

**WITHDRAWAL OF US  
TROOPS FROM SOUTH  
KOREA—NO MORE DELAY**

# **Withdrawal of US Troops from South Korea—No More Delay**

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PUBLISHING HOUSE

PYONGYANG, KOREA

JUCHE 97 (2008)

## **Preface**

The present international situation is, in short, acute and complicated, particularly in Northeast Asia surrounding Korea. Why? Is it simply because of the nuclear issue, the problem of weapons of mass destruction in Korea? No. It is precisely the US hostile policy towards Korea and the US troops in south Korea that render the situation on the Korean peninsula extremely complicated.

The danger of war hovering over the Korean peninsula would be inconceivable were it not for the existence of US troops in south Korea.

The withdrawal of US troops from south Korea is the urgent demand of the times and history that brooks no further delay, especially in the era of independent reunification of the Korean nation, in the era of the June 15, 2000 declaration.

This book gives concise accounts of the theoretical and practical problems to be dealt with in the withdrawal of US troops from south Korea.

Hopefully, this will be of some help to readers who want to know more about the question of Korea's reunification.

## **Editorial Board**

## CONTENTS

1. THE NATURE OF THE US FORCES IN SOUTH KOREA....	1
1) US POLICY TOWARDS KOREA AND ITS FORCES IN SOUTH KOREA .....	1
(1) US STRATEGY FOR DOMINATION OF THE WHOLE WORLD ...	1
(2) US TROOPS IN SOUTH KOREA-MEANS OF REALIZING US POLICY TOWARDS KOREA .....	17
(3) PRESENT STATE OF THE US TROOPS IN SOUTH KOREA.....	26
(4) TRUE NATURE OF THE US FORCES IN SOUTH KOREA .....	30
<b>Not “UN forces”</b> .....	38
<b>Deceptive South Korea-US “Combined             Forces Command”</b> .....	44
2) UNLAWFULNESS OF THE US STATIONING OF ITS FORCES IN SOUTH KOREA .....	49
(1) VIOLENT INFRINGEMENT OF DECISIONS OF INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES AND INTERNATIONAL LAW .....	49
(2) VIOLATION OF THE KOREAN ARMISTICE AGREEMENT .....	56
(3) DISREGARD OF RESOLUTION OF THE UN GENERAL ASSEMBLY .....	59
3) DAMAGE AND SUFFERINGS OF THE KOREAN NATION CAUSED BY THE US FORCES IN SOUTH KOREA .....	60
(1) DAMAGE AND SUFFERINGS OF THE SOUTH KOREANS .....	60
<b>Violation of National Sovereignty</b> .....	60
<b>The Ever-Increasing Cost of Maintenance             of the US Forces</b> .....	65

<b>US Bases: Hotbeds of Crime</b> .....	67
(2) THE PAIN OF TERRITORIAL DIVISION .....	71
(3) THE AUTHOR OF CONFRONTATION ON THE KOREAN PENINSULA .....	74
<b>2. WITHDRAWAL OF THE US FORCES FROM SOUTH KOREA-A DEMAND OF THE TIMES</b> .....	78
1) AFTER THE END OF THE COLD WAR .....	78
2) FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF THE JUNE 15 NORTH-SOUTH JOINT DECLARATION .....	81
3) ANTI-US SENTIMENT IN SOUTH KOREA .....	86
(1) EVER-RISING ANTI-US SENTIMENT .....	86
(2) ANTI-US STRUGGLE BY THE MASSES .....	89
(3) CANDLELIGHT DEMONSTRATION .....	92
4) US TROOPS' RELOCATION SOUTH OF THE HAN RIVER .....	97
5) GOALS OF THE CONTINUOUS STRUGGLE FOR THE WITHDRAWAL OF US FORCES FROM SOUTH KOREA .....	107
<b>CONCLUSION</b> .....	126

# **1. THE NATURE OF THE US FORCES IN SOUTH KOREA**

## **1) US POLICY TOWARDS KOREA AND ITS FORCES IN SOUTH KOREA**

### **(1) US Strategy for Domination of the Whole World**

Quite a long time has elapsed since the end of the Cold War.

In retrospect, how far did people expect peace from the end of the Cold War fraught with arms race and hostility?

Now it is crystal clear—it was an empty dream.

The current international situation is unpredictable and ever-changing. Now that the vicious cycle of terrorism and counterterrorism, war and violence has evolved, mankind's expectation of peace has burst like a bubble.

It stands to reason to think that the flames of war in Afghanistan and Iraq unleashed by the United State under the pretext of countering “terrorism” following the 9/11 incident would spread to other countries.

And so the current situation is quite serious and grave.

The United States is entirely responsible for this. It has been indulging in war and confrontation in all parts of the world, posing as the “single world superpower”

that emerged “victorious” in the Cold War.

The ulterior purpose of the United States is to realize its ambition for domination of the world, i.e. Pax Americana. Pax Americana, again on the lips of the US neoconservatives, means, in short, “peace” resting on the might of the United States, precisely, the US military forces. The bottom line of this doctrine of Pax Americana, or US-controlled security is that world peace and security can be maintained only with the backing of US strength. Its theoretical ground is the assumption that the on-going chaos will gradually disappear if the United States dominates the world, as it has superior military hardware and nuclear weapons.

In the long run, this leads to the conclusion that the United States should perform the function of “policeman” supervising law and social order throughout the world.

Robert Kagan, the prime mover in giving theoretical support to the hardline conservatives within the US administration, wrote about this “policeman,” figuratively, as follows:

“An outlaw begins to kick up a row in a saloon. The situation is uncontrollable. Then, a sheriff kicks the door open and enters. The outlaw is now under control, and the piano-playing starts again, and people drink and dance as if nothing had happened.” (*United States vs. Europe: Report on Conflict*)

Leo Strauss, a professor of political philosophy at Chicago University, was more offensive in his assertion in this respect.

In his book *On Tyranny*, he wrote that “defending democracy from barbarians is a natural right and responsibility” and “permanent war is more desirable

than permanent peace, as the latter makes man corrupt.”

These arguments of the so-called philosophers and ideologues in the United States are nothing but reproductions of the previous theory that openly praised war and plunged mankind into the nightmarish world wars in the last century.

The point at issue is that such a pro-war assertion is supported by the US policy-makers and is reflected in US external policy.

In September 2000, a year before 9/11, a US state policy research institute, Project for the New American Century, submitted to the administration a very assertive report on formulating a new US strategy to cope with the changed circumstances.

Under the premise that the process of transforming the United States into a future hegemonic state would take a long time unless there were an incident like the Pearl Harbour attack, the report recommended: First, nuclear weapons should be used first; second, the regimes hostile to the United States should be changed; third, US military expenditure should be enormously increased; fourth, the United States should make international conventions in conflict with its interests null and void or withdraw from them; and fifth, the United States should station troops in the Middle East and Central Asia. The report's recommendations were then estimated to be necessary for the US administration, but problematic in their feasibility.

However, what became of the US external policy following 9/11?

Surprisingly, it is quite similar to the suggestion of this report. The report's fear of a second Pearl Harbour attack turned out to be the actual reality of 9/11, exactly

one year after the report was presented. Since 9/11, the proposals of the report have been reflected almost in their entirety in the US external policy.

The Bush administration's advocacy of a preemptive nuclear strike, its change of regimes in Iraq and Afghanistan, its increase in military expenditure, its abrogation of some treaties, including the ABM Treaty, concluded with the former Soviet Union, its stationing of troops in the Middle East and Central Asia—all were undertaken as exactly as if following a drama script.

It is doubtful if there was any prophet in the United States who anticipated today's events.

As far as 9/11 is concerned, this incident, if it is viewed as having occurred on the basis of the aforementioned report, was, in all probability, an incident that just “struck the United States across the face satisfying its desire to cry”; accordingly, it provides big room for the possibility that it was cooked up by the CIA.

Who, then, is giving a push to this US external policy is also an interesting question.

The US external policy geared at hegemony of the world is very aggressive, which is indicated by its recent wars.

Needless to say, it is difficult to regard it as the brainchild of Bush himself, who has been calling for a new war and confrontation, claiming that he could not “wait on events, while dangers gather,” (State of the Union Message in 2002), and “Containment is not possible when unbalanced dictators with weapons of mass destruction can deliver those weapons on missiles or secretly provide them to terrorist allies.” (speech at the West Point Military Academy in June 2002)

The prime movers in inducing the US administration to spur on its reckless external policy, the strategy for US domination of the world, are the insiders of the Bush administration, the so-called neoconservatives, and the US military industrial complex they represent.

The “visible” driving force of the first-term Bush administration’s pursuit of the aggressive strategy for world domination was the neoconservatives, represented by Dick Cheney, Donald Rumsfeld, Paul Wolfowitz, John Bolton and Condoleezza Rice.

They frequently appeared in the press to insist that priority to military might over diplomacy would enable the United States to keep its hegemonic position secure.

They claimed that the United States, as the sole superpower, should control the world more aggressively in military affairs, that it is justifiable and appropriate in the light of international law to launch a preemptive strike against an enemy who is judged to be about to go on the offensive in the very near future, and that even if there is no evidence of imminent attack, the United States can use its armed forces in the face of the increasing serious threat to it. All of this confirms their identity as neoconservatives. These neoconservatives are precisely the people behind the blatant US military adventure to invade weaker nations and countries, and occupy regions abundant in natural resources, exposing world peace and security to great challenges.

As far as the neoconservatives are concerned, the UN Charter, which recognizes only a war fought as self-defence to cope with aggression from outside forces as legitimate, is nothing other than an obstacle to the realization of their strategy for world domination. By

taking advantage of the 9/11 as an excuse, they have been employing without hesitation the strategy of unilateral preemptive strike, a strategy the Hitlerite army used to apply to invade other countries during the Second World War. The US hardline forces frequently claimed that they would not tolerate the emergence of any potential force that might be a competitor of the United States, and that they would remove such a threat beforehand. Owing to their manipulation, the United States adopted the defence budget for the fiscal year 2004, amounting to a colossal sum of USD 401.3 billion, an increase of USD 8 billion over the previous year. According to specialists, this budget is more than the total sum of the budgets of 20 countries combined, ranging from Great Britain through France and Russia to China, and probably exceeding the global defence budget from which the US budget is deducted. The US defence budget has snowballed during Bush's term, owing to the "tact and ability" and "manipulative intelligence" of the neoconservative hardliners.

Then, who would be the most pleased with the increase of the defence budget in the United States?

It is none other than the US military industrial complex. The abovementioned neoconservatives are a "visible force" steering the US administration towards a hardline strategy for world domination, while the military industrial complex is an "invisible force" behind the scenes. In fact, it is the latter that actually manipulates even the whole world, to say nothing of the United States, to suit its interests. Viewed in this light, the present US administration is only the representative of the latter, and its external policy is approved only when it

is “sensitive enough to find the itchy part of the military industrial complex and quickly scratch it.”

One can understand this logic more vividly, if one delves into the acquaintanceship between the military industrial complex and the hardline conservative force within the administration. Rumsfeld was once the president of General Instruments, and Amitage was the director of General Dynamics Electronic Systems from 1990 to 1993. And a study of personal backgrounds of those appointed secretaries of the army, navy and air force reveals more surprising facts. Gordon England, Secretary of the Navy, served as the vice-president of General Dynamics for over 30 years, a typical munitions complex producing F-16 fighters and MI-A1 tanks. He was responsible for securing an order from the US Department of Defence for F-18 fighter-bombers worth USD 47 billion. Air Force Secretary James G. Roche was once the president in the electric sensor & systems sector of Northrop-Grumman producing B-2 Stealth bombers. Now that persons with such backgrounds have taken up important positions in the US administration it is as clear as daylight what policy they would pursue. They distinguished themselves in the revival of the US military industrial complex that had been on the verge of bankruptcy due to a reduction in the demand for arms following the end of the Cold War. It is necessary to pay attention to the fact that the military industrial complex exercised great influence behind the scenes till the aforementioned report submitted by the research institute, Project for the New American Century, was adopted as US external policy.

For the benefit of the military industrial complex or

related monopolies, the US administration has been pursuing a world-targeted war policy, a confrontation policy, whose basic nature is, to all intents and purposes, based on its strategy of regional importance or regional dispute control, aimed at world domination. Of course, like all other strategies, it is also backed by military strength and geared at gaining world supremacy.

Judging that the collapse of the Soviet Union, the main obstacle to establishment of Pax Americana, as a result of the end of the Cold War, afforded a most favourable condition for achieving its ambition, the United States advertised a new military strategy, called a strategy of regional importance or regional dispute control. The pretext of this strategy is, seemingly, to cope with “regional threats” or “regional disputes,” but its real objective is based on the intention to seize the Eurasian continent. This does not mean, however, that other regions are outside the concern of the United States. The Eurasian continent is the focal point of this strategy, for it is rich in strategic natural resources, it contains a large percentage of the world’s population, and, most importantly, the rapid economic growth amidst fierce competition between countries in this region has a great impact on the prospects for United States economic development.

For the United States, it is extremely important and valuable to take hold of this continent. But, how?

The viewpoint of former national security adviser Zbigniew Brzezinski is the most prominent of those of most US strategy makers. He recommends, on the premise that Eurasia is the centre of the world and its ruling force is the United States across the ocean, that the

United States should first grab hold of key areas around this continent, in order to dominate the whole continent effectively.

All actions of the United States, in the context of Brzezinski's recommendation, the US strategy of regional dispute control and the current of the present international situation, are obviously taking place according to a well-designed scenario. In other words, the US wars in Afghanistan and Iraq under the pretext of "counterterrorism," its previous aggression in the Balkans, and its strenuous efforts to strain the situation to the extreme in Northeast Asia and dominate the Korean peninsula, can all be considered parts of its attempt to bring the neighbouring areas of Eurasia first under control.

The US military strategy that has been set in full motion against these backgrounds is characterized by the following: firmly establishing a "missile defence shield"; bringing the Middle East, Central Asia and Northeast Asia under its full control; improving the mobility of its military forces with the rapid development of science and technology and lightening its arms and other military equipment; and launching a preemptive nuclear strike at any party standing in the way of its effort to realize its military strategy. It lays bare the real nature of the United States.

The first characteristic of this strategy is to set up a missile defence shield over the US mainland. This plan, the implementation of which was given the green light by Bush's declaration on May 1, 2001, but with opposition from the whole world except Japan and a few other countries, is reckless and unfounded in that it targets the

planet as a whole. This plan, the purported aim of which is to “cover the whole house with glass in order to prevent a few mosquitoes from coming in,” was deliberated by the US Defence Department from the early 1990s, and has been given more encouragement since Bush’s assumption of office in 2001; it constituted the core of the new US defence strategy, the so-called 2001 Quadrennial Defence Review, published on October 1, 2001.

It is a typical plan that mirrors the US’s ambition for world domination and the close ties between the Bush administration and the US munitions industry. On the surface, it appears to be of a defensive nature, based on the concept that missiles launched from so-called “rogue states” are to be detected in time by means of ground radar, reconnaissance satellites and AWACS, and then destroyed by interceptor missiles fired from the ground, air or sea. However, it is by no means exclusively defensive in nature, in that it is based on the concept that it will attack only after it is assured of its safety from retaliation. In plain words, it imagines a warrior armed with only a sword but without a shield hesitating to make a preemptive attack, afraid of retaliation. This principle used to be called the “security theory of crisis” among military specialists. The common understanding of both the United States and the former Soviet Union regarding this principle prompted them to conclude the ABM Treaty in 1972, during the Cold-War period.

In 2002, however, the United States declared its withdrawal from the ABM Treaty, on the excuse that this treaty had “limitations of the times.” It was as good as a declaration of its ambition to pursue the strategy for

world domination continually by taking monopolistic control of the capability for a preemptive nuclear strike. The Bush administration is desperate at its attempt to translate the MD plan into reality. From early 2004 it trumpeted the issue of an Aegis ship-based antimissile missile (AMM) to be deployed in Korean waters in September the same year, and planned to finish its deployment of surface-based AMM in Alaska by the following year at the latest.

Noteworthy in the MD plan is the tremendous amount of funds required. According to experts, USD 60 billion is required for land-based AMM alone, and, if the AMM for sea and air is added, an additional USD 240 billion to a trillion will be needed.

It is clear that the US military industrial complex, including the Boeing Company, Lockheed Corporation, Martin Marietta Corporation and Raytheon Company, which were going almost bankrupt following the end of the Cold War, would be reenergized if they were supplied with such an astronomical amount of fund. Of course, such a benefit was not made available by mere chance. They had long huddled in secret with political circles over the plan and disbursed not a small amount as political funds or research and development funds to that end. From their perspective, the prize is worth any effort, but the global disaster this entails would be enormous.

The second characteristic of the US military strategy is the attempt to secure its domineering position in the Middle East and Central and Northeast Asia. Most of the US armed forces are now deployed in the Middle East and Central Asian regions under the pretext of “anti-terrorism.” From the US standpoint, these regions are

significant in that they are strongholds for occupying the Eurasian continent in the long term, but, more importantly, they are rich in strategic resources such as petroleum and natural gas.

The ulterior motive of the United States to completely seize the Gulf region through the Iraq war was laid bare and met apprehension and denunciation by the peoples of the whole world.

Another area which is no less important to the United States is Northeast Asia including Korea, for it is the only area to which the US sphere of influence did not extend after the end of the Cold War. Despite its desperate attempt to extend its tentacles, straining the situation in this region to the extreme under the pretext of the “nuclear problem” on the Korean peninsula, this area remains adamant, unnerving the United States. As far as the latter is concerned, the Korean question is not simply a matter confined to one country, but a matter of great political importance related to China and Russia as well. As early as June 2000, the US Joint Chiefs of Staff made public Joint Vision 2020, a long-term US military strategy in which they referred to China as a “potential adversary of the United States in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.”

This viewpoint of the United States is totally different from its previous attitude that regarded China as its “strategic competitor,” indicating that its present policy towards China has a Cold-War character.

Observing from a broad perspective the military moves of the United States, one can clearly understand that it has been tightening a huge blockade against Korea connecting the Japanese islands, south Korea, Taiwan and the Philippines.

The third characteristic of the US military strategy is to lighten all of its military equipment in such a way as to ensure high mobility.

This is closely related to the change of the US military strategy following the end of the Cold War. The United States, under various pretexts of regional dispute or “war on terrorism,” has expanded the radius of the activities of its overseas forces, that were previously confined to certain regions for certain tasks.

What is noteworthy here is the extent to which the scope of operation of the overseas forces of the United States has been expanded far beyond the previous one.

For instance, as is shown in the redeployment of the US troops in south Korea to the areas south of the Han River, the regional scope of their activities previously confined to the Korean peninsula is expected to be extended as far as Taiwan.

The US military bases in south Korea, too, are expected to serve as a continental base for supporting US military operations in the whole area of Asia, including Northeast Asia.

Simultaneously with the changes of its military strategy, the United States is now concentrating its efforts on enhancing the mobility of its troops.

Lightening its military equipment, raising their firepower and improving information systems are steps taken accordingly.

Also contained in such steps is, needless to say, the reduction of its troops, at present numbering 1.4 million. This does not mean, however, the reduction of either its military capabilities or military expenditure.

On the contrary, it plans to build an army equipped

with more modern equipment in exchange for reduction in the number of troops, i.e., transforming a “numerical strength-oriented” force into an “efficiency-oriented” force. This step is entirely in accord with the interests of the US military industrial complex in that it creates demand for new weapons.

The fourth characteristic of the US military strategy is to create the possibility of launching a unilateral preemptive nuclear strike against those countries that stand in the way of its strategy for world domination.

As is widely known through its Nuclear Posture Review, the United States has already included Korea on the list of seven countries set as the targets of a US preemptive nuclear attack.

This report came under a barrage of protests and condemnation from the peoples of many countries, for the strategy of a preemptive nuclear attack is the modern replica of the strategy of the Hitlerite Nazi army.

After the Second World War, the Nuremberg trials defined such an act as a “crime against peace.”

The staff members of the US Defence Department, who openly asserted that they would not tolerate the advent of any potential competitor, are now readopting the military doctrine of the former war-maniacs that calls for “removal of a threat in advance.”

This doctrine has already been applied in Central Asia and the Middle East, the surprise, preemptive strike at Iraq serving as the “model.”

What is only left for the United States is how to use nuclear weapons in a preemptive attack. But, according to a concrete study, the US attitude to the issue is inclined to the use of nuclear force.

The United States decided to expend in 2004 USD 15 million of its defence budget on the development of mini-nukes, and USD 34 million on the modernization of the nuclear testing ground in Nevada.

What is the purpose of the United States which is eager to develop mini-nukes while demanding that other countries “not possess or transfer nuclear weapons” and “abandon nuclear programmes”?

In short, it is to become the one and only nuclear power and use nuclear weapons to threaten other countries, and, finally, to create Pax Americana under which the whole world is at its beck and call.

For this reason, the basic stand taken by the United States is that the “nuclear weapons in my hands are for global peace,” an attitude based on a very simple dichotomic black and white logic that the “nuclear weapon in another’s hands disturb the peace.”

On the basis of this logic, the United States describes mini-nukes as “effective means” of accomplishing its “just cause,” regarding them as conventional weapons.

The neoconservatives within the US administration are too intent on the use of nuclear weapons to heed the apprehensions and protests of research institutes and anti-war and anti-nuclear-weapons organizations that the use of such weapons may take a toll of more than 500 000 lives and turn the area concerned into a place unsuitable for living organisms due to contamination by radioactivity.

What is preoccupying them is Machiavellianism—any means may be justifiable if the objective is justifiable.

Such doctrines, which had been accused by history and which should never be followed again, are making a

resurgence one by one with the help of the neoconservatives in the United States, seizing the whole world with a feeling of great anxiety and fear.

The British newspaper the *Guardian* asserted: The United States is going back to its previous position in the Cold-War days in the field of defence; the US military specialists have turned towards the development of mini-nukes, banned following the end of the Cold War, and nuclear bombs for high-precision strikes with high explosive force are destroying the boundary between nuclear confrontation and nonnuclear confrontation.

Meanwhile, the coordinator of the Russian office under the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War said that the decision of the US President and Congress to lift the ban on research into mini-nukes was particularly dangerous, that it meant the beginning of a new nuclear arms race, that there would be neither victor nor loser in a nuclear war, and that the use of nuclear weapons would not be favourable to the United States either.

A Norwegian newspaper carried an article which commented, "It is a very bad omen that the United States is secretly developing a new mini-nuke, and the United States is crazy to develop such a weapon."

All the facts show that the US military strategy for Pax Americana is pregnant with a great danger of plunging humanity into a nuclear holocaust.

The point in question is that the United States is not hesitant at all about its war policy, indulging in domination and interference in all parts of the world, with so much confidence in its strength and swaggering about, prompted by its conception that it can overthrow any

state system if it decides to do so.

Today the United States is not trying nor feeling it necessary to cover up its true colours as an imperialist state.

## **(2) US Troops in South Korea—Means of Realizing US Policy towards Korea**

The present US administration is showing unprecedentedly keen interest in the question of the Korean peninsula.

It is no exaggeration to say that the United States has never been more tenacious than it is now in dealing with the Korean question in the context of its external policy.

It means that the Korean question is now viewed as a matter of special importance in the realization of its external policy.

The United States is not willing to give up south Korea, in spite of the unanimous denunciation from within and without that it is the military ruler in south Korea, mainly because of its military and strategic interests in the Korean peninsula.

In other words, the United States considers that only when it controls the whole of the Korean peninsula, the link connecting the largest continent and the largest ocean, will it attain its final objective of world domination.

For this reason, the US ruling circles, which were preoccupied with world domination, likened the Korean peninsula, in the light of its important geopolitical position, to a bridge or a bridgehead, and even to a “small sword to cut the continent.”

Thus, bringing Korea under control as a forward base of strategic importance poses itself as the essential prerequisite decisive of US dominance of the Eurasian continent.

After the Second World War, the United States managed to take the southern half of this peninsula as its military and strategic base. As early as in October 1946, the first governor, Arnold, of the US Military Government in south Korea said that an “iron curtain had descended across the 38<sup>th</sup> parallel,” suggestive of the strategic importance of the Korean peninsula, and in 1946 the General Staff Office of the US Army Forces declared that “at the present time Korea forms part of the US boundary.” These facts indicate that from the outset of its occupation of south Korea the United States pursued a policy of confrontation, a policy of transforming south Korea into a military base, conscious of the military and strategic importance of the Korean peninsula.

The Korean peninsula was thus to become a focal point of the United States for the extension of its sphere of influence in Asia, witnessing the subsequent three-year Korean war.

The United States unleashed the Korean war by dint of its frenzy and military strength that had grown after the Second World War, and hurled huge armed forces into this war in order to show off its colossal strength and demonstrate its international sphere of influence.

However, the war developed contrary to its expectation, compelling it to plumb the depths of ignominious defeat hitherto unknown in its history of war.

The US’s wild ambition to occupy the whole of the

Korean peninsula was smashed, and it was forced to agree to a dishonourable armistice.

With the conclusion of the armistice agreement the hostilities ceased, but Korea was fixed as a powderkeg front of the Cold War and as a key area for realizing its strategy towards Asia.

Going through the 1960s, when the voices denouncing its pursuit of the Cold War reached a crescendo and its sphere of influence started dwindling rapidly in the international arena, and passing through the 1970s, when the developing countries aspiring after independence became powerful forces, along with its economic recession, and while plunging deeper into the quagmire of the Vietnam War, the United States switched to a “two Koreas” line aimed at making the division of the Korean peninsula permanent.

This strategic switchover of the United States was to meet the international political situation that was developing to its disadvantage, and it is, in a sense, suggestive of the US position not to make any concession on the Korean question even in the worst situation for itself.

Entering the 1980s, this intention of the United States was even more highlighted; it went so far as to designate south Korea as “vital” to its world strategy. Subsequently, it further consolidated the structure of its military rule centring on the stationing of its troops and deployment of tactical and strategic nuclear weapons in south Korea, and operational command over the south Korean puppet army, adding up to a tense Cold-War situation on the Korean peninsula.

Despite such a Cold-War policy of the United States,

however, like the undercurrent of a frozen river, the anti-US sentiments in south Korea grew rapidly far and wide, turning south Korea into a region permeated by anti-US feelings.

Given this situation, the United States could not but make a slight adjustment in its policy of domination over south Korea in the 1990s.

Its approval of the switchover from its previous military dictatorial “regime”-based rule to “civil regime” is a typical example of such an adjustment.

The reason for this switchover was that the United States could not turn its face away from the main trend of the international political order towards detente and cooperation following the end of the Cold War, and that, more importantly, it was apprehensive about the possible disastrous consequences of a rejection of the south Korean people’s demand for democracy and reunification that was rapidly growing in correspondence with the new international political order.

Nevertheless, it did not budge even an inch from its military and security strategy, as the key in its policy towards Korea.

In defiance of the demands of the peace-loving peoples across the world, the US Defence Department insisted that there would be no change in the strategy of forward deployment making up the current US military policy in Europe and the Asia-Pacific region.

Especially, the United States openly stated that it would reinforce its military forces in Asia and make every preparation for confrontation, mainly because it considered that the best way to deal with Korea and other “recalcitrant regimes” was a showdown by means of

force. And in order to get international support for its policy, it started making plots against Korea, including the notorious “nuclear problem” and the missile and WMD problems.

These plots are factual materials which indicate the ultimate objective to which the US Korea policy is directed and which show what opposition it may pose to the task of realizing the interests of the Korean nation.

In the vicious cycle of the worsening situation on the Korean peninsula for over half a century, a security-first strong-arm policy has been pursued by the United States persistently in south Korea, and military threats and blackmail, political and diplomatic isolation and economic blockade and pressure against Korea have been and are still being stepped up. This situation originated in the US policy towards Korea, and is inconceivable apart from it.

The US Korea policy, the core of which is the US military rule in south Korea and the aggravation of inter-Korean confrontation, has no room for Korea’s reunification.

The US policymakers regard the problem of the Korean peninsula, not as that of reunification of the Korean nation, but as that of US military domination, and the US “security.” Considering that the US domination of the whole of Korea is directly related to the vital interests of the United States, they have been applying the theory of strength—that the permanent intervention and stationing of US troops in south Korea are essential to this end.

As far as the United States is concerned, Korea’s reunification can be allowed only on the condition that

US rule is fully ensured. Conversely, reunification must be opposed by all means if it is to guarantee the full sovereignty of the whole Korean nation itself.

The US Korea policy is rooted in the conception that the Korean peninsula is a powder magazine in Asia that may draw involvement from four nuclear or semi-nuclear states and an area pregnant with the possible danger of military conflict, and that, therefore, to cope with this danger, the US, as the only world superpower and international gendarme, must station its troops there.

The United States has also set it as an important means of realizing its policy towards Korea to strengthen its military domination and political subordination of south Korea through its occupation force there, and step up military confrontation and political and economic pressure against Korea.

Against the aforementioned background, US politicians and generals have been expressing their intention to keep US troops stationed in south Korea permanently on the excuse of “war deterrence” and “guarantee of peace” on the Korean peninsula.

All in all, what is basic to the US policy towards Korea is the intention to seize the whole of Korea and, to this end, to employ the US forces in south Korea as the physical means.

The US occasionally claims officially that it wants Korea’s reunification and welcomes inter-Korean talks, but only as a diplomatic gesture in unavoidable circumstances.

But, in fact, it makes not one inch of concession in its basic aim of the domination of the whole of Korea.

Its real intention is also laid bare by the fact that it has

been constantly keeping a sharp eye on the “red line” it drew in relation to the question of the Korean peninsula.

This “red line” implies that the United States would support inter-Korean talks and negotiations only on the condition that its dominant influence is ensured on the Korean peninsula; the US troops in south Korea should not be made a precondition for Korea’s reunification or north-south talks because they constitute a “war deterrent.” Even after Korea’s reunification, the US troops should remain in Korea, discharging their mission as a “peace-keeping force,” and nobody has the right to interfere with the matter of US troops in south Korea, for the stationing is a legitimate right granted to the United States at the request of the south Korean side.

All these parts of the US Korea policy are, in fact, a direct challenge and a major obstacle to Korea’s independent national reunification.

The present misfortune and sorrow suffered by the Korean nation are entirely due to the dominationist aim of the US.

Accordingly, it is most important to recognize the stark historical fact that the existence of the US armed forces in south Korea is the main factor in the aggravating tension and the main obstacle to reunification on the Korean peninsula.

Today’s reality shows that the matter of modifying US policy towards Korea is not a matter of revising a certain aspect or addressing a mistake made in a certain period but a serious matter of correcting its fundamental concept. Otherwise, the question of Korea’s reunification and related problems cannot be solved correctly.

The US is deeply involved in the question of the

Korean peninsula in various forms and ways, and exercises absolute influence in south Korean society because of its control of the major military and political systems, which help it have a say in the question of Korea.

The US policy of intervention in the Korean peninsula is being implemented on a wide scale through the military, economic, political, diplomatic, ideological and cultural systems of the south in the special circumstances of Korea's division.

By drawing on its hegemonic ruling system that has already been set up throughout the world and by means of its monopolized and influential mass media, the United States has defined Korea as part of the "Axis of Evil" and as "rogue state" posing an actual threat to the peace and security of the United States and Northeast Asia. It thus insists that security from Korea's "provocation" is the top priority on the Korean peninsula.

Top priority in security matters means that the hostile confrontation, blockade and isolation against Korea is the primary task to which reinforcement and maintenance of military forces are vital.

An intensified anti-DPRK confrontation posture corresponding to the joint security system and military subordination system based on the south Korea-US Treaty of Mutual Defence and Assistance and Status of Forces Agreement, maintenance and reinforcement of the US troops in south Korea and the US grasp of the military prerogative of the south Korean puppet army through the south Korea-US Combined Forces Command directly show the extent to which the United States is involved in the question of the Korean peninsula and

what it wants to gain from its involvement.

The core of the US Korea policy illustrated by the aforementioned facts is as follows:

First, it is to establish and strengthen a strict system of military rule in south Korea.

The US policy towards south Korea is worthwhile only when it accords with its national interests and its order of world domination.

Second, it is to maintain and intensify its anti-socialist confrontation posture and finally bring the DPRK deep under the US-controlled subordination system. The United States pursues negotiation or takes a hardline attitude, appearing to be ready for a war, both of which, however, are aimed at undermining and demolishing Korea's socialist system. In this respect, the US policy towards Korea conflicts with Korea's strategy for reunification that regards independence as the lifeblood of the nation and identifies the restoration of national independence with the final realization of reunification. Therefore, the US strategy opposes peace and pursues force-to-force confrontation.

Third, the United States is not willing to give up the Korean peninsula, a place of strategic importance in the Asia-Pacific region. Instead, it intends to transform the peninsula into a major stronghold for materializing its strategy for world domination.

Today specialists estimate that the US interest in the Korean peninsula will rise remarkably in the context of its future Cold-War confrontation with China. This supports the theory that the United States intends to continue to pursue its ambition for domination of Asia and the rest of the world on the basis of its strong-arm logic.

### **(3) Present State of the US Troops in South Korea**

At present, when redeployment of the US forces in south Korea is under discussion, it has become a matter of primary concern how their status will be changed. This is an important yardstick for estimating the prospective situation on the Korean peninsula.

The US forces in south Korea consist of land, naval and air forces. The land and air forces, constituting the main body, are deployed along or near the MDL (Military Demarcation Line); and, capable of nuclear attack, they maintain a close relationship with their supply bases in Japan. Compared to this, the naval force, lacking an independent character, provides liaison, support and supply for the US naval bases in Japan.

The land force operates on the Korean peninsula and its neighbouring areas. It belongs to the 8<sup>th</sup> Army, which is composed of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Infantry Division as well as the 6<sup>th</sup> Cavalry Brigade, 17<sup>th</sup> Air Brigade, 19<sup>th</sup> Theatre Support Command, 8<sup>th</sup> Military Police Brigade, 501<sup>st</sup> Military Information Brigade, 1<sup>st</sup> Communications Brigade and 18<sup>th</sup> Medical Command.

The 6<sup>th</sup> Cavalry Brigade consists of two battalions armed with 24 AH-64 Apache helicopters each, and a battalion supporting those two; it is an air unit armed only with attack helicopters. The 17<sup>th</sup> Air Brigade is made up of two assault battalions equipped with UH-60 helicopters and CH-47 helicopters, and a battalion supporting the abovementioned battalions. The 19<sup>th</sup> Theatre Support Command supports the 8<sup>th</sup> Army

Command, and the 8<sup>th</sup> Military Police Brigade safeguards supply lines, maintains order in battle areas and in the rear, and runs POW camps, all in times of emergency. An important unit is the 501<sup>st</sup> Military Information Brigade. The number of units of its kind and scale is five in all in the US Army, one being the one attached to the 8<sup>th</sup> Army stationed in south Korea. Equipped with hi-tech hardware, it is engaged in intelligence activities against Korea and at the same time counterintelligence activities.

The core of the US land force is the 2<sup>nd</sup> Infantry Division. With the “Indian Head” as its symbol, the division inherits the history of the slaughter of American Indians. They began to leave their bloody footprints in Korea during the Korean war. With manpower of 15 000, or about 40% of the US forces in south Korea, it is equipped with various means for transporting nuclear weapons, nuclear-tipped shells, nuclear mines, backpack nukes, multiple-launch rocket systems with a range of more than 30 kilometres and attack helicopters. Such equipment and firepower are estimated to be equivalent to those of south Korea’s two puppet army corps.

The division consists of three combat brigades, an air brigade, artillery brigade, engineer brigade, divisional support headquarters, signal battalion, anti-aircraft battalion, military information battalion, and military police company. The pillars of the division are the three combat brigades. The 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> brigades are still deployed in south Korea, whereas the 3<sup>rd</sup> Brigade withdrew to the US in 1992. Now the mechanized brigade of the 6<sup>th</sup> Corps of the south Korean puppet army fills the place of the 3<sup>rd</sup> Brigade. The 2<sup>nd</sup> Infantry Division is a mixture of US and south Korean puppet forces.

Recently, the reform of US military strategy is exerting an impact on the US forces in south Korea, mostly on the 2<sup>nd</sup> Infantry Division, and specifically on the 2<sup>nd</sup> Brigade. This brigade, equipped with tanks and armoured vehicles and, unlike other brigades, consisting mainly of foot soldiers, is called a light brigade, and has the highest probability of being designated as a task force in future.

The US air force in south Korea is the 7<sup>th</sup> Air Force, one of three under the US Pacific Air Command.

Originally, it was the 314<sup>th</sup> Air Division under the 5<sup>th</sup> Air Force stationed in Japan, and then it became independent in 1986 as the 7<sup>th</sup> Air Force with the Korean peninsula as its theatre of operations. Its strategic value is increasing day by day in light of its reorganization towards manoeuvrability and of its basic strategy of preemptive strike. With F-16 and F-15 fighter-bombers, and U-2 spy planes, or 50% of the US air force in the Pacific, it is based in Kimpho, Suwon, Osan, Wonju, Chongju, Kunsan, Taegu, and Kwangju.

Its main bases are in Osan and Kunsan.

Osan: 7<sup>th</sup> Air Force Command; Command of the 51<sup>st</sup> Combat Air Wing; spy planes dispatched by the Tactical Air Control Centre and the Strategic Air Command. Stationed not far from Phyongthaek, the 7<sup>th</sup> Air Force Command directly controls the puppet Air Force Command of south Korea and the Air Component Forces Command under the Combined Forces Command. When the base in Ryongsan is transferred to it and Phyongthaek, it will become a core base for the US forces in south Korea.

Kunsan: Command of the 8<sup>th</sup> Fighter Wing under the

7<sup>th</sup> Air Force; F-16 fighters capable of carrying nuclear bombs; a number of nuclear arsenals; and the 78<sup>th</sup> Ordnance Detachment, a unit for nuclear operations.

Proceeding from their military significance, the United States studied a plan of integrating the two bases for their administration, but the plan was shelved as it was deemed to be premature.

The base in Kwangju is home to a detachment under the 6168<sup>th</sup> Security Control Battalion, whose task is electronic reconnaissance. The base in Taegu, the 6168<sup>th</sup> Air Base of the US Pacific Air Force, serves as a detachment under the 18<sup>th</sup> Fighter Wing based in Kadena, Japan.

Besides these fixed air bases, there are more than 100 temporary airstrips, 40 of them being 3 kilometres each.

The 7<sup>th</sup> Air Force maintains a very close relationship with the other two air forces under the Pacific Air Command. For example, when the 7<sup>th</sup> Air Force put on a “semi-war” state in 2003, 24 B-52 and B-1 strategic bombers were deployed in Guam, and after that U-2 spy planes and F-15 fighters were additionally dispatched to the 5<sup>th</sup> Air Force in Japan. Another example is the sharing by the US air forces in south Korea and Japan of the same anti-air radar and signal systems.

The US naval force in south Korea is characterized by the fact that it has no substantial combat unit. A naval force and marines numbering 1 000 under the 7<sup>th</sup> Fleet are in Pusan, Jinhae and Pohang, providing liaison, supply and support.

The 7<sup>th</sup> Fleet, one of the two fleets under the Pacific Command, is headquartered in Yokohama, Japan, and operates in the area of the west Pacific. It has various

naval vessels and airplanes, including three aircraft carriers and 15 submarines. On these carriers are planes, which are ready to take off with nuclear bombs in case of an emergency on the Korean peninsula at a moment's notice. The aircraft carriers and nuclear-powered submarines frequently call at Pusan and Jinhae, bringing US troops and military hardware to south Korea, and thus aggravating tension on the peninsula.

In a sense, manoeuvres by the 7<sup>th</sup> Fleet portend a war on the Korean peninsula, so keeping a watchful eye on them is meaningful for peace on the Korean peninsula.

#### **(4) True Nature of the US Forces in South Korea**

##### **Occupation Force—Not “Liberators”**

The historic Pyongyang summit and June 15 North-South Joint Declaration brought about an epoch of détente and cooperation on the Korean peninsula and an epoch-making change in the Korean people's struggle for national reunification.

The epoch demands that all problems arising in the struggle for national reunification be reviewed in conformity with the demands and interests of the nation, and solved on the principle of independence of the nation.

Getting a correct understanding of the true nature of the US forces that have resorted to domination and intervention in the southern half of Korea and created one obstacle after another to the efforts for national reunification is a demand of the times that cannot be ignored or avoided.

It is well known that the US forces, as a physical entity that supports the US strategy towards Korea and the rest of the world by force, have been a major hindrance to the improvement of relations between the north and south of Korea, and to their reunification. Nevertheless, the United States has propagandized that its soldiers went to Korea, as “apostles” to “rescue” the Korean nation from “misfortune and sufferings.” The mastermind of Korea’s division reduced the Korean peninsula to a war theatre of ideologies of the Cold War in the name of “defending free democracy,” rationalized the war in the name of a “crusade,” and pursued the policy of dividing the peninsula, and now presents itself as a goodwill assistant to Korea’s reunification. It claims that it makes efforts in various ways for the sake of south Korea and stations its troops there for south Korea’s “security.”

The pro-US elements in south Korea relay the US propaganda as it is in order to retain their political power under the US umbrella. This sycophantic act, undermining and sacrificing the national interests, serves the United States, which promotes its interests through Korea’s division.

For a correct understanding of the true nature of the US forces in south Korea, it is necessary to see through the US policy of disguising itself as pursuing goodwill for the Korean nation while in actual fact pursuing a policy of domination in its own interests. In view of the historical facts of its division of Korea and hindering of the country’s reunification, and in view of the present situation in which it chastises Korea as a “nuclear criminal” while it is the instigator of the “nuclear issue”

on the peninsula, one can see the traditional way of the United States of covering up its true nature and pursuing its interests in Korea. By employing this method, it landed its troops in Korea in the name of “liberators,” and later changed their name to UN Forces, and then into south Korea-US Combined Forces, each time to adjust to the demand of the situation. But all the deeds they have done in Korea are too contradictory to what they claim they do. An understanding of this nature of the US forces in Korea is essential for those who want peace and Korea’s reunification. This is important for some who might mistake a “wolf” for a “sheep,” and all the more so in view of the fact that no problem concerning Korea can be solved properly unless the true nature of the United States and its troops in south Korea is brought to light.

An active engagement policy of the United States towards Korea began in the days when it deployed its troops in south Korea after the end of the Second World War. On hearing that the US forces would be deployed in the south of Korea to disarm the defeated Japanese soldiers in accordance with the plan of division of the theatres of operation, some south Koreans welcomed their landing at Incheon. This was related to some extent to the fact that the United States was an Allied Power during the Second World War. However, the US forces began to act as an occupation force, and exercised military rule over the south Korean people, who had been full of hope for independence and confidence in a bright future.

The United States did not approach the Korean question from the view of freeing Korea from the colonial shackles of Japan, but from the view that Korea

was indispensable in expanding its own sphere of influence. This view was hinted little by little at the Cairo Conference in November 1943 and the Potsdam Conference in July 1945. Towards the end of the Second World War, i.e., in July 1945, the committee for joint operations planning of the US Joint Chiefs of Staff formulated a confidential document, titled, *Joint Operations Planning Committee 385-1*, which envisaged the occupation of Korea by the United States, Chiang Kai-shek's Chinese, Soviet and British forces. According to the document, the occupation would be realized in three stages. First stage: The main force of the occupation forces would consist of US troops, who were to first occupy Seoul, and then Pusan and Kunsan, places of strategic importance. Second stage: The whole territory of the Korean peninsula was to be partitioned by four nations, as was Germany, facilitating US control of three zones out of four. Third stage: At the time of military control, an Allied Control Committee chaired by the United States was to be set up to place the whole territory of the peninsula under its control.

What is especially noteworthy here is that Korea was treated as a war criminal state, like Germany. The fact that the United States planned to apply exemption to Japan, which had fought in the East Asian region alongside Germany, and divide Korea, a war victim, into zones of occupation in place of Japan is clear proof that it held Korea as a war criminal state. This was another criminal act against the Korean people.

This plan was aborted by the offensive the Korean People's Revolutionary Army and the Soviet army launched against the Japanese forces in early August

1945. From the viewpoint of the Allies' military operations at the time, there was no reason why the United States should dispatch forces to the Korean peninsula.

Nevertheless, on the night of August 10 the US State-Army-Navy Coordinating Committee discussed the area of US operations and the draft of General Order 1, which would be promulgated in Korea by the US forces. It was difficult for the committee to meet Secretary of State Byrnes' demand to advance northward as far as possible to accept Japan's surrender. But proceeding from the view that Seoul should be included in the zone of US occupation, the 38<sup>th</sup> Parallel 45 miles north of Seoul was chosen as the demarcation line. The idea of the demarcation line was approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Coordinating Committee, and then by President Truman.

This is how the demarcation line, which would inflict innumerable misfortunes and sufferings on the Korean nation, was drawn without any justification and in disregard of the opinion and desire of the Korean people.

The 24<sup>th</sup> Corps landed in Inchon on September 8, 1945, and thus started the history of the US forces in south Korea. The command, led by Hodge, and the subordinate units entered Seoul, and accepted the surrender of the Japanese forces, taking over all the ruling machinery. After occupying the areas surrounding Seoul, the US forces extended their occupation to Kaesong, Pusan and other parts of the south of Korea. The word occupation force denotes an army that occupies the territory and establishments of an enemy state, regardless of the latter's opinion. The US forces behaved

true to the word. They regarded the Korean people as enemies, not as people to be freed from the yoke of Japanese rule, and the territory of Korea as one of their occupation zones.

The various orders issued in south Korea at that time reveal the nature of the US forces as an occupation force.

Proclamation No. 1 (MacArthur Proclamation) of the General Headquarters of the US Army Forces, Pacific, made public with the setting by the US troops of their feet on Korean soil, reads in part:

“As Commander-in-Chief, United States Army Forces, Pacific, I do hereby proclaim as follows... . All powers of government over the territory of Korea south of 38<sup>th</sup> degrees north latitude and the people thereof will be for the present exercised under my authority... .

“Article III. Persons will obey my orders and orders issued under my authority. Acts of resistance to the occupying forces or any acts which may disturb public peace and safety will be punished severely.”

The following Proclamation No. 2 contains MacArthur’s terms for ensuring the safety of the occupation forces and maintaining public peace in the occupation area.

These terms show that the US forces in south Korea were literally an occupation force, not a “liberation army.”

The true colours of the US forces as an occupation force were further revealed by their military control.

In accordance with Proclamation No. 1, the US Military Government was officially set up in south Korea on September 11.

Impatient to take control of the whole of Korea, the

United States enforced its occupation policy in the form of military control.

With regard to the nature of the Military Government, the United States claimed that it was a provisional government established by the US forces under the Commander-in-Chief of the Allied Forces, which would rule, guide and dominate the region south of the 38<sup>th</sup> Parallel, and was the sole government in south Korea.

With its more than 70 000 troops in south Korea and the Commander-in-Chief of the US Army Forces exercising absolute power there, the United States began to build a new colonial ruling system of its own. In the course of this, the political organizations and democratic forces which, following the country's liberation, were sprouting across south Korea, with the hope of constructing an independent state, forfeited their justification and legitimacy under oppression, and every element, national and democratic, suffered setbacks. Representative of them were the people's committees, which had been organized at the initiative of the people in south Korea. Regarding them as an obstacle to their rule, the US forces repressed them and finally dissolved them. In this way, they set up an American-style political system and power structure, created an American way of life, and laid the foundation for subjecting everything in south Korea to US interests.

The main purpose of the Military Government was to hold undisputed sway in south Korea, an advance base for the United States in the Cold War.

Maintaining the past Japanese colonial system, and patronizing its officials and even pro-Japanese forces, the US forces reorganized them for the realization of the US

Korea policy. It also appointed to important posts those who knew English, who had studied in Europe or America, and who promised cooperation with the United States, increasing the ranks of the pro-American forces. Meanwhile, it gave the cold shoulder to the nationalist and progressive forces, and blocked their participation in political affairs. Though it set up the Military Government Advisory Council comprised of Koreans, the transitional legislative council and the civil administrator system, claiming that an avenue had been opened for broad political participation by the south Korean people, it was nothing but a deceptive gesture; in practice, it never recognized any independent political organization other than itself.

In fact, the former pro-Japanese forces and traitors, changing sides, recovered their political clout, and began to emerge as a ruling group.

In order to subjugate south Korea during the period of military control, the US forces set up a national constabulary and police, and rapidly expanded their ranks, thus consolidating the foundations for their military control over south Korea.

The Military Government also exerted influence on the social and economic fields in south Korea. The flood of foreign goods, caused by the disposal of enemy property, the military purveyance industry created after the US occupation, the outflow of military supplies, and aid materials made a mess of the south Korean economy, and seriously hampered its healthy development. Changes were also witnessed in the people's view of society and values, undermining the traditional national culture. The foreign culture that made inroads into south

Korean society undermined the national spirit, morals, and ethics, and traditional customs.

The great impact the Military Government had on the political, economic, military and cultural fields was to play a decisive role in defining the course of south Korean history.

The whole course of the military rule the US forces enforced after they had set foot in south Korea clearly proved that they were nothing but an occupation force.

### **Not “UN Forces”**

The hypocritical nature of the US forces in south Korea can be seen from the signboard of “UN forces” they usurped during the Korean war. The “UN Command” has hung its signboard in the base in Ryongsan, Seoul, and handles issues concerning the Armistice Agreement. Study in depth the “UN forces,” and one can see that there is no justification for calling them such, and that the name is merely camouflage for justifying their presence in south Korea.

In fact, the name has a great political and psychological effect on people who have no clear idea of what the “UN forces” are. It provides justification for the stationing of the US troops in south Korea; it seems quite natural that they are stationed there in conformity with the unanimous demand and interests of the international community, not just with the unilateral interests of the United States. And it secures their legitimacy, as it seems they were organized according to the UN Charter, not to US law, and are operating under UN instructions. This is why the United States is now making desperate efforts to put the cap of the “UN forces” on the heads of their soldiers in south Korea.

The misuse of the name of the UN by the United States is an insult to the UN and to the international community, which the UN represents. For this, the United States twice became the target of ridicule and denunciation across the world.

The first time was in the mid-1970s, in 1975 to be exact, when the 30<sup>th</sup> Session of the UN General Assembly adopted a resolution on unconditionally dissolving the “UN Command” in south Korea, with the influence of the United States on the United Nations waning. In order to provide against the possible forfeit of the name of “UN forces,” the United States had to take an emergency measure creating the “Combined Forces” of south Korea and the United States as another legal lever for the stationing of its troops in south Korea.

The second time was in the mid-1990s, when the Four-Party Talks, involving the DPRK, south Korea, the United States and China, were held to discuss a peace mechanism on the Korean peninsula as its major agenda item. In the talks, proposed by the United States, the American side tried to disarm the DPRK through “peaceful negotiations.” The Clinton administration, still in its early days, attempted in vain to bring the DPRK to its knees by means of military pressure, but later changed the policy into a strategy of peaceful negotiations, like the Four-Party Talks. Seeing through the ulterior motive of the United States, the DPRK insisted on fundamentally solving the problem of a peace mechanism on the Korean peninsula, not confining it to some immediate matters. The DPRK maintained that the major factor aggravating the situation on the Korean peninsula is the US forces in south Korea. This was so principled and logical that

many countries supported it. The US side hurried to justify the existence of the US forces in south Korea, claiming that the issue had “originated in the Korean war of 1950-1953,” and that “the north has nothing to do with it.” This meant that the DPRK had no right to unilaterally “interfere” with an issue which had originated under the authority of the United Nations. Apprehensive that this pretext and unreasonable assertion might dig a hole for itself, the United States killed the talks. But this left a room for how to justify its approach to its troops in south Korea.

Apparently, the United States deems it effective to use the name of “UN forces” to evade its responsibility for the withdrawal of its troops from south Korea.

Let us examine the origin of the history of the “UN Command” in south Korea.

The organization of the “UN forces” was raised in the UN in 1950, when the Korean war started. At the outbreak of the war, the United States submitted a report compiled by its ambassador to south Korea to the UN Security Council and called on the United Nations to immediately dispatch to the Korean peninsula multinational “UN forces.” But, the United Nations was not in a position to accept this. In order to do so, the United Nations had to get the approval of all the five permanent members of the Security Council. The former Soviet Union, a permanent member, was absent from the meeting in protest at a debate over the representation of the People’s Republic of China in the Security Council, a heated issue at that time. The United States took this opportunity to railroad the draft resolution. This was clearly illegal conduct in light of Article 27 of the UN

Charter. The United Nations should be held responsible for it, but above all, the United States, which had been exercising absolute authority and influence in the United Nations at the time, should be called to account for it. The United Nations was not an even-handed international organization; it was a puppet of the United States. Taking advantage of the lame-duck United Nations, the United States, in the name of the UN, had already dispatched its forces to the Korean front before the adoption of the UN resolution on June 27.

Another point to be noted in the organization of the “UN forces” is that the United Nations gave neither a “decision” nor an “instruction” with regard to it, but a “recommendation” that assistance by the member nations be placed under the “unified command” led by the United States. In the strict sense of the words, the US forces and the forces from 15 other countries sent to the Korean war were not “UN forces” from the very time of their organization. This was made clear in a letter dated June 24, 1994 from the then Secretary General of UN, Boutros Boutros-Ghali, which reads in part, that the UN Security Council had not organized the Combined Forces Command as a UN organization, but had recommended that the United States set up a “Command” under its own leadership. He was replying to a letter from the foreign minister of the DPRK, who had lodged a strong protest against the military exercises the US forces were conducting in the name of the “UN forces” against the DPRK, a member state of the UN. This means that the United States used the UN recommendation in its own interests.

Experts also take issue with the composition of the

“UN forces” in south Korea. The term “UN forces” means that it consists of foreign troops in a proper ratio. But the “UN forces,” except for the south Korean troops, consisted of mostly American troops covering 99.2% of the air force, 83.8% of the naval force and 88% of the ground force, and naming them “UN forces” was not only cowardly but deceptive (*Far East Military Strategy of the United States*, December 1, 1951). The “UN forces” rapidly went downhill after the Korean war, and in the late 1960s and the early 1970s the other 15 countries pulled their troops out of the “UN forces,” which had been there for symbolic purposes. All that now remain are US troops.

The command system of the “UN forces” is another major reason why they cannot be called UN forces. UN forces must regularly report their activities to the United Nations, and receive its instructions. But the “UN forces” in south Korea are outside the control of the UN, and, worse still, pay no heed to its recommendation or advice.

MacArthur, the first commander of the “UN forces,” admitted that the relationship between the United Nations and the “UN forces” had existed in name only, and everything he had done in Korea had been under the control of the US Joint Chiefs of Staff, adding that all his regular reports had had to go through the US State and Defence departments. His successor, Ridgeway, confessed that the United Nations had no ability to implement any one of its exaggerated resolutions, that when he was the commander of the UN forces in south Korea he never received an order in any form from the United Nations during the Korean war, as far as he remembered, and that whatever he did, he did not take the UN into consideration.

The decisive factor for negating the existence of the “UN forces” is the resolutions adopted at the 30<sup>th</sup> Session of the UN General Assembly in November 1975. The session adopted two resolutions on the issue of the “UN forces” in south Korea, proposed by the DPRK and the United States, respectively. When they are compared to each other, the two sides’ stands on dismantling the “UN Command” coincide, but they differ on whether it should be unconditional or conditional and immediate or in due course. In other words, the DPRK proposed the unconditional dissolution of the “UN Command” and the pulling out of all foreign forces under the UN flag from south Korea, whereas the United States suggested entering into negotiations for a new mechanism that would replace the Armistice Agreement, and dissolving the “UN Command” when an alternative mechanism had been put in place. With no justification to offer following the General Assembly, the United States has staged the Team Spirit war games every year in south Korea to provoke the DPRK, and in recent years it has conducted similar military exercises under other names.

But, in contrast, the DPRK has been making proactive and sincere efforts for peace on the Korean peninsula. It proposed comprehensive disarmament in the late 1980s, adopted declarations on nonaggression and denuclearization at the high-level talks with south Korea in the early 1990s, and proposed concluding a peace treaty and building confidence between the DPRK and the United States at the Four-Party Talks held in the mid-1990s. Through the June 15 North-South Joint Declaration of 2000 it turned the relationship of confrontation between the north and south of Korea into

one of reconciliation and cooperation, and is now making every possible effort to secure peace on the Korean peninsula, as can be seen in its proposal to the United States at the Six-Party Talks (the DPRK, south Korea, China, Russia, the United States and Japan) on concluding a nonaggression pact and realizing denuclearization of the Korean peninsula.

Facts show that the past US stand that it would dissolve the “UN Command” when the Armistice Agreement had been replaced by a peace mechanism was a deceptive one aimed at getting itself out of an awkward position. The “UN forces” have no justification whatsoever for remaining in south Korea, as they are the US troops misusing the authority of the UN.

### **Deceptive South Korea-US “Combined Forces Command”**

Another important problem in getting a correct understanding of the situation of the US forces in south Korea is to have a true picture of the south Korea-US “Combined Forces Command” (CFC). Literally, it means that south Korea and the United States formed an alliance of military forces on an equal footing to jointly cope with contingencies. In fact, the command was formed on the basis of the vertical military relationship between the two armed forces before its formation, not of a horizontal one. And what is doubtful is whether the United States had approved its formation, in name at least, in contrast to its Korea policy.

Some south Korean puppet military authorities tend to interpret this as a “mature development” for “readjustment” of the military relationship between south

Korea and the United States which had existed since the early days of the Korean war, i.e., July 1950, when Syngman Rhee, evacuated to Pusan, sent to the then Commander of the “UN forces” MacArthur a letter saying that he “would feel quite honoured to have the (south Korean) National Defence Forces under Your Excellency’s command,” effectively transferring the operational command of the south Korean puppet army to the “UN forces.”

This is a subjective interpretation proceeding from misunderstanding of the political situation around 1978, when “CFC” was organized, and the situation, in which the United States could not but accede to the “CFC.”

In the early 1970s, the US forces in south Korea were at a loss how to answer the demand for national independence from foreign forces and for peaceful reunification mounting day by day among the south Korean people after publication of the July 4 North-South Joint Statement. From the mid-1970s, the US influence in the UN began to wane, and, when the resolution on dissolving the “UN Command” was passed, it could not have its normal say in world diplomatic affairs. But it did not give up hope that developments would make a U-turn. However, voices demanding the withdrawal of the GIs from south Korea rang louder even inside the United States itself. In 1977, Democratic Party candidate Jimmy Carter, who had called for the withdrawal of the US forces from south Korea during his election campaign, was elected President. He could not ignore the demand of the American people and the peoples of many other countries that the United States pull its troops out of south Korea.

Amidst pressure from within and without for withdrawal of the US forces in south Korea and dissolution of the “UN Command” the present south Korea-US “CFC” was born. This brought about some changes: The one-sided operational command of the US forces in south Korea and the south Korean puppet army—the US President, Secretary of State, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and then the “UN forces” commander—was replaced by a system of the presidents and defence chiefs of south Korea and the United States, south Korea-US military commission and the commander of the “CFC.”

The change, made only for form’s sake, brought the south Korean puppet army under tighter domination by the United States. The newly organized “CFC” revealed several contentious points in terms of its composition and function.

First, despite its external justification of meeting the demand of the changed situation, its formation intensified the influence and supremacy of the US forces over the south Korean puppet army. Through the formation of the “CFC” in answer to the demand for dissolution of the “UN Command,” the United States separated the “UN Command” into the “UN Command” and the US Command, the former with the duty to undertake the administration of the Armistice Agreement. Accordingly, it provided a legal guarantee and institutional code for maintaining the US right to operational command over the south Korean puppet army, with all organizational and commanding systems oriented towards US control. By virtue of the organization of the “CFC,” the commander of the US forces in south Korea came to hold

the post of the commander of the “CFC” in addition to his former posts of the commander of the “UN forces” and commander of the 8<sup>th</sup> Army, making public appearances using any of these titles according to the circumstances.

Next, US officers hold most of the important posts in the “CFC.” With the military commission above it, like NATO, the “CFC” has under it three component commands for the three services—army, navy and air force. In peacetime, it commands the operations of all units of the US forces in south Korea and the south Korean puppet army, except part of the ground force and AA units of the US forces and some brigades under the unconventional warfare task force command and the metropolitan garrison command of the south Korean army. Noteworthy is the fact that the 2<sup>nd</sup> Division, a major combat unit of the ground force of the US forces in south Korea, was placed outside the control of the “CFC” commander when the south Korea-US Combined Field Forces Command was dissolved on July 1, 1992. This means that the ground force under the “CFC” is composed mainly of the south Korean puppet troops. Despite its handful of troops under the command, US officers occupy all the posts of authority in the command, and, through them, the United States exercises absolute authority over the operational manoeuvres of almost all of the military forces in south Korea. For the so-called equal distribution of responsibility within the “CFC,” south Korean puppet generals occupy some insignificant posts in it. The US troops, small in number, keep the south Korean puppet troops hundreds of thousands strong on a string, and at their beck and call.

Another problem is the operational command system of the “CFC.” In 1994, after the end of the Cold War, the US side transferred the right to peacetime operational command to the south Korean side, and clamoured that the “independent capacity” of the south Korean puppet army had been built up and they were qualified to be partners of their US counterparts. The actual situation is quite different. The “CFC” commander, a US general officer, exercises absolute authority with regard to operational command, and the right to division of forces both in wartime and peacetime, the core of the operational command, is in his hands. What needs more attention is that the south Korean side’s right to peacetime operational command is of no particular significance. As the armed forces exist to provide against war, operational command is essential in war. As for the right to peacetime operational command that the south Korean side has, it is insignificant. There is much room for the right to be abused by the US side for starting a war. In a certain sense, the United States must have divided the operational command for that very purpose.

As seen above, the “CFC” is not an entity formed, as the United States and its followers claim, through “mutual cooperation between two independent armed forces” and “equal division of operational command between the two armed forces.” It is an institutional instrument for covering up and rationalizing domination, subordination and one-sided infringement of sovereignty. Through the “CFC” system, the United States is intensifying its military domination of south Korea, and this in turn is giving rise to serious consequences day by day.

## 2) UNLAWFULNESS OF THE US STATIONING OF ITS FORCES IN SOUTH KOREA

No nation in the world has been divided for over half a century and aspires after its reunification ardently like the Korean nation. Many years have passed since the Cold War ended, but the Korean people have not achieved reunification, their national aspiration, and the danger of war still threatens them. This is precisely because of the US hostile policy towards Korea and the US forces in south Korea. So, it is important to acquire a detailed understanding of the unlawfulness and brief history of the stationing of the US forces in south Korea, the motive of their deployment to start with.

### **(1) Violent Infringement of Decisions of International Conferences and International Law**

The first point to be considered in discussing the unlawfulness of the US stationing its forces in south Korea is that it runs counter to the decisions of the international conferences of those days.

As is known, it was on September 8, 1945, after the Japanese imperialists had accepted the Potsdam Declaration and offered unconditional surrender that the US troops set foot in south Korea. In those days the United States, an Allied Power, had to undertake all its military manoeuvres and operations in close cooperation

and agreement with the other Allied Powers. Nevertheless, it bypassed them when stationing its troops in south Korea.

Let us go back to the inter-Allied conferences and declarations.

The Tehran, Yalta and Potsdam conferences are called three historic milestones in the Second World War. At these conferences the leaders of the Allied Powers discussed cooperation in the war against fascist Germany and militarist Japan, military and political problems and other issues. One of the agenda items of the conferences was how to treat the Korean problem, as the country was a colony of Japan, a vanquished nation. When the Korean problem is discussed, the Cairo Conference is always mentioned, in addition to these conferences, because it was the first meeting at which one agenda item was the Korean problem.

At the Cairo Conference, held in November 1943 in preparation for the Tehran Conference, US President Franklin Roosevelt, British Prime Minister Winston Churchill and Chiang Kai-shek of China noted the slavish state of the Korean people and pledged independence for Korea. The declaration adopted at the conference included, at US insistence, quite a strange phrase: "in due course." The conference, and the subsequent inter-Allied conferences, discussed a series of issues other than the Korean problem, and the phrase lacked political and military significance in view of the situation at that time, so no other delegation paid attention to it. Embedded in the phrase was the ulterior motive of the United States to occupy Korea. According to Harry Hopkins, who was once Roosevelt's special envoy, Roosevelt insisted that

Korea should be placed under trusteeship, and the phrase “in due course” should be included although the opinion prevailed that Korea should become independent as soon as possible.

The subsequent Tehran Conference (Russia, the United States and Britain) discussed Soviet military intervention in Northeast Asia after the defeat of Germany. The declaration adopted at the conference did not mention the Korean problem. During a luncheon, the Korean problem was mentioned in passing: Stalin, who had not attended the Cairo Conference, supported the Cairo Declaration, saying that the decision on giving Korea independence and returning Manchuria, Formosa (Taiwan) and the Pescadores (Penghu Islands) to China was appropriate.

But at a meeting of the Pacific War Council held on January 12, 1944, one month after the Tehran Conference, Roosevelt, enumerating the successes achieved by mutual cooperation between the Allied Powers, mentioned the Korean problem in the following vein: As the Koreans are still incapable of maintaining and administering an independent government, we will have to place Korea under trusteeship for 40 years.

This was the first official announcement in a public place of the reluctance of the United States to allow independence to Korea.

It made public its stand again at the Yalta Conference, held from February 4, 1945. At this conference, the United States tried to induce the Soviet Union to intervene in the war against Japan at an early date in order to reduce its losses in the war as the defeat of fascist Germany loomed. In reply, the Soviet Union put

forward as a precondition the return of southern Sakhalin and the Kuril Islands from Japan. This agreement was reflected in the declaration of the conference in top secrecy.

The Korean problem was discussed separately at a tête-à-tête between Roosevelt and Stalin. Roosevelt detailed his idea: Korea should be placed under the trusteeship of the Soviet Union, the United States, China and Britain. Stalin asked why trusteeship was needed if the Korean people were capable of establishing their own government. Roosevelt persisted in his opinion, saying that, according to the US experience, it had taken nearly 50 years for the Filipinos to prepare a self-government and in Korea's case, it might take 20 or 30 years. Stalin said that the shorter the period, the better, and asked if there would be foreign forces in Korea. When Roosevelt said that there would be none, Stalin expressed his consent.

In July 1945, after the war in Europe was officially over, the Big Three met at Potsdam, where they reaffirmed their respective standpoints confirmed at the previous conferences, and called on Japan to surrender immediately and unconditionally. They did not discuss the Korean problem. They only stressed that the Cairo Declaration should be implemented without fail.

In view of the proceedings of these conferences and their declarations, one can arrive at the two following conclusions:

First, with regard to the Korean problem, the conferences did not discuss anything other than its independence. As mentioned above, the Cairo Declaration contained the wording "in due course" at the

one-sided insistence of the United States. But to interpret such a wording in connection with trusteeship was only a subjective desire of the United States. If the United States had felt its standpoint on trusteeship to be fair, it should have used a wording understandable by others, not one understandable only by itself, and discussed the problem officially, not privately. It failed to do so, just because it pursued an ulterior motive difficult to be made public—the occupation of a small, weak country.

Second, the conferences and their declarations never approved the stationing of US troops in south Korea. At Yalta, Roosevelt made it clear that the proposal for trusteeship had nothing to do with the stationing of foreign troops. In light of this, the stationing of US troops in south Korea is a clear violation of its promise to its allies. History records the fact that the United States drafted a measure to occupy at least half of the Korean peninsula when Japan's surrender became imminent, and suggested it to the Soviet Union. But it was meaningful only as a temporary measure for accepting the surrender of the Japanese troops there. It suggested to the Soviet Union that the latter accept the surrender of the Japanese forces in Korea north of the 38<sup>th</sup> Parallel, and in Manchuria and Sakhalin, while US forces would accept the surrender of the Japanese troops in Korea south of the 38<sup>th</sup> Parallel, and in Japan and the Philippines. Nevertheless, this could never serve as a legal pretext for stationing US forces in south Korea.

From the first day of their advance into south Korea, the US forces behaved as if they were an occupation force sanctioned by the Allied Powers. They cracked down on the people's committees and self-governing

bodies, and established a military government office. All the unfortunate incidents and events that took place in Korea after its liberation originated in the US forces stationed in south Korea in those days. If the United States had not violated the declarations and decisions adopted at the international conferences nor stationed its troops in south Korea as a responsible Allied Power, Korea's history would have been different: The country would not have been divided nor experienced war and confrontation.

The second point to be taken into account in discussing the unlawfulness of the US stationing of its troops in south Korea is the international law of war.

For any country, however it seeks to justify itself, to occupy another in violation of the laws recognized internationally is a war crime subject to sanctions and punishment. The law of war with international effect is the 1907 Hague Convention for war on land. It defines "enemy territory" as the most important condition for military occupation. In other words, if the territory to be placed under military occupation is not that of an enemy country, such an act is illegal, and accordingly the state and the troops involved in it are international criminals.

At the time of the advance of the US troops into the southern half of Korea, there was no reason whatsoever to define Korea as an enemy of the Allied Powers. That it was not an enemy of the Allied nations is clear from the fact that the fine sons and daughters of Korea had long waged a war of resistance against militarist Japan with arms under the command of Kim Il Sung. It is also true from the fact that Japan, accepting the July 1945 Potsdam Declaration, recognized that Korea should become independent, and

after its defeat, the Japanese in Korea transferred on their own accord the authority of governing Korea to the people's committees organized in accordance with the Korean people's will, and waited for their punishment. Before the arrival of the US troops, the people's committees at all levels and democratic organizations organized in the whole territory of south Korea had already disarmed the Japanese soldiers and policemen, established their own governments and secured social stability. They were as good as power organs representing the interests of the people in south Korea, but the US forces ignored them and unilaterally pursued a military occupation policy.

With regard to the military occupation policy, US journalist Mark Gayn wrote in *Japan Diary* as follows:

“We were not a liberation army. We rushed there in order to occupy it, in order to see whether the Koreans obeyed the conditions of surrender. From the first days of our landing we have acted as an enemy of the Koreans.”

The military governance pursued by the US forces commanded by Hodge after their occupation of south Korea is contentious in light of international law.

The laws on war stipulate two cases for military governance of one country by another: First, when the occupied country has infringed upon the sovereignty of another country, and second, when disorder prevails in the occupied country after war and the country is incapable of restoring order.

Immediately after liberation the situation prevailing in south Korea did not correspond to either of these cases. On the contrary, disorder and confusion were aggravated by the military rule of the US forces. The Preparatory Committee for Nation-Building, involving Ryo Un

Hyong, An Jae Hong and other prominent figures, was organized on August 15, 1945, people's committees had been organized in the seven provinces, 12 cities and 131 counties by the end of October, and democratic order was being established. But, in disregard of this situation, Hodge, commander of the US forces in south Korea, announced in October 1945: "The Military Government is the sole government of Korea," demanding that "the inhabitants of south Korea obey the orders of the Military Government Office" and threatening that any person who complained of the orders or deliberately slandered the Military Government would suffer punishment.

The Military Government, from the first day of its formation, put emphasis on reducing south Korea to the status of its colony. It banned the activities of all political parties, and dissolved the people's committees. Many innocent people were arrested and executed. In 1946 alone, upward of 4 200 people were executed. Military rule thus checked the independent and democratic development of south Korean society.

All the facts show that the US stationing of its troops in south Korea flies in the face of resolutions and declarations of international conferences and international conventions.

## **(2) Violation of the Korean Armistice Agreement**

An important legal point not to be missed in discussing the unlawfulness of the US stationing of its troops in south Korea is the Korean Armistice Agreement concluded on July 27, 1953, with the cessation of

hostilities in Korea. The agreement, signed by the DPRK and the United States after 500 days of fierce negotiations, contains many points not to be slighted in its implementation today. Many of its core items have lost their significance owing to the deliberate and systematic undermining of the agreement by the United States. Paragraph 60, which can be called the core of the agreement, and the provisions for prohibiting reinforcement of arms, running the Military Armistice Commission and the Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission, whose duty it is to supervise the implementation of the agreement, and prohibiting embargo against the other party exist in name only.

Proceeding from this state of affairs, the DPRK put forward a bold proposal for repealing the agreement and replacing it with a new peace mechanism, and suggested concluding a nonaggression treaty at the Six-Party Talks and other contacts between it and the United States. The DPRK's proposal to abrogate the Armistice Agreement, which is ineffectual in securing peace on the Korean peninsula, and to urgently establish a new peace mechanism in view of the present state of DPRK-US relations, and the prospect of its development is bold and constructive.

The United States, however, is striving to maintain the Armistice Agreement by every means possible.

The United States insists on maintaining the agreement, in order to keep its forces in south Korea. As the truce defines the other party as the enemy, as a party to belligerency, the US forces in south Korea, a party to the agreement, are naturally "lawful." If the state of ceasefire is turned into a state of peace, the hostile relationship between the two countries will be dissolved, and this will naturally lead to arms reduction and

withdrawal of foreign forces. And this is an international practice and trend of the times. Generally, it takes a few months at the shortest and a few years at the longest for a state of truce to be changed into a state of peace. It was by taking this into consideration that the Armistice Agreement contained a paragraph on holding a political conference within three months of the signing of the agreement to discuss the withdrawal of all foreign troops from Korea and the ensuring of peace on the peninsula. This paragraph was part of the core of the agreement, but it was a thorn in the side of the United States, which was determined to keep its troops in south Korea. However, it was unable to delete this paragraph and continue the war. So, it employed three cunning tricks: First, sabotaging by any method the political conference stipulated in Paragraph 60, so as to stop further discussion of the withdrawal of its forces from south Korea; second, concluding the south Korea-US Mutual Defence Treaty, in defiance of the Armistice Agreement by instigating the then pro-US south Korean puppet authorities to thus “legalize” the US forces in south Korea; and third, justifying the presence of US troops in south Korea by finding a pretext in the presence of the Chinese People’s Volunteers in the areas north of the Military Demarcation Line.

With the passage of time, the political conference came to nothing due to the deliberate schemes of the United States, and the Chinese People’s Volunteers had all withdrawn by October 1958 by the initiative of the DPRK. What remains is the south Korea-US Mutual Defence Treaty. The treaty contains, in addition to some problems, which are targets of public outcry, a problem that cannot be overlooked in connection with the Armistice Agreement: the US forces stationed in south Korea. Instead of living up

to its side of the agreement, the United States reneged on its commitment to the agreement by means of the south Korea-US Mutual Defence Treaty concluded on October 1, two months later.

From the moral and legal point of view, the United States should have chosen either of the opposing treaties. But the United States has feigned ignorance for decades with regard to the different “legal promises” to the north and south of Korea. This is a perfidious stance on the part of the United States, and its insistence on keeping the Armistice Agreement in place cannot but be likened to a man covering his own ears while stealing a bell.

The United States has entrusted for form’s sake the authority of handling overall issues with regard to the Armistice Agreement to the “UN Command,” and when circumstances allow, condemns the DPRK by invoking the Armistice Agreement. If it feels so attached to the Armistice Agreement, it should repeal the south Korea-US Mutual Defence Treaty without further delay and take the bold decision of withdrawing its troops from south Korea as stipulated in Paragraph 60 of the Armistice Agreement. As long as this fundamental problem remains unsettled, peace will never come to the Korean peninsula.

### **(3) Disregard of Resolution of the UN General Assembly**

The US forces in south Korea are illegal partly in view of a resolution of the UN General Assembly.

Regarding the US forces in south Korea as a major factor that threatens peace and aggravates tension on the Korean peninsula, the UN passed as early as 1975 a draft

resolution on pulling them out of the peninsula without further delay. In response, the United States proposed a draft resolution, whose gist was that the “UN Command” should be dissolved only when an alternative step was taken, and thus, saved face. And instead of taking measures for peace on the Korean peninsula and for the withdrawal of its forces from south Korea, it began to stage the unprecedentedly large-scale Team Spirit war game after the 30<sup>th</sup> Session of the UN General Assembly, aggravating the situation on the Korean peninsula intentionally, and revenging themselves on the UN and other countries, which had passed the resolution disadvantageous to it.

Decades have passed since that resolution was adopted, but the United States continues as ever its policy of isolating and stifling the DPRK on one pretext or another. It labelled Korea as part of the “Axis of Evil” and a target of nuclear preemptive strike, and formulated a plan of military operations as a follow-up.

### 3) DAMAGE AND SUFFERINGS OF THE KOREAN NATION CAUSED BY THE US FORCES IN SOUTH KOREA

#### **(1) Damage and Sufferings of the South Koreans**

##### **Violation of National Sovereignty**

The damage and sufferings inflicted on the Korean people by the US forces since their military occupation of south Korea are unheard of in human history. The dignity and sovereignty of the Korean nation has been violated,

peace on the Korean peninsula threatened, and its coordinated development has experienced great setback.

Immediately after their advance into south Korea, the US forces dissolved the people's committees, the power organs, and organized a "government" with pro-US elements, thus stamping on the desire of the Korean people for reunification. Out of their ambition to dominate the whole of Korea, they unleashed a war, slaughtered the Korean people en masse and reduced the whole country to ruins through indiscriminate bombing. After the war, they put down the struggle of the south Korean people for independence, democracy and national reunification. They have staged military exercises under various names, aggravating the situation on the Korean peninsula and creating a constant danger of war. Even now, when the Cold War has ended and the current of independence is sweeping the world, they continue to inflict the pain of national division on the Korean nation and stage aggressive war exercises continually.

Especially, the south Korean people are suffering great damage and pains due to the US forces stationed on their land. Having occupied south Korea as a "liberator" and a "benefactor" following Korea's liberation on August 15, 1945, the US forces violated the dignity and sovereignty of the south Korean people in wicked ways, and imposed sacrifice and misfortunes on them.

They usurped the sovereign power, the first and foremost feature of national sovereignty, to dominate the politics of south Korea.

A nation maintains and defends its fundamental demands, interests and dignity by dint of political sovereignty. A nation that does not defend or exercise its

political sovereignty is doomed to be shackled to others economically and militarily, and cannot maintain its principles in the diplomatic field. Political sovereignty is a prerequisite for securing national dignity and sovereignty. That is why no nation allows others to violate its political sovereignty, and every nation fights through fire and water to defend it.

In order to win political control over south Korea after its liberation, the United States stationed its troops there and had them undertake to regulate the direction of politics in south Korea.

The US forces first created a pro-US, sycophantic power structure in south Korea through physical force, and consolidated it. With a plan to lay down its political foundation by such a method as putting forward those faithful to the United States, the US Military Government removed all the democratic figures, who stood in its way. Ryo Un Hyong, who had been enjoying enthusiastic support from the people of all walks of life for his aspiration for independence, democracy and a unified government, was assassinated in his car in broad daylight on July 19, 1946; Kim Ku, leader of the Korean Independence Party and who had been devoting himself to reunification on his return from the April 1948 North-South Joint Conference held in Pyongyang was assassinated; even Song Jin U, a representative of the conservatives, was also assassinated. They then brought Syngman Rhee from the United States and established a “separate government” in south Korea. Before the country’s liberation, Rhee had lived in the United States in exile for decades. When the south Korean people rose up against Syngman Rhee, who had been groomed and

supported as the executor of US colonial rule, the United States threw him out of power without any remorse.

Thenceforth, successive “governments” of south Korea, deprived of all political sovereignty, were established and maintained with the help of the United States, and supported by the US forces in south Korea.

The US forces in south Korea instigated and helped the south Korean puppet authorities to quell the people’s struggle for independence, democracy and national reunification. They helped to suppress the April 3 uprising of the people on Jeju Island against the “May 10 separate election” after liberation. When the aspiration for independence, democracy and reunification was running high among the people after the April 19 uprising in 1960, they induced a south Korean military junta to stage a coup d’etat on May 16, 1961.

The sanguinary suppression of the Kwangju Popular Uprising in May 1980 was undertaken under the instructions and orders of the United States. The uprising was an eruption of the south Korean people’s yearning for independence, democracy and national reunification; it demonstrated their wisdom, sense of justice, indomitable will and bravery. But it was frustrated because of the intervention of the US forces in south Korea. On May 22, when the uprising in Kwangju reached its height, Zbigniew Brzezinski, the then special security adviser to the US President, said at a meeting of the National Security Council in the White House that the Kwangju citizens should be put down “with an iron fist,” and Richard Gleysteen, the then US ambassador to south Korea, told Chun Doo Hwan that the United States was ready to use “if necessary” US troops to suppress the

uprising. (Jiji Press, May 22, 1980, Seoul; *Washington Post*, May 23, 1980) The Department of Defence agreed to enlist some of the south Korean puppet army under the command of General John Wickham, the then commander of the US forces in south Korea, to quell the riot and stabilize the situation. Wickham confessed that he had complied with the request of the south Korean government to free those units from his operational command. Dictator Chun Doo Hwan, by virtue of direct intervention by the United States, hurled nearly 70 000 troops of three divisions, a mechanized unit and a paratroop corps of the south Korean puppet army to quell the uprising, killing 5 000 people, wounding 15 000 and arresting more than 60 000 in Kwangju alone.

These are only a few examples of how the US forces supported the successive dictatorial governments of south Korea by physical force in the latter's checking of independence, democracy and reunification.

The US forces in south Korea violate the sovereignty of the south Korean people by holding the full command of its armed forces. Supreme command of the armed forces is the mainstay of state power that guarantees the sovereignty of a nation. Loss of it leads to military enslavement of that nation and to the loss of sovereignty in all fields of its existence, including politics and the economy.

The key to the military subordination of south Korea to the United States is the latter's enjoying of the former's supreme command of the armed forces.

Usurpation by the United States of the prerogative of command of the south Korean puppet army, started by the July 15, 1950 Taejon Agreement, was detailed by the

November 17, 1954 south Korea-US Minutes and the July 28, 1978 Agreement on the Composition of the south Korea-US Combined Forces Command.

The United States now talks about the balance of operational command, with peacetime control having been transferred to the south Korean puppet army, but it is merely a formal claim: The US forces still hold the operational command not only in wartime but in peacetime.

### **The Ever-Increasing Cost of Maintenance of the US Forces**

The cost of maintenance of the US forces in south Korea is not a problem to be discussed only from a financial point of view; it is a serious problem as the south Korean taxpayers have to cover the cost with the money they earn by their hard work. This problem has recently been complicated in connection with the expenses of moving some US military bases.

In essence, the cost of maintenance of foreign troops is an issue of military strategic importance between states in alliance, and it is a general practice that the country that stations its troops in another compensates the latter for all the cost of using military bases and installations.

However, the United States, instead of paying the cost of using its bases, insists that the south Korean puppet authorities cover the cost under the pretext of defending the latter.

The land occupied by the US military bases and installations costs as much as USD 1.99 billion. The training grounds the US forces are using free of charge cost more than USD 11 million, and the military installations USD 138 million, a year.

The south Korean puppet authorities defrayed USD 6 762 million for indirect support to the US forces in south Korea between 1995 and 1997, and USD 2 195 million in 1997 alone.

The expenses for direct support have exceeded USD 300 million since the mid-1990s; it was USD 363 million in 1997 and USD 440 million in 2001.

These enormous funds spent by the south Korean puppet authorities are used for aggravating confrontation and tension and stepping up war moves on the Korean peninsula—by increasing the number of US troops, modernizing their military equipment and reinforcing their military bases and installations.

The cost of maintenance of the US forces squeezed from the south Korean puppet government for direct support and such types of indirect support as free use of military bases and installations, labour for their upkeep and use of training grounds, totals more than USD 3 billion.

At the talks held for sharing the maintenance cost, the United States forced the south Korean puppet authorities to remarkably increase the latter's share. At the 33<sup>rd</sup> south Korea-US Annual Security Consultation held in Washington on November 16, 2001, the United States demanded that south Korea increase the funds for the maintenance of its troops in 2002 to USD 490 million, or 10.4 % up from 2001, and demanded the same amount in 2003 and 2004 again. At the 35<sup>th</sup> Annual Security Consultation held in November, 2003, it demanded that south Korea bear all the cost of the moving of US bases. It is said that the moving of the base in Ryongsan would cost 110 trillion *won* in south Korean currency.

Forcing south Korea to bear the burden of the US forces, which have nothing to do with security of south Korea, is a quite brigandish demand.

### **US Bases: Hotbeds of Crime**

The US military bases in south Korea are hotbeds of crime. There the national dignity and the human rights of south Koreans are downtrodden. Drug abuse, violence, smuggling and prostitution are prevalent, and all sorts of crimes occur there. The crimes committed by the GIs impose tremendous sufferings on the south Korean people. Infringement of human rights should be taken first to enumerate their crimes.

A man has an equal right to independence to enjoy and exercise as others. No one should infringe upon or trample down this right of others. Despising or discriminating against others, threatening their right to existence and freedom, and suppressing them because of racial difference or the small size of their country can never be justified or rationalized.

By invoking the unequal agreements with south Korea, the US forces rule the roost, and enjoy extraterritorial rights in south Korea. Their infringement of the human rights of the south Korean people finds glaring expression in murder, rape and violence. Following are some typical cases:

- On April 9, 1954, Dixon, a corporal in the 72<sup>nd</sup> MP unit, played at wrestling with a young Korean in front of the drivers' office at the Chongryang-ri Railway Station, Seoul, and when he was defeated, shot the latter to death in revenge.

- On January 14, 1955, a US driver crushed to

death six pedestrians and inflicted severe injuries on four others while driving at high speed in front of the Pusan branch of the Shipping Corporation of south Korea, and a US guard shot a woman in Rimun-dong, Tongdaemun District, Seoul, without any reason, and killed her.

- On June 15, 1955, Sergeant Brown shot a man to death in Chilsong-dong, Taegu.

- On June 19, 1955 a US soldier, while practising pistol shooting in Inchon, targeted at a girl student of the Inchon Normal School, and shot her dead.

- On July 27, 1956, a US soldier sprayed gasoline in a house in Sungui-dong, Inchon, and set fire to it, killing a woman.

- On December 8, 1956, a private first class of the 37<sup>th</sup> Regiment, 7<sup>th</sup> Division, levelled his M-1 rifle at a 16-year-old boy in Pomil-dong, Pusan, and shot him dead. No reason for it was given.

- In February 1958, two officers of the US Air Force in Pupyong caught a 16-year-old shoeshine boy for alleged robbery, beat him and stabbed him to death. They then put the corpse in a case and carried the case by a helicopter before dropping it in a dustbin at the Uijongbu Airport.

- On February 27, 1960, a US soldier of the 3<sup>rd</sup> Regiment, 7<sup>th</sup> Division, shot a resident at Yongbuk Subcounty, Phochon County, Kyonggi Province, to death with his carbine.

- In April 1960, a first sergeant of the 40<sup>th</sup> tank unit of the 7<sup>th</sup> Division, a private first class of the 19<sup>th</sup> Infantry Battalion of the 4<sup>th</sup> Guided Missile Command, and a master sergeant of the 8<sup>th</sup>

Mechanized Regiment of the 1<sup>st</sup> Mechanized Division shot pedestrians dead on the 20<sup>th</sup>, 25<sup>th</sup> and 29<sup>th</sup>, respectively, and inflicted severe injuries on others.

- On February 13, 1961, a US private first class ran his vehicle over a young man on a bicycle in Sakson-ri, Thaeon Subcounty, Sosan County, South Chungchong Province, fracturing the latter's skull. And in Pusan US soldiers hung a worker on the arm of a crane and immersed him in the sea, claiming that he was not obedient. In Phyongthaek, Kyonggi Province, a US army crane carrier killed six pedestrians.

- On March 9, 1961, US soldiers ran their vehicle over two nine-year-old girls walking along a road in Singal-ri, Kihung Subcounty, Ryongin County, Kyonggi Province. On March 16, 1961, a US army vehicle ran over a four-year-old boy playing by the roadside, and on the evening of March 19, 1961, another vehicle ran into a woman in Seoul when she was crossing the road, seriously injuring her.

- On January 2, 1960, a captain in the 40<sup>th</sup> Tank Battalion of the 7<sup>th</sup> Division led his men to take two women living in Tongduchon to their barracks and cut their hair short. Then ten US soldiers made sport of them, before dismissing them. This incident was widely publicized in those days.

- On the night of May 4, 1961, a corporal of a signal corps stationed in Sokcho, Yangyang County, Kangwon Province, broke into a house in the county town and attempted to rape a woman in it. When she resisted, he stripped her naked, tied her hand and

foot, strangled her and kicked her in the abdomen. She later died.

- In October 1992, a soldier of the 5<sup>th</sup> Platoon of the 25<sup>th</sup> Infantry Company of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Division raped a girl at the US base in Tongduchon, struck her on the head with a bottle and pushed the bottleneck into her privates and an umbrella holder into her anus.

- On June 13, 2002, two soldiers drove their armoured vehicle over two 14-year-old schoolgirls in Kwangjok Subcounty, Yangju County, Kyonggi Province.

Environmental pollution by the US forces has reached its extreme.

In accordance with the Plant Control Plan 1968, in the late 1960s the US forces sprinkled in the areas south of the Military Demarcation Line over 7 000 drums of defoliant, a chemical prohibited internationally, killing many animals and plants, and making the soldiers, who took part in the sprinkling, and the civilians living in the areas, suffer from diseases related to the chemical. Today US soldiers are devastating the land through bombing and bombardment during large-scale military exercises. Over 1 000 pieces of nuclear weapons and depleted uranium-tipped shells introduced into south Korea are contaminating the land, seas, rivers and lakes.

Water containing such lethal chemicals as potassium cyanide, sarin and radioactive materials flows out of the US base at Ryongsan and into residential areas and the Han River. In early February 2000, the deputy head of the morgue under the 8<sup>th</sup> Army Command let hundreds of litres of solution of formaldehyde and methanol, a mixture of poisonous materials, drain into the Han River.

In this way, the various military exercises the US forces in south Korea stage devastate croplands and entail serious noise pollution, and the oil, sewage and poisonous chemicals from the US bases produce skin disorders, lung cancer and leukemia, threatening the lives of the people living in their neighbourhoods.

The US bases are a breeding ground of drug abuse and decadent culture.

Drug abusers number in the thousands among the US soldiers in south Korea, and they do great harm to south Korean society. Taking stimulants by young people in south Korea, was introduced by the US soldiers, who smuggle them into south Korea to traffic in them. They even force south Korean prostitutes to take drugs to satisfy their own sexual tastes. Half of the 3 000 prostitutes in Tongduchon were once found to be drug addicts. Two or three months after taking drugs they began to catch diseases, and eventually died or became disabled.

The US soldiers spread in south Korea pornographic materials. In 1998 alone, more than 600 kinds of pornographic video cassettes and thousands of copies of pornographic periodicals found their way into the neighbourhoods of the US base at Tongduchon.

These corrode the good manners and customs peculiar to the Korean nation and the human rights of the south Korean people day by day.

## **(2) The Pain of Territorial Division**

The US forces in south Korea are directly responsible for the territorial partition of Korea, and they continue to divide the country even today when the Cold War has

long been over. In this sense, the history of the US forces in south Korea can be said to be the history of Korean people's pain over territorial division and of all sorts of misfortunes and sufferings of the Korean nation.

Now, Korea is the only nation in the world whose territory is divided into two. Koreans are a homogeneous nation. They had lived on the same territory sharing the same blood and language and creating their own history and culture. It is none other than the United States that has divided this nation into two, divided an organic body that cannot exist separated.

The Korean compatriots have groaned under the pain of national division for more than 60 years. Many of them do not know whether their family members and relatives on the other side of the Military Demarcation Line (MDL) are still alive or dead.

The 240-km-long concrete wall built along the MDL is a symbol of national division.

As the Korean people's desire for national reunification gained momentum with the signing of the July 4 North-South Joint Statement in 1972, the United States instigated the south Korean puppet authorities to build a concrete wall south of the MDL. Construction of the wall began in 1977, and was completed in a few years. Double and treble electric wire entanglements are set up on the wall, and pillboxes are in place at regular intervals. Behind the wall are observation posts equipped with computer devices. The wall winds not only through land but across rivers and up steep cliffs. The wall divides 122 villages and eight counties into north and south, and 514 hamlets that had been in the area of the Demilitarized Zone have disappeared. And roads, large

and small, mountain ranges and railways have been cut into north and south. Rivers, like the Rimjin and Pukhan, and streams have been cut in more than 110 places.

A rusty pylon standing alone on the MDL rends the hearts of the Korean people as a symbol of national division and indignation.

In March 1989, Rev. Mun Ik Hwan, adviser to the Coalition for the National Democratic Movement in south Korea, bearing the unanimous reunification desire of the south Korean people, went to the north via other countries. In June the same year Rim Su Gyong, a delegate of the National Council of Student Representatives in south Korea, took the same route to participate in the 13<sup>th</sup> World Festival of Youth and Students held in Pyongyang. The people of the south, who participated in the opening ceremony of the reconstructed Mausoleum of Tangun, the founder king of Korea, held in October 1994, and the Pan-National Reunification Rally held on August 15 commemorating the liberation of the country from Japanese military rule had to come to Pyongyang via a third country, not via Panmunjom. Due to this concrete wall, a physical barrier across the country, the people in the north and the south, one and the same nation, cannot travel over their own land nor meet freely.

The term “unconverted long-term prisoners” was coined by the division of the country. These people are patriots who devoted their youth to the country and its reunification for decades. They were behind bars for scores of years for the sole reason that they refused to change their political creed, and out of prison they live deprived of their elementary rights to existence. In the

twilight of their lives they live in rented rooms obtained by the good offices of human rights organizations in south Korea. What is essential for them is medical service. They are suffering from various diseases because of many years of imprisonment. Several years ago Jong Sun Dok died. She had joined the guerrillas on Mt. Jiri and fought against the colonial enslavement policy of the United States, and for independence and democracy of south Korean society and national reunification with arms in her hands for more than 10 years. Arrested, she underwent all kinds of maltreatment for 23 years. Released from prison, she had suffered from diseases, the aftermath of torture, but received no elementary medical treatment before breathing her last.

The 18 other former long-term prisoners, whose request for repatriation to the north has been rejected by the south Korean authorities, cannot realize their wishes to see the sights of Mt. Kumgang, either.

Besides these, a tense situation fraught with the threat of another war prevails in Korea owing to the war games staged by the US forces in south Korea every year.

### **(3) The Author of Confrontation on the Korean Peninsula**

Owing to the US Korea policy aimed at domination of the whole of Korea, an extension of its strong-arm strategy, the danger of war hangs heavily over the Korean peninsula.

The state of confrontation created on the Korean peninsula is attributable entirely to the United States, and its author is none other than the US forces in south Korea.

Because of the geopolitical and strategic importance of the Korean peninsula, the United States has its eye on the whole of the Korean peninsula to realize its Asia policy and world conquest. It is its general strategic goal to invade other countries and conquer the whole world by dint of power politics, the strategy of war. Its Asia strategy, its Korea policy in particular, is the centrepiece of this strategy. It regards that the Korean peninsula is a gateway to Asia, and accordingly it can conquer Asia and then the rest of the world only when it brings the whole of Korea under its control.

The gist of the US Korea policy is to consolidate its military domination of south Korea and invade north Korea to dominate the whole of Korea. It stations its troops in south Korea for the pursuit of this policy. In this context should be viewed its advance into south Korea in 1945 on the plea of disarming defeated Japanese forces, its subsequent aggravation of the political situation on the Korean peninsula and its unleashing of a war there.

For more than five decades since then, it has resorted to war manoeuvres and increasing its war potential in south Korea in violation of the Korean Armistice Agreement. The US troops in south Korea are armed with weapons of mass destruction, including nuclear weapons, and they are prepared to play the role of a shock brigade should a war break out again in Korea. Its ambition to invade the north has been made clear in its successive war scenarios, like OP Plan 5027-98, OP PLAN 5027-2000, OP PLAN 5030 and New OP PLAN 5026. In March 2003, President Bush submitted to Congress a document titled, Nuclear Posture Review, which contains a new war plan, claiming that the United States could

launch a preemptive strike on north Korea without consent of the south Korean government, and establish there a government to its liking.

In accordance with this plan, the United States reorganized the US forces in south Korea into a field army on a wartime footing, and has deployed in south Korea various items of state-of-the-art military hardware that were tested in the Iraq war.

In violation of Paragraph 13 D of the Armistice Agreement that forbids the introduction into Korea of any weaponry that might threaten the other side, the United States introduced Honest John and other nuclear weapons in 1958, deployed 280mm atomic guns and missiles in 1959, and brought in backpack nukes and nuclear mines by the end of the 1970s. In recent years, it has shipped into south Korea Stryker armoured vehicles, Shadow-200 unmanned surveillance planes, GBU-28 “bunker busters” and JDAM “smart bombs” that were tested in Afghanistan and Iraq.

The United States, in an attempt to expand the war on terrorism to Korea with the end of the Iraq war, deploys various reconnaissance planes in Okinawa, Japan, at Kadena Air Force Base in particular, a base important in its war policy against north Korea.

The Japanese newspaper *Ashai Shimbun* reported that in February 2003 three RC-135 strategic reconnaissance planes had been assigned to the 390<sup>th</sup> Information Company in Kadena Air Force Base. In June, the number of E-3 Sentry aircraft in this base was increased to three, and in November the number of U-2s was increased to five. Recently eight spy planes of various types, like EP-3 and WC-135 W, were sent to the base.

US forces stage large-scale military exercises in south Korea and the seas surrounding the Korean peninsula. These exercises are more evidence that the objective the United States pursues in its Korea policy is war, not peace, and tension, not reconciliation.

In the meantime, the United States resorts to acts of war provocation on the Korean peninsula. It is well known to the world that the incident of the USS *Pueblo*, an armed spy ship, the Panmunjom incident committed by the US forces in south Korea, the incident of the EC-121 spy plane, the nuclear crisis between 1993 and 1994 and the US forces helicopter incident were intentional and planned acts of armed provocation. Air reconnaissance by the US forces against north Korea is becoming more and more frequent. In November 1998 alone, aerial spying cases numbered over 150, or five on average every day.

US forces have conducted in south Korea 13 700 war exercises and military drills so far: 900 large-scale exercises with the south Korean puppet army under the titles of Team Spirit, Ulji Focus Lens, Foal Eagle and RSOI, and 2 400 exercises of their own by arms and services.

The material damage the south Korean people have suffered from the exercises amounts to a huge figure: To name some, USD 12.50995 billion in destroyed houses, USD 3.42 billion in destroyed farm lands, USD 1.84291 billion in destroyed forests, and USD 2.13759 billion in destroyed fishing grounds.

The war racket of the US forces in south Korea is still continuing, bringing indescribable misfortunes and suffering to the Korean people.

## **2. WITHDRAWAL OF THE US FORCES FROM SOUTH KOREA—A DEMAND OF THE TIMES**

### **1) AFTER THE END OF THE COLD WAR**

Withdrawal of the US forces from south Korea is natural in light of the justification for their deployment.

During the Cold War, the US troops in south Korea justified their presence as a deterrent against north Korea's "threat of southward invasion," as if they were stationed there according to the "demand" of the south Korean people.

Now that the Cold War between the East and the West has ended, a radical change has been brought about in the relations between the north and south of Korea for national reunification, particularly after the June 15, 2000 North-South Joint Declaration. Furthermore, the south Korean people are demanding the withdrawal of the US troops from south Korea more strongly than ever before. The United States ought to withdraw its soldiers from south Korea, but it shuts its eyes to the present situation and the demand of the south Korean people. Why do the US soldiers, who should be in their own country over the ocean, remain in south Korea? Are they really assuring "peace" in south Korea, as they claim to be? With their negative nature surfacing and the demand for their

withdrawal growing, they are obsessed about justifying themselves.

They advocate that the root cause of the confrontation and aggravation of tension on the Korean peninsula is “bellicose north Korea” and the threat of its “southward invasion” in line with the strategy of “liberating” and “communizing” south Korea by means of armed forces, and that they should remain in south Korea to “defend” it from this “threat.”

The stereotyped theory of the “threat of southward invasion” is not a new one. It is one of sophistries the United States has systematically presented for decades for its hegemonic policy towards south Korea. It still clings to the theory while refusing to withdraw its troops and nuclear weapons from south Korea, to remove military confrontation or to conclude a nonaggression treaty. But is the north so bullheaded as to resort to a strategy so unfeasible and unacceptable to any one? The case is quite the contrary. It is widely known that the north has put forward fair and reasonable proposals for national reunification proceeding from the actual situation prevailing in the country and the national interests, and has made sincere efforts for their realization.

An objective estimation of the present structure of the opposing armed forces on the peninsula produces the conclusion that it is north Korea which is being threatened, in contrast to the US insistence. The north gives priority to military affairs and directs its primary efforts to the development of its defence industry because only the powerful war deterrent created by Songun politics is a guarantee of the security, sovereignty and

peace of the country. To view this in relation to any attack strategy or “threat of southward invasion” can be likened to a thief crying “Stop thief.”

The same logic can be applied to the north’s war deterrent. The north was forced to take war deterrent. The United States has shipped into south Korea nuclear weapons since decades ago, and threatened the north by staging various military exercises and resorting to war provocations. Today its nuclear threat to the north is very serious. For the north to possess war deterrent in this situation is a natural self-defensive measure.

The US troops in south Korea should be withdrawn in view of the “theory of the balance of power,” which was advocated in the days of the Cold War.

It is true that the United States clamours about a “threat” from the north, in place of the “theory of the balance of power,” but there is little difference between the two, as they both pursue one and the same objective.

During the Cold War, the United States insisted that its troops should be stationed in south Korea as a deterrent until the balance of military power between the north and south of Korea was secured, and that a tip in that balance would lead to a war. In the days of fierce confrontation between the East and the West, the theory seemed to be plausible. But it proved to be misleading propaganda in the post-Cold War days. Immediately after the end of the East-West confrontation, the US troops should have been pulled out for peace on the Korean peninsula. Instead, the United States saw it as a golden opportunity for crushing the north. It rallied its satellite countries to launch a joint operation of stifling and isolating the north, at the same time justifying the

operation by resorting to a misinformation campaign on the issues of nuclear weapons and WMD, and then the “Axis of Evil.” The “theory of the balance of power” has disappeared of its own accord, and the United States has not made any explanation of the reason. Any such explanation in the present situation of the Korean peninsula would logically lead to the withdrawal of its troops from south Korea, driving itself into a cul-de-sac of its own making. So it now clamours about a “threat” from the north.

In this context, one needs to pay attention to what former US President Nixon said. He said that the United States should justify itself for intervention in international issues, not intervene in them to justify itself. For the United States, justification follows intervention, and is not the reason for intervention.

The various theories the United States has presented are solely for justifying its stationing of troops in south Korea, not for peace on the Korean peninsula.

## 2) FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF THE JUNE 15 NORTH-SOUTH JOINT DECLARATION

The June 15 North-South Joint Declaration brought about a radical change in the Korean people’s struggle for independent reunification and is a banner they should invariably uphold in their effort for national reunification.

The main idea underlying the great proposition “By our nation itself” clarified in the declaration is national independence.

It is a banner of the nationwide struggle for the country’s reunification—the long-cherished desire of the

nation—and to realize the complete sovereignty and prosperity of the country by carving out the nation's destiny independently.

As independence is the life of a man, so it is the life of a nation. As a man without independence is as good as dead, a nation deprived of its independence becomes a ruined nation. The members of a nation must hold fast to the stand of independence come what may.

In the case of Korea, its territory and its people have been divided by outside forces. Its reunification involves putting an end to domination and interference by outside forces in the affairs of south Korea, securing its independence on a nationwide scale, and connecting the severed bloodline of the nation for its unity as one nation.

The June 15 Joint Declaration reaffirmed that the master and protagonist of the struggle for national reunification is none other than the Korean nation, and called all the compatriots to the struggle. It induces each and every Korean, be he in the north, south or abroad, to burn in his heart with desire for reunification and patriotism. It also propels him to the cause of patriotism, and the road to reconciliation, unity and reunification.

Withdrawal of the US forces from south Korea is prerequisite for the implementation of the June 15 Joint Declaration.

First, the US forces have placed obstacles in the way of Korea's independent reunification.

Since the first day of their advance into south Korea, they have stubbornly hampered the struggle of the Korean people for independence and reunification.

Soon after setting foot in south Korea, they mercilessly suppressed the anti-US April 3 uprising of

the people on Jeju Island and the struggle of coal miners in Hwasun. In the 1960s, when the south Korean people rose up against the Syngman Rhee regime, they supported the dictator in suppressing the uprising.

With the desire of the Korean nation for reunification running high in the early 1970s, the July 4, 1972 North-South Joint Statement was made public, the main content of which was three principles of reunification— independence, peaceful reunification and grand national unity. Through the statement, the north and south confirmed the unanimous desire of the whole nation for reunification, and solemnly proclaimed before the nation and the world their will to implement the statement with all sincerity. As the whole country was seething with the passion for reunification, the US troops in south Korea, in line with the Korea policy of the US administration, brought pressure to bear upon the south Korean puppet authorities, and, under this pressure, the south Korean puppet authorities nullified the joint statement by issuing the June 23 Special Statement, in which they defined the “two Koreas” policy as their official policy. The United States even induced the south Korean puppet authorities to build a concrete wall along the MDL to perpetuate the division of the country.

In the 1980s and 1990s the schemes of the US troops in south Korea against peace and reunification of Korea became unabated.

In the 1980s, the north proposed establishing the Democratic Federal Republic of Koryo, an embodiment of the unanimous desire of the whole nation for reunification. At the beginning of the 1990s high-level talks were held on several occasions between the north

and south of Korea, producing the Agreement on Reconciliation, Nonaggression, and Cooperation and Exchanges between the North and South and the Joint Declaration on Denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula—both geared to removing the danger of nuclear war and creating conditions and environment favourable for peace and reunification.

In the 1980s, however, the US troops instigated the military fascist dictators of south Korea to suppress by force the righteous struggle of the Kwangju people for independence, democracy and reunification. And in the 1990s they obstructed in every way peace and reunification of the Korean peninsula by ratcheting up a nuclear crisis on the peninsula prompted by its wild ambition for conquest of Korea as a whole, keeping their tight grip on south Korea as their base for aggression, as their nuclear outpost.

In the new century, when a radical change has come about in the Korean people's struggle for independent reunification by the publication of the June 15 Joint Declaration, the US troops are still entrenched in south Korea, stifling the Korean people's desire for national reunification.

Second, the US troops are the destroyer and enemy of peace on the Korean peninsula.

The US military authorities, on the plea of providing against a "contingency," mapped out the New OP PLAN 5026. In accordance with this plan, they moved 24 B-1 and B-52 strategic bombers to Guam, introduced six F-117 Stealth bombers into south Korea, and deployed 110 tactical ground-to-ground missiles with a range of 300km in the eastern sector of the front along the MDL. Also

they set out for the three-year plan for military buildup to strengthen the US forces in south Korea by defraying USD 11 billion.

They continue to stage various nuclear war games, like RSOI, Foal Eagle and Ulji Focus Lens, with the south Korean puppet army, targeting the north. On the plea of coping with “contingencies,” they even stage exercises for evacuating the families of the US troops in south Korea, involving not only the families but non-combatant Americans.

On June 11, 2003, a south Korean newspaper carried an article contributed by Prof. Kang Jong Gu of Tongguk University, titled, *The US Troops Are the Chief Culprit of Crises on the Korean Peninsula*. At a symposium held on the 16<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the June uprising, the professor pointed out that “the chief culprit of the crises on the Korean peninsula is not the north but the United States, the US troops in south Korea to be exact,” citing as examples the crisis of a second war between 1991 and 1992, nuclear crisis in June 1994, missile crisis in 1998, first naval skirmishes on the West Sea in 1999, Bush’s “Axis of Evil” speech in 2002, second naval skirmishes on the West Sea in 2002, and war crisis on the Korean peninsula in 2003. He called the US troops a “fuse for a proxy war” and the “material foundations for danger of a war on the Korean peninsula,” continuing that to overcome the danger of a war the north and south should “advance to a peace mechanism on the Korean peninsula, the withdrawal of US troops in south Korea and disarmament.”

### 3) ANTI-US SENTIMENT IN SOUTH KOREA

#### **(1) Ever-Rising Anti-US Sentiment**

Nowadays, anti-US sentiment is rising higher in south Korea, developing into an all-people anti-US struggle. In June 2002, in the lead-up to a south Korea-US football match, the major websites of south Korea carried these words: “We still remember what a US skater did to our skater during the Winter Olympic Games at Salt Lake City. Let us demonstrate the strength of our nation to the whole world,” “Just wait, US, we will take revenge for the Winter Olympic Games,” and “Let’s defeat the US team to display our national dignity.” And a “campaign for an online signature of one million people in prayer for US defeat” was launched. Frightened by the atmosphere, the US team went home immediately after playing the match under the “protection” of the south Korean puppet police.

Many messages on the Internet called for opposition to the purchasing of F-15K fighters from the United States, boycotting of US goods, and a struggle against the killing of two schoolgirls by an armoured vehicle of the US forces. Noteworthy is the participation in the anti-US struggle by teenagers, who call their friends through the Internet to come out in the struggle, themselves participating in it hand in hand with their younger siblings.

The anti-US sentiment rising in south Korea is related to the fact that the south Korean people have begun to

view the US troops through a lens of national independence.

In the past, many south Korean people took the US troops as their “guardians.” In the 1980s, however, when they witnessed the US Command supporting the military dictatorial regime in its suppression by force of the Kwangju Uprising, they realized that the GIs had never been their “liberators” or “guardians.” This sentiment has now spread to the whole society of south Korea.

The south Korean people’s sentiment against the United States is also related to the extraterritorial privileges of the US troops.

Although they commit crimes such as murder, robbery, rape and drug abuse, they have recourse to the Status of Forces Agreement (SOFA) to evade justice. These days, it is said that the criminals are tried, but not in the presence of the south Korean side. The apology they make for their criminal acts is only aimed at quelling the anti-US sentiment of the south Korean people, making a mockery of their feeling of national dignity and sovereignty.

The anti-US sentiment gained further momentum after the killing of two schoolgirls by GIs in June 2002. It was an eruption of a “dormant volcano,” a pent-up sentiment against the US.

Anti-US sentiment runs high among broad sections of the people. Taking part in anti-US demonstrations now are also the common people, who had formerly been too preoccupied with making a living to concern themselves with anti-US movements; artistes, sportspersons and others who are engaged in special fields; and environmental and religious organizations, which had

been indifferent to politics. Even those in judicial organs and some National Assemblymen have begun to think ill of the United States.

This sentiment is related to the identification by the Bush administration of the north as a target of nuclear attack following the “Axis of Evil” speech.

After 9/11 President Bush invoked “counterterrorism” to threaten the countries disobedient to the United States, and in 2002, in his State of the Union Address, defined north of Korea, Iran and Iraq as the “Axis of Evil,” threatening that the United States would not hesitate to fight wars against these countries. A Korean proverb has it that “Your lips might be crooked, but speak out properly.” The “Axis of Evil” speech is a glaring expression of the unilateral and self-opinionated stand of the United States that it would prevent by force other countries from developing weaponry for self-defence while the United States itself is armed with all sorts of WMD, including nuclear weapons.

It only brought the south Korean people to the understanding that should a war break out on the Korean peninsula it would be only the Korean nation that would suffer disaster, not the United States. The Preparatory Committee for a Peace Declaration by Seven Million People, which involves academic, religious and civic organizations, held a press conference and demanded that the United States abandon its hardline policy towards the north. And many civic and social organizations, including the National Union of Teachers, denounced the US policy.

Firmly implanted in the minds of the south Korean people is the spirit of independence, the feeling that the

US forces in south Korea are the enemy of peace and reunification, and the root cause of evil.

## **(2) Anti-US Struggle by the Masses**

The south Korean people's struggle against the United States has now assumed the character of a mass struggle, a struggle of the majority, not minority, a struggle of various sections of the population, not a few sections. It is an eruption of their pent-up fury against the US troops, who have trampled on their national sovereignty, and a manifestation of their will for national independence and national reunification.

The struggle is being staged by various social circles and broad sections of the masses in various forms—against the US hardline policy towards the north aiming at a nuclear war, for withdrawal of the US forces from south Korea, against the additional dispatch of south Korean puppet troops to Iraq under the pressure of the United States, against the construction of a US embassy building on the site of the Toksu Royal Palace, demanding the punishment of US criminals, and revision or nullification of SOFA. This means that a radical change is taking place in their attitude towards the United States.

The present anti-US struggle has some characteristics different from those of the past.

First, it is an all-people struggle. Seen in the struggle are broad sections of the masses, male and female, old and young.

Second, the struggle, which was confined to one or a few regions, has extended to all regions of south Korea.

To be highlighted in this respect is the formation of one organization after another in various parts of south Korea. These organizations are fighting for the return of the US military bases, a stop to murders of the south Korean people by GIs and against the US war policy. The organizations fighting for the return of the US bases are increasing in number in the areas where the US bases are located.

In Kunsan the Citizens' Association for Demanding Withdrawal of the Bill on Raising the Rent of a Runway for Civil Aviation at the US Base in Kunsan was formed on September 23, 1997, and the Kunsan Citizens' Association for Regaining Our Land, the US Base, involving labour, social and civic organizations, was formed on May 11, 1998. In October 1995, the Committee for Investigating the Actual Conditions of the US Military Base was organized in Tongduchon. In 1996, the last year of the plan for the return of the Ryongsan base, several organizations, including the Alliance for Democracy and National Reunification, formed in Seoul the Seoul Citizens' Association for Regaining Our Land, the Ryongsan Base. These are only a few examples.

The US troops were forced to return the firing range in Maehyang-ri by August 2005, after more than half a century. This was the fruition of an unremitting struggle of the organizations of local people to drive out of their native land the US troops, the root cause of all their miseries and sufferings.

In 2002, immediately after the killing of two schoolgirls by US soldiers, 130 anti-US and reunification movement organizations, like the Solidarity for Reunification, Confederation of Trade Unions and

Council for National Reconciliation and Independent Reunification, organized the Pan-National Committee for the Measure of the Killing of Schoolgirls Sin Hyo Sun and Sim Mi Son by a US Armoured Vehicle. The number of organizations involved in the group had increased to 400 by the end of that year. During the three months from June to August 2002, 1.2 million people in total took part in the struggle. In just eight days after November 20, when the US criminals were found “not guilty,” as many as 1.1 million from 1 000 organizations rose up against the verdict. This struck the US soldiers in south Korea with terror.

The Anti-US, Anti-War Youth and Students Hunger Strike to Urge Conclusion of a Nonaggression Treaty between the North and the United States and Withdrawal of the US Troops Who Murdered the Schoolgirls, Preparatory Committee for Solidarity of the Masses in Eastern Seoul, National Council of College Faculties for a Democratic Society, National Council of Churches, Student Council of Koryo University, Student Council of Hongik University, Headquarters of the Mass Movement for Driving Out the US Troops, and other civic, youth and student organizations issued statements and appeals in March 2002, calling on the entire nation to frustrate the US war-oriented policy against the north through a united effort, and open a way to life for the nation.

What is noteworthy in the anti-US struggle is the formation of women’s organizations. On April 29, 2002, the Anti-US Women’s Association, the first of its kind in south Korea, was formed with a membership of 500. Under the banner of national independence, women’s independent unity and women’s emancipation, it holds a

rally every Tuesday in front of the US 8<sup>th</sup> Army Command in Ryongsan, Seoul. Having exerted efforts to expand its organizations in the provinces and lay a mass foundation, it has developed into a grouping of 1 000 women.

Anti-US groups have also been formed among artistes, sportspersons, medical workers, intellectuals and journalists. Even academic organizations, which were hesitant to undertake an anti-US struggle or were indifferent, religious organizations, which had turned a blind eye to political issues, and civic organizations, which had concerned themselves only with environmental issues, are now participating in the struggle, bringing their anti-US feelings into bold relief.

### **(3) Candlelight Demonstration**

In June 2002 two 14-year-old schoolgirls, Sin Hyo Sun and Sim Mi Son, were killed on their way to a birthday party, when they were run over on a narrow road in Hyochon-ri, Kwangjok Subcounty, Yangju County, Kyonggi Province, by a US armoured vehicle driven by Sgt. Mark Walker, the driver, and Sgt. Fernando Nino, the spotter, attached to the 44<sup>th</sup> Engineering Corps of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Division.

The tragic news immediately spread all over south Korea, leading to an eruption of the half-a-century-long anti-US feelings of the south Korean people. They denounced the murder, like other crimes the GIs had committed for decades in south Korea, as attributable to the barbarity of the US soldiers, who do not value the Korean people's lives, and demanded that severe

punishment be meted out to the murderers and other responsible people, like the commanders of the 44<sup>th</sup> Engineering Corps and the 2<sup>nd</sup> Division, to which the vehicle in question belonged.

The US troops, however, resorted to mean tricks to avoid any possible trouble. On the day of the killing, they appeared at the spot under the cover of darkness, for an “investigation.” When a south Korean puppet policeman arrived later, they blocked his approach to the spot. Without any grasp of the spot, they concluded that “the driver had driven the vehicle according to the rules” and “it was an unavoidable accident.” This meant the victims had been at fault. Under pressure from the public, they promised a “joint investigation” with the south Korean puppet police. But after a considerable delay they suddenly announced their unilateral “investigation findings” along with doctored photographs, concluding the case with an explanation that it had been an “ordinary traffic accident owing to communication failure.”

To make matters worse, on July 3, before the funeral ceremony for the girls, the US troops set off fireworks to celebrate US Independence Day, and Sgt. Mark Walker, one of the criminals, went pub crawling near his unit.

Their brazen and shameless acts added fuel to the fire.

The struggle, conducted from June 2002, gained momentum in November that year, when the criminals were found not guilty at the final hearing. The military tribunal of the 8<sup>th</sup> Army, whose chief judge, jury, attorney and barrister were all Americans, found the two soldiers innocent. The tribunal justified its verdict, claiming that though the vehicle’s spotter had spotted the schoolgirls and instructed the driver to stop the vehicle, the

instruction had failed to be transmitted to the latter due to faulty communication equipment. This meant that the criminal had been the faulty vehicle, and the girls were responsible for the accident because they had taken a road under military manoeuvres.

The point is that the communication failure, the main point of the argument at the trial, was a fabrication aimed at covering up the crime. The jury ignored the testimonies by the investigator and the officer in charge of equipment, who said that it had been normal, and accepted the accused's lies and excuses. Contrary to the accused's explanation, it was fine on the day of the accident, the girls kept out of way at the sight of the armoured vehicle, and the vehicle must have taken some time to get from where the criminals had seen the girls to the accident spot. It follows that it was not a traffic accident owing to poor equipment, but a deliberate crime by US soldiers, who seek pleasure in killing others. In this way, the US forces staged a trial of their own by invoking SOFA, and then judged the criminals not guilty. They went to the length of sending the criminals back to the United States, saying that it was their request.

The US forces, who enjoy extraterritorial privileges in south Korea, did not feel any guilty about the accident from the beginning, and never thought of bringing the criminals to justice. They calculated that the anti-US sentiment of the south Korean people would calm down with the passage of time.

The situation, however, developed in a different way.

The south Korean people, who felt that their national dignity had been trampled on, turned out in the struggle with candles in their hands.

The candlelight demonstration held in the plaza of Kwanghwa Gate near the US embassy in Seoul in memory of the two schoolgirls was a prelude to a large-scale struggle. From then on, men and women of all ages gathered in the plaza every evening, forming a sea of candles and shouting, “We are not a US colony and we hate such treatment,” “Value peace and human rights and establish south Korea-US relationship corresponding to the self-respect of the US,” and “Make a new framework for the south Korea-US relationship.” On December 14, 2002, the year of the killing of the two schoolgirls, candlelight demonstrations were held in 57 places across south Korea, with the participation of a total of 300 000 people. On December 21, the first rally to form a human chain with candles around the US embassy was held in Jongmyo Park, and on December 24, Christmas with Hyo Sun and Mi Son, an anti-US event, was held across south Korea. On December 31, the last day of the year, south Koreans and Korean compatriots resident abroad commemorated the Day of Action of One Million People in 100 places in south Korea and in 20 foreign countries.

On March 5, 2003, the 100<sup>th</sup> day after the first candlelight demonstration at Kwanghwa Gate, the 100<sup>th</sup> grand candlelight procession was held under the auspices of the Pan-National Committee for the Measure of the Killing of Schoolgirls Sin Hyo Sun and Sim Mi Son by a US Armoured Vehicle, demonstrating the height of the anti-US consciousness of the south Korean people.

The candlelight demonstrations, which had originated in the anger at the killing of the schoolgirls developed into an anti-US independence and reunification movement, and became a symbol of the south Korean

people's resistance against the United States and their steadfast will for reunification. Meanwhile, it developed in various forms, such as candlelight memorial service, candlelight rally, candlelight concert and candlelight procession, into the main method of their struggle and the main means for displaying their militancy.

In December 2002 south Korea's Yonhap News Agency reported:

“People from all strata, without exception—nuns, monks, pop stars, actors, teachers and lawyers—are coming out into the streets with candles in their hands. In the 1980s south Korea witnessed violent anti-US demonstrations, but the scope of their anger was not as wide as it is this time.”

The 365<sup>th</sup> candlelight rally held in front of Kwanghwa Gate declared that the candles would remain lit until the demands to revise SOFA, remove the threat of war on the Korean peninsula, stop additional dispatch of south Korean troops to Iraq, etc., were met. The National Emergency Action against the Additional Dispatch of Troops to Iraq, involving 351 civic and social organizations, held a press conference at which it made clear its opposition to the US demand upon south Korea for additional dispatch of the latter's troops to Iraq and appealed to the south Korean people: “Let our people rise up to hold higher the flame of national independence and peace.” This indicated that the candlelight of tears and grudges of the past is now raging as the torch of struggle against the United States and war, and for national reunification. Since the south Korean people will struggle until they drive out the US troops from south Korea and realize national sovereignty, the United States is well advised to withdraw its troops from south Korea.

#### 4) US TROOPS' RELOCATION SOUTH OF THE HAN RIVER

To successfully launch the struggle to drive out the US troops from south Korea, it is also important to have a correct understanding about the issue of US troops' relocation south of the Han River.

A touchy issue in the recent development of the military and political situation on the Korean peninsula is the relocation of US troops in south Korea south of the Han River.

In mid-January 2004, the Sixth Future Alliance Policy Initiative Consultation was held in Hawaii between south Korea and the United States. The meeting decided to move the military base in Ryongsan, Seoul, except for an area of some 8 400 m<sup>2</sup> and some offices in it, to Phyongthaek south of the Han by the end of 2006. It is known that, several other problems, like moving the US 2<sup>nd</sup> Division in the forward area near the MDL to the rear and replenishing its equipment, were also discussed.

Why was the United States going to relocate its troops in south Korea at that time? Opinions vary, but experts claim there were three reasons:

First, it is related to relocation and rearrangement according to its plan of military renovation. The plan envisages changes in the military to meet the changed military situation. One item is the reorganization of some of the army units into rapid deployment units. Previously, strategies for blockading visible and known enemy challenges were formulated, and troops were accordingly

deployed in some fixed areas. But now the United States plans, on the supposition that it does not know when and where a regional conflict might erupt, to upgrade the manoeuvrability of its existing forces so as to immediately dispatch them to any place conflict arises, and intervene. The focus of this new plan is the upgrading of manoeuvrability. For this, existing heavy equipment should be changed to light equipment, and ground forces should strengthen their ties with the air and naval forces to facilitate transport.

As is known, the US military estimates that it would take 96 hours (four full days) to move its troops of a brigade level from the US proper to south Korea, and 120 hours (five full days) for the troops of a division level. The troops would have to have recourse to air transport, not to naval transport, and transport aircraft can carry only lightly-equipped troops. In early 2004 the Pentagon announced that the previous strategy of “maintenance of a deterrent line through commitment of ground force” was changed into one of “precision strike by air and naval forces,” apparently according to the plan.

The 2<sup>nd</sup> Division has become the spearhead of the plan in south Korea. The US military is planning to develop the division, the core combat unit of the US land force in south Korea, into a rapid deployment force, and change its equipment at great expense. It made public a plan to build up the war potential of the US troops in south Korea at a cost of USD 11 billion, and transferred to the 2<sup>nd</sup> Division the hi-tech weapons that had been used in the Iraq war. The intention to move the division to Phyongthaek south of the Han is closely related to the plan of organizing a rapid deployment force. The region

is the home of the 7<sup>th</sup> Air Force. It is much more favourable strategically for a rapid deployment force, whose life is manoeuvrability, to be stationed in an area which is the home of transport aircraft.

The scope of operations of the US forces in south Korea is not confined to the Korean peninsula; it stretches to Hokkaido, Japan to the north, to Taiwan to the west, and Guam to the east. In this region, the US forces in south Korea are concerned with the Korean peninsula first, and with China, a potential rival, next. In time of emergency the 2<sup>nd</sup> Division will have to be able to move rapidly not only in Korea but also outside Korea, which is impossible without recourse to transport aircraft. The 7<sup>th</sup> Air Force, which has such aircraft, is headquartered in Osan, and has most of its units in Osan and nearby Phyeongthaek. This is why moving the 2<sup>nd</sup> Division from Uijongbu and Tongduchon, the first-line region, to Osan and Phyeongthaek is now under discussion.

In parallel with this, the United States is reorganizing its forces in Hawaii, Guam and Japan. It has announced a plan to move the reconnaissance base of the Pacific Fleet from Hawaii to Japan, specifically to Misawa, under the pretext of a “nuclear and missile threat” from the DPRK.

Second, it is related to the rising anti-US sentiment among the south Korean people. Some people stubbornly attempt to deny the significance of the anti-US struggle of the south Korean people, claiming that the United States is not a country to redeploy or withdraw its troops because of such a “trivial matter” as the local people’s adverse sentiment. But this is not so. The south Korean people’s ill feeling against the United States began to

grow in relation to the various crimes committed in its military bases in various parts of south Korea, and finally developed in relation to national sovereignty and peaceful reunification. The feeling grew in the wake of the publication of the June 15 Joint Declaration, and was displayed as large-scale candlelight processions held to cherish the memory of the two schoolgirls killed by the GIs. This type of anti-US struggle over several months and in every part of south Korea, dealt a great psychological blow to the US troops in south Korea and to the policy makers in the United States. Soon after, the leading US newspapers began to carry articles that demanded withdrawal of the US troops in south Korea, bringing pressure to bear upon the White House and Pentagon.

Fox-TV anchorman Bill O'Reilly said, "Why should we (Americans) suffer such an indignity from south Korea? We should immediately withdraw our forces from south Korea." CNN anchorman Robert Novak wrote in a contribution to the *Washington Post* that the south Koreans had become sick of the Americans, while the latter could not bear the former any longer. Henry Sokolsky, a former Pentagon official of the administration of George Bush senior, said at a seminar that if the anti-US state of affairs continued, the United States would most probably withdraw its troops from south Korea. What should not be overlooked in this or that insistence in the United States on withdrawing its troops is that it is arrogant and preposterous. All insist that the United States must withdraw its troops not from the viewpoint of world peace and security but because the south Korean people have betrayed their "benefactor" and "saviour."

Is the United States the “benefactor” and “saviour” of the south Korean people? The United States has never been a country that sacrifices itself, in any case, for the sake of others. The top priority for its foreign policy and national strategy is its national interests. If it deems it would profit little or suffer a loss, it never engages in any international dispute or conflict; on the contrary, it finds excuses to stir up disputes and then to intervene if this is deemed to be profitable to it. It is for this reason that it is still engaged in Korea though it is denounced as an aggressor and plunderer. It was the same with the Iraq war. In spite of opposition from almost all countries and the UN, it invaded Iraq in the name of “liberating” the Iraqi people from Saddam Hussein’s dictatorship and “defending” world peace from Iraq’s weapons of mass destruction. The latter has been clearly proved to have been an excuse for the United States to unleash the war.

It applies the same artifice in south Korea.

The United States insists that it has “protected” south Korea from north Korea’s “threat” and brought economic “prosperity” to it. What it has brought to the south Korean people is the pain of national division and the feeling of confrontation against their compatriots in the north. Had the United States not divided Korea into two, such a complex problem as military confrontation would not have originated, and Korea would have become an economic giant through normal economic development. The United States, however, occupied the southern half of Korea and has pursued a policy of dividing the country and incited hostility between Korean compatriots, and through this has gained tremendous political and economic profit. In this context, the US troops in south

Korea can be called an entity that renders military support to US interests. With anti-US sentiment running high and anti-US demonstrations being held continuously in south Korea, Americans do not hesitate to make intolerable, insulting remarks.

For instance, Doug Bandow, a senior fellow of the Cato Institute, wrote in an article contributed to National Review Online: “If a country wants America’s protection, it can’t complain when Washington calls the shots,” “And as long as America protects the ROK, it will rightly demand special treatment for its soldiers,” and “...a country pays a price when it is a de facto protectorate.”

The conservatives in the United States say that the redeployment of its troops south of the Han implies its will to withdraw the troops without any regret if the south Korean people wish it. If this is true, the United States should redeploy its troops to the US proper. The United States still does not have any intention of withdrawing its troops from south Korea. The redeployment is aimed at threatening the south Korean people and neutralizing their anti-US sentiment. The plan to dispatch to Iraq thousands of troops of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Brigade of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Division should be viewed in this context. The United States took its forces away from south Korea to Iraq not simply to cope with the Iraqi crisis but to stamp out the anti-US independence struggle and breathe life into the dying pro-US conservative forces by reviving the defunct “security awareness” in south Korea, quite a scheme peculiar to the United States.

Third, the redeployment is a link in the whole chain of countermeasures against the strong military capabilities

and Songun politics of north Korea. In a sense, this can be said to be the most decisive of the three reasons. The south Korean newspaper *Dong-A Ilbo* analyzed this as follows:

“The United States has emphasized that the redeployment of its troops in south Korea was a plan separate from the deterrent against the north and from the south Korea-US alliance. But it is accepted opinion that the main purpose is to station them out of range of the long-range artillery pieces of the north in case of an emergency.”

A similar sentiment can be found in an interview of Kim Myong Chol, a military and diplomatic commentator living in Japan, carried in the south Korean monthly *Mal*:

“The moving of the US troops in south Korea to the areas south of the Han is in effect using people of Seoul as human shields. This shows that the United States is afraid of the north. If it is ready to defend south Korea, it ought to deploy its troops in the forward area.”

In the past the United States deployed the 2<sup>nd</sup> Division, the core force in south Korea, near the MDL, and called it a trip wire. This meant that this unit would ensure automatic engagement of the US forces in case of emergency. In other words, when a war broke out in the Korean peninsula, the 2<sup>nd</sup> Division deployed in the front would inevitably be in danger and the United States would have to dispatch reinforcements from the Pacific and US proper to save the division. On April 20, 2003, General LaPorte, commander of the south Korea-US combined forces, said that the trip wire was a negative term, and an insulting one for the soldiers of the 2<sup>nd</sup>

Division, adding that it was a bankrupt concept. As he said, the US troops had given up on their own accord the role of a trip wire long before. This was not widely known, as the process was kept a military secret.

Until 1971, the 2<sup>nd</sup> Division defended a line of 18 miles around Panmunjom along the MDL. When the 7<sup>th</sup> Division withdrew from south Korea, it reduced the line to Camp Bonifas (the area where the Panmunjom incident of August 18, 1976 took place), a symbolic line. The symbolic role of the trip wire of the US troops completely disappeared with the withdrawal of the 3<sup>rd</sup> Brigade of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Division at the end of 1992. At that time the remaining two brigades of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Division retreated from the front line to the region of Tongduchon and Uijongbu. Now, retreat farther south from the region is under discussion. The retreat farther south is closely related to the daily increasing combat power of the KPA (Korean People's Army). The United States views that the artillery of the KPA deployed along the MDL retains an edge in firepower and range. If this is true, the US troops in Tongduchon, not so far from the MDL, are within the range of the north Korean army's artillery in case of emergency. Then, far from defending the trip wire, the US troops would only suffer increasing casualties, prompting public opinion in the United States to rise against the war. In this sense, the US troops along the front line are "hostages" of the KPA. In order to avoid this tragic fate, the US troops had already given up the role of trip wire, and now try to move to the areas south of the Han.

Of course, the redeployment is aimed not simply at moving the troops out of the firing range of the artillery

of the KPA; it is aimed mainly at reducing the loss of manpower to the minimum and maintaining tactical superiority in the early stage of a war. In this context, the redeployment does not ease but aggravates the situation on the Korean peninsula.

The north's newspaper *Rodong Sinmun*, dated November 19, 2003, pointed out in an article titled, *Redeployment of the US Military Bases: A Military Measure for Northward Invasion*, as follows:

“The recent tactics of operations of the US military are to avoid man-to-man fighting and fight an aggressive war by placing their bases far away from the battleground and making preemptive strikes and concentrated offensives by means of aircraft and missiles. The Iraq war shows that they have changed their tactics: In order to reduce losses and achieve their aggressive purpose, they will launch ground warfare only after weakening the enemy through powerful and intensive strikes by long-range aircraft and artillery.

“Having already strengthened the systems of command and information of its forces in south Korea and equipped them with state-of-the-art weapons of mass destruction, the United States schemes to realize its operational plans by redeploying its aggressive troops in the areas south of the Han.”

In this way, the moving of the US bases is a retreat to cope with the strong war potential of north Korea and at the same time completion of preparations for a war against it.

To cope with the US aggressive policy to dominate the whole of the Korean peninsula by drawing on its strong-arm strategy, the north holds military affairs as

priority state affairs and directs primary efforts to the defence industry, thus frustrating the US aggressive attempts at every step and defending peace on the peninsula. The United States does not sit face to face for talks with the countries whose military potential is minimal, and finds any excuse to invade them. Though it says in public that it would not attack north Korea and that it would settle the nuclear issue of the Korean peninsula by peaceful means, it makes every preparation in secret for a preemptive strike against it. While it is reorganizing the structure of its military forces, the United States, whose policy towards Korea is for war, not for peace, is seeking relaxation of north Koreans' vigilance, even for a moment. In this context, the north's emphasis on military affairs can be called the best choice for peace. Songun politics and the KPA's strength prevent a war from breaking out on the Korean peninsula. In the face of this, the United States dare not ignite a war on the peninsula, and rushes to withdraw its forces to the rear.

The south Korean people should demand complete withdrawal of the US troops, not their redeployment, and reject the US demand on the south Korean puppet authorities for the covering of the expenses of their redeployment.

Complete withdrawal of US forces from south Korea is the only way to durable and lasting peace on the Korean peninsula.

## 5) GOALS OF THE CONTINUOUS STRUGGLE FOR THE WITHDRAWAL OF US FORCES FROM SOUTH KOREA

The first goal of the struggle for driving the US troops out of south Korea is to nullify the US-south Korea Mutual Defence Treaty, an excuse the United States offers to justify the deployment of its troops in south Korea whenever it faces a demand for their withdrawal.

The Mutual Defence Treaty was signed on October 1, 1953, and came to effect on November 11 the following year. A close look into the origin and contents of the treaty makes it obvious that it is an utterly preposterous document.

First, the treaty runs counter to the Korean Armistice Agreement concluded a few months before its signing.

True, an agreement can be followed by another. But the former must be nullified if the latter contradicts it. The United States, however, has clung to the dual attitude of maintaining the Armistice Agreement together with the Mutual Defence Treaty. As the two documents contradict one another on the withdrawal of the US forces from south Korea, this reveals the arrogance of the Americans, who despise Koreans. If the United States is determined to maintain the Armistice Agreement, as it has said, it must annul the Mutual Defence Treaty.

Second, the Mutual Defence Treaty is not a normal arrangement between two sovereign states, but something like a document signed between a suzerain and its colony.

Article 4 of the treaty stipulates that south Korea grants the United States the right to deploy ground, naval and air forces in and around the former's territory, and the United States accepts this.

To throw more light on the humiliating character of the treaty, it is necessary to compare it with Article 4 of the Korea-Japan Protocol, which Korea was forced by Japan to sign in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century.

This article stipulates that in case there arises a threat to the safety of the royal family and territory of Korea due to an invasion by a third country or civil war, the government of Japan shall take necessary measures, the government of Korea shall provide sufficient convenience to the government of Japan to facilitate the latter's measures, and the government of Japan is entitled to use any time any place that it deems strategically necessary to attain the abovementioned objectives.

The two treaties have some differences in wording, but none in content. This means that the humiliating treaty signed in the period of Japanese colonial rule continues to exist even today; only the suzerain has been replaced by the United States.

The injustice of the treaty finds expression in the date of its expiry. Article 6 stipulates that the treaty is valid indefinitely, but will expire one year after one party notifies the other that it will no longer abide by it. This means that as long as the treaty is effective, the US military presence in south Korea will be legitimate indefinitely. As far as the expiry of the treaty is concerned, the positions of the United States and south Korea seem equal. But there is a loophole; its annulment is possible only when a truly independent government is

established in south Korea through a revolution or a similar event. In this case, the United States can handle the situation as it wishes in a year by manipulating its followers.

The treaty is thus an unequal one that legalizes and perpetuates the US hegemony in south Korea. According to this treaty, south Korea can do nothing without US consent.

The second goal is to nullify the Status of Forces Agreement. The south Korean people's grudge and anger against this agreement have reached their extreme, as the agreement shackles them not to protest against humiliating treatment by the GIs. In this sense, it can be said that the agreement is the key link in the whole chain of relations between south Korea and the United States, an essential factor that infringes upon the sovereignty and right to survival of the Korean nation.

This type of agreement does not exist only between the United States and south Korea. In general, the stationing of troops in a foreign country is based on a military agreement, which stipulates facilities and areas to be used by the troops and their status. Thus, the troops require an agreement on their status to be stationed in a foreign country.

Then, why does the agreement pose a problem only in south Korea? Herein lies the quintessence of the matter.

With regard to the privileged status of the US forces in south Korea, Gregory Henderson, who once worked at the US embassy in south Korea in the 1950s and 1960s, recalled in his thesis in the following vein: South Korea is of the nature of a subsidiary company, the whole stock of which the US military authorities hold; when there

arises a disagreement in the US government, the opinion of the military authorities is absolute, at least on the south Korean matter. He said, "...Every US soldier from officer down enjoys material indulgence in south Korea. Material indulgence includes abundant supply of fresh bodies of young local women."

The GIs are protected by law whether they have committed robbery, rape or murder. This is the tragic reality incurred by SOFA.

The United States thought that the GIs in south Korea should feel as comfortable as on a sofa, and thus named the agreement. This exemplifies the true nature of the agreement that tramples upon the self-esteem and dignity of the Korean nation.

The agreement was signed in July 1966. Its predecessor was the Transitional Temporary Status of Forces Agreement on Military Affairs and Security signed in August 1948. This stipulated that the privileged position of the US soldiers in south Korea would be protected by law, though temporarily, after the establishment of a new "government" in south Korea. This agreement was replaced by the Taejon Agreement reached in July 1950, and the Meyer Agreement in May 1952, the former granting the GIs privileges and the right to exclusive control over south Korea and to detain its people when necessary, and the latter privileges and tax exemption conducive to carrying out the Korean war.

These agreements proved to be the main factors of the continual brutal and violent crimes committed by the GIs in the 1950s and 1960s. Anti-Americanism surfaced among the south Korean people in those days.

Embarrassed, the United States and the south Korean

puppet authorities held working-level talks from April 1961 to discuss the conclusion of a new agreement on the status of the US forces in south Korea. The talks ended in 1966, producing the present SOFA. Before signing the agreement, the United States set a condition that south Korea should dispatch troops to the Vietnam war, and the south Korean puppet regime complied. According to international law, foreign troops must honour the law of the country where they are stationed. But the fact that SOFA was concluded two decades after the US forces had landed and with a string attached by the United States shows how unjust it is.

Later, the agreement witnessed several amendments. The first amendment was made against the backdrop of mounting anti-American feelings among the south Korean people and their outcry with regard to the US military bases and crimes by the GIs from 1980 on. The agreement amended after negotiations from December 1988 to January 25, 1991, gave more weight to the sharing of defence expenses, neglecting the demands of the south Korean people.

The second negotiations for amendment were held at the time as the south Korean people's anger blazed forth once again over the crimes committed by the GIs one after another, including the raping and killing of Yun Gum I in 1992. The negotiations began on November 30, 1995, but were suspended on May 27, 1997, as the US side abruptly and unilaterally notified the south Korean side that there was no need for such negotiations.

This enraged the south Korean people. After that, they began to view the crimes in the context of history of the US forces in south Korea. In the course of this, some

incidents, like the brutal massacre of innocent civilians committed by the US forces during the Korean war and the spreading of defoliant in the 1960s over the areas along the MDL on their orders, were unearthed. South Koreans viewed these incidents in connection with the discharging of poison into the Han River from a US base, the stealing by a US athlete of the title of a skating event from a south Korean athlete during the 2002 Winter Olympic Games and the running over of two schoolgirls by a US armoured vehicle.

Against this background, the negotiations were resumed on August 4, 2000. But, from the first day the US side did not show any willingness to settle the abovementioned cases, and the negotiations bore no fruit.

Then, why is SOFA so problematic?

First, it provides against legal sanctions for crimes US soldiers commit.

The murder of Yun Gum I and the killing of the two schoolgirls are vivid testimony to how cruel and brutal the crimes are.

The crime crueller and more brutal than these is the fact that the US military court, by invoking SOFA, releases the culprits without any legal sanctions. This is another crime committed by SOFA.

With regard to crimes committed by the GIs, SOFA stipulates that whatever their reasons and details, the south Korean side should not detain the criminals concerned if the crimes were committed during their military duties, that if the criminals are taken into custody, they should be handed over to the US side any time the US forces authorities demand, and that they could be summoned by a south Korean court only when

necessary. It also provides against search by the south Korean side of US military facilities and bases.

The agreement has thus placed the US bases outside the jurisdiction of south Korea. Taking advantage of this, US soldiers flee to their bases immediately after committing crimes, and the south Korean puppet police and victims giving chase find themselves in a cul-de-sac.

It is a different case in other countries where US forces are stationed. They entered into agreements with the United States on the principle of reciprocity. The agreements, for instance, with Germany and Japan, facilitate the detaining and questioning of US soldiers who commit crimes, and the exercising, despite the request from the US forces, of jurisdiction according to the decision of a local court. They also stipulate that US soldiers who flee to their bases after committing crimes should be handed over to the countries concerned, and these countries may arrest the criminals without a warrant. In accordance with the agreements, these countries grant without restraint requests for the investigation of the criminals.

SOFA, an unprecedentedly humiliating agreement, the like of which cannot be found anywhere else in the world, has been forced only upon south Korea.

Second, SOFA presents a problem in the articles concerning the use of the military bases.

The US forces themselves define the objective of their bases, the period of their lease and their rent. At present, the total area of the 101 US bases in south Korea is over 237 km<sup>2</sup>. Article 6 of the Mutual Defence Treaty stipulates that the treaty is valid indefinitely. The article renders it legal that the area is virtually under permanent

ownership of by the US forces. This article cannot be found even in the Korea-Japan Protocol, which opened the road for the Japanese colonial rule of Korea.

Owing to SOFA, things inconceivable take place in south Korea. Nine US soldiers live in the Puchon base, covering an area of 560 km<sup>2</sup>, in Inchon; the base causes much inconvenience to the urban traffic and the citizens' life. Korean Airlines and Asiana Airlines pay the US forces for using their airstrips in Kunsan. In the firing range at Maehyang-ri, Kyonggi Province, farming families who have been living there for generations pay the US forces for farming on the land inside the base.

Another problem not to be overlooked is that rivers and mountains have been polluted by the toxic waste and poisonous substances from the US military bases, threatening the people's lives. Article 4 of SOFA stipulates that when the US government is not obliged, when it returns facilities and areas to the south Korean government on the expiration of this agreement or at an earlier date, to restore the facilities and areas to the condition in which they were at the time they became available to the US armed forces, or to compensate the south Korean government in lieu of such restoration. The US forces, with recourse to this article, are polluting soil and water in south Korea without feeling any guilt over it.

Third, SOFA affords the US forces various benefits in respect of customs duty, tax, telecommunications and public charges.

Levyng customs duty and tax is an expression of national sovereignty, and nobody should be exempt from this. But in south Korea, the US soldiers enjoy special

treatment in this regard. The benefits they enjoy from tax payment and free entry and exit in accordance with SOFA are beyond imagination. The US soldiers, civilians attached to them, and their families in south Korea are virtually exempt from taxes on their ownership, use and transfer of property. Entry into, and exit from, south Korea is as easy for them as travelling in their own country; the entry and exit procedures are simplified for their convenience, and they are rarely charged customs duty. Not only US vessels and aircraft but also all vessels and aircraft registered with other countries and used in the service of the United States use any seaports and airports in south Korea free of charge. Taking advantage of this special treatment, the GIs are lining their pockets. For instance, while travelling abroad under the pretext of military business, they take out all kinds of goods free of customs duty, even things which are considered “national treasures.”

All these things are done under the shield of SOFA. In order to put an end to the subordinate relationship, SOFA must be abolished; otherwise, crimes committed by the US forces cannot be eradicated nor can the independence and right to existence of the south Korean people be defended. If the agreement is repealed, the American soldiers will not be able to do as they wish, and will choose of their own accord to go home. In this sense, driving the US forces out of south Korea and repealing SOFA are closely related to one another.

The third goal in the effort for driving the US forces out of south Korea is to fight against the military exercises staged in and around the Korean peninsula under various names.

The US military exercises, held as annual events, aggravate the situation on the Korean peninsula, interfering with the improvement of relations between the north and south of Korea and the realization of their reunification. The United States and its followers describe these exercises as “exercises for defending the security” of south Korea, but this is nothing but a far-fetched excuse. As is well known, the United States has long given up the threadbare concept of “defence against the threat of southward invasion” from the north, and has adopted a new doctrine, that of a preemptive nuclear strike, against the DPRK. Highlighted in the US forces’ operational plans is the fact that they all include a preemptive strike by means of nuclear weapons. The United States has opted for these plans out of its judgment that it cannot win any war without them. To name a few of the war plans, they are OP PLAN 5027-98, CON PLAN of OP PLAN 5027, and New OP PLAN 5026. These plans differ from one another somewhat in their contents and the stages of their execution, but they are identical in pursuing a preemptive nuclear strike against, and occupation of, the DPRK. They envisage six stages in keeping with the characteristics of military operations.

In the first stage, a preemptive attack by means of nuclear weapons will be launched by air and sea. In the second stage, the counterattack capability of the People’s Army of the north will be neutralized. In the third stage, troop reinforcements from the US proper and neighbouring regions will arrive and the overall forces will be reorganized for an offensive. In the fourth stage, these forces will break through the MDL by means of

ground battles, and airborne troops will occupy Pyongyang. In the fifth stage, in parallel with this, the whole territory up to the Amnok and Tuman rivers will be occupied. In the last stage, military rule will be enforced for political control over the north. These plans are envisaged to take 48 days at the shortest, and 120 days at the longest, to be implemented.

When drawing up these plans, they did not care a straw about a possible nuclear holocaust on the Korean peninsula. What they were concerned about was whether the plans would be feasible. If the plans went astray, innumerable GIs would be killed and, in the worst case, the US proper might be turned into a lake of fire unprecedented in its history. This would be a nightmare. They know that this nightmare could easily become a reality. If the United States had not taken this into consideration, it might have followed the plans and ignited a war on the Korean peninsula a long time ago.

It is clear that the United States stages military exercises in and around the Korean peninsula in order to remove “obstacles” in the way of bringing the plans into effect. Freedom Banner exercises are conducted for a quick reaction to an emergency on the Korean peninsula, with the enlistment of the Marines in Okinawa, Iwakuni, Hiroshima and the Hawaii, while the RSOI and Foal Eagle exercises are conducted for testing the manoeuvrability of the forces around the Korean peninsula and for mastering the process of manoeuvring the reinforced US troops and integration with the south Korean puppet troops. These war games, based on the simulation of a second Korean war, are aggravating the situation on the Korean peninsula to the extreme. This is

testified to by the fact that these exercises are staged near the MDL with the enlistment of weapons of mass destruction, including M1 Abrams tanks.

These exercises, because of their provocative, offensive and aggressive nature, exert a negative influence on the improvement of relationship between the north and south of Korea, and peace on the Korean peninsula. Whenever the exercises are held, the situation on the Korean peninsula, hitherto moving towards detente, freezes all at once and multiple layers of inter-Korean negotiations and talks experience twists and turns. Since they are held at a time when all Korean compatriots wish for national reunification and are making great efforts for an improved relationship, their objective needs no further explanation.

The United States claims that as they are annual exercises of a defensive nature, they are not dangerous, and have nothing to do with the negotiations and improvement of relations between the north and south of Korea, but it is nothing but sophistry.

That fact that the United States, through these exercises, which are neither a “war deterrent” nor a mere demonstration of its military superiority, is pursuing a bigger objective—increasing tension on the Korean peninsula and then proceeding to ignite a war—is getting more and more clear these days. If the US-led forces stage military exercises in south Korea, the whole armed forces of the north enter into a state of combat readiness in response, resulting in the suspension of all contacts between the north and south and growing confrontation between the two sides. The United States knows full well that the north’s response is a measure taken to provide

against a real threat, not for the purpose of deliberately propagandizing the US stand against peace. But it still stages them stubbornly, prompted by its scheme for an aggressive war, and this brings to light the fact that the military exercises pursue hegemony through war, not “war deterrence.”

The exercises are dangerous in that when they are held a state of unpredictability appears as to when and how they might switch over to actual warfare. An important thing in a military operation is how to enlist and build up troops and means of transport to hurl them in the theatre of operations. Today, when military science and technology has reached a high stage of development, enlisting, building up and deploying military forces without the knowledge of the other party has become next to impossible, and thus a surprise attack is out of the question. One option is to make troop deployment an annual event in the name of military exercises, and launch a surprise attack just when the enemy is off his guard. As the US troops are all arranged in attack formation in accordance with the operational plans, overall preparations for attack will be completed if only the forces reinforced from the area surrounding the Korean peninsula and the US proper join them under the pretext of military exercises; what remains is to go over to actual warfare at a signal.

The US staging of various military exercises these days when the easing of tensions and securing peace on the Korean peninsula is an urgent demand is an unpardonable crime against the Korean nation. What escalation of tension, hostile confrontation and nuclear war would bring to the Korean nation is nothing but a

nuclear holocaust. Now the Korean peninsula is in a touch-and-go situation. So long as the US soldiers are stationed in south Korea and confrontation goes on, a phase decisively favourable for peace and national reunification cannot be unveiled on the Korean peninsula, and peace cannot be guaranteed in Asia as a whole, either.

In view of ensuring peace on the Korean peninsula and the global trend towards independence, it is an urgent task to fight against the military exercises in combination with the struggle to drive the US troops out of south Korea.

The fourth goal of the struggle to drive the US troops out of south Korea is a nonaggression treaty between the DPRK and the United States.

The treaty is a prerequisite for replacing the present war-like atmosphere on the Korean peninsula with a peace-oriented one, and for improving relations between the DPRK and the United States. This is why the matter has been brought up for in-depth discussion on several occasions, like the bilateral contacts between them and the Six-Party Talks.

The DPRK asserts that conclusion of a nonaggression treaty is a core problem and starting point for ensuring peace on the Korean peninsula and a precondition for improving relations between the two countries at the present stage. In other words, concluding a nonaggression treaty is a priority problem for putting an end to the hostile relations between the DPRK and the United States, and opening a new phase for peace on the Korean peninsula.

A nonaggression treaty is a must, as it is indispensable

for solving a host of problems entangling the Korean peninsula and for opening a new phase of relations between the DPRK and the United States. Such a treaty would bind the two parties to put an end to military confrontation and refrain from attacking the other in any form, and follow this up with tangible support measures. If such a treaty is concluded, there is no doubt that the long-standing mistrust and hostile relations between the two countries will be removed and security guaranteed for them both, and the danger of war hanging over the Korean peninsula will abate, opening a way for the settlement of peace. It will also make a breakthrough for confidence-building between the two countries, and lay a foundation for solving the problems of the past through dialogue and negotiations, by peaceful means.

A nonaggression treaty, based on understanding and confidence between the signatories, is possible only when their hostile feeling of confrontation and mistrust is eliminated. The DPRK was proceeding from its will for peace, its will to tide over the present crisis created on the Korean peninsula and put an end to its hostile relationship with the United States, a product of the old times, when it proposed the treaty in October 2002 and brought this matter to the Six-Party Talks and held various bilateral contacts with the United States.

But the US attitude to the proposal is quite contradictory. When the proposal was presented, it gave a distorted judgment of it, saying that it was merely “brinkmanship” aimed at exacting compensation from the United States. Then it suddenly changed its stand, and put forward a cunning proposal: That it does not reject the DPRK’s proposal, but this proposal should only be

accepted by way of a “written security guarantee” in the form of non-binding parliamentary resolution and “collective security guarantee” endorsed by neighbouring countries.

Such a written security guarantee, which would not be legally binding, would meet the fate of the Agreed Framework and Joint Communique concluded between the two countries in the past. A collective security guarantee is no different from the former, as the United States might be able to unburden its responsibility and obligation and share rights and obligations with the countries neighbouring the Korean peninsula with regard to peace on the peninsula. This, after all, shows that it is not willing to conclude such a treaty with the DPRK.

Then, why is the United States dead set against a nonaggression treaty?

In a word, if such a treaty were to be concluded, the US forces would be deprived of the justification of their deployment in south Korea; the United States would have to withdraw its troops from the Korean peninsula. Such a treaty would be a stumbling block to its war policy in Korea, and accordingly withdrawal of its forces and nuclear weapons from south Korea would become the order of the day. The US administration is under pressure from within and without on the issue of withdrawal of the GIs in south Korea. Despite the evident trend towards detente on the Korean peninsula and the high-running anti-US sentiment and demand for withdrawal of its troops, the United States is not willing to pull them out of south Korea. This is clearly a refusal to face reality. The United States has yet to give an answer to the question: Is there any reason whatsoever to reject north Korea’s

proposal for a nonaggression treaty if the final objective of its policy towards Korea is “defence of peace,” as it claims? Former US President Clinton denounced the Bush administration, saying that a nonaggression treaty between the United States and north Korea was necessary and there was no reason why the United States should not enter into such a treaty.

The international image of the United States has been tarnished by the issue of a nonaggression treaty, but it persists in its opposition, from the view that, once concluded, the treaty might exert a negative influence on its forces in south Korea, the backbone of its policy towards Korea; in other words, it cannot reconcile its domination policy towards Korea with peace on the Korean peninsula. It is true that in the present situation on the Korean peninsula if a nonaggression treaty was concluded, it would not bring about immediate withdrawal of the GIs from south Korea, and peace would not settle on the peninsula of its own accord. It is also true that any measure or action oriented towards peace cannot prove effective unless a legal guarantee for peace is secured.

The DPRK’s proposal for a nonaggression treaty is a yardstick with which to distinguish clearly the essence of the ever-more-complicated situation developing on the Korean peninsula. This is why such a treaty is so essential for removing the confrontation between the United States and the entire Korean nation now prevailing on the peninsula.

The fifth goal of the struggle for driving the US forces out of south Korea is to enlist international solidarity.

The struggle is not limited only to the interests of the

south Korean people; the peace and security of the whole of Northeast Asia, and furthermore of the world as a whole, are related to it. This is recognized by the White House, the Pentagon and the Asia watchers in the United States. Their view is that if the US forces were withdrawn from south Korea, the after-effects would be felt even in Japan, and in that case the United States would have to take its hands off Northeast Asia.

William Cohen, former Pentagon chief, wrote in the *Washington Post* that if the US forces were withdrawn from south Korea, China would attempt to occupy the power vacuum, Japan would counter China by the development of nuclear weapons, and India would launch into expansion of its influence to contain China. A former national security adviser to the White House wrote in *The New York Times* that the US forces play a central role in containing not only north Korea but also the political and military expansion of China and in leading the situation in Northeast Asia. It is apparent that these opinions proceed from the standpoint that the US forces should not be pulled out of south Korea. But one thing is clear—they recognize that the US forces in south Korea exert an influence not only on the Korean peninsula but also in the area surrounding it. As the United States is now resorting to invasion and war without hesitation in various parts of the world, the countries neighbouring the Korean peninsula approach the issue of the US forces in south Korea with apprehension and anxiety. Many countries take a negative view of the presence of the US forces in south Korea, with an understanding, particularly in the context of the Iraq war, that the US strategy for world hegemony has now reached a very dangerous stage.

Frustrating the arrogance and arbitrariness of the United States, which poses itself as the ruler of the world, the prime mover of the world order, including driving the US forces out of south Korea, is a major task for peace and security in Asia and at the same time a prerequisite for peace on the Korean peninsula.

## **Conclusion**

Today the United States and its followers clamour as if the Songun policy pursued in the DPRK is making the situation around the Korean peninsula tense and presenting a great threat to them. This is nothing but a deliberate misinterpretation of the real situation.

The major responsibility for the complicated and acute situation created on the Korean peninsula today rests squarely with the US hegemonic strategy towards Korea and its occupation of south Korea.

The United States has imposed territorial division upon the Korean nation by stationing its troops in the south. It has introduced nuclear weapons into the peninsula, thus giving rise to the nuclear problem there. Still not satisfied with its more than 1 000 nuclear weapons in south Korea, it is attempting to bring bunker busters there.

The US forces in south Korea, the physical manifestation of the US strategy towards Korea, have made attempts to unleash a war at every available opportunity, but each time they have been frustrated by a resolute countermeasure of the Korean People's Army.

The US war policy has already reached the limit of bankruptcy in Korea, owing to the Songun-based, independence-oriented mode of taking harder line to hard line in the showdown with the United States. It will inevitably end in the withdrawal of the US forces from south Korea.