Human Security, Promotion of Peace and Justice:
The Case of Korea[*]

Ho-Won Jeong

Professor of Institute for Conflict Analysis and Resolution, George Mason University

Ingyu Oh

Visiting Professor at the International and Area Studies, University of California, Berkeley

SangKee Peter Lee

SangKee Lee is President of Committee for Korean Studies at University of California, Berkeley

Abstract

In understanding human security in Korea, the paper reviews the areas of human rights, economic equity, ecological balance as well as national security and prevention of war. National security has often been used to justify human cost derived from the imposition of policies and laws that support dominant political and economic elite. The authors examine factors that undermined human security during the Cold War era, then review more recent issues pertaining to the past legacy. Despite improvements in human rights, democratization in South Korea has yet to fulfill its promises of reduction in economic disparities and reforms of security laws as well as the need for balance between ecological preservation and economic growth.

Keywords: Korea, human security, democracy, development, state

Introduction

Democratization and economic development of South Korea and recently the nuclear program and human rights concerns in North Korea have drawn growing international attention from both academics and policy makers.[1] What has been inadequately addressed is the concept and dynamics of nation building and human security of Korea since World War II. Literature on peace encompasses human rights violations caused by ethnic/sectarian conflict, poverty, diseases, economic disparities and inequality, ecological degradation, and displaced people.[2]

These concerns have been represented by human security that emerged at major international forums such as the United Nations and among foreign policy making circles in Canada, Sweden and other Western welfare countries (Conteh-Morgan, 2005; Calhoun, 2005). By stressing social and economic well-being of individuals and groups, human security promotes autonomy and other "positive" peace values. Thus the emphasis on human security is contrasted with security paradigms which are limited to the protection of national borders and state institutions.

Human security has not been seriously considered in the Korean peninsular given the country's political reality shaped by the existence of two opposing governments. Following its division in 1945 and the Korean War in 1950-3, the dominant security discourse was derived from the maintenance of two antagonistic regimes. During the Cold War period, concerns for individual and civil rights were superceded by an emphasis on national security. In national security paradigms, the state has been less concerned about the protection of individual well-being and dignity.

The efforts to maintain and protect dominant political and economic interests have been detrimental to human security. Individual rights such as freedom of speech can be arbitrarily curtailed and violated by the state. In addition, heavy military spending led to low priorities on government spending on social and economic welfare of the poor. Korea's division, therefore, created an environment of systematic subjugation of human security in the name of national security.

In understanding human security in Korea, four areas - National Security Law, environment, economic equity and peace - can be examined. High human cost has been incurred by the state's flagrant violations in these fields under the name of national security and with the desire for economic growth. In each of these areas, we will first examine the factors of human security violations in the Cold War era (1948-1989), then move on to more recent issues pertaining to human security in the post-Cold War era. Democratization in South Korea in the late 1980s brought about reforms to rectify human rights violations, but serious concerns still remain.

Furthermore, the rapid pace of economic competition with globalization has brought many challenges to human security. For instance, the emphasis on a free market economy has hindered the development of a genuine social welfare system, and economic priorities have prevented tougher environmental regulations. Growing income gaps, a lack of attention to disabled people and other marginalized including foreign workers, are all a threat to human security. Finally, the third part discusses the promotion of human security in Korea and its relevance in the global context.

---

[1] For democratization of South Korea, see Kim (2003) and Oh (1999). For economic development of South Korea, see Chung and Kirkby (2000). For North Korea's nuclear program, see Cha and Kang (2003).
[2] For extensive review of peace and conflict resolution, see Jeong (2000).

Emerging Concerns of Human Security

National security and national interest are currently the dominant lexicon of international relations. As realist paradigms suggest, no permanent allies, simply permanent interest, is applied and practiced in diplomatic circles. This can mean that people are the means to stability and not the end. On the other hand, a liberal realism interprets the world as more interconnected and interdependent, and recognizes the role of ideology, culture, along with economic stability in shaping international order (Nye, 2003). The liberal, internationalist paradigm sees the possibility of peace occurring through the strengthening of international institutions, economic interdependence and spread of liberal democracy. This paradigm has yet to fully explain the growing gap between Northern hemisphere and Southern hemisphere and the difficulty of many developing countries in consolidating democracy.

Therefore, a new paradigm based upon human security, advocated by United Nations Commission on Human Security, has to emerge to address civilian security in armed conflict, protection of refugees, self-determination for minorities, reduction in poverty and empowerment. By recognizing that security challenges are becoming more complex and various new actors are attempting to play a role, the focus must broaden from the state to the security of people (Commission on Human Security, 2003). In other words, this shift of paradigm to human security will fill the void of the human concerns both missing under the realism and liberal paradigm. Protection of human security will encompass a condition free of injury/threats to an individual's, group's or community's well-being, including freedom from threats and physical and psychological abuse (Conteh-Morgan, 2005).

The end of Cold War symbolized by the fall of the Berlin Wall had global repercussions in terms of the transition to the global economy and increasing ethnic hostilities and conflicts. International institutions led by IMF, World Bank, and WTO have attempted to make an uniform standard of global commerce and trade to promote economic integration of all countries. However, expanding trade and investment have deepened economic disparities between rich and poor countries, further creating difficulties for the marginalized populations of the world. The threats to human security were also generated by inter-ethnic conflict (i.e. Rwanda, Sudan, Yugoslavia, etc) that produced several millions of refugees and killings of innocent civilians.

National and human security can be compared in terms of negative and positive peace. In dominant views of national security, protection of national interests depends on military strength and building an alliance to counterbalance opposing forces. Human security, on the other hand, is more concerned about the protection of civilian life in violent conflict situations, and prevention of abuses. In terms of positive peace, human security pays more attention to the reduction in economic disparities and better management of the environment that can be deep root causes of conflict. However, economic and environmental issues become important in national security only in the context of the control over resources and market.

Table 1; *Security Paradigms and Control of Violence*

	National Security	Human Security
Control of War and other Physical Violence	Neo-realist paradigm which presupposes conflict to be inevitable between states Military strength in favor of superiority	Non-territorial, human-centered Safety of civilians in armed conflict; control of communal violence and crimes; nonviolent resolution of conflict Protection of individuals from arbitrary, unlawful acts by state, group or individuals
Economic and Social Concerns	Torture and other subjugation of human rights in the war on terrorism Maintenance of existing order for global commerce Market oriented approaches to social welfare	Humanitarian protection of displacement of people Balance between economic growth and the protection of the biosphere and natural habitat Meeting basic economic necessities to be compatible with human dignity, empowerment and autonomy

Human Security in Korea

Human security needs to be introduced as a strategy to protect vital freedoms and give people the building blocks of survival and dignity. Human security in a Korean context can be understood in terms of National Security Law, reduced military threats, economic well-being and ecological protection. A significant way to enhance conditions for human security in South Korea is to substantially revise or abolish the National Security Law, the single most important institution of subjugation of human security in the name of anti-communism. The arbitrary use of Article 7 of the law permits imprisonment of any individual praising or sympathizing with anti-state elements such as reading about "juche" or praising Kim Il Sung. The broad, ambiguous interpretation of the terms "praising or sympathizing" has led to countless human rights abuses. Thus a substantial revision or abolishment of the National Security Law with a separate criminal code to fill the void of security threats (i.e. terrorism) has to be undertaken both as a confidence building measure between South and North Korea and to eliminate state-sponsored human rights violations.

The attainment of human security in Korea through reduction in military threats is intricately linked to changes in political and military situations in East Asia, the origin and effects of the Cold War division and the subsequent establishment of two separate regimes in North and South Korea. The military build-up and modernization of the Chinese military, Taiwan issue and territorial disputes all preclude a positive atmosphere from promoting human security in the Korean peninsular. A formal, permanent multilateral forum that addresses these security issues has to be developed along with a strengthening civil society.

Reducing environmental degradation is central to human security since pollution,

overpopulation, global warming and destruction of the biosphere are transnational threats to people's livelihoods. The Korean War, subsequent establishment of military bases, US-South Korean military training, growth-oriented economic models and rapid pace of globalization all have contributed to deteriorating environmental conditions. An ecological security will ensure the preservation of the biosphere and its natural cycles for the health and livelihood of the current and future generations. Various environmental groups have demanded regulation of the use of land for protection of migratory and indigenous species.

The goal of human security has also been negatively affected by a growing global economic competition and disparities between different sectors of society. The re-establishment of pluralistic democratic institutions expanded political rights to organize opposition in 1987. However, global economic integration has brought many challenges to human security, as various external and internal factors prevented South Korea from quickly adapting to the competitive global market. Furthermore, the continuing military confrontation in the Korean peninsular did not help devote government funding to social welfare programs. Overcoming these challenges is essential to ensuring those under-privileged an opportunity to a life of dignity with empowerment and voice.

Economic welfare has also not been a primary concern due to the government's emphasis on the promotion of market forces. In some sectors especially with weak trade unions, workers have been paid much lower (You and Lee, 2000). The 1997 economic crisis in South Korea has brought into public debate concerns over the lack of social welfare with the creation of homeless people. The impact of the Asian Financial Crisis highlighted the lack of economic security in an era of rapid pace of globalization. In short, a viable economic security system has to be a part of the future discussion on human security to reduce human miseries.

National Security Law: Towards Substantial Revision or Abolishment

The National Security Law was enacted with the founding of Republic of Korea (ROK) in 1948 for control of anti-state activities. In reality, this regime security law curbed anti-state activities which included not just threats to the legitimacy of the government but also the democratic and labor movements. The existence of the National Security Law codified the division of Korea and embodied hostility and distrust between the two regimes. Amnesty International, who condemned this law as antiquated and a violation of international human rights standard, called for either a substantial amendment or complete abolishment. Past abuses include a publisher Lee Sang Kwan, jailed for publishing books about the lives of long-term political prisoners, and Ha Young Joon, a student who posted a socialist text on a computer bulletin board (Harrison, 2002). Recently, a sociology professor at Dongguk University was interrogated by the police agency because he described the Korean War as a war of reunification by North Koreans (Lee, 2005).

Article 2 and Article 7 of the law have been a constant source of contention. The inclusion of "non-government group claiming itself a government" in the category of anti-State group in Article 2 has been problematic because it implicitly states North Korea as an anti-State group. The political, social trend since Kim Dae Jung's Sunshine Policy, which advocates an engagement policy with North Korea, is in direct

contradiction with Article 2 of the law.

The infamous Article 7 of the law- any person praising, encouraging or siding with an anti-State organization shall be punished by imprisonment - allows for arbitrary imprisonment of any "anti-State" activities. The broad interpretation of the anti-state terminology provided an institutional mean of suppressing anyone opposed to the authoritarian regimes of Park Chung Hee and Chun Doo Hwan. Even during the civilian leadership, many were arrested for simply exercising their basic freedom such as reading a Karl Marx or joining organizations deemed pro-North.

The current debate between the conservatives and liberals/progressives on the National Security Law collides over whether to revise or abolish it. The Grand National Party (GNP), a conservative party, espouses revising the National Security Law in order to address human rights abuses but maintaining the core of the law by citing the inherent security threat from North Korea. For example, GNP has proposed to soften the ban prohibiting contacts with members of anti-state groups so that a simple praise does not constitute a crime. The crime of praise and encouragement will be renamed as a crime of instigation. The liberal factions within the ruling Uri Party have proposed to scrap the law and revise a criminal code to fill the possible legal vacuum arising from the abolition of the law (Korea Times, 2004).

The political stalemate in the National Assembly and confrontational nature of the debate with activists of both wings protesting constantly exemplifies the difficulty of reconciling both the traditional security threat and a desire to amend past hostilities towards national reintegration. A 2004 survey shows that while 48.3% of the population calls for a partial revision of the anti-communist law with its name and frameworks remaining unchanged, only 13.9 % of the population want the law unchanged and 7.8% support abolishing the law (Financial Times, 2004). A close to a majority of the population, therefore, understands the need to address the human rights abuses inherent in the law but remains ambivalent about giving up the traditional notion of security.

A substantial revision or abolishment of the national security law with a separate criminal code is a first step towards eliminating the legal framework conducive to human security violations. The main obstacle in resolving the national security law debate is the inherent structural hostility and distrust between South Korea and North Korea. The Korean War has embedded into the social consciousness the enemy images of North Korean which was overly reinforced and heightened during the authoritarian period. Thus the Cold War period allowed Park Chung Hee in the 1970s and Chun Doo Hwan in the early and mid-1980s to generate a state of fear to limit public debates about North Korea. The need to tighten and control freedom was rhetorically legitimatized as a vital part of national security, but such hideous acts in reality were undertaken as regime security.

Unfortunately, democratization of South Korea did not create a favorable landscape for a shift to human security. The limit on free discussion about North Korea continued even under the popularly elected civilian administrations of Kim Young Sam and Kim Dae Jung. The existence of National Security Law thus depicts the pervasiveness of Cold War politics on the Korean peninsula, and it is a major impediment to national reunification because North Korea is implicitly classified as an "anti-State" element.

Since the inception of the engagement policy with the historic June 15, 2000 summit, there has been a decline in the number of South Koreans imprisoned under the Article 7

of the law (Financial Times, 2004). The gradual erosion of the distrust between South and North Koreans bodes well for the possibility of future national reintegration. In short, resolving this matter is a crucial step towards ending the Cold War politics on the Korean peninsula and a confidence building measure necessary for national reunification. Human security cannot certainly be achieved with legitimatization of state dominant security policies through propaganda and coercion.

Towards Sustainable Environment

The Korean War, one of the first events that heralded the U.S.-Soviet confrontation since World War II, invariably caused environmental destruction on the peninsula, especially North Korea as it was bombarded by US air force. With the economic development along with the rapid integration into the global economy, capital accumulation, investment and growth were prioritized over environmental concerns.

Wars between and within states invariably cause environmental degradation that pales in comparison to pollution caused by economic activity (Wall, 2001). The Korean War produced such a result. In addition, joint military exercises such as the annual Team Spirit destructed natural habitats. The annual Team Spirit exercises are justified in the defense of South Korea from a North Korean invasion. Yet, the current engagement policy of South Korea is in complete odds with the Team Spirit exercises. Not only does the military training further reflect and cement the hostility between US and North Korea, the continuing emphasis on the military build-up in the guise of national security has precluded a discussion on the environmental damages. The impact of ecological damage caused by the presence of US military bases has also been ignored because the government sees the military alliance with the US as the utmost priority. Many environmental concerns rising from the presence of US military include noise pollution causing partial or complete hearing loss due to the military airfields, oil leaks contaminating underground water near Seoul, illegal dumping of toxic chemicals into the Han River and asbestos contamination in US military bases.

Environmental degradation has also been caused by a lack of reliable mechanisms of environmental protection. The passage of the Environmental Protection Law (1963) and establishment of Ministry of Health and Social Affairs (1967) responsible for pollution prevention was at best symbolic because there was not sufficient budget allocation for them. The emphasis on economic growth coincides with a low priority on environmental concerns; environmental degradation is a long term problem that cannot be felt in the short run. Today, the lack of strong pollution control measures has had a lasting detrimental impact on the people. Chronic respiratory ailments and the incidence of environmentally linked cancers are rising steadily; increasing air pollution produces acid rain; surface-water pollution is most critical where nation's freshwater and coastal water resources have been subject to moderate to high levels of municipal, agricultural and industrial contamination (Eder, 1996).

NGOs such as the Korean Federation for Environmental Movements have taken a large part in the education of the public. More government aid in the form of leadership training, financing, proper educational materials, facilities and distribution system is needed to create an environmentally friendly Korea (Lee, 2001). To prevent future disasters, the government and business along with civil society have taken proactive measures.

The reconstruction of North Korea cannot simply be based on economic development. It has to integrate policies that address both environmental concerns and economic development in order to guarantee a long-term quality of life. Economic growth without any concerns for the environment has tremendous economic cost in the long run. For example, in the 1960s and 1970s, the sewage treatment facilities were underdeveloped in South Korea due to government focus on industrialization and urbanization. With the inevitable rise of land prices, degradation of aquatic ecosystems and the difficulty in installing sewage treatment facilities after urban infrastructure, huge economic costs have been incurred in the last decade to install new sewage treatment facilities.

A joint North/South project of designating the DMZ as Korea's natural environmental heritage provides a rare opportunity for both Koreas to work and develop trust on an important national, biosphere matter. Current study points to the existence of a rich biodiversity in the area. The Civilian Control Zone (CCZ) flora of the DMZ (5 to 20 km wide buffer zone) includes 1170 vascular plants and the waterway supports 83 fish species, including 18 endemic species. Nine rare species of mammals inhabit the CCZ, including the black bear and the musk deer (Kim, 1997). This joint ecological venture will not only preserve a portion of Korea's natural habitat which has been largely destroyed during the war, but it also will preserve a historical heritage of Korea's beautiful, rich biosphere. In addition, this project will entrust South and North Koreans with a responsibility to work in concert for a united green Korea.

In brief, preservation of ecological balance and control of pollution are vital to the maintenance of quality of life and promoting peace in the Korean peninsular. Failure to protect nature from reckless economic projects and weak political commitment to environmental preservation would prove to be detrimental to the future generation's well-being. The adoption of sustainable development models oriented toward recovery of endangered species and land regulations as well as participation in efforts to control global warming should be an essential component of protecting the welfare of both the current and future generation of the population. The country also needs to take regional and international initiatives to control the destruction of marine eco-systems in its surrounding seas and air pollution caused by a rapidly industrializing China.

Economic Security

During the authoritarian period, not a lot of attention has been paid to economic inequity and disparities, since the government built its legitimacy in pro-growth economic policy over all other concerns. The military tension between South and North Korea gave Park Chung Hee and Chun Doo Hwan the justification for repressing workers' rights and abusing human rights. The establishment of Korean Central Intelligence Agency (KCIA) in 1961 became an institutional means of suppressing anyone perceived to be pro-communist or anti-government – often targeting labor leaders, radical students. To legitimize its rule, at the same time, Park's regime pursued economic growth with the creation of Economic Planning Board (1962) that facilitated heavy industrialization, infrastructural development and export-oriented light industrialization (Lie, 1998).

When a welfare system was introduced such as the Industrial Accident Insurance Act of 1963, it reflected the military regime's desire to legitimatize itself in the eyes of

the public. The insurance act initially only covered firms with over 500 or more employees in manufacturing and mining industries. In the first year of application, only 81,789 employees were covered – 1.05% of all employees at the time. The rationale behind this piecemeal initiative was to provide protection for those workers in the export-oriented industries, the engine of Korea's economic growth (Park, 1999). Similarly, the state health insurance initially covered workers in the larger firms and then expanded slowly. Even though laborers in large firms were relatively treated better, workers in middle and small firms were in a vulnerable position.

The state-business cronyism further prevented the rise of any viable trade unions. The only legal trade union, Federation of Korean Trade Unions (FKTU), was under the direct control of the government. Until 1997, the Trade Union Act prevented other unions from forming at one workplace, thus, ensuring government control of labor under FKTU and barring intervention in the workplace by third parties. Essentially, the Korean state's labor control had been repressive and anti-labor during the authoritarian period (Koo, 2002).

In the post Cold War era, the rapid pace of globalization has brought additional detrimental social ramifications to the Korean society. The 1997 Financial Crisis highlighted the lack of social protection and safety net in South Korean society: unemployment rate skyrocketed from 2.6% to 8.7% between 1997 to 1998; the poorest segments of the population were hit particularly hard; there was a downward leveling of income as the proportions in the lowest income group increased drastically; ideas such as the "collapse of the middle class" and the burst of the "psychological bubble", which in the past maintained a highly motivated and optimistic attitude on people's economic futures, were given credence (Chang, 1999).

Despite some optimistic forecast, the economic recovery since the crisis has not yet provided much relief to the poor and vulnerable segment of the population. According to the Ministry of Health and Welfare, more than seven million, 15% of the population, are currently categorized as living in poverty as a result of the protracted economic downturn, high unemployment and growing income disparities (Asia Pulse Limited, 2005). Many North Korean defectors in South Korea live amidst poverty and unemployment - 70% of them living off government welfare - as they face hardships adapting to a capitalist society (Korea Times, 2004). Many of the 330,000 foreign workers in South Korea, where 90% of them are unskilled workers and almost 80% are illegal, are exploited in the form of delayed payment of wages and compensation, extremely poor working conditions, industrial accidents and physical violence and sexual harassment by South Korean employers (Kim, 2004). One of the most deprived and neglected group is the 4.8 million disabled people, only fifty percent of whom received elementary education. Recently, two visually impaired subway riders were killed by an oncoming train after falling from the platform onto the track (Lee, 2004). These crude facts of life show that aggregate increase of GDP did not translate into individual protection and empowerment for the vulnerable.

The division of the two Koreas helped usher in more than two decades of authoritarian rule which cited the need for stability and protection against chaos produced by democracy and the threat of the communist North. In the name of national security, the governments prioritized economic growth to compete with North Korea which had a higher living standard until mid 1970s. A military coup d'etat in 1961 was legitimized at

the expense of workers' livelihood and dignity. Rapid pace of globalization further exacerbated economic security situation as the financial crisis hit Korea in 1997, and the state has been slow to address income disparities and discrimination against homeless and other marginalized people. Therefore, a realignment of economic development based on human needs has to emerge and be embedded in the society's social consciousness. Economic and social well-being also has to be advocated in North Korea which face starvation and a failed economic system that lack sufficient production of consumer goods.

From Negative Peace to Positive Peace

Post-Cold War period marks new forms of international violence as genocide, displacement of people and groups, spread of AIDS/HIV, poverty and violence by states and between states emerge, especially in the Southern hemisphere. Despite South Korea's democratization and economic development, Korea remains a unique case with the continuation of Cold War politics. The Korean War ended in a stalemate in 1953 with the subsequent signing of the armistice agreement between North Korea and China on one side and US-led United Nations on the other side. The end of war was followed by an arms race and the emergence of authoritarian rules.

The two states were often mirrors of each other until the democratic movements in the South overthrew the regime led by a former military general. Both regimes abused the power of the state extensively to suppress any anti-government movements. Countless number of human rights abuses was committed on both sides of the peninsula under the cloak of national security. The Cold War environment and the palpable military tension in the DMZ allowed both regimes to instill fear in the public rather than hope and "positive" peace.

Democratization and economic development of South Korea gave South Koreans more confidence and sympathy in dealing with its counterparts in the North. The June 15th, 2000 historic summit between President Kim Dae Jung and Chairman Kim Jong Il marked a new era of engagement between South and North Korea. Series of events later marred the historic summit, however: the newly elected President Bush in 2001 effectively dismissing the sunshine policy when Kim Dae Jung paid a visit to the White House and the North Korea's nuclear program coming to the headlines in late 2001. Despite these setbacks, the South Korean public perception of North Korea has drastically changed from hostility and fear towards sympathy and engagement.

The public perception shift does not, however, reflect the reality of the heavily fortified DMZ and the ongoing issue of nuclear proliferation on the Korean peninsula. North Korea presently stations 1.1 million active duty forces, 3,500 main battle tanks, 3,000 armored personnel carriers and light tanks and more than 12,000 large-bore artillery tubes (500 of its artillery can reach Seoul, 40km away, from their current positions). On the other side, South Korea maintains a military of 685,000 troops and deploys about 2,300 main battle tanks, 2,500 armored personnel carriers and light tanks, 5,000 light-bore artillery pieces, 538 combat aircraft, 115 attack helicopters, 39 major surface combatants in its navy and 20 submarines. The US stations two brigades comprising of 37,000 in South Korea and maintains a nuclear umbrella and vast air/navy superiority over North Korea (O'Hanlon and Mochizuki, 2003). In short, these remnants of the Cold War military confrontation are fundamental obstacles to achieving peace.

Therefore, a shift of paradigm is needed. Under the realist paradigm in international relations, states are in constant conflict and balance of power is the key strategic guidance in foreign policy. The liberal, internationalist paradigm focuses more on international economic interdependence, democratic peace theory and communication/information technology revolution creating a transnational social network of people. Yet, instead of focusing on power struggle between states or economic integration through trade which has abetted the growing gap between rich and poor countries, a more constructive and holistic paradigm emphasizing civilian security and sustainable development is necessary. What should be undertaken is an understanding and recognition that the national division of Korea has resulted in countless human security violations, and the division itself is a direct threat to the peace and stability of the region.

The new reconstruction of a nation needs to give an opportunity for human security. It is necessary to conclude a peace treaty between United States and North Korea/ China formalizing the end of the Korean War. Political and economic reconstruction of North Korea should be based on improvement in meeting basic necessities of the population. Conflict prevention needs to be institutionalized in terms of responding to territorial disputes and promoting disarmaments. Transnational network of civil society plays an important role in raising awareness and pressuring the government to undertake appropriate actions.

Transitioning from "negative" peace to "positive" peace can be achieved as the agenda for reunification is based on reintegration, solidarity, equal opportunity and compassion. In this environment, reconciliation between former adversaries can occur. Human security in Korea will be enhanced by changes in international relations. Korea and other Asian countries' historical grievances against Japanese occupation, territorial disputes such as Dokdo Islands and Senkaku/Diaoyo Islands, nuclear proliferation and arms race all have to be addressed bilaterally or in a formal regional forum to build up trust and confidence and, more importantly, implementation and enforcement mechanisms.

The security dilemma in the region can be attenuated as all regional players make their military programs transparent to other countries with the adoption of military strategies geared toward protection of human lives instead of strengthening capabilities to attack other countries. Human security is not easily achieved in light of Chinese military modernization, North Korea's nuclear programs, strengthened military ties between Japan and US. It will be necessary to develop a sustained transnational network of NGOs, universities, religious groups that can represent a conscious voice by shifting the old paradigm of state-centered security programs towards a constructive human security paradigm.

Conclusion

Ethnic, religious, class and sectarian tensions and divisions have continuously decimated human population. Human security has yet to be fully applied in the study of international relations on peace-building and nation-building. The Korean case provides a peculiar circumstance where obstacles to human security exist in the fields of law, environment, economic well-being and disarmament. The original sin of the political division has caused immeasurable human cost which involved gross violations of human rights.

The case of Korea provides useful, insightful guidelines to other countries on the path towards the development of post-industrial society. Transitioning from military confrontation to peaceful co-existence remains a challenging task for Korea without a proposal for disarmament and confidence building measures. Unless the tensions between economic growth and equity along with the protection of vulnerable ecological systems are sufficiently addressed and reconciled, the quality of human life will not be achieved. Both individual value changes and institutional transformation are necessary to develop social norms that support the ideas of human security.

References

Asia Pulse Limited, 2005. More than 15% of South Koreans Living in Poverty." August 11.

Barash, David P., and Charles Webel. 2002. *Peace and Conflict Studies*. London: Sage Publications.

Cha, Victor D., and David C. Kang. 2003. *Nuclear North Korea A Debate on Engagement Strategies*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Chang, Kyung Sup. 1999. "Social Ramifications of South Korea's Economic Fall: Neo-Liberal Antidote to Compressed Capitalist Industrialization." *Development and Society*, Vol. 28, No. 1, pp. 57-62.

Chung, Jae-Yong, and Richard J. R. Kirkby. 2002. *Political Economy of Development and Environment in Korea*. New York: Routledge.

Commission on Human Security. 2003. *Final Report* (http://www.humansecurity-chs.org/finalreport/).

Conteh-Morgan, Earl. 2005. "Peacebuilding and Human Security: A Constructive Perspective" and Laurie Calhoun's "Moral Personhood and Human Security." *International Journal of Peace Studies*, Vol. 10, No. 1, pp. 69-86.

Eder, Norman. 1996. *Poisoned Prosperity Development, Modernization, and the Environment in South Korea*. New York: East Gate Book.

Financial Times, 2004. "Number of Anti-communist Law Violators Drops Sharply." October 1.

Financial Times, 2004. "Half of S. Koreans Support Revision of Security Law: Poll." October 19.

Harrison, Selig. 2002. *Korean Endgame*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Jeong, Howon. 2000. *Peace and Conflict Studies*: *An Introduction*. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate.

Kim, Ke Chung. 1997. "Preserving Biodiversity in Korea's Demilitarized Zone." *American Association for the Advancement of Science*, Vol. 278, No. 5336, pp. 242-43.

Kim, Samuel S., ed. 2003. *Korea's Democratization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kim, Wang-Bae. 2004. "Migration of Foreign Workers into South Korea: From Periphery to Semi-Periphery in the Global Labor Market." *Asian Survey*, Vol. 44, No. 2, pp. 316-17.

Koo, Hagen. 2002. *Korean Society: Civil Society, Democracy and the State*. New York: Routledge.

Korea Times, 2004. "North Koreans Living in Poverty in South." October. 18.

Korea Times, 2004. "GNP Prepares for Softened National Security Law Revision." December 13.

Lee, Brian. 2005. "South Korean Professor Questioned over pro-North Column." *Chungang Ilbo*, September 3.

Lee, See-Jae. 2001. "Social Education for Environment and Environmental NGO in Korea." Catholic University of Korea.

Lee, Sun Young. 004. "Disabled Discontent Grows at Welfare Delays." *Korean Herald*, December 11.

Lee, Young-Kee, "Securing Stable Financial Resources for Sewage Treatment Facilities."

UNEP 8th GCSS/GMEF (http://www.unep.org/GC/GCSS-VIII/ROK.sanitation. pdf).

Lie, John. 1998. *Han Unbound*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Mearsheimer, John. 2001. *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*. New York, NY: Norton.

Nye, Joseph. 2003. *Understanding International Conflicts: An Introduction to Theory and History*. New York: Longman.

O'Hanlon, Michael E., and Mike Mochizuki. 2003. *Crisis on the Korean Peninsula*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Oh, John Kie-Chiang. 1999. *Korean Politics*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

"Outline of the Report on the Commission on Human Security," United Nations Commission on Human Security (http://www.humansecuritychs.org/finalreport/ Outlines/outline.pdf).

Park, Chan-Ung. 1999. "Economic Miracle for What? State and Workers' Health in South Korea." *New Solutions*, Vol. 9, No. 1, pp. 81-101.

You, Jong Il, and Ju-Ho Lee. 2000. "Economic and Social Consequences of Globalization: The Case of South Korea." New York, NY: Center for Economic Policy Analysis.