



# BULLETIN

Embassy of D P R Korea in Abuja, Nigeria

5th September, 2018

---

---

## **Building a Peace Regime on the Korean Peninsula – An Urgent Demand of the Times-Kim Yong Guk, Director General of the Institute for Disarmament and Peace, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea**

Establishing a peace regime on the Korean peninsula is a historical task which brooks no further delay.

For the long period of 70 years since its founding, the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea(DPRK) has waged an arduous and unremitting struggle to ensure peace and security of the Korean Peninsula.

The painstaking efforts and great devotion made by the great leaders Comrades **Kim Il Sung** and **Kim Jong Il** to prevent war on the Korean Peninsula and realize national reunification, peace and prosperity will go down forever in the history of the DPRK together with its 70-year-long history.

Thanks to the respected Supreme Leader Comrade **Kim Jong Un**’s bold decisions and strong will to safeguard peace and energetic leadership, who is invariably carrying forward, from generation to generation, the lifetime wishes of the great leaders, epoch-making changes are taking place in the struggle to accomplish the cause of national reunification by relinking its broken vein and through realizing national unity, and to achieve peace and security, and prosperity of the Korean Peninsula.

Recalling the history of the struggle which our Republic has waged, since its foundation, to ensure peace and security on the Korean Peninsula, I present my paper on the need to build a peace regime on Korean peninsula at present, and the ways and means to realize it.

### **1) DPRK’s Efforts to Build a Regime for a Lasting and Durable Peace on the Korean Peninsula**

The struggle of the Workers’ Party of Korea and the government of the DPRK to build a lasting and stable peace regime on the Korean Peninsula began in the 1950s and 1960s, when they strived to replace the armistice agreement with a peace agreement, and continued into the 1970s and 1990s.

At the 3<sup>rd</sup> session of the 5<sup>th</sup> Supreme People’s Assembly of the DPRK held in March, Juche 63(1974), the great leader President **Kim Il Sung**, with a view to

ensuring peace on the Korean Peninsula, put forward an idea to send a letter to the US Congress in which we proposed to hold talks with the United States on concluding a peace agreement and withdrawing all foreign armed forces, and saw to it that vigorous external activities were made to have a resolution adopted in support of this proposal at the United Nations General Assembly.

At the 30<sup>th</sup> Session of the UN General Assembly held in October, Juche 64(1975), the DPRK-proposed resolution, “On turning the armistice into a durable peace in Korea and creating conditions conducive to accelerating independent reunification of Korea”, was adopted by an overwhelming majority; This was the fruition of the tireless struggle of our Republic to ensure peace and security on the Korean Peninsula.

Coinciding with the UN General Assembly, the DPRK government clarified once again the proposal to replace the Korean Armistice Agreement with a peace agreement, provided that the U.S. armed forces had withdrawn from south Korea.

However, in August, Juche 65(1976) the U.S., turning a blind eye to our just peace proposal, made Kissinger, the then Secretary of State, offer a counterproposal to hold the so-called “3-party talks” of the DPRK, the U.S. and south Korea.

In response, we convened a joint conference of the government, political parties and social organizations of the DPRK, when we put forward an epochal and important proposal to hold a 3-party talks of the DPRK, south Korea and the U.S., whereby a peace agreement be concluded between the DPRK and the U.S., and a non-aggression declaration adopted between the north and south of Korea to ensure peace and security on the Korean Peninsula.

Our proposal to hold a 3-party talks enjoyed warm welcome and support from many countries of the world; For only 9 months since its publication, thousands statements, speeches, solidarity letters and messages were made in support of the proposal in more than 130 countries and 20 international organizations throughout the world.

The efforts of our Party and government to establish a regime to ensure a lasting and durable peace on the Korean Peninsula continued into the 1990s; we put forward realistic proposals one after another, including the proposal made in April, Juche 83(1994) on establishing a new peace mechanism for preventing war and guaranteeing a durable peace on the Korean Peninsula, the proposal made in February, Juche 85(1996) on concluding a DPRK-U.S. provisional treaty, a more specified version of the previous one, and the proposal made in October, Juche 87(1998) on setting up a “3-party joint military organization” for easing of tensions on the Korean Peninsula .

Thanks to the proactive measures and positive efforts of the DPRK, the U.S. came to the table of negotiations with the DPRK; On 20<sup>th</sup> October, Juche 83(1994) President Clinton of the U.S. sent to the great leader Comrade **Kim Jong Il** a letter, in which he confirmed the will to implement to the letter the DPRK-U.S. Agreed Framework, and on the next day, 21<sup>st</sup> October, the DPRK-U.S. Agreed Framework for settling the nuclear issue was concluded.

In addition, We actively participated in the 4-party talks of the DPRK, the U.S., China and south Korea, which began in Juche 84(1995), for the purpose of creating a framework for peace and security on the Korean Peninsula at earliest date; In the talks, we raised as a key agenda the issue of concluding a DPRK-U.S. peace agreement and of withdrawal of the U.S. armed forces from south Korea, and worked hard to realize it.

In the new century, too, the DPRK government waged a resolute struggle to conclude a peace agreement with the U.S.

In October Juche 89(2000), as a special envoy of the great leader General **Kim Jong Il**, the 1<sup>st</sup> vice-chairman of the National Defense Commission of the DPRK paid a visit to the U.S., when the DPRK-U.S. Joint Communiqué was adopted and made public to the effect that the hostile relations between the DPRK and the U.S. be turned into normal state relations, and to this end, a peace agreement be concluded, and state relations developed between the two sides; This visit was an occasion to create an atmosphere favourable for building a peace regime.

Afterwards, the DPRK took part in the 6-party talks, at which we maintained strongly and consistently that the issue of concluding a peace agreement be held as a key agenda for realizing denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula.

“Declaration for Development of North-South Relations and Peace and Prosperity” which was adopted on 4<sup>th</sup> October, Juche 96(2007) stated clearly the need to put an end to the existing armistice mechanism and build a lasting peace mechanism.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the DPRK issued a statement on 11th January, Juche 99(2010), proposing to the signatories to the Korean Armistice Agreement to convene a meeting at the earliest possible date for the purpose of replacing the Armistice Agreement with a peace agreement; And at the 70<sup>th</sup> session of the UN General Assembly in Juche 104(2015), we reiterated our principled stand to conclude a peace agreement with the U.S. to replace the armistice agreement signed in Juche 42(1953).

The historic Panmunjom Declaration adopted on 27<sup>th</sup> April, 2018 also stated; “The north and the south agreed to declare the end of war this year, the 65th anniversary of the Armistice Agreement, replace the Armistice Agreement with a peace accord and actively promote the holding of north-south-U.S. tripartite or north-south-China-U.S. four-party talks for the building of durable and lasting peace mechanism.”

Since the adoption of the Armistice Agreement up till today, we have put forward different sorts of disarmament and peace proposals on more than 300 occasions to ensure peace on the Korean Peninsula; This fact alone clearly shows how sincerely our Party and government have endeavoured for the building of a lasting and stable peace regime on the Korean Peninsula.

The history of the struggle waged by the DPRK to bring about peace and security on the Korean Peninsula for over a half a century proves that a genuine peace cannot

be achieved on this land unless the hostilities and confrontation between the DPRK and the U.S. are terminated.

## **2) Building a Durable and Stable Peace Regime – A Task of the Times To be Addressed Urgently**

The respected Supreme Leader Comrade **Kim Jong Un** said as follows;

**“The peninsula remains in a state of temporary ceasefire, and the prevailing volatile situation threatens the existence and development of our fellow countrymen and hinders national reunification.”**

The Korean Peninsula has been placed for decades in an unstable state of ceasefire, which is the status of neither a war nor peace.

In March 2010, the U.S. weekly magazine “Newsweek” pointed out the Korean War as the longest among the successive 12 wars led or involved by the U.S. It mentioned that because a formal peace treaty was not concluded, the Korean War, strictly speaking, has been lasting for more than 60 years.

The armistice is, in essence, a temporary halt of hostilities between warring parties. Therefore, it doesn’t mean the termination of a war, and they cannot guarantee a durable peace by only keeping the armistice agreement.

An armistice which is effected through temporary agreements between the commanders-in-chief of the army doesn’t mean the peace between both warring sides. For this reason, in the past, the warring parties concluded peace agreements soon after concluding armistice agreements for the termination of war and durable peace.

The war history of all ages and countries also show that the temporary state of armistice lasted for merely a few months or some years at the maximum.

The Korean Armistice Agreement also stipulates clearly the articles calling for holding a political conference at a higher level within three months after the signing of the Armistice Agreement to take measures to recover the status of a peace; This proves that an armistice agreement is a transitional measure to prevent the recurrence of war till the conclusion of a peace agreement, leading to the establishment of a durable peace mechanism.

After conclusion of the Armistice Agreement, the DPRK government directed every possible measures to turn the state of armistice to a durable peace, but the U.S. blocked the advent of peace on the Korean Peninsula by deliberately and systematically violating the Armistice Agreement and destroying the armistice system established according to the Agreement.

In August 1953, when the ink of the signatures on the Armistice Agreement was yet to dry, the U.S. concluded the “mutual defense treaty” with south Korea, thus “legalizing” the permanent presence of the U.S. armed forces in south Korea; This was an open violation of Paragraph 60 of Article 4 of the Armistice Agreement which stipulates for the withdrawal of all foreign armed forces from Korea and the peaceful settlement of the Korean issue.

In addition, in October the same year, the U.S. unilaterally walked out of the venue of a preliminary talks held for convening a political conference of a higher level for the peaceful settlement of the Korean issue, and in April 1954 it deliberately ruptured the Geneva Conference convened for the settlement of Korean issue, thus totally blocked the implementation of Paragraph 60 of Article 4 of the Armistice Agreement.

Being not content with these, the U.S. systematically breached Paragraph 13 d which bans the introduction into Korea of all arms and equipment, Paragraph 23 of Article 2 related to the activities of the mechanism for monitoring and controlling military hostilities, and other relevant paragraphs of the Armistice Agreement which call for ceasing all hostilities against the other party.

The U.S. moves to totally scrap the Armistice Agreement reached an extreme phase when it let a “general” of the south Korean army having neither justification nor qualifications hold the post of a senior member of the “Military Armistice Commission” in Juche 89(1991) despite our strong opposition and protest.

After burying in history the Armistice Agreement, which was imperfect but still had the mission in name to deter wars, the U.S. turned the direction of its main strike in its strategy for world domination towards the Asia-Pacific region, while steadily revising and supplementing all sorts of scenarios of aggression against the DPRK including “OPLAN 5027” and “OPLAN 5030”, and for their implementation, massively reinforced latest destructive weapons. Thus the Korean peninsula, rather than being a military buffer zone, has turned into an area at the brink of war in which an accidental shot of an individual soldier can lead to a war, and the demilitarized zone(DMZ) has been converted into a heavily-armed zone.

These extremely dangerous and unstable security environment had persisted while the U.S. hostile policy towards the DPRK entered a more extremely dangerous phase, in which they intensified political isolation, nuclear threats and barbarous economic sanctions against the DPRK; It is against this background that the nuclear issue on the Korean Peninsula spawned.

The reality clearly shows that without building a regime to ensure lasting and stable peace on the Korean Peninsula, it is impossible to improve the relations between the DPRK and the U.S. and to realize denuclearization on the Korean Peninsula.

### **3) Adoption of War-End Declaration – First Process in Building a Lasting and Stable Peace Regime on the Korean Peninsula**

On 12 June, Juche107(2018), the first-ever DPRK-U.S. summit meeting and talks were held in Singapore, and a joint statement was adopted and made public.

In the Joint Statement, the DPRK and the U.S. committed to establish a new DPRK-U.S. relations in accordance with the desire of the peoples of the two countries for peace and prosperity and work together to build a lasting and stable peace regime on the Korean Peninsula.

The international society widely commented on the summit with one voice that “the DPRK-U.S. summit is a historical landmark in turning a war into a peace”, “the



DPRK-U.S. Joint Statement is the first measure to terminate the Korean War which is still going on since 1953, and that “if the U.S. side takes ‘genuine measures for confidence building,’ north Korea would also take ‘corresponding good-will measures’”, and so on.

The main key to ensuring full implementation of the DPRK-U.S. Joint Statement is to build confidence between the two sides.

This is because whether or not confidence would be built between the DPRK and the U.S. will determine whether the hostilities and confrontation between two sides would be terminated or not.

Historical experiences show that although excellent joint agreements of great political significance are concluded, it is natural that many problems would arise in their practical implementation under the situation of distrust in which neither side trusts the other.

This is a serious lesson and conclusion that we have drawn from the history of the DPRK-U.S. confrontation which has lasted for more than a half a century.

To successfully implement the DPRK-U.S. Joint Statement, it is essential to build confidence between the DPRK and the U.S., and a phased approach is also needed in which both sides address issues gradually one by one starting from the problems that they can resolve easily.

So far, in order to build confidence between the DPRK and the U.S. and to make active contributions to peace and security on the Korean Peninsula and in the world, we had the initiative in taking a series of good-will measures including suspension of nuclear test and ICBM test launch and dismantlement of nuclear test ground as well as the humanitarian steps of repatriating MIA remains.

The U.S. should respond positively to our good-will, and make concrete actions to show their firm will to implement the DPRK-U.S. Joint Statement.

On the issue of confidence-building between the DPRK and U.S., first of all, a declaration of ending the Korean War should be made, as the first process, to manifest the political will to establish the lasting and stable peace regime on the Korean Peninsula.

Concluding a peace agreement is a time-consuming process, because the hostile relations between the DPRK and U.S. were not created in a few days’ time, but have lasted long for centuries, and each other’s feelings of enmity and contradiction are deeply rooted, and there are piles of complicated problems which are difficult to solve.

Therefore, once there is a political will on the part of the parties concerned, it is reasonable to terminate the status of war by adopting a declaration on ending the Korean War, which is quite possible.

In fact, in the light of the spirit of the North-South summit in Panmunjom and the DPRK-U.S. summit, the issue of declaring termination of the Korean War must have already been solved.

Many countries in the world are expressing deep concern over the fact that this problem has not been settled yet.

It is our steady will to faithfully implement the DPRK-U.S. Joint Statement step by step while building confidence between the two sides upholding the intentions of the two leaders.

Therefore, the US should earnestly respond to our sincere efforts to build a lasting and stable peace regime on the Korean Peninsula in accordance with the spirit of the DPRK-U.S. Joint Statement.

**Posted on:** 2018-09-04

**Categories:** Statements

