyeongtaek, a city south of Seoul. Other obstacles, remain however. The biggest is a cost-sharing agreement between the two countries for restoring environmental damage to lands used by the U.S. military before its transfer to Pyeongtaek.

The issue has been prolonged not only by disagreements between Korea and the United States, but within the Korean government as well. Too many regulations and laws are entwined around this issue. Washington argues that it has no obligation to pay for the environmental restoration of the land, citing clauses in the Status of Forces Agreement. Korea, however, has officially stated that it is the United States's obligation to pay, according to an agreement between the two countries on the environment inspection and restoration of the U.S. military base. The United States said the Status of Forces Agreement, which is backed by international law, has priority over the other agreement, which has no legal binding power.

The problem is that the latter agreement was too vague. One clause states that the Korean government must respect all related environment laws and regulations, as long as it does not harm U.S. standards and policies. Seoul stresses the first part and the United States emphasizes the latter.

Different opinions by different ministries have only worsened the situation. The Environment Ministry views the controversy as an environmental one and wants to make the United States pay more money. The Foreign Ministry and Defense Ministry, however, care more about the future of the South Korea-U.S. alliance. Each ministry must have taken its own stance out of regard for national interest. However, they must now come to an agreement, because the U.S. military relocation cannot be delayed any further. The Foreign Ministry should not underestimate security issues under pressure from civic environmental groups. This issue must not become another obstacle when there are already many hindrances surrounding the transfer of the U.S. base. There are already too many problems with the transfer. Seoul should compromise with Washington, and Washington should also take a step back, so that the issue does not become another wedge between the two nations.

6) Korean Anti-Base Protests Turn Violent. Starting on May 12, about 11,000 riot police stationed in and around the city began to attack the crowds that had been drawing a day previously to protect the site as construction machinery moved in. The fighting continued on through the weekend, with hundreds injured on both sides, and at least 13 police needing emergency surgery. By Saturday over 300 protestors had been temporarily arrested for blocking construction workers and about 60 protestors are being detained on more serious charges of attacking and injuring riot police officers.

Many of the demonstrators had been long term-residents of the area, and although offered financial compensation for loss of property, had decided to stay and fight for their home to the bitter end. One 74-year old farmer told reporters, "I've lived here all my life. I'm not going to leave, not until I die." Almost 700 families have lost their homes to the new base, and since they are mostly elderly and have been used to living off the land, they have very little likelihood of being able to find new homes or jobs. Most of the protestors, however, belonged to the local labor unions or were students from the neighboring colleges and universities, and had come to show their anger over the government's decision, which had been made without any involvement of the local residents.

The decision to build a new base in Pyeongtaek came after a 2004 agreement between Seoul and Washington to relocate the U.S. military headquarters in Yongsan, Seoul further south somewhere cheaper, and to a location where the U.S. base would be less vulnerable to possible North Korean missile attacks. Many analysts argue that Pyeongtaek was chosen since there is already a U.S. base there, and that the land, though not very hilly compared to the rest of Korea, is much cheaper than anywhere else in the same province.

The protests came to a climax on Friday when thousands of riot police attacked activists who had taken over a local elementary school. As police stormed in below and construction diggers began knocking down the walls, many students climbed on the roof shouting, "Stop the construction of the U.S. military base in Pyeongtaek! Oppose war on the Korean Peninsula!" The battle continued for seven hours, as soldiers battled from classroom to classroom. At least 109 protestors were injured and over 30 military police needed medical attention.

Defense minister Yoon Kwang-ung defended the decision to attack the demonstrators, arguing that most of the organizers were anti-US protestors who were not from the local area. He added, "The government has decided that we can no longer delay this project, considering that unless this project progresses according to schedule, diplomatic relations with the U.S. would be affected and would result in ever higher financial burdens for the country's defense."

7) Progressives, Conservatives Clash Over US Base. The row over the planned relocation of U.S. military bases to Pyongtaek, Kyonggi Province, is turning into a conflict between progressives and conservatives as each party will hold a separate rally for or against the issue. A coalition of civic groups said it would stage their planned demonstration May 14 in Daechuri, Pyongtaek, in protest against the relocation. Police say the illegal

rally would be blocked. ``Police have refused to allow our rally without any proper reasons. Banning a peaceful rally is illegal,’’ a member of the coalition said.³⁰⁾

The group demanded the government set up a committee for peaceful resolution of the issue, and release protesters arrested for last week’s violent rally. May 4, activists and villagers opposing the relocation clashed with riot police and military who drove them out at an elementary school inside the planned military site. Some 210 were injured during the violent clash. However, Lee Taek-soon, National Police Agency commissioner general, said that as the rallies are likely to become violent like the previous one, police would ban protest rallies at the site and would block roads to Daechuri.³¹⁾ With 10,000 protestors expected, police plan to dispatch 20,000 riot police to Pyongtaek. They have already started blocking roads and inspecting drivers entering the region.

The Ministry of National Defense has said soldiers would use bamboo sticks _ distributed for self-protection _ to push demonstrators from of the site.³²⁾ The military also warned earlier that it would court-martial civilians who trespass the site allocated for the U.S. military base. Also up to 10,000 people are expected to take part in a candlelight vigil organized by the civic coalition in Kwanghwamun, central Seoul from 5 p.m on May 13. On the other hand, about 300 conservative groups, including the New Right Union and Free Citizens’ Alliance of Korea, claim the project should be carried out as planned. They plan to hold rallies in Pyongtaek on May 20 and in Seoul on May 23, to urge the government to carry out the relocation plan and to deal sternly with illegal demonstrations.

Prime Minister Han Myeong-sook on Friday appealed to contending parties to solve disputes through conversation and compromise, not through violence. ``Another large-scale demonstration is scheduled this weekend, and I worry that society’s internal discord is worsening. I ask for public understanding and cooperation for a desirable resolution of the situation,’’ Han said.³³⁾

5. Searching for the solution

Prime Minister Han Myeong-sook May 11, 2006 called for a compromise solution through peaceful dialogue to resolve disputes over the planned expansion of a U.S. military base in Pyeongtaek, Gyeonggi Province. In a "message to the people," the prime minister urged anti-U.S. activists to stop staging violent protests, saying that the government will only advocate the principles of nonviolence and peace. "I regret the previous violent protests," said Han, lamenting a series of clashes between civic activists and riot police in Pyeongtaek. "Physical clashes should never recur. Every person concerned should maintain a calm attitude (toward the issue) now," said Han in a 5-minute live broadcast yesterday morning.³⁴⁾

Prime Minister Han Myeong-sook speaks at a news conference yesterday about the intensifying U.S. military base expansion dispute.³⁵⁾ The statement came a day before planned protests against the expansion plan. "Every citizen can have differences with (the way that) the government (operates state affairs) and are entitled to speak their views freely. But their opinions should be carried (only) in a legitimate and peaceful way." In the prepared

statement, Han said that her government admits there had been a lack of dialogue between the authorities and the residents before going ahead with the plan.³⁶⁾ But she said that the government will now make a concerted effort to resolve the ongoing dispute by sharing opinions with the people concerned. "The government will find a better solution by constantly holding dialogue with residents in a sincere and open-minded attitude," said Han.³⁷⁾

But the nation's No.2 administrator stressed the need to carry on with the planned U.S. base relocation, saying it is necessary to maintain the bilateral alliance in order to ensure stability and the development of Korean society. South Korea and the United States in 2003 reached agreement to relocate the U.S military base currently in central Seoul to Pyeongtaek. The public statement on the issue was released after Han held a breakfast meeting with 15 community leaders from all walks of life.

Tension has been heightened in Pyeongtaek as civic groups said May 11 that they will go ahead with mass rallies in Seoul and Pyeongtaek, 70 kilometers south of the capital, despite the government's firm position. Headed by the Pan-national Committee to Deter the Expansion of U.S. Bases, a coalition of 138 leftist civic groups, activists urged the government to organize a consultative institution to peacefully resolve the dispute. The committee also demanded the release of those arrested and punishment for officials "responsible for the violent oppression." Sixteen protesters have been arrested for their involvement in two violent protests last week.

Police have decided not to authorize the demonstration in Pyeongtaek this weekend and plan to take harsh measures if protestors go ahead. Police will block all roads to Daechuri village, the epicenter of the fierce dispute, to prevent demonstrators from approaching the land designated for the base expansion. Police said they will deploy riot police at the entrances of expressways on Saturday to block demonstrators coming from Seoul from entering the town.

May 14, 18,000 riot police will be deployed on the farmland to deter the planned rally and guard the fenced-off site. The government set up a 29-kilometer-long wire fence around the land last week. About 8,000 riot police are currently stationed on the perimeter of the site, together with 3,000 soldiers inside the area.³⁸⁾

Peace and Security Governance. Today, it is impossible to "prosper" without "peace" and it is the time where regionalism, nationalism and localism are interacting each other at multi-level with spread of Globalization. In this situation, South Korea society should go beyond national, local and geographical limit to build the solid national security pursuing its own peace and security. And a key agenda for establishment of it would be a peace strategy concerning the way how to lead the institutionalization of peace system in the Korean peninsula and Northeast Asia as well as prosperity in economic sector. The writing is approaching security and peace issue of mediation with a multi-level governance perspective. so it suggest 'peace governance' as a concept for approaching security and peace issue of South Korea and it focuses on two issues to introduce the concept and direction of 'peace governance'. The first is to introduce the basic concept of peace strategy South Korea should

keep. The second is to introduce a structure of multi-level governance that can be performed under unified perspective in the basis of inter-connection among local-state-Northeast Asia area.

J. Galtung had divided peace into 'negative peace' that has no violence without any other interactions and 'positive peace' that has cooperation and unification.³⁹⁾ It is simply said that 'negative peace' is an absence of war and it is achieved through settlement of conflict, war and dispute under recognition that peace is opposed to war. 'Positive peace' means veritable development that shows satisfaction of basic human needs, economic welfare and equality, justice and conservation of realized value of human and nature.

Security and peace were coordinate concepts each other in the perspective of the Cold War. But, existing security paradigm traditionally centered on military security has changed into the comprehensive security including non-military sectors such as economy, resources and environment while the actor and factor threatening security changed in turning point, the end of the Cold War and Globalization brought new situation. The threats now include not only warfare between states caused conflict or confrontation in political and military fields but economic conflict, environmental disruption, drug, disease, criminal organization at the international level and international terrorism. Various sectors for expansion or hold of each state's own core value and interest have begun to emerge with military security.

Security and peace are developing from individual concepts into connected concepts. Introduction of a concept of comprehensive security promoted new dimensions of security and a new concept of human security plays a role as a linkage between security and peace drawing great attention in the world. The concept of human security properly includes newly emerged security concepts, for example, economic security, environmental security and food security.

The first is a security through 'unlimited self-defense' ensuring security through military ability. The second is a security through 'limited self-defense'. The third way is 'international security' based on joint cooperation. The fourth is 'abolition of war' through disarmament as a pursuit of peace by peaceful measures. Security and peace could be understood as interlinked concepts connecting the present and future rather than as separated and opposite concepts. Therefore, we can say, the pursuit of peace is a process of going toward 'positive peace' with expansion and development of cooperation and reconciliation and 'negative peace' based on stable security.

New security concepts, such as comprehensive security and human security are beyond state level or cooperation in the international level. So, the way to peace is a process of agreement and cooperation for the pursuit of positive peace and building of negative peace through partnership and network among various actors, such as state, international organizations and NGOs. Governance is a new system, institute,

Mechanism and management style for group management and it is from the cognizance management based on partnership or network of relationship between state and society (or market) is more efficient and democratic

than that based on vertical system of the relationship between two. The term, governance generally is used for explaining current situation, governance without government in the international politics and it is a complex concept containing vertical and lateral transfer of state's power and the dimensions became diverse in the time globalism, regionalism, nationalism and localism co-exist with simultaneous and multi-dimensional promotion of globalization and localization. We can distinguish the 'governance' into several forms.

First, global governance is a form that seeks problem solution through co-operation among states and interaction and cooperation between transnational actors in the global level. Second, regional governance is a form that pursue a solution centered regional common bodies among neighbors. Third, national governance is for finding better solution in handing nation wide challenges at state level. Fourth, local governance means mainly that structure of private-public cooperation system and network for local development and resident's participation at local common body and a form of the governance operated on sub national level. A good governance in dealing with issues of multi-level policy could be a balanced multi-level governance operated under unified perspective based on interconnection among global, regional, national and local level.

The governance issue with multi-dimensional nature will go deeper and deeper as globalization, democratization. localization and information revolution make a progress, As for the solid national security of South Korea seeks, establishment of peace should be promoted through interaction among inter-state level in the Korean peninsula as two-Koreas' relationship, whole of the Northeast Asian regional level. Facing with drastically changing global business environment, Korean government is seeking to develop Korea into the economic hub of Northeast Asia in the 21st century.

As for national security, its effect will be maximal when it is based on support, consensus and participation from people. In conjunction with this, we need to add the concept, civilian-based defense to the unified defense. The civilian-based defense is from wide range of participation from whole society. This system that gives civilian active and leading role is meaningful in terms of its balance with idea of democracy in political order that is increasingly decentralized and diverse as well as it is based on optimistic peace idea that insists nonviolence brings peace and it is better choice for human being. But, To turn from existing military led defense to new civilian led defense cause policy makers to hesitate in the Korea's situation. It would be a choice for local level rather than state level.

Regarding the change of security environment from the Cold War era to Post Cold War, from authoritarianism to democracy, and centralization era to decentralization, existing security policy centered state should be changed into new policy. Multi-party cooperative security system formed under the concept of cooperative security follows a perspective that security can not be pursued with the opponent's sacrifice any more and should be achieved through cooperative way.

CSCE/OSCE (Organization on Security and Cooperation in Europe) is an outstanding case for regional cooperative security system grounded on common security and cooperative security. But, Northeast Asia has no common security threat unlikely Europe and little experience concerning pluralism or collective cooperation. Arguments discussed so far, expect countries to step up and jump start exchange and cooperation in business but have a trouble to get out of structure of dispute and confrontation in military and political fronts in Northeast Asia.

So, to build conference body among the concerned entities would be considered but the way has a fundamental limit. To do this, building of security network among social networks will contribute to official dialogue and cooperation between governments. However, as for South Korea, it should regard plan of active strategy to build cooperative security system in Northeast Asia as Switzerland or Belgium which gave great contribution to establishment of multi-party system in Europe.

6. Concluding remarks

No more violence. The planned base relocation is a national project, not only sanctioned by the National Assembly but also based on public consensus. Of the 680 families on the farmland allocated for the new base, 69 are refusing to move out. They will have to be evicted if no compromise is made on compensation. Still, the government believes there is room for mediation. But a bigger problem is with the outsiders who have taken sides with the farmers and their families - student activists, militant unionists and members of antiwar groups opposed to the plan to move U.S. troops to the new base. Some of them claim the base will become an American outpost of attack against other countries while others assert it will become a base for a preemptive U.S. attack on North Korea.

But they are ignoring the need to maintain U.S. troops here to deter North Korean aggression and to deal with potential military emergencies in Northeast Asia. True, inter-Korean relations have improved since the 2000 summit in Pyongyang. Still, Pyongyang's nuclear ambitions pose a threat to security on both the Korean Peninsula and the entire Northeast Asian region. An intensifying arms race between China and Japan is also a source of instability.

Against this backdrop, South Korea needs to strengthen its military alliance with the United States. Construction of a new base in Pyeongtaek, which will help enhance the strategic flexibility of U.S. troops in their regional role, must be understood in this context. Obstruction to construction cannot be tolerated any longer, because, as the Korean defense minister pointed out, a delay will cause diplomatic friction and thus erode security ties with the United States, not to mention an increase in the costs. The Korean government will have to deal harshly with any attempt by anti-American activists to prevent land development in the region.

On the other hand, the government will have to continue negotiations regarding compensation with those families that are refusing to move out. They may have legitimate grievances about being dislodged, even though the government insists it has offered a proper level of compensation. It goes without saying that outsiders, such as anti-American activists, must not be allowed to interfere in the negotiations in any way.

ENDNOTES

- 1) Police announced April 03, 2006, that they have begun to investigate anti-American civic groups whose rally interrupted a South Korea-U.S. joint military exercise. The targets include the Pan-Korea Alliance for Reunification and the Solidarity for Peace and Unification of Korea, police said. The rally was held March 30 in the South Chungcheong province. They included members of a group calling itself the Pan-Korean Alliance for Reunification. The demonstrators spent some 50 minutes at the site, wielding pickets with such slogans as, "Stop preemptive strike exercises against North Korea which prevent the establishment of a peace framework on the peninsula." Some tackled U.S. soldiers taking part in the training to calls of "Yankee, Go home!" and "Stop the war exercises." Police admitted they took precautions against protests from fishermen and local peace activists but were caught off guard by activists "from outside" who interrupted the drill "unexpectedly." Police say they will consult with the military before deciding whether to book them for obstructing officials.
- 2) President Roh Announces, 25, April, 2006, New Doctrine in Handling Islet Affairs. President Roh Moo-hyun declared a virtual war of diplomacy against Japan for a fundamental solution on the long-standing dispute over ownership of Dokdo, a group of rocky islets in the East Sea. In a lively televised statement Tuesday, Roh, characterizing the rocky islets as a symbol of full restoration of Korea's sovereignty, pledged to directly confront Japan's claim to the islets. The declaration, the toughest ever on Japan, is seen as a new President Roh doctrine, vowing to fundamentally change Korea's diplomatic strategy in countering Japan's territorial claims to Dokdo, to be more active and aggressive. We would like to estimate it as a show of the President's determination to seek a fundamental solution by taking the matter head-on. It is the first time for the President of Korea to mention the historic background of the matter directly. President Roh rightly reflected the underlying sentiment of Korean's toward the Dokdo affair when he said that "Japan's claim over Dokdo is an act of contradicting Korea's full liberation and independence."
- 3) Robert Dujarric, "Modernizing the ROK-US Alliance: The Role of the USFK," *The Korea Association of International Studies*, No. 14(2003), pp. 116-120.
- 3) OPLAN 5027 is the US-ROK Combined Forces Command basic warplan. Under Operations Plan 5027 (CINCUNC/CFC OPLAN 5027), the United States plans to provide units to reinforce the Republic of Korea in the event of external armed attack. These units and their estimated arrival dates are listed in the Time Phased Force Deployment List (TPFDL), Appendix 6, to Annex A to CINCUNC/CFC OPLAN 5027. The TPFDL is updated biennially through U.S./ROK agreements. CINCUNC/CFC OPLAN 5027 is distributed with a SECRET-U.S./ROK classification.
- 4) OPLAN 5027-04. In late 2003 it was reported ["Military Alters Plans For Possible Conflicts" By Bradley Graham Washington Post November 18, 2003, pg. 18] that " ... the new plans would allow the United States to respond without waiting for as many ground forces to arrive, by substituting air power for artillery and getting such critical equipment as counter-battery radars -- for pinpointing enemy mortar and artillery fire -- on scene ahead of the rest of their divisions. The resulting force might not be as "elegant" as planners would like, but "it will certainly be capable..." While Patriot is the only missile defense system deployed by the US military, the Defense Department expected that three "emergency capabilities" for missile defense will begin to emerge in the year 2004. Those capabilities are ground-based midcourse interceptors being installed in Alaska as part of a Pacific test bed; sea-based midcourse interceptors on one or two Navy Aegis

- ships; and an Airborne Laser prototype. These could provide an emergency capability against a North Korean missile attack, but it will be extremely limited. Five anti-missile interceptors will be deployed at the site.
- 4) Nearly 10 people on both sides were injured and about 30 protesters were detained after the confrontation, said police in Pyeongtaek, Gyeonggi Province.
 - 5) The Korea Times, May 6, 2006
 - 6) There are many NGOs behind the Daechuri problems, directly not interested in this area. This made the mediation process hindered.
 - 7) The Korea Times, *op. cit.*
 - 8) Ibid.
 - 9) Ibid.
 - 10) Choogang Daily Newspaper, April 14, 2006.
 - 11) The Korea Times, May 5, 2006.
 - 12) Strategic flexibility is a concept of extensively utilizing the U.S. forces in Korea to respond to crises across East Asia. Washington, however, needs to prudently review the geopolitical characteristics of the Korean Peninsula before implementing any plan.
 - 13) Chosun Daily Newspaper, May 5, 2006
 - 14) Ibid.
 - 15) The Korea Times, May 6, 2006.
 - 16) Ibid,
 - 17) The experience in Kwangju also firmly yoked Koreans' struggle for liberation from dictatorship with a conviction they must also distance themselves from US control, commentators say. Since the Korean war, tens of thousands of US troops have been stationed in the South and at the time of the Kwangju uprising, a US general retained ultimate operational control over combined US and South Korean forces. "The US had been supporting Park Chung Hee since [he took power] in 1961, and it did nothing as Chun Doo-hwan seized power," Bruce Cumings, professor of history at the University of Chicago and a prominent Korea expert, told the BBC News website. "It was as plain as the nose on anyone's face that the US was supporting Park Chung Hee and then his protege, and it was much more worried about stability and North Korea than it was about democracy in the South.
 - 18) The Korea Herald, May 6, 2006.
 - 19) In May 1980, hundreds of civilians were massacred by soldiers in the south-western city of Kwangju after rising up against military rule. Although it was brutally put down, the Kwangju Uprising is now seen by many as a pivotal moment in the South Korean struggle for democracy in the long period of dictatorship following the Korean war. And some contend the uprising had important ramifications which are still being felt now, both inside Korea and beyond its borders. There is a sombre monument and museum dedicated to the massacre in Kwangju, and the anniversary of the beginning of the siege on 18 May is now a public holiday in Korea.
 - 20) The Korea Herald, May 6, 2006.
 - 21) Ibid.
 - 22) Ibid.
 - 23) Ibid.
 - 24) The Korea Land Partnership Plan (LPP) appears to offer a strategy to help reduce U.S. military infrastructure. However, the Committee continues to be concerned about several aspects of the plan, which commits both the Department of Defense and Government of South Korea to make major infrastructure investments over many years. For example, the plan calls for significantly increasing the number of accompanied tours in South Korea. Further, The Committee understands that there are land exchanges currently under consideration, which

fall outside the LPP. The plan also does not address potential force structure changes that might be envisioned over the next 10 years and their impact on overall infrastructure requirements. The Committee requests that the General Accounting Office review the LPP to provide the Congress with a better understanding of the plan, associated costs, burden sharing implications and other related factors that may not be addressed in the plan. This report should be provided to the congressional defense committees not later than March 15, 2003.

25) ([http:// appropriations .senate.gov/ record.cfm?id=203403](http://appropriations.senate.gov/record.cfm?id=203403))

26) (page 2, Executive Summary Land Partnership Plan) ([http://www. korea. army. mil/ LPP/](http://www.korea.army.mil/LPP/))

27) The Korea Times, May 8, 2006.

28) Ibid.

29) Ibid.

30) The Korea Times, May 12, 2006.

31) Ibid.

32) Ibid.

33) Ibid.

34) The Korea Times, May 12, 2006.

35) The Korea Herald, May 11, 2006.

36) Ibid.

37) Ibid.

38) The Korea Herald, May 13, 2006.

39) Johan Galtung, *Peace by Peaceful Means* (London: Thousands Oaks, 1996)

REFERENCES

- Adler, Emanuel and Michael Barnett(eds.). *Security Communities*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Alagappa Muthiah(ed.), *Asian Security Order: Instrumental and Normative Features*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2003.
- Allison, Graham. "The Impact of Globalization on National and International Security," in Joseph S. Nye, Jr and John D. Donahue(eds.), *Governance in a Globalization World*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 2000.
- Anwar, Dewi Fortuna. "Human Security: An Intractable Problem in Asia." Muthiah Alagappa(ed.), *Asian Security Order: Instrumental and Normative Features*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 2003.
- Brown, Neville. "Climate, Ecology and International Security." *Survival*, Vol. 31. No. 6.
- Buzan, Barry. *People, State, and Fear: An Agenda for International Security Studies in the Post-Cold War Era*. 2nd. ed. Bolder: Lynne Rienner, 1991.
- Byung Chul, Koh(ed.), *The Korean Peninsula in Transition: The Summit and Its Aftermath*, Seoul: The Institute for Far Eastern Studies, 2002.
- Byung Moo, And Yong Sup Han(ed.), *Korean Security Policies Toward Peace and Unification*. Seoul: The Korean Association of International Studies, 1996.
- Evans, Paul. "Asian Perspectives on Human Security: A Responsibility to Protect?" a paper Presented International Conference on Human Security in East Asia, 16-17 June, 2003, International Conference Hall, Korea Press Center, Seoul, Korea.
- Goodman, Mel. "The Militarization of U.S. Foreign Policy." *Foreign Policy in Focus, Policy Brief*, Vol.9, NO. 1, February, 2004.
- Fukuama, Francis, *State-building: Governance and World Order in the 21st Century*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 2004.
- Haftendorn, Helga. "The Security Puzzle: Theory-Building and Discipline-Building in International Security," *International Studies Quarterly*, 35, 1991.
- Jahn, Egbert, Pierre Lemaitre, and Ole Wæver. *Concepts of Security: Problems of Research on Non-Military Aspects*. Copenhagen Papers no. 1, Copenhagen: Centre for Peace and Conflict Research, 1987.
- Legault, Albert, "New Norms in the Field of Peacemaking: The Challenge of Implementation," in Raimo V. V yrynen(ed.), *Globalization and Global Governance*, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers. Inc., 1999.
- Pierre, Jon(ed.). *Debating Governance*, New York:: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Un Chul, Yang(ed.), *The Political Economy of Korean Unification*, Sungnam: The Sejong Institute, 1998.
- V yrynen, Raimo V. (ed.), *Globalization and Global Governance*, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers. Inc., 1999.

- Singer, M., and Wildavsky, A. *The Real World Order: Zone of Peace/Zones of Turmoil*. New Jersey : Chatham House Publishers, 1993.
- Smith, Paul J. "Transnational Security Threats and State Survival: A Role for the Military?" *Parameters, US Army War College Quarterly*, Autumn, 2000.
- Walt, Kenneth N. "Globalization and Governance." *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 23, December, 1999.
- Walt, Stephen M. "The Renaissance of Security Studies." *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 35, 1991.
- Weiss, Linda. "Globalization and National Governance: Antinomy or Interdependence?" *Review of International Studies*, 25, December 1999.