

Letter of Appeal to the American Public

(October 2004)

U.S.-Korea Relationship-Historical Perspective
Division of Korea: The United States has been intimately involved in the Korean problem starting with the split of the country and every step thereafter.

In the last stage of the Pacific war, the Soviet Union declared war on Japan and committed their massive Far Eastern Army. Washington feared that the whole Korean peninsula would be occupied by the Soviets, putting the U.S. under a strategic disadvantage in any future confrontation with Russia. Thus on August 1945, the U.S. proposed to demarcate a line in Korea between the Soviet and U.S. advancing armies by simply offering the 38th parallel that bisects the peninsula. The Soviets agreed.

Korean War: This division of the country became a de facto split with two occupied zones; each governed by opposing ideologies, i.e., **Cold War**. After a brief, fruitless discussion with the Soviets on the possibility of unifying the two halves, the U.S. referred the issue to the United Nations. In November 1947, the General Assembly of the UN created a Commission, which supervised a general election held in South Korea and established the **Republic of Korea (ROK)**. Less than a month later the **Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK)** was announced in North Korea under the aegis of the Soviet Union.

It is relevant to recall that many Korean leaders at the time opposed this establishment of two governments seeing the action as sowing the seeds for a future conflict between them. This prophetic analysis became a reality on June 25, 1950, when the Korean War erupted. South Korea, ill prepared for such an all-out military conflict with the well equipped, highly disciplined North Korean army, was at the verge of disintegration. The United States hastily reentered Korea under the flag of the United Nations to defend the ROK. The ROK army was placed under American command. The Chinese intervened to support the DPRK. After more than three years of intense fighting that devastated the peninsula, the war ended in stalemate. An uneasy truce was signed between the U.S., North Korea and China. South Koreans, viewed the truce as an American betrayal of the commitment to unify their country and declined to become a signatory of the armistice. To this date, the DMZ separates the two Koreas; no peace treaty was ever signed between the Korea and the U.S. in spite of repeated requests by the North Koreans; and 37,000 U.S. soldiers are still stationed in South Korea.

Clearly the Korean conflict was a proxy war between the communist powers and the West. It is simplistic to regard it as an American rescue effort to save South Korea from the invading North Koreans. Nothing clarifies this point better than the speech given by President Truman at the Joint Session of the Congress in 1952. Justifying the American war effort, he stated; "The Korean War is not a Korean war, it is an American war to contain the communism fought in Korea and not at the coast of California—"

Koreans are deeply troubled by recent remarks by some Americans, influential in foreign policy planning in Washington, on the present nuclear issues in the Korean peninsula, e.g., "A unilateral action by the Americans must be considered in taking out the nuclear threat by the North Koreans—" (Richard N. Perle, 2003, WSJ), or "The United States has earned its right to intervene in Korean peninsula unilaterally with the blood of 57,000 U.S. soldiers who died there —" (Brent Scowcroft, 2003, WSJ) Forgotten is the blood of two million Koreans who died during the war, as well as half a million Chinese deaths. These kinds of arrogant and factually inaccurate remarks seem to underlie the mindset of the current Washington policy planners. To the well educated, self-assured emerging Korean generation, such remarks only generate fear and hostility toward the current U.S. administration.

Nuclear Crisis in Korean Peninsula & Agreed Framework between the DPRK & the U.S.

Nuclear Crisis in the Korean Peninsula: The first allusion to the possible use of nuclear weapons in Korea was made by General MacArthur, to stem the tide of Chinese communist forces massively crossing over the Yalu into North Korea in 1951.

America continued to threaten North Korea with nuclear retaliation even after the war, whenever events strained the relationships e.g., the Pueblo incident (1968), the shooting down of the U.S. EC 121 reconnaissance plane (1969), the Panmunjom tree trimming incident (1976).

The collapse of the USSR and its Eastern European allies deprived North Korea of energy sources, trading partners and foreign investment. Continued U.S. sanctions and embargoes severely restricted her trade. Ever-increasing military outlay of South Korea combined with the presence in the peninsula of 37,000 U.S. troops backed by the world's largest nuclear superpower, the United States (that repeatedly belittles its sovereignty and constantly reminds it of its vulnerability in the face of the U.S. nuclear ability) had contributed to the North Korea's security concerns and must have led to their interest in acquiring nuclear weapons mainly for the purpose of gaining leverage against this external threat in much the same context as in the case of, Israel and Pakistan.

In 1993, the United States detected evidence that North Korea may have started processing spent fuel rods from its nuclear reactors in Yongbyun that can lead to plutonium fissionable devices. Confronted with this accusation, North Korea withdrew from the **Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT)** and defiantly refused the request for an inspection visit by the IAEA (International

Overview

United in a common urge to appeal directly to the American people on issues involving the future direction of American foreign policy on the Korean peninsula, and representing significant segments of the Korean-Americans and others concerned, we the undersigned have come together.

Many Koreans believe that U.S. foreign policy dealing with the Korean peninsula in the past three years is flawed. It is flawed in that it is devoid of consistency, lacks relevant historical perspective, is insensitive to cultural nuances, and is based on an arrogant stance, best described as **"Might is Right"**

Many Koreans believe this flawed policy is largely responsible for the steadily aggravating relationship between the U.S. and North Korea that resulted in North Korea emerging recently as a fledgling nuclear power.

North Korea is a country seeking a new political and economic paradigm. This is why the historic process of détente began on June 15, 2000 as the heads of the North and South met in Pyongyang; this is why they have been insistent on the peace treaty with the U.S., lifting of U.S. sanctions and embargoes and finally, all else failing, a minimal security guarantee from the U.S. in the form of a nonaggression pact. None of these has been forthcoming. As a matter of fact, even the request for an opportunity for a meaningful bilateral dialog has been denied by the U.S.

North Korea hardly constitutes a threat against the U.S. even with its fledgling nuclear weapons and 1.2 million army. Indeed, balancing the scale of arms is the reality of North Korea; It is located at the other side of the globe, smaller than the state of Maine, produces not a drop of oil and suffers from severe shortages of food, health care and energy. Its reported GDP is only 0.03% of that of the U.S.

Confrontation between the U.S. and North Korea however could constitute a real threat against South Korea, a thriving country of 42 million people, located just south of the **DMZ (Demilitarized Zone)** and with 37,000 U.S. soldiers stationed on its soil. Therefore, the maintenance of détente, and a cooperative relationship with its northern brethren is an essential imperative for the people of the Republic of Korea.

Many Koreans believe that the current US foreign policy is in need of major rethinking, and that the time for such a process is now, just prior to November, when American people will express judgment on the current administration. Therefore, we present this "Letter of Appeal to the American Public"

Atomic Energy Agency). The U.S. Clinton administration then took steps to prepare itself a plan for a surgical bombing of the **Yongbyun** facility, (#5027 Operation). This first nuclear crisis in Korea was mitigated by Pyongyang talks between former president **Jimmy Carter** and president **Kim, Il Sung** of the DPRK and the understanding between the two was later codified in the form of **"Agreed Framework between the DPRK and U.S."**, signed in October, 1994 in **Geneva** by **Kang Sok Ju** of North Korea and **Robert L. Gallucci** representing the U.S.

This so-called, "94 Agreed Framework", if implemented faithfully by both parties, could have led not only to a nuclear-free peninsula, but also a mutually beneficial and peaceful relationship between the U.S. and both Korea. The breakdown of this agreement caused by

both sides is the major reason for the current "Second" nuclear crisis in the Korean peninsula.

For this reason, it is important to examine the content of this now largely defunct Agreement, as well as the record of compliance, or the lack of it, by both sides.

1994 Agreed Framework between the DPRK and The United States: The Agreement consists of **Four Articles.** The most important part of the Agreement from the U.S. perspective was the pledge by the DPRK not to pursue its ongoing work to process spent fuel rods, and to open the DPRK to ongoing IAEA on-site surveillance, as well as an additional comprehensive inspection by the agency just prior to the installation of the nuclear reactor equipment for the two LWR's (Light Water

Reactor)-(see below.) Both countries agreed to maintain the denuclearization of the Korean peninsula in compliance with the principles of the **1992 North-South Joint Declaration on the Denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula** (this would make the process of uranium enrichment by North Korea also a violation of the Agreement.) The Agreement also contained an important clause defining cessation of nuclear threats by both sides against each other (meaning U.S. nuclear threats against the DPRK, since the U.S. would be the only nuclear power after the Agreement).

The fact that North Korea had been in full compliance with this part of the Agreement had, on an annual basis, been officially certified by the CIA until 2002, when North Korea's uranium enrichment effort became an issue. The CIA

WE APPEAL TO ALL AMERICANS

✓ **Vote** in November, vote for change, vote for peace and vote for the return of **"American Values"**

☎ **Urge** Washington to change the nation's Korean foreign policy in the direction of peace, stability, friendship and bilateral talks that will lead to a nuclear-free Korean peninsula.

☎ **Urge** Washington to withhold support for the congressional "North Korea Human Rights Act" that can only promote tension and confrontation in the Korean peninsula.

☎ **Urge** Washington to adopt a Korean foreign policy that will advance reconciliation and reunification of the two Koreas, so that 72 million Koreans can also create their **"Shining City on the Hill"**

Paid for by the member Korean-American individuals and organizations of the **Korea Peace Network P.O. Box 8244 Rochester, MI 48307 Phone: (586)-431-9699**
A more complete, full text of this letter appears on theKPN Website: <http://www.koreapeacenetwrok.info/>
E-mail: information@koreapeacenetwrok.info

KPN Signatory List

- Korea Peace Network (KPN)
- Korean American National Coordinating Council (KANCC)
- National Association of Korean Americans (NAKA)
- National Committee for Peace in Korea (NCPK)
- Korean-American League (KAL)
- US-DPRK Medical Science Exchange Committee (UDMEDEX)
- Peacemaking Network

Yoon, Kilsang
Rhee, Syngman
Hyun Joon Ki
Hahn, Michael S.
Cho, William Tong Sul
Lee, Haeng Woo
Yang, Eun Sik
Pak, Moon J.
Pak, Shin Ja
Pak, Moo-Jae
Kim, Doahn
Hsu, Victor
Lee, Min Yong
Seo, Keun Il & Soon Cha
Ahn, Choongsik
Kim, Chongho James
Kim, Bong
Singer, Phillip
Vogel, Kurt
Sung, Jae-Sang
Kang, Jong Il
Kim, Seung-Kuk
Kim, James
Cho, Hee-Yun
Sunwoo, Harold
Stokes, Marilyn
Swain, David
Matthews, Gene
Ogle, George & Dorothy
Liem, Channing
Lee, Jung Woo
Kim, Yun-kuk
Harris, Ruth
Patterson, Pat
Kim, Sung Man
Suh, Hyuk-Kyo
Povlich, Ronald
Kussner, Shirley Ann
Kim, Mi Jung

Park, Yang Soon
Riley, Ewa
Pak, Eugene
Kim, Angie
Gorstein, Jonathan
Pak-Gorstein, Suzinne
Pak, Youngjean M.
Kishner, Bernard
Lim, Choon S.
Kang, Yang
Jung, H. S.
Lim Choon
Kim, Hyunhwan
Kim, Won
Min, Anselmo
Chu, William H.K.
Moon, Tong Hwan
Rumpf, Roger
Woodside, Pamula
Cho, Myung Ji
Kim, Yoon Berrn
Borrie, Don
Cho, Mi-Jung
Liem, Ramsey
Kim, John
Hwang, Sam
Pak, Jung-Jae
Suh, Shin-Jae
Lee, Lee
Kim, Joo-Tae
Back, Wan-Seng
Gwak, Tae-Young
Chung, Rang-Mo
Choi, Bo-Kyung
In, Byeong-Moon
Chang, In-Sun
So, Byung-Hoon
Park, Sang-Sun
Kwon, Seung-Eon
Kim, Ou-Whan
Kim, Young-il
Jeong, Dong-ik
Yang, Hee-Chul
Sim, Byeong-Ho
Yim, Bang-Gyu
Lee, Eun-Young
Lee, Kwang-Hee
Kim, Soo-Nam
Lee, Seung-Jin
Kim, Seung-Kuk
Kim, Jong-Ok
Kim, Jin-Sim
Whang, Keun-Su
Yu, Byeong-Wha

Choe, Kong-Sik
Yu, Ki-Jin
Park, Jung-Pyung
Song, Kye-Chae
Lee, Sung-Keun
Kim, Sun-Bun
Lew, Lack-Jin
Choe, Sang-Won
Park, Sun-Ja
Jeong, Hoe-Sun
Kim, Soo-Chul
Jung, Young-Kwon
Park, Hoe-Sang
Kim, Hyun-Sook
Park, Young-Taek
Hong, Yi-Hwan
Kwon, Hyoung-Taek
Kwon, Hee-Do
Kim, Yong-Lan
Park, Seok-Yool
Han, Sang-Ryul
Jang, Chang-Jun
Park, Soon-Kyung
Kim, Byung-Tae
Hong, Keun-Soo
Cho, Syong-Ryong
Park, Kwang-Won
Yoon, Yung-Jan
Oh, Gi-Mo
Han, Suck-Hyun
Hong, Sun-Meng
Ahn, Myung-Lok
Hwang, Wan
Park, Yong-Hyun
Kim, Nak-Joong
Hwang, In-Chul
Kim, Jung-Ja
Jung, Duk-Yong
Chang, Wol-Gun
Kim, Sung-Hee
Lee, Moon-Sang
Yang, Jae-Duck
Hong, Sun
Jung, Mi-Ja
Kyoung, Keng-Mi
Ka, Ok-Hyun
Kang, Jeong-Koo
Noh, Jong-Sun
Lee, Chang-Geul
Jong, Sei-Jin
Lee, Jang-Hee
Oh, Ji-Hyeung
Yoo, Sai-Jong

Jung, Ji-Ung
Jou, Myong-Cheol
Kim, Tae-Joon
Im, Ho-Il
Hwang, Hoon-Sung
Cho, Uhn
Whang, Sang-Ik
Park, S. Joon
Kim, Seo-Won
Kim, Ae-Young
Kwon, Sang-Ah
Jung, Sang-Ryul
Chai, Soo-il
Chung, Hak-Sung
Kang, Jong-il
Seo, Chang-Ho
Bang, Jung-Kyun
Kim, Pan-Tai
Ko, Soon-Kye
Lee, Myoung-Bok
Kim, Sang-Gyoon
Kim, Yin-Su
Lee, Hong-Kyu
Hwang, Jung-Won
Kim, Yoon-Ok
Kim, Yoon-Ok
Sim, Jae-Whan
Bae, Yong-Han
Song, Dae-Hyun
Jo, Young-Ok
Lee, Sang-Hun
Choi, Eun-Kyung
Maeng, Soon-Do
Kim, Ji-Seop
Kim, Ju-Cheol
Kim, Ok-Hee
Kwon, Seung-Ja
Son, Chung-Ho
Lee, Eun-Hyang
Kim, Young-Sung
Park, Sung-Ho
Lee, Keum-Cheon
Moon, Byoung-Mo
Kim, Min-Gon
Kim, Meung-Hi
Sin, Jeung-Won
Kuean, Il
Lee, Jeong-Ja
Han, Young-Seun
Son, Hei-Lak
Kim, Dong-ik
Kim, Hyeun-Ju
O, Eun-Kyeung
Lee, Ji-Hyeung
Cho, Jung-Ki

Kim, Hyun-Ho
Kim, Han-Seung
Kim, Mi Jung
Choi, Seoung-Choi
Kim, Jin-Sei
Kim, Dae-Won Kim
Kim, Jun-Bae
Lee, Han-Oh
Cha, Jun-Sub
Park, Kyung-Jo
Choi, Eun-Sik
Yoo, Seung-Woon
Lee, Soon-Keun
Choi, Joong-Seok
Kim, Kab-Tae
Jung, Dae-Wha
Ahn, Byung-Ook
Kim, Pan-Tai
Lee, Se-Young
Lee, Hyung-Sang
Jang, Sang-Choi
Kim, Dong-Chun
Cho, Hyo-Je
Han, Hong-Koo
Oh, Yoo-Seok
Park, Eung-Hong
Choi, In-Choi
Jung, Hae-Seob
Choi, Moo-Yeong
Lee, Min-Hwan
ParK, O'bog
Jung, Hae-Gu
Cho, Hyun-Yeon
Lee, Nam-Seok
Cho, Hee-Yeon
Choi, Jae-Hoon
Kim, Rebecca
Jang, Sang-Mi
Kang, Kuk-Jin
Choi, Min
Lee, Sang-A
Chu, Chong-Hwan
Jeon, Jae-Ho
Lee, Jae-Hwan
Kang, Ki-Sik
Lee, Jang-Won
Choi, Bang-Sik
Kim, Yong-Hwan
Baek, Chan-Hong
Yoo, Sang-So
Kim, Yong-Soo
Seol, Dong-Bon

certification was a congressional requirement to obtain its approval for the heavy oil shipment to North Korea,—(see below.)

In exchange for this commitment by North Korea, the U.S. agreed to meet the following, time-specific obligations, which it then failed to honor:

1. **To build two light water reactors to meet the energy needs of the DPRK:** The Agreement specified that the first reactor would begin to produce 1,000 MW of electricity by the year 2003, the second reactor to follow a year later. This combined energy production of 2,000 MW by the year 2004, was expected to fuel the DPRK's economic recovery. **The U.S. failed to deliver on this pledge. In 2002, after eight years of work, the KEDO (Korea Energy Development Organization), which is the administrative organization that oversees this project and headed by the U.S., predicted a delay of some four to five years until the electricity could flow out of the LWR! Funding for the project is nearly completely provided by South Korea and Japan, and to a significant extent the technology comes from South Korea. There had not been any delay from these countries in the discharge of their commitments. Therefore, the LWR project did not constitute a U.S. "reward" for North Korea's "bad behavior" as asserted by some high level policy planners in the current U.S. administration.**

2. **The provision of 500,000 tons of heavy oil per year by the U.S.:** This was meant to provide energy until the LWR's came on line. **The shipment was promptly halted by the present administration as the current crisis began in 2002, despite the urging of moderation by Japan and South Korea on the grounds of humanitarian concern..**

3. **Normalization of the relation and lifting of the sanctions and embargo:** Article Two of the Agreement clearly states that within three months of the date of the document, all barriers to trade, investment, telecommunication services and financial transactions would be reduced, and a liaison office would be opened in each other's capitals. Nothing along these lines was pursued by the U.S.

4. **Denuclearization of the peninsula and cessation of hostility between the two countries (Article Three and Four):** Finally, the principle of denuclearization and the abrogation of the use of nuclear weapons in the Korean peninsula was administered a grave blow by the current U.S. administration when a secret plan called **"Nuclear Posture Review"** was revealed in 2002, in which the U.S. use of nuclear weapons against so-called **"Rogue States"** not armed with such weapons was not to be ruled out, and North Korea was found to be on the list of such "Rogue States".

Current U.S.-DPRK Relationship & Nuclear Crisis (2001-2004)

The inauguration of the president **George W. Bush** and his Republican administration completely transformed the relationship between the two countries. President **Bush** made frequent derogatory remarks about North Korea's leader; made light of South Korea's effort toward South-North détente; the '94 Agreed Framework was denigrated as an example of appeasement by the **Clinton** administration. This undiplomatic rhetoric further deepened North Korea's skepticism of U.S. motives on the Korean peninsula.

The horrible event of September 11 (2001) was followed by President Bush's **"Axis of Evil"** speech, (January 29, 2002) in which he branded North Korea as one of the evil countries. North Korea responded by professing nuclear intent; opening its sealed fuel rods to produce fissionable material; withdrawing its membership in the **NPT**; and expelling IAEA observers from Pyongyang. The United States escalated the situation by halting heavy oil shipments and declaring the end of the '94 Agreement. North Korea responded by formally closing the LWR construction site and expelling all the **KEDO** workers.

Today, the U.S.-North Korea relationship is in a dangerous stalemate. The U.S. continues to refuse bilateral talks, and instead promotes multilateral conferences (China, Japan, Russia, and South Korea), with the hope that it will isolate North Korea and exert pressure to disarm its nuclear weapons program. It insists that North Korea must comply with Complete, Irreversible, Verifiable, Dismantling of its Nuclear weapons program before it will enter into any bilateral negotiations with her. North Korea has responded by proclaiming itself to be a de facto nuclear power, but hints that it is ready to negotiate if a security guarantee in the form of nonaggression pact with the U.S. is forthcoming.

North Korea is now accelerating its internal political and economic changes. The introduction of an early form of a market economy has had an invigorating effect on its economy. Externally, it has been successful in opening new diplomatic relations with its neighbors as well as with European states. It has broadened political and economic interaction with South Korea. Ironically, it appears that the hard-line, U.S. foreign policy is having the effect of isolating the United States, rather than the DPRK in the Far East. **"North Korea is Reaching Out, and World is Reaching Back"**-NYT, 2004/08/20, Norimitsu Onishi)

The most recent American initiative that could potentially further aggravate the U.S.-North Korea relationship and destabilize current North-South détente comes from the legislative branch. It is the **"North Korea Human Rights Act"** that just passed both Houses. The Act encourages the defection of North Korean nationals by providing financial support and the chance of settlement in the U.S. **It is the opinion of many concerned Koreans both in the U.S. and South Korea that the Act is not only ill timed but also harmful to the relationship between the U.S. and North Korea as well as that between North and South Korea.**

This advertisement is neither endorsed nor financed by any of the presidential candidates or any other organizations supporting their candidacies.