

THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION

FOREIGN POLICIES OF EMERGING-MARKET DEMOCRACIES: WHAT ROLE
FOR DEMOCRACY AND HUMAN RIGHTS?

Washington, D.C.

Friday, April 15, 2011

PANEL 6: SOUTH KOREA

Moderator:

KONGDAN (KATY) OH
Nonresident Senior Fellow, The Brookings Institution

Author:

CHAIBONG HAHM
Director, Asan Institute for Policy Studies

YOUNGSHIK BONG
Senior Researcher, Asan Institute for Policy Studies

Commentator:

SCOTT SNYDER
Director, Center for U.S.-Korea Policy, The Asia Foundation

* * * * *

PROCEEDINGS

MR. PICCONE: We're going to begin the next panel and then we'll break for lunch and hear from Samantha Power, but we're now going to turn to Republic of Korea and I want to introduce Katy Oh, who's a non-resident senior fellow with the Brookings Institution.

MS. OH: Thank you. Thank you. The Indonesian panel was a hard act to follow and Rizal's blunt and honesty as well as the sense of humor and Don's incredible brainpower, and I hope that my Korean younger brothers will really be a good team too.

My job is basically to be an elegant looking but very tough police call in terms of traffic and of time control. My nickname is "Ms. Punctuality", not "Ms. Congeniality", so particularly we lost already about seven minutes. Let me briefly introduce our distinguished speaker and discussant. Luckily, I know these two gentlemen very well, but there is one missing gentleman, coauthor Dr. Hahm. Due to his busy schedule, the director of the Asan Institute for Policy Studies cannot be here today, but Mr. Bong, Daniel, will be a great representative of their cause of the paper.

They have all the details here. Basically, they are the good brain and the hardworking scholar, and also maybe the real Koreanist, they look like Korean, they speak Korean, they are working in Korea, and so bringing the real insights from the region.

Discussant, Scott Snyder, I've known him for almost maybe nearing

two decades and he's been really the versatile person, prolific writer, and he's right near the corner at the Asia Foundation, so if you would like to know more about them, please Google them, and now let's start.

And I say, since the audience seems to be very bright and having lots of questions, I would like to ask them to be very precise with their time. Maybe Daniel, no more than 20 minutes and I'll give him some flack, and then maybe Scott about seven to nine minutes. So, Daniel, it's you.

MR. BONG: Thank you. All right, it's good to be here, Katy, and well, let me just start with one adage from conscious teaching that -- conscious said that you have to first clean your soul, then keep your house in order, then you are ready to govern the country, and then you can finally bring the peace to the world. In that regard, South Korea is just taking a baby step to just being able -- becoming able to keep its own house clean and in order and ready to move to support, the promotion of democratic values and human rights, but not there yet.

The key point of my presentation is that conditions that enable South Korea to emerge as a young democracy with a market economy is somewhat impeding its capacity to make contributions to the international project promoting democratic values and human rights.

For a long time, promotion of democracy to South Korea, democratic (inaudible) has long been primarily regarded as a domestic business. South Korea has been, until recently, very busy taking care of its own business. In the past the democratization or democratic values were synonymous with just

improving the quality of government or achieving the free and direct elections to restore the peoples' right to choose their own government.

And the human rights of justice are also regarded as domestic issues. It has been focused on prosecuting the ex-collaborators of the government, while rewarding or redressing the sacrifice made by the liberation army family members during the colonial period and redress the other injustice leveled upon social activists in anti-authoritarian government movement in '60s and '70s.

There are two notable examples that Korea supports for promoting human right values and democratic values were made at the international levels. One example is South Korea's demand for due compensation and apology by the Japanese government for forced labors and the (inaudible) of women during colonial period, and there was anti-American movement that erupted in 1990s and the earlier part of the new century addressing the US accountability for dumping toxic materials illegally in the Han River and the bombing exercise, and of course the protest of the acquittal of the two U.S. GIs who had been charged for extent manslaughter of two female young students during the military exercise in 2002.

But, as you can see, the target beneficiaries were -- remain -- were still Koreans themselves, not people in foreign countries. So, the underlying assumption remains the same, that implementing democracy has been largely regarded as the duty of hegemonic powers if it's made at international levels because only the major powers had a capacity to legitimize and institutionalize

liberal (inaudible) and a forward mechanism to control.

It has not been -- it wasn't a long time ago, I remember the publication date of Samuel S. Kim's volume, "Korea's Democratization" was 2003 and most of the chapters included in the volume were in (inaudible) casting very doubtful forecast about the future of democratic consolidation in South Korea. The prediction was that because of particularly a cultural and (inaudible) background, South Korea was not likely to succeed in democratic consolidation and the arrival of Asian financial crisis in 1997 and 1998 augmented such doubtful forecast, but today South Korea is included as one of the six countries representing the emerging market democracies.

My argument is that good governance and prosperity require stability and in that regard that rather than putting the important question in dichotomy, whether the U.S. influence on South Korea in security matters undercuts South Korea's potential to become democratized forcing it to remain as a garrison state, or whether U.S. influence has been promoting South Korea's democratic consolidation. Such a dichotomy is rather stale and not so meaningful to examine the rich aspects of South Korea's inroad toward young democracy and market economy.

So, the key point is the peculiar experience of South Korea, as a subject of the democratic imposition at the end of the Pacific War, with the occupation of the United States, is of very critical importance in understanding the potential -- internal capacity of South Korea as a potential contributor to this promotional democracy approach.

Let me just give you one anecdote that I heard during high school. My history teacher explained that in 5,000 years of Korean history, the foreign invasions and occupations were so numerous and frequent, that on average every four years South Korea experienced either foreign invasion or occupation. Think about it, it's as frequent as Olympic or World Cup soccer games. You can have a long-term perspective of economic development or good governance or political stability, so that incorporation of South Korea to the capitalist camp from the beginning of the Cold War in international politics has a significant influence on South Korea's gradual development as (inaudible).

I'm not saying that that incorporation was all peaches and cream, but you can't deny the other positive effect in terms of granting basic governance and political stability for South Korea.

Then the next question is why such democratization by imposition did not go away. Of course the other authoritarian regimes took advantage of the secured externality during the Cold War for personal gains and corruption, but at the same time they opportune a cost of choosing alternatives to that political institution and economic system was prohibitively high for even military authority leaders because nationalism did not just simply disappear at the end of the Pacific War in Northeast Asia, but Asian countries tried to realize the national minister's desires by different means from territorial acquisitions or military expansion usually by economic means, like Japan, Taiwan, and South Korea choosing capitalist path toward the same goal of nationalism, and they did not have the luxury to choose alternative path to realize their nationalism as their

communistic counterparts did, like communist China and North Korea.

So, even authoritarian leaders in South Korea had to keep economic development as a top priority for the country. So, such a political necessity helped prevent South Korean state from deteriorating into seeking predatory behavior and instead provided the conditions that gradually increased the state (inaudible) economic development as the foremost priority of state action. And the continued economic development nurtured the growth of middle class, which contributed to the eventual demise of the military authoritarianism 1980s.

The key development in recent history of democratic consolidation in South Korea is the leadership turnovers in the last three presidential elections which has broadened the ideological, regional, and generational spectra of democratic political participation. (Inaudible) province leaders was elected as a president, so it dissipated the appeal of regionalism and the election of (inaudible) government represented the arrival of the post-Korean War generation in politics and the inclusion of the liberal progressive faction in mainstream politics.

So, former victims during the authoritarian period became the (inaudible) makers at the heart of the government.

So, international justice was gradually improved and the Korea was ready to gain more capability to redress the external justice.

The base of democracy in South Korea is now broader than at any point in history and everybody has become kind of a stakeholder.

So, one peculiar aspect of South Korea gaining more internal capacity as a mature democracy is that the internal capacity doesn't necessarily completely translate into its capacity to contribute to external promotion of democracy. Here the security externalities in history come into play. One example is South Korea's extreme reluctance to contribute ODA to other countries, the reason being that helping North Korea with economic aid has been the top priority for South Korea, so South Korea has been hesitant to leave a chunk of its external assistance to other countries than North Korea.

And during the two liberal governments, South Korean government has been either abstained or, you know, walked away from the UN resolutions -- Human Rights Commissions resolution to vote to address the human rights violations inside North Korea. Their justification was that it was far more important to improve the general inter-Korean relations to give North Korea more room to engage in meaningful, political, and economic reform, and the Republic of Korean Human Rights Commission, which was established in 2001, stipulated the human rights situation inside North Korea would be outside the purview of its investigation in the name of respect of the sovereignty of North Korea, but it clashes with the Article III of the South Korean constitution that defines the entire population in both Korea as Korean nationals entitled to due protection of law -- of Korean constitution.

So, dealing with the peculiar internal historical legacy across the DMZ has been a major impediment to South Korean government to freely engage in this project of promotion of human rights and democratic values

abroad.

Let me conclude by pointing out the two recent developments that kind of help free the elbow room for South Korea to engage in democratic promotion overseas, one is the -- it's a disappointment with North Korea, and the other one is, it's a disappointment with China. The basic premise of the Sunshine Policy, the unilateral engagement policy toward North Korea, has been at maximum it will help transforming North Korea more akin to liberal polity and market economy. At minimum at least it will generate positive peace dividend in place of traditional military deterrence. Without resorting to traditional military deterrent, the argument goes that the Sunshine Policy will ensure the same benefit between two Koreas.

But recent accidents, the sinking of Cheonan battleship and the bombardment of Yeonpyeong Island that caused casualties of innocent civilians, really changed the public support for this vision of long-term engagement with North Korea. In addition -- that was also coupled with the shock of another case of heredity succession from Kim Jong-il to his son.

So, South Koreans, who are willing to give benefit of doubt to North Korea that North Korean politics and its system have to be understood, not by universal principles and logic, but through internal endogenous logics as a case in its own category, began to withdraw their support for engagement policy, a policy leaving North Korea as an exception to the general rule.

Another disappointment regards China. To the dismay to many South Koreans, China refused to join the international condemnation of North

Korea during these two provocations. That really changed the longstanding presumption of South Koreans' (inaudible) with China in 1992, that as long as both countries expand their economic interdependence and trade, their argument goes, then, that China will eventually be on the side of South Korea at least on conditional terms, but the benefit -- expected benefit of economic engagement failed to manifest during these two incidents and according to the annual survey conducted by my Asan Institute for Foreign Policy Studies, that in response to the question whether we have to be -- issue a strong statement accusing China for its non-action despite possible economic damage, 51 percent of South Koreans supported that claim before the Yeonpyeong bombardment incident, but after the Yeonpyeong incident, the support rate rose to 68 percent.

So, in conclusion, the security externality has been closely linked to South Korea's capacity and willingness to the promotion of democratic values and human rights abroad and the wild cards here are South Korea's relations with North Korea and China. When there is an increased convergence between its pursuit of national security interest and its support for these values, then South Korea can be more consistent and active in promoting this project of democratic promotion abroad, but South Korea is no exception as the previous panels repeatedly emphasized, it's a susceptibility to hypocrisy in balancing these two potentially conflicting aims.

Thank you.

MS. OH: Thank you. In terms of time management I give you A and now let's move to Scott. Scott, you can have a little bit generous time

because you may have a lot of things to say. Thank you.

MR. SNYDER: Well, and whatever I don't say, I'm sure that Katy will say as a supplement to my comments.

The last time I was on a panel that Katy moderated we were talking about the question of whether or not Korea was an emerging middle power, and the reason why I raise that is that there is a literature on emerging middle powers that really overlaps with this category of emerging markets democracies, and I think that one, you know, interesting aspect of that literature is related to the idea that middle powers have, as a distinctive, been able to contribute international public goods in some unique ways, but that emerging middle powers haven't necessarily performed up to that standard, and I think there's something very similar in the way that the prospectus for this conference has been written and it essentially focuses a lot on some of the same countries.

I agree with the core issues that Youngshik has laid out in terms of inhibitors to Korea being a more active promoter of democracy and human rights. I would kind of boil it down to Korea, for a variety of reasons, including its security position, its regional position, and its relationship with the United States, hasn't necessarily been able to look past its own situation to be engaged with the world up to now in ways that would really enable Korea to make those kinds of contributions, but at the same time, if you look at the countries that we've covered in this study, I think that you could argue that South Korea is the country that does have the closest foreign policy orientation to that of the United States, and that Korea may be the partner of the United States that is most well-suited to

be an effective promoter of democracy and human rights around the world, but having said that, I think that Korea's experience and the story that it would tell, tie democracy and development to each other in really inextricable ways, and so I think the way in which Korea is likely to be interested in telling and promoting that story is really through the lens of its development experience, not necessarily through the lens of the idea of maybe democracy promotion.

A couple of things that I just want to highlight, including a couple of things that are not in Youngshik's paper, but one of the, I think, factors that makes Korea interesting as a case that hasn't been mentioned, but I think is interesting to consider, is that Korea also has a kind of missionary impulse embedded within its society and in particular in the form of the influence of Christianity in Korea, and the reason why I raise that is because Korea's the second largest Christian missionary sending country in the world.

That doesn't necessarily make it a good promoter of democracy and human rights because, in fact, that external focus on -- or the external effects of those missionaries have also been contested within Korean society. As Korean missionaries have gotten themselves into trouble in various places, it's actually become an issue of contention in terms of perceptions among the Korean public, about the image that they are projecting, and so I would just highlight that as an interesting, in a way, footnote to this broader discussion.

I think that there's a paradox that Korea faces in its own region. I want to talk about a couple of the issues that Youngshik laid out. One is the fact that Korea is in this Northeast Asian region. If it were located anywhere else it

wouldn't face the same constraints that it does being in between China and Japan and also, you know, related to the ongoing conflict with North Korea. And this circumstance, I think, is peculiar because it means that Korea has not -- maybe perceives itself as more constrained in its own region than it does outside of its own region as one looks at questions of, you know, influence.

One of the factors that Youngshik goes into in great detail in the paper is really related to this preoccupation with North Korea, and the issues of human rights in North Korea, and the way that that has been such an active subject of public debate, and I would just note that, you know, one peculiarity of the Korean debate about human rights as it relates to North Korea is that the ideological positions in Korea and the ideological positions in Korea and the ideological positions of the outside world are kind of shifted in a way that I think makes it -- it constrains Korea's ability to extend beyond North Korea to consider this issue, and what I mean by that is that, you know, in South Korea it's really conservatives that have focused on human rights promotion in part as a vehicle by which to get at the potential change in the regime in North Korea, whereas the liberals have really been relatively silent on human rights in North Korea having been the leaders in trying to reach out to North Korea, and I think that that factor, the polarization domestically in South Korea, has also had a negative effect in terms of Korea's engaging in a discussion about democracy promotion and human rights abroad. And then I think another issue that's kind of interesting to look at is the issue of China and the kind of influence that Korea and China -- you know, that Korea has had in the context of China or the kind of discussion that

there is, and I think that here it's interesting that Korea has been very heavily economically engaged with China and that Korea has also had an influence, I think, in terms of Chinese perceptions. And what I'm really getting at is the influence of Korean pop culture in China and I think that part of the attraction there is precisely that Korean dramas are made in an atmosphere that is free compared to the Chinese-produced dramas.

And so I would just suggest that that, you know, issue of the relationship between China and Korea is interesting because at the same time that we see that influence, you know, within China, we also see that, I think, that China essentially, you know, basically fears the idea of being next to a democratic, reunified Korea. And so that's another, you know, interesting thing to consider.

And then I think the last thing that I'd like to put forward is really the question of a double-edged view of Korea in the outside world in some other developing countries where Korea could have influence. On the one hand you have Korea as a model for having succeeded in development, but on the other hand you have evidence of Korea as a -- or Korean companies as rather exploitive -- exploitive in terms of their own labor practices, and so you have that kind of double edged, you know, influence.

And so I would simply suggest that if Korea really wants to share its experience with democracy and development, it's most likely to be through its ODA channels, but if that's going to happen, I would also suggest that Korea would need to remake its approach to overseas development. Right now the

approach is more focused on the kind of development that's about infrastructure and capacity building and less on promoting good governance. And if Korea really wants to take its own experience and use that effectively to reach out to the world through its development experience, there's a variety of resources internally that Korea could rely on in order to be able to project that, but right now the system is not really configured to do so.

So, let me stop there.

MS. OH: Thank you. Thank you, Scott. I have not been involved in the organizing of this conference, but usually I had a privilege to receive the paper earlier and I really read it very carefully a couple of times, and just for the sake of maybe the revised version and the future proceedings of collection of these papers, my suggestion -- not exactly question, because we don't have time for a theoretical discussion here but reading this Hahm and Bong's paper, the fundamental question arises from my mind is that, so what is the model or models for the spread of democracy, that (inaudible) exclusively, and how does South Korea fit into this model? It's a very fundamental question and they have to address more logically, more clearly, and another thing is that it hit me very much is that after reading the paper, what makes a country an effective spreader of democracy?

And the paper started with the democracy usually by the hegemonic country like U.S. and western powers. In that case only the hegemonic can spread democracy rising more soft to medium great power, cultural power may have more efficient way to deliver maybe the democracy

more than the hegemonic concept, and I'm very glad that Scott mentioned Korean cultural pop operas and the pop music and all the soap operas that is now sold globally and if you go from Afghanistan to Australia, you may have 24 hour Al Jazeera and all these added on channels, and let me tell you, I've been really awoken by the phenomena of this Korean cultural product.

But after reading that the bottom line that I came up with from the paper is that the assumption of this paper is that the major qualification for spreading democracy is that you be a strong democracy, and I think that's a little bit weak, so I would like to add a couple of things.

There are three levels, dimensions of the way to look out, in a sense, how to be a promoter instead of imposition, how to promote that (inaudible) critical questions before. I think on the cultural level Korea -- Korea already is going through that dynamic promoting process, the Korean cultural product I am talking about, and people in (inaudible), people in Sri Lanka, people in Dakar, Bangladesh, poor, rich, when they see that this brilliant, sometimes very dynamic and interesting Korean cultural product, they raise this question, what kind of country is that? And then they try to distinguish between North Korea and South Korea.

The other thing is the so-called products of technical achievement. I was shocked one morning in Paris to describe about beautifully dressed, several hundred Parisian are standing in front of a beautiful building near (inaudible), and they were waiting for the Samsung electronic store to open up and then basically that raises question, what kind of country can have such an

incredible product? How did they achieve this?

And finally, again, Scott mentioned, so-called KoICA, Korea International Cooperation Agency, and now raise the value and the volume very much, and what about the half million Korean stand up in front of Japanese embassy for the tsunami donation? That is a powerful, powerful statement sending the message to the country like China and any other countries where there are lots of cash but don't do anything serious.

So, I think Korea is doing it without even pronouncing it and so that's my comment. I have a lot of things to ask and offer, but I think I should not be a dictator, so let me open the floor, and please identify your name clearly and then question please or comment.

Yes, the lady with the green scarf.

SPEAKER: Sorry to nitpick on semantics, but I guess it's a chicken or an egg question, but you said that the authoritarian regimes during the '50s, '60s, and '70s, had to fulfill the nationalistic ideals that weren't fulfilled during the period before, and in order to do that they had to go out and develop. But there is also scholarship on them using nationalistic ideals as the tool to manage and keep the mass under their control, you know, witnessed by the nationalistic contents and the history textbooks, and raising (inaudible) of national securers and such. So, if you could comment on that that would be great.

MR. BONG: Okay. Thanks for your question. What I was trying to emphasize was that even the military authoritarian government had to satisfy the urge in the public for nation building and modernization with some means and

basically the socialist path was not available because of the external imposition of the political conditions on South Korea as opposed to North Korea's situation geared toward socialist path. So, I don't deny that state means to -- effort to satisfy the nationalist endeavor in the public was not cost free.

There is a lot of disastrous outcomes coming out of that mobilization but the emphasis should be placed on what prevented such mass mobilization stay by and large in course (inaudible) that promotes gradual economic, you know, development and the political liberalization as opposed to the situation in the north.

MR. SNYDER: Yeah, this question actually touches on a point that I neglected to mention that I wanted to talk about and that is that right now the Korean government, as it thinks about promoting its own development experience, is really focused on the Samil Movement, which is really rural community-led development, but its heyday was the 1970s which was actually maybe the height of authoritarian repression in South Korea.

And so although Koreans by their own experience believe that that development experience created conditions under which it was possible for democracy -- for democratic transition to occur, in fact the conditions under which the model that they were promoting were successful were under an authoritarian context, and so I think this also is a kind of dilemma -- practical dilemma that Korea faces as it thinks about the relationship between development and democracy promotion.

MR. PLATTNER: Yes, Mark Plattner. Of all the countries we're

considering, I would say Korea, perhaps, is the one that's been closest to the United States, most clearly an ally. On the other hand it's also a country where anti-Americanism, at least periodically, seems to be at the forefront of certain foreign policy issues. I'm wondering if you could reflect on how that connects with Korea's attitude toward issues of human rights and democracy.

MS. OH: That's Dr. Bong's specialty, so --

MR. BONG: I'm not anti-American at all.

MS. OH: Not in this sense, not that one. He's the expert.

MR. BONG: Well, there were some pieces on South Korea being anti-American at the turn of the century and my conclusion is that Koreans, being anti-American, need to be seen as Koreans being American. What I mean by this is that it's South Korea's protest of the United States for its failure to uphold its democratic values and ideals in its foreign relations with South Korea as its ally, that it's not a pent up nationalist criticism of everything related to America, that's al-Qaeda's anti-Americanism, but South Korea's anti-Americanism has a very strong utility aspect.

It's when United States foreign policy imposes a direct threat to its national survival, for instance the Bush Doctrine, which declared regime changes in North Korea without duly taking into account the fear of catastrophe among South Koreans during the early 2000s, which the situation is quite similar to the West German citizens -- citizens in West Germany during the Reagan era staging the huge, massive protest against the installment of Pershing II missiles toward the Soviet Union.

So, anti-Americanism has a close link to the fear of entrapment among U.S. allies, including South Korea. There is no denial that South Korea's foreign policy is closely linked, as Scott mentioned, to its relations with United States as long as there is a direct military threat from the north and it's a geopolitical location. But at the same time South Koreans do not fool themselves that they have to court workable relations with China as a major trading partner, so that puts South Korea in a very difficult position.

For security it has to maintain good relations, partnership with United States, but for its economic future, you cannot upset China. So, it will be very interesting how South Korea can balance these two difficult agendas and participate in democratic promotion.

Maybe that's why -- Scott also addressed this point -- South Korean government has been more sanguine in making contributions to democratic promotion agendas outside Northeast Asia, like it dispatched in reconstruction troops in Afghanistan and Iraq, but it negotiated with Washington about delicate wording of possible redeployment of U.S. forces in South Korea in a possible emergency situation in Northeast Asia, not to upset China in any way.

MR. SNYDER: Well, I agree with everything that Youngshik said. I'm going to try to say it in a more simple way and also I think that there is a part of your question that maybe I can, you know, help with, and that's really related to, you know, first of all, anti-Americanism, I think, was a misnomer, really, in South Korea in 2000 to 2004, and if we look at the levels of Korean public support for the United States today it seems wildly out of sync with the reality.

But there are issues because of the alliance relationship that raised the question of, is South Korea best suited to pursue democracy promotion in coordination with the United States or separately from the United States? And so I think that's a fair issue to consider.

The other thing that I'd like to, you know, add, is that as you look at South Korean foreign policy, the value of values, I think, is assumed but it's not stressed, and system type does affect South Korean policy choices, but there really hasn't been a discussion in South Korean foreign policy debates about how to change system type up to now.

MR. GERSHMAN: Carl Gershman, NED. Youngshik, could you share with us your thinking, also the thinking in South Korea, on what would need to be done to -- in the big project for South Korea for democracy promotion, which is North Korea. You know, it's possible we don't know, but that regime may not last forever. And sooner or later, South Korea is going to be confronted with the challenge of rebuilding in North Korea and hopefully rebuilding in a democratic way.

Is there any thinking being given to this challenge in South Korea? And if so, could you basically outline it to us briefly?

MR. BONG: Well, this is just my personal observation, but the major difference that I recognize from the North Korea policy of the Lee Myung-bak government, different from the North Korean policy of previous -- his predecessor, is that the Lee government does not hide its commitment to devising the continuous plan assuming there's some emergency situation

possibly taking place inside North Korea. The turning point was the report of the ailment of the Kim Jong-il two years ago and the ensuing heredity succession of Kim Jong-un, his third son. So, rather than basing North Korea policy on the assumption that North Korea will be here to stay, the new line of North Korea policy or South Korea government emphasizes the need to secure basic political stability and the seed of reasonable governance inside North Korea.

I don't know how that outcome can be achieved, through multilateral means or unilateral means, that should be subject to debate between South Korea and other related parties, but the Lee government has been repeatedly emphasizing that the future scenario inside North Korea after the contingency should be made in line of market economy and liberal democracy. So, the basic blueprint has been laid by the initiative by the South Korean government.

MS. OH: I cannot resist to add a couple of points. I think Youngshik's darn right that the Lee government is not hiding any intention or showing what South Korea should do, but for the last ten years of Sunshine Policy, when I interviewed more than 300 defectors, they usually ask whether the room that I'm interviewing them is bugged by South Korean government (inaudible), so I said, no, maybe somebody else has bugged this room, and they said, who they are? Maybe American embassy because I go to American embassy (inaudible), and they said, please turn off the music, I will speak loudly.

What I'm saying here is that the Sunshine Policy, with all the good intentions, really distorted the South Korean fundamental issue of how to deal

with the North Korean issue. Basically all the North Koreans arriving in South Korea, they were going through the debriefing session saying that first of all, when you are going to the real society, Korean society, don't ever mention that Kim Jong-il is a bad guy. Number two, tell North Korea is reforming a good country, that we are coexisting peacefully for a while. I think that kind of pretense era is gone, and I think there is a deep awareness of South Korean policy elite and the practitioners of the policy and scholars of fundamentally thinking North Korea going with the nukes, provoking, only the unification is the last resolution.

Room is deadly silent and maybe everybody's hungry or -- shall we adjourn? And in that case I think I will take the dictatorship again. Let's give a good hand for these guys and have a nice day.

(Applause)

(Recess)

* * * * *

CERTIFICATE OF NOTARY PUBLIC

I, Carleton J. Anderson, III do hereby certify that the forgoing electronic file when originally transmitted was reduced to text at my direction; that said transcript is a true record of the proceedings therein referenced; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which these proceedings were taken; and, furthermore, that I am neither a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of this action.

/s/Carleton J. Anderson, III

Notary Public in and for the Commonwealth of Virginia

Commission No. 351998

Expires: November 30, 2012