

The Korean War: Forgotten No More

A Conference on the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Outbreak of the Korean War

Georgetown University
June 23-25, 2000

CONFERENCE REPORT

Sponsored by Korea University, the International Foundation for Korea University,
The Korea Society, and Georgetown University

The Korean War: Forgotten No More

A Conference on the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Outbreak of the Korean War

Georgetown University
June 23-25, 2000

Sponsored by Korea University, the International Foundation for Korea University,
The Korea Society, and Georgetown University

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD Donald P. Gregg	4
CONFERENCE AGENDA	5
CONFERENCE SUMMARY Donald N. Clark	9
ABOUT THE PRESENTERS	31
ABSTRACTS OF THE PRESENTATIONS	48
BIBLIOGRAPHY ON THE KOREAN WAR Vipan Chandra	66
Ordering Information	
PHOTOGRAPH	

Conference report edited by Frederick F. Carriere, Homer Williams and John Kim
The Korea Society, 950 Third Avenue, 8th Floor, New York, NY 10022
Email: korea.ny@koreasociety.org
www.koreasociety.org

FOREWORD

Doanld P. Gregg
President & Chairman
The Korea Society

The Korea Society has played a role in presenting two major conferences on the Korean War in recent years. The first conference, held on July 24th and 25th, 1995, was entitled “The Korean War, An Assessment of the Historical Record.” A major emphasis of that conference was an analysis of newly declassified material from the Kremlin archives that shed revealing light on the roles played by Stalin and Mao Zedong in starting, supporting and prolonging the war. The focus of that conference essentially was on political and military affairs.

In my foreword to the report on that conference I wrote “I know that the perspectives of history change with time, and that this conference does not place the Korean War in its final resting place. I am also confident, as new and more insightful perspectives on the Korean War are arrived at, that this report will be one of their foundations.”

Those words serve as an appropriate introduction to the second conference, called “The Korean War, Forgotten No More,” held five years later, June 22-25, 2000, on the fiftieth anniversary of the outbreak of the Korean War. The historical perspectives had changed markedly over those five years. The Pyongyang summit between President Kim Dae-jung and Chairman Kim Jong Il had just been held, offering hope, at long last, for an end to the Cold War divisions on the Korean Peninsula. On a far more negative note, the ongoing No Gun Ri investigation of alleged atrocities against Korean civilians by the U.S. Army in July 1950 was also very much on the mind of all conference participants.

These off-stage events provided a setting in which an effort was made to probe into new aspects of the war. Particular emphasis was placed on the war’s lasting impact on civilians, who had survived, but whose lives and perspectives had been changed by what they had seen and endured as brutal combat flowed around them, sometimes engulfing loved ones before their very eyes.

An effort was also made to show what North Korea has become, and how memories of the war, affect both the attitudes and behavior of that isolated country.

In my experience, I had never seen the Korean War so honestly and intensively discussed by such a wide range of participants. I believe that this conference has helped to place the Korean War in the broad, complex and open-ended context that is required if it is to be understood and effectively dealt with in terms of its continuing impact on America’s current policy options in Northeast Asia.

Professor Donald Clark has prepared this conference report. I extend my thanks to him, and to all the other participants who made the conference such a memorable and significant occasion.

CONFERENCE AGENDA

Friday, June 23

Welcoming Remarks

Robert L. Gallucci, Georgetown University)

Donald P. Gregg, The Korea Society

Sihak Henry Cho, The International Foundation for Korea University

Congratulatory Address

Jung Bae Kim, Korea University

Panel 1 *Background: The Korean War Revisited*

Chair: Bonnie B. C. Oh, Georgetown University

Occurrence at No Gun Ri Bridge: An Inquiry into the History and Memory of a Civil War

Bruce Cumings, University of Chicago

The Rationale for War in Korea

Kathryn Weathersby, The Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars

Korean War Studies Revisited: Third Wave and Beyond

In-Taek Hyun, Korea University

The Effects of the Korean War in the Context of the Cold War: A View

Through the Prism of the Vietnam War

Stanley Karnow, Pulitzer Prize Winning Journalist and Author

Panel 2 *War as Crucible: Development of Korean Nationalism and Identity*

Chair: Chae-jin Lee, Claremont-McKenna College

Chuch'e Ideology: Origins, Theory and Practice

B.C. Koh, University of Illinois at Chicago

Effects of the Korean War on the Social Structures of the Republic of Korea: A Sociological Analysis

Eui Hang Shin, University of South Carolina

The U.S. Bases in South Korea: Their Continuing Impact

Katharine H. S. Moon, Wellesley College

Changing Images of Americans in Korea

Donald N. Clark, Trinity University

Luncheon Keynote Address

The Shifting Korean Ideological Divide: From the Korean War to the Pyongyang Summit
Sung-Joo Han, Professor of Political Science and Director of the Ilmin
International Relations Institute, Korea University

Panel 3 *Concordant Discord: Reviving Suppressed Memories of the Korean War*

Chair: Donald P. Gregg, The Korea Society

The Trial of Sul Chungsik: Politics and the Ambiguity of Choice
Uchang Kim, Korea University

*Faithful Endurance of Families in Divided Korea: Social Devastation
and Cultural Strength*
Choong Soon Kim, University of Tennessee at Martin

The Korean War: Forgotten and Remembered
David R. McCann, Harvard University

A Land Covered with Sores: Poets of the Korean War Weeping Over Their Fatherland
Ji Moon Suh, Korea University

Panel 4 *Current Perspectives on the DPRK*

Chair: Don Oberdorfer, Johns Hopkins University

DPRK Relations with China, Russia and Japan
John Merrill, U.S. Department of State

U.S.-DPRK Relationship: Retrospect, Prospect and Policy Recommendation
Ok-Nim Chung, Brookings Institution

Fourteen Months North of the Parallel: Experiences and Reflections
Tibor Meray, Award Winning Author and Journalist

*Foreign Economic Policy Constraints of the DPRK in the Global Era:
A New Breed of Ideation?*
Han S. Park, University of Georgia

Evening Forum

The Tragedies of the Korean War: No-Gun-Ri
Donald P. Gregg, The Korea Society
Hong-Choo Hyun, Law Firm of Kim & Chang (Seoul)
Don Oberdorfer, Johns Hopkins University

Saturday, June 24

Panel 5 *U.S.-ROK Relations: Cost and Benefits of the Korean War*

Chair, Kyung-Won Kim, Institute of Social Sciences

The Korean War and the American Relationship with Korea
William Stueck, Jr., University of Georgia

Civil-Military Relations and Political Development in Korea
James R. Lilley, American Enterprise Institute

U.S. Priorities in the Cold War and Post-Cold War Eras
Ralph A. Cossa, Pacific Forum-CSIS

From Patron To Partner: U.S.-ROK Economic Relations, Past and Future
Marcus Noland, Institute for International Economics

Panel 6 *Korea and Her Neighbors: Future of the Korean Peninsula*
Chair: Nancy Bernkopf Tucker, Georgetown University

Optimistic Realism: Balancing Major Power Interests on the Korean Peninsula
Victor D. Cha, Georgetown University

ROK-Japanese-U.S. Relations: A Japanese Perspective
Ko Shioya, Bungei Shunju

Russia and the Future of the Korean Peninsula
Alexandre Y. Mansourov, Brookings Institution

Korea-China Relations: A Chinese View
Xiaoming Zhang, Peking University

U.S.-Korea Relations: A Korean Perspective
Kyong Soo Lho, Seoul National University

Luncheon Keynote Address

The Korean War and Its Unsettled Legacy
Hong Koo Lee, Ambassador of the Republic of Korea to the United States

Panel 7 *Reflections on the Long-term Impact of the Korean War*
Chair: Sihak Henry Cho, The International Foundation for Korea University

The Primary and Transgenerational Impact of the Korean War
Hesung Chun Koh, East Rock Institute

The Forgotten ROK Soldiers of the Korean War
John K. C. Oh, The Catholic University of America

Some Remembrances and Reflections About Korea: Before, During and After the War
Edward L. King, U.S. Senate Professional Staff Member (Ret.)

A Retrospective from the Trenches: The War from a Marine Lieutenant's Perspective

Bernard E. Trainor, Lieutenant General, USMC (Ret.)

Panel 8 *Conference Summary and Wrap Up*

Chair: Kyung-Won Kim, Institute of Social Sciences

Donald P. Gregg, The Korea Society

Sung-Joo Han, Korea University

Hong-Choo Hyun, Law Firm of Kim & Chang (Seoul)

David I. Steinberg, Georgetown University

Sunday, June 25

Wreath-laying Ceremony at Arlington National Cemetery

CONFERENCE SUMMARY

by
Donald Clark
Trinity University

About the Conference

During the half century since the outbreak of the Korean War, misunderstanding and confusion have often clouded discussions of the conflict, its origins, and its impact on the people of Korea and the nations that participated on both sides. On June 23-25, 2000, scholars, journalists, officials, and other experts on Korean affairs gathered at Georgetown University to consider the legacy of the war from many standpoints. The “Forgotten No More” theme of the conference was meant as an assertion that the events of the Korean War had meaning, and the tremendous sacrifices by those involved were not in vain. It was also a claim to better understanding and hope that a careful retrospective might offer wisdom for leaders in Korea and other countries whose interests lie in peaceful progress and transition on the Korean peninsula.

The conference took place against the backdrop of the dramatic news surrounding the visit of South Korean President Kim Dae-jung to meet with Chairman Kim Jong-il in P’yongyang, on June 13. The euphoria surrounding the North-South Summit influenced much of the discussion at the conference and spread the conferees’ attention across questions for the future as well as issues from the past. The fact that the summit appeared to have gone well was regarded with favor and even joy at the conference. Though there were appropriate cautionary notes, the events in P’yongyang added a second historical dimension to the conference—a sense of history in the making and a sense that the discussions might actually serve to influence changes for the better.

Most of the conference presenters prepared formal papers and submitted abstracts in advance for publication in the program. The papers were duplicated and distributed to conference attendees; however, presenters often departed from their texts to react to the recent events, sharing their expertise and perspectives for the future. Moreover, the familiar panel discussion format was enriched by continual conversations, among presenters and audience members, that occupied the entire weekend. These conversations occurred not only in the auditorium but also in the hallways, during coffee breaks and meals, at the hotel, and even on the bus en route to the ceremony at Arlington National Cemetery, which marked the end of the conference. Though they can hardly be captured in a report that is limited to what was said in the auditorium, it is these more informal interactions that made the conference such a valuable experience for everyone present.

Panel 1: Background: The Korean War Revisited

The conference began with a historical panel that examined several specific problems. The first was the fallout from the report of the massacre of civilians at Nogŭn-ri that broke out with an *AP* report on the front page of *The New York Times* in September 1999. Though the incident was well-known in Korea and not entirely new to Americans, the American public in general had

never confronted it. The 1999 news reports forced a high-level review of responsibility for the incident and why it had happened. In his written paper, **Bruce Cumings** pointed out the extreme difficulty encountered by Nogŭn-ri survivors and victims' relatives in obtaining attention and redress for the killings. He examined the psychology and responsibility of U.S. military leaders and soldiers on the ground in Korea in 1950, and he proposed Nogŭn-ri as an example of why "truth" is so questionable in the context of the war.

In his oral presentation, Cumings offered a wider context for his point about the fratricidal violence of the fighting during the early months of the war by providing examples of how American leaders in Korea had created conditions for violence in the Korean countryside and a perception of ordinary Koreans on the left as political enemies. He concluded by returning to the point that underlies his studies of the Korean War in general: to confine the idea of the Korean War to the interval of June 25, 1950–July 27, 1953, is an American construction that sanitizes the American role by excluding the part played by the United States in setting the stage and exacerbating the internal conflicts that grew out of the Japanese colonial experience in Korea.

Kathryn Weathersby's presentation looked at the communist side's motivations in the Korean War. She characterized the experience as a political/military tutorial for Kim Il-sung by the two greatest communist tutors, Josef Stalin and Mao Zedong. Kim's primary objective was unification; however, he realized that he could not achieve this without a combination of opportunity and support from Moscow and Beijing. The goal of reuniting or liberating all of Korea was never questioned by the communist side—it was assumed to be inevitable in a revolutionary sense, and their question was when it would occur.

Weathersby's second point was that the success of the North Korean invasion, while not preferable to a spontaneous uprising in the South against the Rhee government, depended on such a rebellion. Kim Il-sung badly overestimated his support in the South, assuming that the people there would choose socialism once U.S. forces had left Korea. In backing Kim's invasion, Stalin was thinking about "changes in the international environment" (i.e., the communist triumph in China) as proof of Asia's revolutionary strength and America's weakness and unwillingness to fight in Korea. Stalin instructed Kim to train elite attack units with Soviet help. The agreed-upon method was to concentrate North Korean forces at the 38th parallel; to make peaceful reunification proposals; and when North Korean peace initiatives were rejected, to attack swiftly, before the ROK and U.S. could gather an effective resistance. The plan did not envision fighting anyone but the South Koreans.

Though Stalin promised and provided material support for Kim's invasion, he did not promise direct intervention. Indeed, he was more willing to see Kim Il-sung evacuate North Korea in the fall of 1950 than to send Soviet troops to rescue the DPRK.

Hyun In-taek took the conference on a review of the historiography of the Korean War. In the first wave of historiography, an American-led "orthodox" view accused North Korea of outright aggression in keeping with a global effort by the socialist community to challenge democratic capitalism and test Western resolve. This was challenged by "revisionists" who argued that South Korean provocation (and sometimes even outright aggression) had been orchestrated and concealed by American defense interests. During this first wave, studies on the war in North and

South Korea were colored by politics and military interests, and they were also unknown outside Korea.

A second wave of studies encompassed the rise of revisionist theories and their critics in the 1970s and 80s. Central to this literature is the work of **Bruce Cumings**. It argues that the Korean War was an internal matter (a civil war growing out of distortions left by the colonial period), that its origins lie in the immediate aftermath of liberation, and that South Korea provoked the war. These constructions deeply affected Korean historians and called into question the legitimacy of the South Korean regime. Critics responded that revisionist interpretations used evidence selectively, that too much was made of left-wing activity in the South between 1945 and 1950, and that the Korean War was not merely an internecine struggle but a conflict highly aggravated by outsiders.

During the second wave, new documents came to light in Russia and China that clarified their roles in the war. It became possible to discern the degree of coordination among P'yongyang, Moscow and Beijing. Captured North Korean documents also shed light on motivations and decisions of the Kim Il-sung regime.

Since the waning of the Cold War, Korean War studies have continued to explore formerly inaccessible archives, making for highly-nuanced interpretations. For example, controversy still surrounds the dog-and-tail question of Stalin's influence on Kim Il-sung, and vice-versa, during the months prior to the North Korean invasion. The debate about motivations and calculations in the origins of the Korean War rages on, yet many other areas of analysis remain underdeveloped. There needs to be more examination of other issues such as the failure of preventive diplomacy and deterrence, the effectiveness of crisis management, and the role of individuals in decision making by the state.

Stanley Karnow contributed his perspective as a historian of American involvement in Vietnam, referring to the influence of American domestic politics on foreign policy and the problem of America's interest in Korea compared to America's global interests.

Karnow put Kim Il-sung's relationship with his communist allies into a broader context that included Ho Chi Minh's relationship to the Russians and Chinese. For example, at the 1954 Geneva Conference, the Soviets and Chinese made Ho Chi Minh accept the 17th parallel as a compromise to make it easier for them to deal with the West in other areas. The Korean experience seemed to constrain them from pressing harder for an immediate war of national liberation in Vietnam.

Meanwhile, as the Ngo Dinh Diem regime was taking hold in South Vietnam, the United States feared that Vietnam would turn into a repeat of Korea. This is why we trained the ARVN as a conventional army in the early 1960s. During his presidency, Lyndon B. Johnson was haunted by what had happened in Korea. He was reluctant to provoke the PRC into intervening on the other side; hence, bombing campaigns were limited to areas south of the 20th parallel. As it turned out, Mao Zedong was reluctant to intervene in Vietnam, for he was busy engineering the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution. Lin Piao's "Long Live the Victory of the People's War" speech in 1965 was China's way of saying, "Let people's liberation movements rely on themselves."

The Johnson Administration heard a different message and envisioned a nightmare scenario of Chinese stirring up wars throughout the Third World.

A central fact is that North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front were willing to take losses until the United States finally gave up or lost the war. For the United States, therefore, Korea actually turns out to have been somewhat successful, with events in the year 2000 suggesting more success than perhaps realized at the time.

In the Q & A session, the panelists and audience addressed issues in the presentations as follows:

In response to a question relating events in Vietnam to the Korean War era, **Stanley Karnow** explained that Ho Chi Minh had asked for international recognition in general. Tito offered it, and Ho rejected it because he didn't want to offend Stalin. Vietnamese Communists were very close to the CCCP during the mid 1950s and 60s. Those were seasons when the United States was worried about collusion among Communist nations worldwide. Those were also decision points, and under the circumstances there was a rational foundation for the way American strategists thought.

Karnow added that in Korea, Kim Il-sung was something of a “judo expert,” using the Soviets more than they were using him. Kim was busy manipulating the USSR and PRC to get maximum support from both sides. There were parallels with the refusals of Ho Chi Minh and the Americans to allow two separate Vietnamese states to be represented in the United Nations by separate delegations. Karnow ended by questioning the impact, or lack of impact, of Zhou Enlai's warning to the U.S. not to cross the 38th parallel in the summer of 1950.

Kathryn Weathersby responded that it was ironic for the Chinese to have made crossing the 38th parallel the contingency, when they had already said in May 1950 that they would intervene in Korea if necessary.

Noting that Hyun In-taek had said the Chinese Communist Party had a new border army in Manchuria at that time, **Rob Warne** wondered how the United States could have misunderstood its meaning.

Hyun In-taek's replied that South Korea had been unprepared for an outright attack; therefore, the North Koreans enjoyed great success in the beginning of the war. When the tables were turned, the decision to roll back Communism by invading North Korea was an American stratagem that belittled Chinese capabilities—a mistake as it turned out.

Alexandre Mansourov commented that he was struck at how the same documents could be read so differently by different researchers. Taking issue with Kathryn Weathersby, he argued that as Stalin's insecurity grew, he was more subject to manipulation by Kim Il-sung. The “changes in the international circumstances” that Weathersby mentioned were actually changes that weakened (not strengthened) the Soviet Union.

Tibor Meray also asked Weathersby about Stalin’s “international circumstances,” saying that Stalin was much more interested in Europe than he was in Asia. After victories in WWII, Stalin had suffered two severe setbacks—Berlin and Tito. He was not so interested in revolution and wars per se, as he was in *some kind of success*, and Korea looked like such a success.

Weathersby commented that Stalin was busy responding to events in Asia, and he took a number of actions. Recognizing the PRC and DRV, he urged support for the Japan Communist Party. Stalin saw the American adoption of NSC-48 (not to interfere in the Asian mainland) as a withdrawal. His forward policy in Asia was probably a counter to U.S. advances in Europe, but it was primarily aimed at the threat from Japan. His greatest concern in East Asia was a re-militarized Japan, and he always worried that Japan would threaten Russia in the Far East again.

An audience member reflected on **Bruce Cumings’** references to the U.S. civil war in the context of the Nogŭn-ri discussion and noted that people in the United States tend to dismiss the Nogŭn-ri incident as typical of war and nothing remarkable.

In a general response to this and other questions about Nogŭn-ri, Cumings pointed out that it takes great effort to recall conditions in Korea in 1950, as life was very different then. Yŏngdong County, where Nogŭn-ri is located, was a place where the People’s Committees (*inmin wiwŏnhoe*) continued to operate right up until 1950—meaning that there was an ongoing struggle over who was going to own the land and whether people were going to be able to organize unions of farmers and laborers. The Nogŭn-ri incident grew out of local conditions—rumors, reports and fears about the local people were in the minds of the Americans as they passed through the district.

Panel 2: War as Crucible: Development of Korean Nationalism and Identity

Panel Chair **Chae Jin Lee** opened with a response to **Rob Warne’s** question from the previous session, saying that General Douglas MacArthur and the Central Intelligence Agency knew about the Chinese assembly of 300,000 in Manchuria, but they failed to comprehend its significance for events in Korea. In response to **Stanley Karnow’s** question about Zhou Enlai’s warning, Lee noted that the Chinese prime minister had meant that China would not “stand idly by” if the 38th parallel was crossed by UN forces (meaning the Americans but not necessarily the South Koreans). However, the British diplomat passing this message to the U.S. appended his own editorial comment that the *Pannikar*, the Indian diplomat through whom Zhou had issued the warning, was regarded by the British as “usually not reliable,” thereby encouraging the Americans to dismiss the entire exchange as meaningless.

B.C. Koh began his paper on North Korean *juch’ŏ* ideology with some retrospective points. Thanks to Wada Haruki, we are able to realize how Kim Il-sung rose to prominence while he was under the protection of the Soviet Union and subordinate to Russian authority. At points during the Korean War, he was effectively subordinate to Peng Te-huai. Peng did not have a high opinion of Kim Il-sung, and the North Koreans reciprocated with coolness toward Peng. Admiral C. Turner Joy, the chief UN negotiator at P’anmunjom, noted that North Korean chief negotiator Nam Il was only the nominal chief.

Thus we can track the impulses that emerged in the *juch'e* idea all the way back to World War II and understand Kim Il-sung's need to assert his autonomous military/political/economic existence. *Juch'e* is the opposite of *sadae* ("serve the great"). It represents a world-view that teaches the North Koreans (1) that people are masters of their own destiny and their own success or failure is due to their own efforts; (2) that the supreme values to be pursued are independent sovereignty and national power (*minjok che'iljuui*); and (3) that ideational factors matter more than material factors.

Kim's *juch'e* ideology also sees social and political life as permanent, while biological life is ephemeral. Self-reliance in economy and military defense, therefore, is vital for national independence. Participants in the organic life of the whole contribute willpower and hard work, and together they uphold national sovereignty.

In terms of practice, North Korea has made many attempts to express *juch'e* via policy. Until recently, North Korea shunned the South as the antithesis of *juch'e*. Now it views dealing with the South as consistent with *juch'e* because such dealings enhance the viability of the North. *Juch'e* thus provides guidelines, but it's not a straitjacket, nor does it seem to impede pragmatism in P'yongyang.

Eui Hang Shin spoke about the impact of the Korean War era on Korean society in demographic respects such as mortality, fertility and forced migration. He surveyed the way the social and political circumstances created by the war era affected relations between the state and civil society, using National Security legislation through the years as a case study of the needs of the "strong state" taking precedence over civil liberties and human rights. He discussed the way the South Korean military emerged from the war area as the most disciplined and effective element in the South Korean state system and the inevitable emergence of the officer corps as the leading echelon of national politics. These circumstances militarized the national life of South Korea.

American backing for the military and the state structure of South Korea lent much inertia to the tendency to subordinate democratic development to requirements of national security. The emergence of military elites in government and the economy contributed to the persistence of American influence. It developed that the most powerful people in South Korea represented institutions that had been patterned originally on Japanese models but were being transformed into systems that were modeled on Western/American ones.

In the meantime, there were dramatic developments in Korean society such as family separations, interracial marriages, and overseas adoptions. American military bases, personnel, radio, and television introduced American culture on a wide scale. English lessons, the Peace Corps, movies, and imported products broadened the impact of America on Korean national life. All this happened in South Korea only, further shaping a half-nation in ways that will make it ever-harder to integrate a national culture. Even within South Korea, the war era and its aftermath have created regional inequities and conflicts that are very difficult to resolve.

Katharine H.S. Moon addressed aspects of human relations between Americans and Koreans that constitute a main part of the legacy of the Korean War. American-Korean relations are full

of paradoxes. For example, the U.S. helped stabilize and protect South Korea, creating opportunities for Korea to grow and prosper, while disregarding Korean sovereignty through terms of the Status of Forces Agreements (SOFA). A second contradiction might be the personal relations of American servicemen with Koreans as they helped out in orphanages and created a real exchange of culture with local people, as opposed to American soldiers who damaged Korean property and insulted Korean sensibilities. Moon cited servicemen who spent their own money to pay the debts of club hostesses and prostitutes and some who even married the women and brought them home to contribute to the enrichment of American social life, as opposed to those who abused Korean women—as in the notorious murder of Yun Kūmi by Private Kenneth Markle—and military husbands who have brought Korean wives home and kept them virtual prisoners in their marriages.

Moon noted that the rising tensions concerning American bases and service personnel in Korea comes with the perception that they are there no longer to protect the South but to position American power in an evolving East Asia, where the real issue is China's rise as a rival to the U.S. Korean discussions often refer to the need for better “trust” and “sincerity” in the U.S.-Korean relationship. For example, American investigations of the damage done by American bombing drills at Maehyang-ni seem to have been cursory and designed to exonerate the Americans. In cases like the investigation of the Nogūn-ri massacre, Koreans were outraged when an American Embassy officer was quoted as objecting to Korean press attacks on the U.S. but glossing over Korean atrocities in Vietnam.

It would be better to consider the emerging nuances of these critiques, and the fact that there is a spectrum of opinion and a diversity of participation in protests and criticisms among Koreans reflects a maturing public discourse in South Korea. Korean demands for renegotiation of the SOFA are certainly justified, and the blowback from the presence of so many American military personnel is an authentic problem that the United States should take seriously. There is also plenty of hypocrisy on the parts of both the U.S. and South Korean governments when it comes to the existence of camp towns and sex industries in the environs of American bases. Powerful establishment interests in the U.S.-South Korean relationship find the human cost of these features of the alliance to be perfectly acceptable, even though the costs are paid by relatively defenseless people. Demands for change should not surprise anyone.

Donald Clark's presentation contemplated various images of Americans in North and South Korea and how cultural and racial stereotypes have affected expectations about Americans on the Korean side. The Korean War obliterated whatever goodwill had been created in North Korea regarding the United States and the West from the days when American missionaries and Westerners in general had seemed to represent a positive alternative to Japanese-style modernization.

Clark reviewed how the U.S. military had shaped attitudes toward America in South Korea immediately after Liberation and how Americans developed habits of taking Koreans for granted. He pointed to four basic paradigms of opinion in South Korea toward the United States: (1) America as Korea's “historic helper;” (2) America as the “careless colossus” that affects Korea, often without being aware of the effects of its actions; (3) America as the “ailing giant,” a declining power whose defeats in Vietnam, helplessness to deal with terrorism, and its own

internal problems no longer merits Korean admiration; and (4) America as the “ruthless hegemon,” which has always sought to exploit and manipulate Korea and keep Koreans in a quasi-colonial state of being. He concluded by suggesting that with the role of American negotiators in the Agreed Framework process and the emerging North-South dialogue, perhaps the United States is starting to play a new part in the Korean drama, that of facilitator for the process of national reconciliation.

During the discussion period, the panelists and audience members made the following additional points:

Panel chairman **Chae Jin Lee** amplified **B.C. Koh’s** presentation by providing additional information about Kim Il-sung’s early education and experiences in China and his relationship with Chinese leaders.

An audience member asked whether the U.S. should give more support to change in the ongoing SOFA renegotiations, while another questioned the basis for change if it was driven mainly by Korean media coverage (often inflammatory) of crimes by American foreign personnel.

Katharine Moon answered that the American side wonders what’s really behind the Korean government’s demands for SOFA revision, since the U.S. already regards the agreement in Korea as the second most restrictive after Japan. The United States has a lot of experience with SOFA negotiations and is naturally pressing for the best possible terms. As for the media, it seems to her that the news in Korea is often misleading or incomplete. She agreed that there is a distortion that aggravates conflicts.

Panel 3: Concordant Discord: Reviving Suppressed Memories of the Korean War

Korean authorities tried to suppress information and expression about what had taken place during the war by manufacturing some of the “memory loss” that followed. Nowhere is this more evident than in the literature of Korean writers who chose to live in the north, a group collectively known as the *wolpukchakka*. The *wolpukchakka* were blacklisted in South Korea, their novels and essays were gathered up and destroyed, and their names were erased from the history of modern Korean literature. Their work continued to circulate underground, however, and with democratization in the late 1980s came a resurgence of interest in what they had to say. Anthologies of *wolpukchakka* literature were published, and the general public began to realize what was lost in the national conversation during the state-sponsored “organized forgetting” of their work.

Uchang Kim’s paper told the story of Sul Chungsik, one of the *wolpukchakka* during the Korean War. Sul was from a distinguished lineage in the northeastern province of Hamgyong pukto, and he was educated in the United States at Mt. Union College and Columbia University. He was thirty-three when Korea was liberated from Japan, and he wrote feverishly during the five years before the Korean War. He joined the Korean Writers League (*Choson munhakka tongmaeng*) and the Korean Communist Party.

As a youth in the 1930s, Sul Chungsik had written of the conflict between his native Confucian culture, which stressed self-cultivation, and the manifest need for activism to liberate Korea from Japanese colonial rule. After World War II, he wrote about the tragedy of a liberation in which Korea continued as a foreign-occupied semi-colony, dominated by former colonial collaborators whose vestigial Confucian values were being used as a cover while they pressed selfish agendas. Sul was appalled by the human suffering, economic distortion, and militarization of post-liberation Korea. He was outraged that freedom was being “postponed indefinitely,” while the dream of liberation was turning into the nightmare of civil war. His writings naturally offended the emerging elites of the Republic of Korea.

Uchang Kim stressed that we do not know enough about Sul Chungsik’s thinking during this period to evaluate his function as a prophetic voice in pre-1950 Korea, but he was not just a left-wing writer. National sovereignty was his passion, and he was as opposed to Soviet occupation as he was to an American one. Initially, he did not oppose to the U.S. Military Government, having welcomed the Americans as friends in 1945, but it soon became clear to him that the Americans cared little for Korea as such but saw it as a pawn in their world-wide contest with the Soviet Union, even if it meant guaranteeing a false “democratic order” in South Korea by installing collaborators and reactionaries in positions of power.

Sul Chungsik wrote in a spirit of *wonhan*, which Uchang Kim translated as “regret,” though it is a term with stronger meaning that signifies “vengeful thought or reproachful resentment against a person from whom one had a better expectation.” *Wonhan* was Sul Chungsik’s attitude toward the United States and toward the fact of liberation. His position seems commonplace in today’s Korea, but in the Korean War era it was forbidden to express such sentiments. His writing, together with other sources of political taint (associations with notorious Communists, membership in leftist organizations, and family ties to known Communists) caused him to leave the South in order to escape police harassment. He joined the North Korean Army during the war and served as their English interpreter in the P’anmunjom talks. In the end, he was betrayed by his American connection. Accused of being part of a group spying for the Americans, he was tried and executed in 1953. He was forty-one.

The organized forgetting of Sul Chungsik’s work by the state in South Korea has made it difficult to reconstruct the man’s life in its complexity, though to do so might help us understand the mix of confusion and lost hope that afflicted Korean politics in the late 1940s. Political fundamentalism continues to label him a leftist writer, but it is clear that he was deeply and sincerely Korean, gifted with an ability to express the *wonhan* that motivated so much of what happened during the Korean War era.

Kim Choong Soon spoke about Korea’s divided families, reflecting on the title of his own book on the subject matter, *Faithful Endurance*. He described Korean family dispersal and the rapturous reunions experienced by some of the divided families during the extraordinary 1983 national telethon whereby KBS viewers were matched with long-lost relatives across the country. Kim spoke of the power of filial piety in the maintenance of family consciousness across long decades of separation, and of continuity as an issue in the origins of family separation—namely, that many families in North Korea saw life in Korea as safer for the

existence of males who had to survive at all costs to perpetuate the family line. Hence, men migrated south, as did married couples, but few women went on their own.

Kim's paper offered a number of first-hand interviews with refugees who had fled to the south and were part of the long-deferred reunion process, examining their motives and their positions vis-à-vis their families and lineages. He also noted some of the complications growing out of the televised reunions, including the inadvertent discovery that people's spouses had remarried and started second families. He pointed out painful psychological adjustments that came with life-changing rediscovery of persons to whom people were suddenly and permanently tied again, and he concluded by proposing that all such issues are microcosms of the complexities that will attend any national reunion in the future.

David McCann reflected on the Korean War in the context of American politics, where it has always been constructed as an exercise in America's world-wide effort to contain Communism. That is what it means to many Americans who are unable to comprehend it as a Korean event. This partial understanding has made it easier to overlook—the "Forgotten War." Yet it was an event that shattered Korean life. Bruce Cumings was among the first to describe it as a civil war, and though this created controversy and enhanced understanding, many aspects of the war experience continue to be "forgotten," particularly as they affect Koreans. For example, the Cheju uprising of 1948, the memory of which was so long suppressed within South Korea, has emerged as a case study of an early episode in a war that clearly lasted for much more than the three years that are normally counted. The grievances that boiled over in the 1980 Kwangju uprising may also be seen as related, raising questions about our understanding of the forces that drive Korean national life even today.

What was the Korean War? When did it begin? What parallels may be discerned between Korean and American domestic history over the period of 1945-55? Do the parallels extend to earlier and later decades? Literature often expresses the longevity of grievances that have roots in events that have long been "forgotten."

In a reading of war poetry, **Suh Ji-moon** demonstrated McCann's point as she presented literary representations of injury and grievance going back many decades in the lives of the writers. In her abstract, she discussed the "eclipse" of the Korean War as a topic by studies that went further back, to the colonial period. Her presentation, however, focused on the poetry of conflict with brotherhood that epitomizes the Korean War experience in literature. She presented the work of two poets in particular, Yu Ch'i-hwan and Cho Chi-hun, writers whose style is stark and free of many of the flourishes and artifices that complicate much of the war poetry that has been penned since the 1960s. Their impact derives from their eyewitness quality and simplicity, which create an intimacy with the war experience that the reader can feel.

A third poet, Yu Ch'un-do, a woman in medical school when the war broke out, wrote poetry that represented the war itself as the embodiment of evil. Empathizing with wounded soldiers in a Korean People's Army field hospital, Yu Ch'un-do's poems carry a bitter anti-American message, but they also recall the suffering of women and the way they are affected by war. They suffer as helpless noncombatants, as special targets of foreign soldiers, and as young widows whose futures lie in shreds.

As an expert translator of Korean literature into English, Suh was able to communicate to the conference some of the raw power of these Korean War poems. Some of the poetry looks to the smallest things as signs of humanity and hope. There are ironic, or even romantic, poems about nature's beauty amid the horrors of the fighting. As Suh said at the end of her presentation, "Korea's survival owes entirely to people having held on to that fragile hope."

Panel 4: Current Perspectives on the DPRK

Don Oberdorfer introduced the panel and pointed to the great currency of the topic. He presented some questions that he characterized as a pop quiz for the panelists: What was Kim Jong-il's motivation for staging the summit as he did? Will the two sides really make progress? What will be the lasting effect of the summit, and how will its results be implemented?

John Merrill started out by giving credit to both Kim Dae-jung and Kim Jong-il. Merrill felt that the South Koreans have shifted their view over time to think of Kim Jong-il as someone in charge and capable of conducting business with the south. Kim Jong-il, while he didn't want to deal with Kim Young-sam after the condolence issue, gave signs that he was ready to reengage with Kim Dae-jung. In response to Oberdorfer's pop quiz, Merrill commented that North Korea has made several runs at tentative reforms, but each time they've pulled back from actually doing so. This time, however, there are more possibilities and more hopeful signs for success.

In her paper, **Chung Ok-nim** recalled that during the Cold War the U.S.-North Korean non-relationship was a basic foundation of the U.S.-ROK alliance, and it also served the purposes of the South Korean regime. The North Koreans have succeeded in undermining the foundation by forcing open a dialogue with the United States, and also Japan. Though the U.S. and Japan have been slow to engage North Korea under Kim Jong-il, the North is trying to speed things up. Kim Jong-il might be playing for economic gains, ways to exert influence on American electoral politics, or perhaps even a bold achievement to mark his upcoming sixtieth birthday.

Will Kim Jong-il succeed? Chung thought he might in the short run. It seems clear that he is tired of being known as the dictator of a rogue state, but he also needs infrastructure and development aid from the south. In the long run, the thaw with North Korea is South Korea's success—the success of Kim Dae-jung. There are many in the South who hope that North Korea has bitten the "poisoned part of the carrot."

What about the future? There are possible pitfalls. Reinforcing Kim Jong-il's safety net means strengthening North Korea's dictatorship. In the south, where politics are relatively volatile, ideological change could alter the scenario. Chung thought that it would be a long time before North Korea changes regimes or South Korea achieves a successful penetration of the North Korean system.

Kim Jong-il seems to have understood the dangers of his isolation and has embarked on a strategy to reorganize his relations with the outside world. Will he succeed in giving as little as possible and getting as much as he can for it? Knowing the West, **Tibor Meray** said he probably

will. Meray added that in the short run, Kim obviously wants to save his system; in the long run, it's less likely that anyone can devise a system where power is shared. Dictatorships are solid as long as they stay dictatorships. The problem comes for them when they try to evolve or liberalize, as has often been the case lately. According to Meray, we don't need to watch North Korea's external relations as much as circumstances within North Korea. If there is change there, it will be significant; otherwise, it's just a political game.

Han Shik Park was in North Korea when Kim Dae-jung proposed the summit with Kim Jong-il. North Koreans responded with calculated acceptance. According to Park, their motivation was not to trick the world with peaceful words as they prepared for war, not to give signs that they were embracing wholesale reform or giving up their system, not to put the performing ability of Kim Jong-il on display, not even to extort economic advantages from South Korea. Rather they were working on winning the "legitimacy war" with South Korea. It's important to remember who invited whom to the summit, and who is traveling where. This has been done before, as when Kim Ku went to P'yongyang in 1948 to discuss unification and ended up in a subordinate position during the talks. In 2000, people noticed that Kim Dae-jung met Kim Jong-il under a great portrait of Kim Il-sung and his son. As far as symbols are concerned, the South Korean president appeared outranked.

Are such ploys effective? Has the north "won," while the south has "lost?" The communiqué accepted the *juch'e* idea, the confederacy idea, release of political prisoners by South Korea, exchanges of citizens, and a Kim Jong-il visit to Seoul. Park felt that none of this hurt Seoul, and it was rather successful for the Sunshine Policy. There will be many useful changes; however, the important dynamic is within, not between, each of the two systems. Disagreements between political factions on each side will cause considerable political pain, and in the long run, these struggles could prove more than painful—they could be dangerous.

During the discussion period, one panelist questioned **Han Shik Park's** stress on the north-south contest for legitimacy. The panelist saw the scenes in P'yongyang during the summit as extraordinary gestures of recognition toward the Seoul government and added that we should be cautious about communicating what we might inwardly hope for North Korea's demise, because they'll pull back if they lose faith in the process.

Chung Ok-nim said that as long as the progress is cautious and methodical, the policy of engaging North Korea is the "least bad" option for South Korea.

Han Shik Park added that North Korea has proven its capacity for tolerating economic pain, but what the regime can't afford to lose is its legitimacy. It cannot tolerate proof that South Korea is better at system maintenance and distributive justice. They'll try to find their legitimacy on grounds of ideology, and when they find their legitimacy being threatened on other grounds, they'll pull back.

Don Oberdorfer recalled a conversation he had with Hwang Jang-yop about the summit that Kim Il-sung had planned before his death in 1994. Hwang explained that the time was right

because (1) there was a reduced danger of war; (2) the South might come across with some money; and (3) public opinion about North Korea would improve in the south.

Will Kim Jong-il succeed at his father's plan? Oberdorfer felt in the short run, yes and maybe (but only maybe) in the long run. More to the point, they need some kind of economic reform in order to survive at all. Meanwhile, "unification" is whatever the two sides can agree on. There seems to have been some narrowing of differences at the P'yongyang summit. He no longer saw the possibility of a takeover scenario but rather some kind of confederal arrangement. Unification is important to North Korea but not at all costs and not on South Korea's terms.

Finally, Oberdorfer discussed some issues that he saw as myths. It's a myth that North Korea has given up on the U.S., which is more important to them than the PRC and Russia. He also discounted the theory that the region is returning to an early 20th century-type balance of power consisting of South Korea/Japan/U.S. on one side and North Korea/China/Russia on the other.

Special Presentation by Tibor Meray Fourteen Months North of the Parallel: Experiences and Reflections

In one of the highlights of the conference, award winning author and journalist Tibor Meray told the tale of his experience in North Korea during the Korean War. Assigned to cover the armistice talks in Kaesong for the communist daily *Szabad Nep* ("Free People"), Meray left his native Hungary for North Korea in 1951. What first struck him upon arrival was the "utter devastation" caused by the war. Having witnessed the atrocities of World War II did not prepare him for the total destruction he saw in a country that "had ceased to exist...a world of smoking shacks, bomb-craters, torn up tramway tracks, wrenched-out trees, and corpses, corpses and more corpses." The majority of the corpses were those of women, children and the elderly; the corpses of soldiers were an insignificant minority. Even with the high stakes involved, was it reasonable or justifiable to wage quasi-total warfare in that manner?

Meray later discussed the connection between war and the manipulation of truth. The two have always gone together, and it was in the twentieth century that the term "psychological warfare" came to be. The Korean War was no different, and perhaps the biggest fabrication of this war was that of North Korea claiming the U.S. had used germ warfare [His paper on this topic has been reprinted as an article, "Germ Warfare: Memories and Reflections," *The Korea Society Quarterly* (Fall 2000), pp. 10-11 and 44-45]. Being the first correspondent from the West permitted to visit a prisoner camp in North Korea, Meray was shown a sugarcoated exhibition that did not reflect the torture, starving and suffering that really occurred there. Only years after his account of these POW camps were reported to the world, did Meray realize that he had been greatly misled and used. However, he made it very clear that dishonesty existed on both sides.

Finally, Meray pointed out how the Korean War was unique. It was a turning point in that for the first time, there was never an official declaration of war. Since then, there have been no such declarations, even though there have been a number of wars. The most distinctive aspect of the Korean War is that it was the first war that ended without a clear victory. A "shrinking back from total war" occurred here and carried over into Vietnam. Even though the U.S. and its allies had

“immense superiority” in a war against a dictator, the dictator remained. This later occurred in Kuwait and Kosovo. Is the stronger party simply content to slow down the enemy and wait for his eventual fall? Is that worth the amount of sacrifice? While we think of answers to these questions, Kim Il-sung’s son, Saddam Hussein, and Milosevic remain in power.

Evening Forum

The Tragedies of the Korean War: Nogŭn-ri

Journalist **Don Oberdorfer**, Ambassadors **Hyun Hong-Choo** and **Donald P. Gregg** participated in a discussion of the Nogŭn-ri investigation and its implications for U.S.-Korean relations. All three were advisors to the inquiries being conducted by the U.S. Department of Defense and the ROK Ministry of National Defense, and they were completely familiar with the documentation available along with the nature and direction of the investigations. The three panelists had thought the investigations would have been finished before the conference. However, since the investigations were continuing at that time, they were speaking as participants but were not in a position to pre-judge the results.

Ambassador Hyun Hong-Choo spoke of the way the story had developed. Though there had been widespread knowledge of an incident at Nogŭn-ri in which American soldiers had killed a large number of Koreans who turned out to be unarmed refugees, it had taken a major news service (*AP*) and newspaper (*The New York Times*) to elevate the incident to the status of real news. Hyun cited the political sensitivity of the issue in several respects. First was the problem of precedence—incidents of this sort, however regrettable, are sufficiently typical of modern warfare, and special arrangements for compensation, etc., for Nogŭn-ri might pose problems in the future. Second was the fact that the story itself was a sign of increased press freedom in Korea, and a correct understanding of what had happened and who was responsible was likely to emerge through the workings of a free press in a newly democratic South Korea. He added that the story was in danger of being distorted as different versions of it evolved during repeated questionings of the villagers. Ambassador Hyun ended by saying that Korea has legal mechanisms for individuals to bring claims into court for proper compensation, and these processes ought to be the victims’ best remedy.

Ambassador Donald Gregg gave his own observations about the quality and professionalism of the investigations by the two governments and the sincerity of those involved in seeking the truth about Nogŭn-ri. He noted that times have changed, and one reason the investigation has been so long in coming is that governments are now holding themselves to higher standards, even in warfare.

Don Oberdorfer addressed the belated discovery of Nogŭn-ri as “news,” noting that an account of it had appeared in English as early as 1991, in **Bruce Cumings’s** second volume. Oberdorfer pondered the fact that previous massacres of civilians in wartime, at least by the standards of the 1940s and 50s, were not seen as extraordinary as what is now being made of the incident at Nogŭn-ri. As horrific as it was, it remains typical of modern warfare. The way the Nogŭn-ri story broke and the way it has developed, forcing people to confront it and make judgments, is newsworthy in itself. The extension of the massacre into a comment about the nature of

American fighting men is unfair, and it is natural enough for American Korean War veterans to resist and resent the painting of American troops as killers of civilians, in his view.

A searching discussion followed the three presentations, as members of the audience raised issues about the behavior of Korean troops in Vietnam, along with other instances of atrocities in Korea, including the United Nations troops' massacre of civilians at Sinch'on-ni.

Former Foreign Minister Han Sung-joo recalled his visit to Vietnam in 1994, his attempt to acknowledge the violence between Korean troops and Vietnamese civilians, and how the report of his "apology" had caused a furor in the Korean press. He added that President Kim Dae-jung's more recent visit to Vietnam, during which he expressed similar regrets, had caused no such reaction back home, perhaps constituting a sign of a more mature political atmosphere in Korea.

Ambassador Gregg raised the issue of the likely psychological state of the Americans in the Nogun-ri incident by recalling the Japanese-American soldier who, when belatedly awarded a Congressional Medal of Honor for killing twelve Germans in WWII, answered that his "heroism" had actually been nothing more than "road rage" in today's parlance. Gregg finished by saying that times and standards change, and the honest and decent impulses behind the current effort to find the truth are signs of what's right with both sides today.

Panel 5: U.S.-ROK Relations: Cost and Benefits of the Korean War

Wars do not easily yield cost-benefit analyses, and the topic of this panel did not confine the presenters to literal facts and figures. Rather, it illuminated aspects of the entanglement of the United States in Korea since the second world war in terms of commitment to South Korea, the preeminence of military factors in U.S. relations with Korea and interests on the Korean peninsula, and lingering problems in U.S. trade with South Korea.

In the first paper of the morning, **William Stueck** discussed the origins of what is sometimes called "an alliance forged in blood." He began with a review of U.S. relations with Syngman Rhee's government on the eve of the Korean War and the apparent lack of a firm commitment to the ROK in early 1950. By the end of the war, Rhee had succeeded in obtaining a mutual security treaty with the U.S.; this was his price for agreeing to the armistice.

The war had also altered U.S. influence on internal Korean politics. In 1952 Rhee had to resort to constitutional manipulation and martial law to effect his reelection. Stueck referred to the ROK Army's offer to take Rhee into custody and Washington's resistance of the temptation to get rid of him. In subsequent episodes, the U.S. consolidated its policy of maintaining stability in Korea by supporting the existing regime. In the coups of 1961 and 1980, security interests also trumped democratic development, as the U.S. declined to intervene in cases where the ROK military did not take charge of the political system.

In the economic sphere, the U.S. consistently provided the aid necessary to sustain the South Korean economy after the Korean War. Stueck did not see this as a healthy relationship because

he felt that the ROK gained leverage on the U.S., and the more committed the U.S. became, the more leverage it gave up.

Former Ambassador James Lilley then spoke on American military-civil relations. He started with the MacArthur-Truman confrontation in 1951 as an episode that defended the principle of civilian control but led to the phenomenon of limited war, setting the stage for the future of civil-military relations in the United States.

In the aftermath of the war, Ambassador Ellis O. Briggs faced Generals James A. Van Fleet and Mark Clark, the latter in Tokyo as head of the Far Eastern Command. Briggs objected to rogue operations in the war and saw the establishment of military operations as a Pentagon fiefdom with no input from other elements such as the American Embassy. Control of the military in Korea was rather confused. General Mark Clark controlled transport, housing, etc., which he handed out like patronage, causing Briggs to appeal to Ambassador Robert Murphy in Tokyo. When Murphy demurred, Briggs began using Rhee, and Rhee supported Briggs in symbolic ways.

Jumping ahead to the Kwangju uprising of 1980, Lilley reminded everyone to recall how the military establishment acted without input from the Embassy at that time, as in the case of General Richard Stillwell arranging B-52 flights near the DMZ in the aftermath of the Panmunjom axe murders in 1976. In the case of Kwangju, the Combined Forces Command arrangement made for confusion about American military relations with the ROK, as has been shown in many analyses of events at the time. In 1987, on the other hand, during the democracy demonstrations that brought forth Roh Tae-woo's "June 29th Declaration," there was a steady effort by civilians in the U.S. Government to prevent the use of force.

The Yongsan golf course issue is another long and tedious discussion between the U.S. civil and military hierarchies. Involved were issues of likely military retention, attrition, and ROK-U.S. military relations (i.e., courtesies from the American side to Korean military counterparts who liked to play golf). Tensions developed between American civil and military components in Seoul because of their differing stakes.

The patterns seem to be shifting, and the overture of Kim Dae-jung to North Korea represents his identification of potentially predatory neighbors who played off Korean factions and turned Korea into a pawn: the price of national division is the continued weakness and manipulation of Korea by foreign powers. Kim carries to the north a persuasive argument that the U.S. presence is a force for stability in the region. The American presence probably has to change, but it is a reason for confidence in Kim Dae-jung's and South Korea's ability to pursue equilibrium in whatever changes come in the future.

Ralph Cossa focused on post-Cold War history. During the Cold War, deterrence had been the number one priority in Korea and remains so for the foreseeable future. It provides the security that Kim Dae-jung needs for the Sunshine Policy. If the formula for the future is the coexistence of two confederate Korean states, there will still be a need for military deterrence on the peninsula.

Continuity also includes the demonstration of continuing American commitment to the region as a whole. The diminution of the U.S. presence worldwide raises questions about its role in Asia. Nevertheless, the fact that U.S. commitment in Asia has remained steady, even during ordeals such as the Vietnam War, is a sign of stability that should continue because it makes constructive change like the Sunshine Policy possible.

U.S. national security strategy includes the “pillar” of promoting democracy and human rights. What has changed since the Cold War is a chance to go beyond deterrence to a more active promotion of democracy in Korea as such. While claiming some credit for favorable circumstances in Korea, Americans see the Koreans on center stage (with the U.S. in the background) providing encouragement and, in some instances, incentives.

The Perry process was forced on the Clinton Administration by Congress, and the result has been a much better coordinated policy. However, we are still playing catch-up with the rapidity of change in Korea. We have not entirely decided what post-Cold War policy will be in Korea, especially after reunification, so there needs to be an active discussion and debate. Neither government has made much of a case to their people for maintaining the American presence in Korea. The conventional view among the people in Korea (and the U.S.) is that the U.S. will withdraw. This is unwise, and we should be making the case that the U.S. should have a strong security role in the future of the Korean peninsula.

Marcus Noland’s paper reviewed the U.S.-ROK economic relationship, beginning with references to the history of American aid, then moving into the realm of trade conflict after Korea began exporting manufactured goods to the United States. The pattern of Korean economic development, including protectionism and government intervention in the marketplace, created circumstances that led to the crash of 1997. Though concerns about trade imbalances have waned during America’s recent, unprecedented macroeconomic performance, if the U.S. economy were to soften, pressure would grow to rectify perceived unfairness in trade with Korea and other Pacific Rim economies. It would be a shame not to have something better than the bilateral threat/protest mechanisms that characterized previous trade disputes. It would be useful to employ multilateral structures such as the WTO. One question for the future is whether the relatively healthy trade atmosphere will last beyond the end of President Kim Dae-jung’s term in 2003.

Noland also departed from his text to discuss views of North Korea. He saw mixed signals about whether the North Koreans are serious about reform, or even whether they are capable of it. Noland sees South Korea as an asset in this regard: certainly the PRC and Vietnam did not have anything resembling the support that could come from South Korea if the North Koreans decide to ask for their assistance. On the other hand, it’s not clear who would benefit from reform in North Korea—the people, the military, or some other special interest. Wariness is in order.

Meanwhile, the Agreed Framework and KEDO seem ill suited for the needs of North Korea and other interested parties. We should renegotiate the Agreed Framework and talk the North Koreans into accepting something other than nuclear power plants, something that they actually need much more.

In the discussion session, the panelists and audience members made the following additional points:

Reconsideration of American deployments in Korea is probably overdue. The military tends to prepare for the last war, and much of the American presence in Korea seems designed to deal with an infantry invasion, which is no longer the likeliest war scenario. Moreover, the way U.S. forces are deployed in Korea opens the U.S. to blackmail.

We have to keep wider interests in the region clearly in mind when we look at Korea's future. For example, China dreads a united Korea under Seoul's control. We always need to keep China and Japan in the loop.

We need to work on strengthening all three sides of the U.S.-Japan-ROK triangle, especially the Japan-ROK side.

The U.S. presence in the region keeps the region from slipping back into rivalries of the past. The U.S. force structure probably needs to change—perhaps to break the link between “commitment” and “forces on the ground,” but it has to remain in the region.

The Agreed Framework is still a viable and useful tool for dealing with North Korea and bringing them into contact with the wider world. It's useful that the entire agreement involves several nations. The North Koreans themselves seem to be counting on the completion of the KEDO power project. However, it would be a good thing, as Marcus Noland suggested, to find a way to redirect the massive fund now being used for KEDO's Light Water Reactors toward something more useful for the North Koreans. At least give them a chance to say “no.”

Panel 6: Korea and Her Neighbors: The Future of the Korean Peninsula

The prospect of reunification, or simply diminished tension on the Korean peninsula, is of intense interest to neighboring countries. A united Korea would be a powerful player in the region, and its military and economic potential would alter the strategic balance. How would this affect the position of the United States in the Pacific?

In the panel presentations, **Victor Cha** started off by looking back at the history of the relationship between Korea and Japan, drawing out propositions for Japan's vision of its own future, its need to balance a resurgent China, and the importance of the United States as an interlocutor between Korea and Japan. Cha and fellow panelist Ko Shioya recalled the significance of Korea in recent Japanese history, pointing out that the Korean War sparked Japan's economic recovery from World War II and encouraged the push toward Japanese rearmament despite Article IX of the MacArthur constitution. Presently, Japan is showing quite a bit of interest in Korea, not only as a favorite tourist destination but also as a partner in such things as search and rescue operations in the East China Sea and cooperation in international law enforcement. Japan and Korea are co-hosting the 2002 World Cup, and Japanese viewers seem to enjoy Korea-related television programs. There is even an increased willingness to own up to the

abuses of the past, as when Prime Minister Obuchi apologized to Korea in writing for the tragedies of the colonial period.

South Korea has also changed its stance toward Japan under the Kim Dae-jung administration, and the import of Japanese music and movies is now permitted. Japan keeps thinking about normalizing relations with North Korea, an idea that the United States and South Korea are in a position to encourage. But the past has hardly been forgotten. Koreans are demanding that Japan open old war records, compensate victims, and acknowledge Japanese misdeeds in school textbooks. Japan and Korea are not about to fall into each other's embrace, and both see the United States as a moderating influence between them.

Alexandre Mansourov introduced Russia's historic view of Korea as a buffer state and the Russian aversion to an unfriendly regime in Korea, though Russian interest in Korean affairs lags behind its interest in China and Japan. Most Russian-Korean matters—with the exception of the Korean War during Stalin's era—have been handled at a relatively low bureaucratic level. Thus, Russia does not oppose the reunification of Korea, but it is cautious about how this might affect the region, particularly if Korea becomes aligned with Japan and the United States.

Russia sees four possible scenarios in Korea. The best would be a Korean free trade economy mediated by the influence of many powers. The worst would be a united nationalist nuclear-armed Korea with claims on surrounding territory. A third scenario would be unification of Korea with the creation of a small refugee state, perhaps around the Rajin-Sonbong area, for the refugee elite of the DPRK—something like Parhae after the fall of Koguryō. The fourth and most likely scenario is a unified Korea aligned with either a dominant land power (China) or sea power (the United States). At present, Russia sees such multilateral efforts as KEDO as ways to squeeze out Russian influence, so it tends to prefer a China-leaning Korea in the future. But a new generation of Russian leaders may turn out to prefer the scenario under which a free-trading united Korea leans toward the U.S., because Russian and American strategic interests in the region are basically in harmony. At any rate, the recent visit of President Vladimir Putin to North Korea signals a rise in Russian interest in Korean unification.

Xiaoming Zhang recalled the pattern of Korea's relationship with China, going back to the tributary system, and Korea's natural tendency to seek shelter under Chinese protection. The end of the Cold War has set the scene for a new kind of relationship in which South Korea, and probably a future united Korea, will stand on much more equal footing with China in terms of diplomacy and trade. However, China does have a vital interest in Korea, and it wants any reunification process to be peaceful. It does not want to see a reunited Korea under the sway of any Chinese rival and probably would not like to see U.S. forces remain on the ground in Korea after reunification. China would like to have a close relationship with Korea that is separate from multilateral arrangements for the region such as APEC, the Tumen River project, and the Four Power talks. While bilateralism and multilateralism are not mutually exclusive, China sees vital strategic interests in Korea and will oppose anything that raises threats to itself on the Korean peninsula.

Lho Kyoung Soo focused on U.S. relations with South Korea, their common ground, and reasons for tension that exist between them. He pointed out that both share an interest in

reunification, since the costs of continued national division are much greater. However, there is no road map to national reunification. We only know that the lack of continued forward movement could bring on rising nationalism and anti-Americanism in South Korea. The people of the “386 generation” (Koreans in their 30s, educated in the 1980s, and born in the 1960s) do not share the same sentiment of the U.S. as their elders. They see the U.S. realistically, through the experience of Korean-Americans.

In the discussion period, the panelists and audience members made the following additional points:

Rob Warne questioned if **Lho Kyoung Soo** had understated the commonality between the United States and South Korea. Lho elaborated that the U.S.-ROK alliance is not in danger, but the problem is that the academic and media communities have evolved and no longer see the world as the ROK government sees it. They come from a generation shaped by Kwangju and the experience of the Park and Chun dictatorships, and they see the need for political processes (including foreign relations) to become more transparent as part of democratization. **Alexandre Mansourov** worried that there might actually be a conservative backlash in South Korea that could jeopardize the Sunshine Policy. To keep the inter-generational perceptions from diverging too far, perhaps delegations of South Korean students could be sent north to experience life up there, he suggested.

Panel 7: Reflections on the Long-term Impact of the Korean War

Hesung Chun Koh reflected on Koreans who migrated out before the war started, among whom the primary and intergenerational effects of the war are (1) the way it shaped Korean-American identity on the surface and subliminally, and (2) the way it forced them to rely on their own (and their families’) strength and resilience. Dr. Koh compared the Korean War experience with that of Japanese-Americans in concentration camps under Executive Order 9066, the atomic bomb survivors (*hibakusha*) in Japan, and Holocaust survivors in Europe.

In her experience, the war gave Koreans a better sense of self and comprehension of what it meant to be human. People were stripped down to their essential selves, and some were devastated by the loss of home. Many women and children were forced to find strength to do unusual things: children had to find food and represent their families at political and neighborhood meetings, while women had to take jobs on military bases. The normal boundaries limiting women’s and children’s spheres broke down. There was a burning determination to work hard and never be hungry again.

John K.C. Oh spoke about the experiences of Korean soldiers and the challenges faced by the new ROK Army in defending against the invading North Koreans. American military histories leave the impression that the Korean forces were inept and unreliable, but the fact is that they bought time on the initial retreat from Seoul and held their ground along the most dangerous fronts of the Pusan Perimeter, as shown in the battle of Tabu-dong, the first clear defeat for the North Korean People’s Army. Yet the battle gets no mention in any book that Oh has seen.

In the march north during October 1950, the miscalculations of Chinese intentions were General MacArthur's, but Korean units took the brunt of the disaster even though most of the attention goes to the suffering of the U.S. Eighth Army and the units that had to evacuate from the Changjin Reservoir. Koreans did not defect or desert or surrender as Chinese Nationalists and South Vietnamese had in other anti-Communist wars. Although Americans suffered very heavy losses, nearly three times as many South Koreans were killed in action, accounting for 70% of total deaths. The South Korean military does not get its due in military histories of the Korean War.

Edward L. King spoke from the point of view of one who landed in Korea as a seventeen year-old enlisted in 1946, served two years in the occupation force, and then returned to Korea in the 34th Infantry Regiment during the Korean War, arriving in time to help defend the Pusan Perimeter. By the time King turned twenty-three, Korea had become the crucible in which he sacrificed much of his youth. The experience has colored his career and work as a foreign policy advisor on the U.S. Senate staff.

King proposed a fresh look at the wisdom to be derived from the Korean War. For those who can put aside the anguish of America's Vietnam experience, Korea can be seen as something much better than the too-often cited "stalemate." It was the first victory in the ultimate winning of the Cold War. King praised the effort to recall the lives that were given for freedom in Korea and the efforts of the conferees and others to give proper value to what was accomplished there.

Bernard E. Trainor went to Korea as a junior officer in the Korean War's second phase. He and his fellow Marines were patriotic and committed to stopping what they saw as a renewed threat to peace and freedom following the defeat of right-wing totalitarianism in World War II. As believers in "total victory," they were shocked by having to fight under the political constraints of the Cold War. It was dismaying to see a hard-won advantage squandered in the frustrating atmosphere of the P'anmunjŏm peace talks. They were glad just to survive and go home after many months of bloody fighting along the front, yet they have always believed they had accomplished something noble in stopping the advance of Communism on the Pacific Rim.

During the discussion, the panelists and members of the audience made a number of additional points touching on the way the war had affected the lives of individuals, whether adoptees, war brides, or veterans. **General Kim Hŭngsu**, former Chief of Staff of the 2nd ROK Corps defending the Chŏrwon Valley, thanked John K.C. Oh for giving credit to the ROK military. The general recalled having been very worried about the heavy amount of Korean casualties that numbered more than 300 per day—the UN was suffering about 70 per day.

Conference Summary and Wrap-up

In the final session of the conference, **Ambassador Donald P. Gregg** thanked **David Steinberg** and Georgetown University, the President of Korea University, **Fred Carriere** and the staff of The Korea Society for planning and managing what was a most worthwhile conference. After

some personal reminiscences, he asked if the U.S. would ever be able to adjust to the policy demands created by a resurgent Asia. What is a sustainable U.S. presence in Asia? What will be our stance toward China? Congress does not give hopeful signs for an enlightened Asia policy, but we can also see grounds for optimism, such as the results of Kim Dae-jung's Sunshine Policy.

Ambassador Kim Kyōng-wōn added some general comments and made the personal observation that he had benefited from the Korean War in that it allowed him to escape North Korea. **Former Foreign Minister Han Sung-Joo** pointed again to the complexities of the U.S.-Korean relationship and the continuing presence of American troops on Korean soil. The troops have played a political role as well as a military one, contributing to stability and democratization. He then gave a list of possible scenarios for changes in the strategic balance in Northeast Asia and outlined some of the benefits and consequences of them.

Ambassador Hyun Hong-choo summarized the year 2000 in terms of opportunities for constructive change in the U.S.-Korean relationship, ranging from the effects of the just-concluded North-South summit to the maturing of the economic relationship.

David I. Steinberg concluded the conference with some brief comparisons. World War II had been a just war against evil enemies with strong support and trust in government. The Vietnam War was very different—a class war with shifting goals and a lack of trust in government. Korea was also different. Racism played a part in the way we saw the issues there. Perhaps one of our failings is the way the educated class in the United States thinks about foreign policy—educated people should know better. “Rogue states?” “States of concern?” Today it seems our real problem is arrogance. The Korean War should have taught us our limits.

About the Presenters

Victor D. Cha

**Assistant Professor, Department of Government and School of Foreign Service,
Georgetown University**

In 1999, Victor D. Cha was the Edward Teller National Fellow for Security at the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace at Stanford University and a recipient of a Fulbright senior scholar award. Cha is the recipient of numerous other academic awards, including a Fulbright award for dissertation research in Korea and a MacArthur Foundation Fellowship. He spent two years as a John M. Olin National Security Fellow at Harvard University's Center for International Affairs and as a postdoctoral fellow at the Center for International Security and Cooperation (CISAC) at Stanford University. He has appeared as a guest analyst on various media including CNN, Associated Press TV and Fox-TV. Cha is the author of *Alignment Despite Antagonism: The United States-Korea-Japan Triangle* (Stanford Univ. Press, 1999), which was the winner of the 1999-2000 Masayoshi Ohira Memorial Foundation Main Book Prize for best books on the Pacific Basin/East Asia and a nominee for the 2000 Hoover Institution Uncommon Book Award. Cha also has authored numerous articles on international relations and East Asia appearing in edited volumes and scholarly journals including *Survival*, *International Studies Quarterly* and *Journal of Peace Research*.

Sihak Henry Cho

President & Chairman, The International Foundation for Korea University, Inc.

As president and chairman of the board, Sihak Henry Cho oversees the activities of The International Foundation for Korea University, Inc., a not-for-profit U.S. corporation which was established to raise funds to support domestic and overseas scholarships, research grants, scholarly seminars and workshops sponsored by Korea University. Cho received a master's degree in business management from the University of Illinois (1961) and moved to New York to teach Tae Kwon Do, the martial art which he perfected while serving as captain of the Korea University Tae Kwon Do Team in 1956. In 1964, he started the nationally known All-American Open Championship Tournament and has continued running this competition every year for the past thirty-six years. Cho has served as the president of the Korean-American Association of Greater New York (1972-74) and has been active in Korean community affairs for almost forty years. He has received numerous honors including the Black Belt Hall of Fame Man of the Year in 1971 and the People's Honor Decoration (*Suk Ryu Chang*) in 1970. Cho, a pioneer of American Tae Kwon Do, has written three textbooks on the subject and has been a World Book Encyclopedia article contributor since 1976.

Ok-Nim Chung

Visiting Fellow, Center for Northeast Asian Policy Studies, Brookings Institution

Ok-Nim Chung has taught at Stanford University (1996), Korea University (1997-98) and Hanyang University (1999). She was a post-doctoral fellow at the Asia Pacific Research Center of Stanford University (1995-96) and a visiting scholar at the Hoover Institution (1996-97). She

is a member of the Junior Advisory Group for the NSC of the Presidential Executive Office of Korea and a co-project director for the Council on Foreign Relations-Seoul Forum Project on Managing Change on the Korean Peninsula with Dr. Michael Green. Chung was an *Anam* full scholarship student at Korea University, where she graduated *summa cum laude*, and received her Ph.D. degree in political science. She wrote *Five Hundred and Eighty-Eight Days of North Korean Nuclear Crisis*, which was summarized in English in the *IRI Review*. Articles written by Chung include: “The Origins and Evolution of the U.S.-Japan Military Alliance: A Korean Perspective” (*Stanford*, 1998); “Regional Perspectives and Roles on the Korean Peninsula” (*Korea and World Affairs*, Vol. 22, No.2, Summer 1998); and “The Role and Limits of KEDO as an International Institution” (*IRI Review*, Vol.3, No.1, Spring & Summer 1998).

Donald N. Clark

Professor of History and Director of International Studies, Trinity University

Donald N. Clark is a specialist on Korean affairs, drawing on experiences that began with his childhood in Seoul growing up as the son of Presbyterian missionaries. He went on to earn his Ph.D. in East Asian history at Harvard University in 1978. His experience in Korea includes periods as a Peace Corps volunteer, Social Science Research Council dissertation fellow and a senior Fulbright scholar (most recently at Yonsei University in 1990). Clark is the author or editor of numerous publications including: *Christianity in Modern Korea* (University Press of America, 1986); and *The Kwangju Uprising: Shadows over the Regime in South Korea* (Westview Press, 1988). For three years, Clark edited The Asia Society’s annual on Korean affairs entitled *Korea Briefing* (Westview Press, 1991-93). His interest in the history of the city of Seoul is reflected in two co-authored works published in Korea: *Seoul Past and Present: A Guide to Yi T’aejo’s Capital* (RAS, Korea Branch, 1969); and *Discovering Seoul* (RAS, Korea Branch, 1986). At present, Clark is completing a book entitled *Missionaries, Miners, and Military Advisors: The American Encounter with the Empire in Korea, 1900-1950* and a general text for Greenwood Press entitled *Culture and Customs of Korea*.

Ralph A. Cossa

Executive Director, Pacific Forum CSIS

Ralph A. Cossa manages the programs on security, political, economic and environmental issues in the Asia-Pacific region of The Pacific Forum CSIS, a non-profit foreign policy research institute in Honolulu which is affiliated with the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) in Washington, DC. He also is the editor of the Pacific Forum’s quarterly electronic journal, *Comparative Connections*. Cossa is a board member of the Council on U.S.-Korean Security Studies and an Overseas Honorary Research Fellow with the Korea Institute for Defense Analysis. He served in the U.S. Air Force from 1966-1993, achieving the rank of colonel and serving in his last assignment as special assistant to the Commander-in-Chief, U.S. Pacific Command. Cossa writes and speaks extensively on Asian political/security affairs and is a frequent contributor to *The International Herald Tribune*, *The Japan Times*, and other regional newspapers and periodicals. Among his most recent works are *U.S.-Korea-Japan Relations: Building Toward a ‘Virtual Alliance’* (CSIS Press, 1999), *The Agreed Framework: Is it Still Viable? Is it Enough?*, and *Trilateral Relations Among the United States, Japan, and China*.

Bruce Cumings**Norman and Edna Freehling Professor of International History and East Asian Political Economy, University of Chicago**

Bruce Cumings has previously taught at Swarthmore College, the University of Washington, Northwestern University and was also director of the Center for International and Comparative Studies. He received his B.A. from Denison University (1965) and his Ph.D. from Columbia University (1975). He is the author or co-author of eight books, including a two-volume study, *The Origins of the Korean War* (Princeton University Press, Vol.1, 1981, Vol.2, 1990). The first volume won the John King Fairbank Book Award of the American Historical Association for the best book in the previous two years on Asia since 1800; the second volume won the Quincy Wright Book Award of the International Studies Association for the best book on international affairs in the previous year. His other books include *War and Television* (Visal Routledge, 1992), *Korea's Place in the Sun: A Modern History* (Norton, 1997), and *Parallax Visions: Making Sense of American-East Asian Relations at Century's End* (Duke University Press, 1999). He is the winner or finalist for four book awards. Cumings has written more than seventy articles in various journals and was the principal historical consultant for the Thames Television/PBS documentary, *Korea: The Unknown War*.

Robert L. Gallucci**Dean, Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service, Georgetown University**

Prior to his appointment as dean of Georgetown's School of Foreign Service in 1996, Robert L. Gallucci had completed twenty-one years of government service, serving since 1994 with the Department of State as Ambassador-at-Large. Gallucci began his foreign affairs career at the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency in 1974. He earned a bachelor's degree from the State University of New York at Stony Brook, followed by a master's and doctorate in politics from Brandeis University. Before joining the State Department, he taught at Swarthmore College, Johns Hopkins School for Advanced International Studies and Georgetown University. He has received fellowships from the Council on Foreign Relations, the International Institute for Strategic Studies, Harvard University, and the Brookings Institution. He is a recipient of the Department of the Army's Outstanding Civilian Service Award (1991) and the Pi Sigma Alpha Award from the National Capital Area Political Science Association (2000). Gallucci has authored a number of publications on political-military issues including *Neither Peace Nor Honor: The Politics of American Military Policy in Vietnam* (Johns Hopkins University Press, 1975).

Donald P. Gregg**President & Chairman, The Korea Society**

Donald P. Gregg was raised in Hastings-on-Hudson, NY. After completing his service in the United States Army from 1945 to 1947, he earned a B.A. (*cum laude*) in philosophy from Williams College in 1951. Gregg joined the Central Intelligence Agency immediately after graduation and over the next quarter century was assigned to Japan, Burma, Vietnam and Korea. He was special assistant to the U.S. Ambassador in Korea from 1973 to 1975, and was decorated by the Korean government in 1975. Gregg was seconded to the National Security Council staff in

1979, where he was in charge of intelligence activities and was subsequently given responsibility for Asian policy affairs. In August 1982, he was asked by then Vice President George Bush to become his National Security Advisor, supporting the vice president in the areas of foreign policy, defense and intelligence. He then retired from the CIA, and was awarded the CIA's highest decoration, the Distinguished Intelligence Medal. During his service with Vice President Bush, Gregg traveled to 65 countries including Korea. From 1980 to 1989, Gregg also served as a professorial lecturer at Georgetown University, where he taught a graduate-level workshop entitled "Force and Diplomacy" to students in the Master of Science in Foreign Service program. From September 1989 to 1993, Gregg served as the U.S. Ambassador to Korea. While ambassador, his efforts were directed toward helping the U.S.-Korea relationship mature from a military alliance into an economic and political partnership. Gregg was also active in support of U.S.-Korea business activities. Prior to his departure from Korea on February 28, 1993, Gregg received the Department of Defense Medal for Distinguished Public Service, a decoration from the Prime Minister of Korea, and an honorary Ph.D. in International Relations from Sogang University. In March 1993, Gregg retired from a 43-year career in the United States government to become the president and chairman of The Korea Society. In May 1996, Gregg received an honorary degree, Doctor of Humane Letters, from Green Mountain College, Poultney, Vermont.

Sung-Joo Han

Professor of Political Science and Director of the Iimin International Relations Institute, Korea University

Before returning to Korea University in 1995, Sung-Joo Han was the Republic of Korea's minister of foreign affairs (1993-94). He also has served as the UN secretary-general's special representative for Cyprus (1996-97) and as a member of the UN Inquiry Commission on the 1994 Rwanda Genocide (1999). He is a graduate of Seoul National University (1962) and the recipient of a Ph.D. degree in political science from the University of California at Berkeley (1970). Han has taught at the City University of New York, Columbia University and Stanford University, and was a distinguished fellow at the Rockefeller Brothers Fund. He has served as chairman or co-chairman of several bilateral forums that the Republic of Korea has had with other countries including ASEAN, Canada, Japan and France. At present, he is chairman of the East Asian Vision Group, established by the Summit Meeting of thirteen East Asian Countries (ASEAN plus China, Japan and Korea) with the task of providing a vision for East Asian regional cooperation. Han also serving as co-chairman of the Council for Security Cooperation of the Asia Pacific, a second-track regional security organization.

Hong-Choo Hyun

Senior Partner, Kim & Chang

Born in Seoul, Korea in 1940, Hong-choo Hyun attended Seoul National University College of Law and Columbia Law School in New York. Now a senior partner with the firm of Kim & Chang, Hyun was ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the Korean Permanent Observer Mission to the United Nations from 1990-91 and ambassador to the United States from 1991-93. After serving in the Korean army as a judge advocate officer, Hyun worked as a prosecutor for Seoul District Public Prosecutor's Office and the Ministry of Justice. He became the first deputy director of the Agency for National Security Planning in 1980. From 1985-88, he

was a member of the National Assembly. During this time, he also was director of the Office of Policy Coordination and deputy secretary general of the Democratic Justice Party. From 1988-90, Hyun served in the cabinet as the minister of legislation. He has been a member of Korea's Special Committee for Constitutional Revision (1987) and Committee for Presidential Transition (1988). He is currently a member of the U.S.-Korea Business Council, the U.S.-Korea 21st Century Council, Korea International Trade Association Advisory Board and Advisory Council of the Korean Constitutional Court. He is the author of *Transition in Korea* (1987), and has published numerous articles. For his many accomplishments, Hyun has received the Order of Public Service Merit (1973, 1984, 1992) and the Order of National Security Merit (1975, 1981) from the Korean government. He also is a recipient of the Columbia Law School Medal for Excellence (1993).

In-Taek Hyun

Associate Professor of Political Science and International Relations, Korea University

Prior to his current tenure at Korea University, In-Taek Hyun served as a senior research fellow at the Sejong Institute and as a research fellow at the Institute of Social Sciences. Hyun is serving as secretary general for the Korea Association of International Relations. He is the editor of *IRI Review*, which is published by the Ilmin International Relations Institute of Korea University, and *Strategic Studies*, which is published by the Korea Research Institute for Strategy. Hyun is a member of the advisory committee for the ROK National Security Council and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade. He is a graduate of Korea University and received his Ph.D. degree in political science from the University of California at Los Angeles. Dr. Hyun is the author of publications on international relations such as *European Unification and the New European Security Order* (1998, in Korean), *Searching For a New National Strategy* (1995, in Korean), *Korea and Japan* (1993), *APEC and A New Pacific Community* (1993), and *Korean Defense Spending* (1991, in Korean). He also has numerous professional articles both in Korean and English.

Stanley Karnow

Pulitzer Prize Winning Journalist and Author

The late Theodore H. White called Stanley Karnow the "foreign affairs expert on foreign affairs." Karnow has reported from Europe, Africa, the Middle East and Asia for *Time*, *Life*, the *Saturday Evening Post*, the *London Observer*, the *Washington Post* and NBC News. He was an editor of *The New Republic*, a columnist for King Features, and a columnist for *Newsweek International*. He has contributed to the *New York Times Magazine*, *Foreign Affairs*, *Foreign Policy*, and many other publications. Among his assignments, Karnow traveled with Presidents Eisenhower and Johnson and accompanied President Nixon to China in 1972. He was in Vietnam in 1959, when the first Americans were killed, and covered the war until its conclusion. Karnow graduated from Harvard University and attended the Sorbonne and the Ecole des Sciences politiques in Paris. In 1990, he won the Pulitzer Prize in History for *In Our Image: America's Empire in the Philippines* (Ballantine Books, 1990). His best-selling book, *Vietnam: A History* (Penguin USA, 1997; originally published in 1983), has sold 1.5 million copies to date. His latest book, *Paris in the Fifties* (Random House, 1999), is based on his experiences as a *Time* correspondent in France.

Choong Soon Kim**University Scholar and Professor of Anthropology, University of Tennessee at Martin**

Dr. Kim has been teaching at the University of Tennessee at Martin since 1971. From 1981-1991, he was chairman of the department of sociology and anthropology. He was a senior Fulbright scholar at Seoul National University (1988-89); a visiting professor at Hirosaki University in Japan (1990); a Rockefeller Foundation scholar-in-residence at the Bellagio Study Center in Italy (1990); a senior Fulbright scholar (1993-94) and visiting professor at Yonsei University (1998). In 1998, Kim received the *Inch'on Award*. In addition to publishing monographs and articles in various scholarly journals such as *American Anthropologist* and *Current Anthropology*, he is the author of several books including *Anthropological Studies of Korea by Westerners* (Yonsei University Press, 2000); *A Korean Nationalist Entrepreneur: A Life History of Kim Songsu, 1891-1955* (SUNY Press, 1998); *Japanese Industry in the American South* (Routledge, 1995); *The Culture of Korean Industry: An Ethnography of Poongsan Corporation* (University of Arizona Press, 1996); *Faithful Endurance: An Ethnography of Korean Family Dispersal* (University of Arizona Press, 1988); and *An Asian Anthropologist in the South: Field Experiences with Blacks, Indians, and Whites* (University of Tennessee Press, 1991; originally published in 1977). Kim is currently working on a book entitled *Two Worlds, Three Decades, and One Anthropologist: Identity, Marginality, and Reflexivity*.

Jung-Bae Kim**President, Korea University**

Jung-Bae Kim became a professor in the history department at Korea University in 1970, and has been president of the University since 1998. Previously, he was vice president and also served as the dean of several divisions including Academic Affairs, the College of Humanities, and the College of Economics and Commerce. He has been a visiting professor at Harvard University (1980-81) and an invited professor at the College de France (1982). Kim attended Korea University, where he received his B.A., M.A., and Ph.D. in history. He also has studied in the department of anthropology at the University of Hawaii. Kim is the president of the Society of Dangun, president of the Association of Korean Petroglyphs, and a board member of several other associations including The Korean Council for University Education. He has written numerous articles for Korean publications and several books including *The Origin of the Korean Ethnic Group and Its Culture* (Korea University Press, 1973), *New Currents in Treatises on Korean Ancient History* (Korea University Press, 1980), and *The Origin and Formation of the Ancient Korean State* (Korea University Press, 1986).

Kyung-Won Kim**President, Institute of Social Sciences**

In addition to his position at the Institute of Social Sciences, Kyung-Won Kim serves as president of the Seoul Forum for International Affairs, a private council concerned with Korea's foreign relations. Prior to assuming his current positions, Kim was ambassador to the United States (1985-88) and the United Nations (1982-85). From 1975-1980, he served as special assistant for International Affairs to the president and from 1980-1981 as chief of staff to the

president. Before entering government service, Kim taught political science at York University in Toronto (1963-66) and New York University (1967-71). Returning to Korea in 1971, he joined the faculty of Korea University as a professor of political science. Kim received his B.A. in political science from Williams College, where he was admitted to Phi Beta Kappa, and his Ph.D. in political science from Harvard University. Williams College awarded him an honorary doctor of law degree in 1984, as did York University in 1994. The author of *Revolution and the International System* (1970) and many articles, both in Korean and English, Kim writes a biweekly newspaper column for the *Chosun Ilbo*.

Uchang Kim
Professor of English, Korea University

Uchang Kim has been teaching at Korea University since 1974. Previously, he taught at Seoul National University (1963-74) and the State University of New York at Buffalo (1969-72). He was educated at Seoul National University, Ohio Wesleyan University, Cornell University and Harvard University. Kim received a M.A. from Cornell University and a Ph.D. in the history of American civilization from Harvard University. He has been a fellow of the American Council of Learned Societies at Harvard University (1980, 1981), a visiting scholar at the University of Cambridge (1992-93) and the University of Tokyo (1993), a visiting professor at Harvard University (1995) and at the International Research Institute for Japanese Studies in Kyoto, Japan (1997-1998). He has received the Seoul Shinmun Criticism Award (1986), the Palbong Criticism Award (1992), the Taesan Literary Award (1994), the Kumho Culture Award (1997), and the Korea University Award for Academic Distinction (1998). His publications in English and other languages include contributions to *The Silence of Love* (University of Hawaii Press, 1980), *Flowers of Fire* (University of Hawaii Press, 1986), *Anthology of Korean Literature: From Early Times to the Nineteenth Century* (University of Hawaii Press, 1981), and *Modern Korean Literature: An Anthology* (University of Hawaii Press, 1990).

Edward L. King
Professional Staff Member, United States Senate (Ret.)

Edward L. King is currently an adjunct professor in the School of International Service at American University and a private consultant on foreign and defense matters. He retired from the U.S. Senate, where he served as senior foreign policy advisor on the Democratic Policy Committee, advising three successive Democratic leaders on foreign and defense policy issues. His many years of political activity also include serving as a U.S. senator's administrative assistant, a commissioner on the Congressional Commission on Central American Negotiations, consultant to the Joint Economic Commission, lobbyist, and executive director of the Coalition on National Priorities and Military Policy. King has testified before several Congressional Committees on foreign and defense matters. He enlisted in the Army during WWII and was assigned to U.S. occupation forces in Korea (1946-48). Sent again to Korea in 1950, King served as a combat infantry officer until 1952, ultimately retiring as a Lt. Colonel. King completed his undergraduate studies at the University of Nebraska and graduate studies at the University of Madrid. He is author of *The Death of the Army: A Pre-Mortem*, selected by the *New York Times Review of Books* as one of the twelve best current events books of 1972.

B. C. Koh**Professor of Political Science, University of Illinois at Chicago**

B. C. Koh is currently teaching courses in comparative politics, international law and international organization. Previously, he has taught at Louisiana State University, Temple University (Japan), Seoul National University and Yonsei University. A native of Seoul, Koh received an LL.B. from Seoul National University (LL.B) and a M.P.A. and Ph.D. from Cornell University. His non-academic experience includes serving as an officer in the Republic of Korea Air Force and working as a reporter for The Korea Herald, for which he also served as a columnist (1984-87, 1991). Koh has served as the chairperson of the Committee on Korean Studies for the Association for Asian Studies (1976-77, 1987-88) and was a member of the Joint Committee on Korean Studies of the Social Science Research Council and the American Council on Learned Societies (1986-91). He has authored four books including *The Foreign Policy Systems of North and South Korea* (University of California Press, 1984) and *Japan's Administrative Elite* (University of California Press, 1991). Koh also has contributed chapters to numerous anthologies and articles to such journals as *Asian Survey*, *Comparative Political Studies*, *Comparative Politics*, and the *Journal of Politics*.

Hesung Chun Koh**Chair & President, East Rock Institute**

Together with her late husband, Dr. Kwang Lim Koh, Hesung Chun Koh established the Korea Institute in Cambridge, MA (1952), which today continues to operate as the East Rock Institute in New Haven, CT, making it the oldest Korean cultural institute in the United States. She is also director emerita of Research and Development, and of East Asian Area Research, HRAF at Yale University. Koh received her Ph.D. in sociology and anthropology from Boston University (1959) and did post-doctoral work in Chinese studies at both Harvard University and Georgetown University as a NDEL Fellow. She has taught at Yale Law School, Yale University, Boston University and Albertus Magnus College. She is the author or editor of five books and numerous articles on various aspects of Korean culture, society and women, information systems and comparative culture research. Koh has been the editor of the *Korean and Korean American Studies Bulletin*, a semi-annual journal, and is the recipient of many awards including the Republic of Korea Prime Minister's Award (1990) and the Korean Broadcasting System Korean Overseas Compatriot's Award (2000).

Chae-Jin Lee**Professor of Government, Claremont-McKenna College**

Chae-Jin Lee is currently BankAmerica Professor of Pacific Rim Studies, professor of government, and director of The Keck Center for International and Strategic Studies at Claremont McKenna College. He previously taught at the University of Washington, the University of Kansas, the University of California at San Diego, and at California State University-Long Beach where he served as the dean of the School of Social and Behavioral Sciences. Lee received his B.A. from Seoul National University and his Ph.D. from the University of California at Los Angeles. His publications include *China and Korea: Dynamic Relations* (Hoover Inst. Press, 1996), *U.S. Policy Toward Japan and Korea* (co-authored with

Hideo Sato), *Zhou Enlai: The Early Years* (Stanford Univ. Press, 1996), *China and Japan* (Hoover Institution Press, 1984), and *China's Korean*. Lee has edited or co-edited *North Korea After Kim Il Sung* (Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1998), *Patterns of Inter-Korean Relations, The Korean Peninsula and the Major Powers, Political Leadership in Korea, The United States and Japan* (Keck Center International Strategic Studies, 1992), *The Prospects for Korean Reunification* (Keck Center International Strategic Studies, 1993) and *U.S.-Japan Partnership in Conflict Management: The Case of Korea* (Keck Center International Strategic Studies, 1993).

Hong Koo Lee

Ambassador of the Republic of Korea to the United States

Amb. Lee has a long and distinguished career in academia, government and politics. From 1994-1995, he served as prime minister of Korea under President Kim Young Sam. Until his posting in Washington, DC in 1998, Lee served as chairman of the then-ruling New Korea Party (now the opposition Grand National Party) and as a member of the Korean National Assembly. Before entering government service, he followed a distinguished career in academia, beginning as assistant professor of political science at Emory University (1963) and Case Western Reserve University (1964), then as professor of political science at Seoul National University (1968-98). Lee was a member of the executive committee of the International Political Science Association (1985-88); president of the Korean Political Science Association (1986-88); member of the Commission on Global Governance, which proposed a reform of the United Nations system in 1995; and also chairman of the World Cup Bidding Committee, which successfully won the right to host the 2002 World Cup in Korea and Japan. Lee received his doctorate in political science from Yale University, after completing his undergraduate studies at Emory University (1959) and studying at Seoul National University's College of Law (1953).

Kyongsoo Lho

Professor, Graduate School of International & Area Studies, Seoul National University

Kyongsoo Lho was born in Seoul in 1954. He earned his bachelor's degree in Government, *cum laude*, from Harvard University. Following military duty and government service in Korea, Lho resumed his studies receiving his doctorate in International Politics from Oxford University. Since 1994, after five years of research and teaching at Stanford University, Lho has been professor of international politics in the Graduate School of Public Administration at Seoul National University. Together with his university responsibilities, including his duty as associate dean of the GSPA and joint professorial appointment to the Graduate School of International and Area Studies, Lho serves on the advisory panels of the National Security Council, the Ministry of Unification and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade. His most recent publication, co-edited with Kay Moller, is *Northeast Asia towards 2000: Interdependence and Conflict* (Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, 1999).

James R. Lilley

Resident Fellow of Asian Studies, American Enterprise Institute

Before joining AEI in 1993, James R. Lilley served as assistant secretary of defense for International Security Affairs (1991-93). He was the U.S. ambassador to the People's Republic

of China (1989-91) and the U.S. ambassador to the Republic of Korea (1986-89). Lilley also has been an adjunct professor at the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies, a fellow at Harvard University's Institute of Politics and the Philip M. McKenna Visiting Scholar at Claremont McKenna College. In his business career, Lilley has represented Hunt Oil of Texas and United Technologies in Hartford, CT. He graduated from Phillips Exeter Academy (1945), earned a B.A. from Yale University (1951), and received an M.A. in international relations from George Washington University (1972). He also has attended the University of Hong Kong and Columbia University for studies in classical Chinese. He is the co-editor of *Beyond MFN: Trade with China and American Interests* (AEI Press, 1994) and *Crisis in the Taiwan Strait*. Lilley has also written numerous pieces for leading publications including the *Washington Post*, *The Washington Times*, *The New York Times*, *U.S. News and World Report* and *Foreign Policy*.

David R. McCann

Professor of Korean Literature, Harvard University

David R. McCann recently moved to Harvard University, where he is the Korea Foundation Professor of Korean Literature. He graduated from Amherst College and went to Korea with the Peace Corps as an English teacher at the Andong Agriculture and Forestry High School. After completing M.A. and Ph.D. degrees at Harvard University, he taught classical Japanese language and literature, directed the Office of Foundation Relations, and eventually became a professor of Korean literature at Cornell University. McCann has published a number of books on Korean literature and literary culture, anthologies of Korean poetry and translations. His poems have been published in various journals; one is included in the *Pushcart Prize Anthology III*. His recent work includes *The Classical Moment: Views from Seven Literatures*, co-edited with Gail Holst-Warhaft (Rowman and Littlefield, 1999). Two books scheduled for publication this year are *Early Korean Literature: Selections and Introductions* (to be published by Columbia University Press) and *The Korean War and the Peloponnesian War: A Comparative Study of War and Democracy*, co-edited with Barry S. Strauss.

Alexandre Y. Mansourov

Visiting Fellow, Center for Northeast Asian Policy Studies, The Brookings Institution

Alexandre Y. Mansourov is currently conducting research on Korean, Japanese and Chinese foreign policy; alternative ways of creating a multilateral security framework for Northeast Asia; and foreign policy decision-making in the United States. His areas of specialization include comparative politics (Korea, Russia, Japan and China), international relations (international security and trade, nuclear and missile non-proliferation in East Asia), and American government. He is a former research associate of the Korea Institute at Harvard University (1997-99). In the late 1980s, Mansourov served in the Soviet embassy in Pyongyang as a Foreign Service officer. He has taught courses on Korean history, civilization and foreign policy at Columbia University. He received his B.A. in international relations from the Moscow Institute of International Relations and his Ph.D. in political science from Columbia University. Mansourov is the co-editor of the recently published book *The North Korean Nuclear Program: Security, Strategy and New Perspectives from Russia* (Routledge, 2000).

Tibor Meray

Award Winning Author and Journalist

After completing his university studies in Budapest, Tibor Meray started working for *Szabad Ne'p* (Free People), the major daily of the Hungarian Communist Party, becoming the editor of its cultural pages and of the literary periodical *Csillag* (Star). He was sent to North Korea to cover the cease-fire talks and was present at the signing of the cease-fire accords at Panmunjom. Belonging to the group of writers who rebelled against Stalinism, Meray was one of the speakers at the meeting of the famous Petofi Circle, which is considered the event that prepared the Revolution of 1956. He has been honored with numerous literary prizes including the Kossuth Prize, the highest literary prize in Hungary (1953), and the Hungarian Pulitzer Memorial Prize (1992). He has been decorated with the Order of Honor of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the Imre Nagy Memorial Plaque, the Order of the Honor of the Republic of Hungary, and the Chevalier de la Legion d'Honneur (France). Besides novels and movie scripts, his most important works are *Thirteen Days that Shook the Kremlin*, *The Revolt of the Mind* with Tamas Aczel (Greenwood Publishing Group, 1975), *That Day in Budapest*, and *LaRupture Moscou-Pekin*.

John Merrill

Foreign Affairs Analyst, Bureau of Intelligence and Research, U.S. Department of State

John Merrill received a B.A. in political science from Boston University, an M.A. in East Asian Regional Studies from Harvard University and a doctorate in political science from the University of Delaware. His areas of specialization includes international relations, Chinese modern history, comparative politics, and the politics of both the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the Republic of Korea. Merrill has held teaching and research positions at Georgetown University, George Washington University, the University of Delaware, Lafayette College, and the Center for Strategic and International Studies. He is the author of *Korea: The Peninsular Origins of the War* (University of Delaware, 1989); *Was it an Invasion or War of National Liberation? The Korean War, 1948-1950 (Kwahak kwa sasang, 1988)* in Korean; and *The Cheju-do Rebellion (Shikan-sha, 1988)* in Japanese. Merrill also has written numerous journal articles.

Katharine H. S. Moon

Associate Professor of Political Science, Wellesley College

Katherine H. S. Moon's teaching and research interests focus on international relations and Asian politics, with emphasis on gender, women, social movements and human rights. She received her B.A. from Smith College (*magna cum laude*) and her Ph.D. in politics from Princeton University. She has served on the board of trustees of Smith College and the Project on Government Oversight in Washington, DC. Moon is the 1999 recipient of an American Association of University Women fellowship, which supported her book project on culture and gender in U.S. foreign policy processes. She has also served as a consultant for the Office of the Senior Coordinator of International Women's Issues, U.S. Department of State/President's Interagency Council on Women and is on the editorial board of several academic journals on international relations. Moon is the author of *Sex Among Allies: Military Prostitution in U.S.-Korea Relations* (Columbia University Press, 1997) and articles on women and the U.S. military,

“comfort women” of World War II, international trafficking of human beings, and labor migration in Asia.

Marcus Noland
Senior Fellow, Institute for International Economics

Previously, Marcus Noland was a senior economist at the Council of Economic Advisers in the Executive Office of the President of the United States and held research or teaching positions at Johns Hopkins University, the University of Southern California, Tokyo University, and the Korea Development Institute. He received a B.A. from Swarthmore College and a Ph.D. from Johns Hopkins University. Noland has been the recipient of fellowships sponsored by the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science, the Council on Foreign Relations and the Council for the International Exchange of Scholars. Noland is the co-author with Bela Balassa of *Japan in the World Economy* (IIE, 1988); the author of *Pacific Basin Developing Countries: Prospects for the Future*; co-editor with C. Fred Bergsten of *Pacific Dynamism and the International Economic System*; co-author with C. Fred Bergsten of *Reconcilable Differences? Resolving United States-Japan Economic Conflict* (IIE, 1993); editor of *Economic Integration of the Korean Peninsula* (IIE, 1998); and co-author with LiGang Liu, Sherman Robinson and Zhi Wang of *Global Economic Effects of the Asian Currency Devaluations* (IIE, 1998).

Don Oberdorfer
Distinguished Journalist in Residence, SAIS, Johns Hopkins University

Don Oberdorfer was a journalist for thirty-eight years, a *Washington Post* staff member for twenty-five years, and the paper’s diplomatic correspondent for seventeen years. In 1993, he joined Johns Hopkins University’s Nitze School of Advanced International Studies (SAIS) as a resident scholar. He graduated from Princeton University in 1952 and served in Korea immediately following the signing of the armistice in 1953 as a lieutenant in the U.S. Army. He has twice won the National Press Club’s Edwin M. Hood Award for diplomatic correspondence (1981, 1988). He also was a two-time winner of Georgetown University’s Annual Edward Weintal Prize for diplomatic reporting (1982, 1993). In 1996, Princeton bestowed on him its annual Woodrow Wilson Award, which is given to a graduate who has performed exemplary service to the nation. His SAIS-sponsored book *The Two Koreas: A Contemporary History* was published in 1997 by Addison-Wesley in Boston and in 1998 by publishers in London, Seoul and Tokyo. The Japanese edition was awarded the 10th Annual Asia-Pacific Book Prize in Tokyo. Oberdorfer is the author of thousands of newspaper articles on current affairs and dozens of magazine articles.

Bonnie B. C. Oh
Distinguished Research Professor of Korean Studies, Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service, Georgetown University

Bonnie B. C. Oh concurrently serves as the coordinator of Korean Studies and the interim director of the Women’s Studies Program at Georgetown University. Last fall, she was appointed as the University’s Main Campus Ombudsperson. She received her Ph.D. from the University of Chicago and has written extensively on issues relating not only to Korea, but to the wider

Northeast Asian region as well. Oh was the co-editor of *East Meets West* (Loyola Press, 1988), a history of the Jesuit entry into China, contributing to the volumes dealing with China, Japan and Korea. She is currently co-editing a book on the “comfort women” of World War II (to be published by M.E. Sharpe in 2000) and *Korea Under the American Military Government* (also to appear in 2000 from Peter Lang Publishers, Inc). She is the author of “China” in the *Compton’s Encyclopedia* and is currently revising an entry on Korea in the *World Book Encyclopedia*. Oh has refereed for journals and academic presses, including *The Journal of Asian Studies* and *Harvard University Press*.

John K. C. Oh

Professor of Politics, The Catholic University of America

Previously, John K. C. Oh was the academic vice president and chair of the political science department of The Catholic University of America. He also was dean of the graduate school at Marquette University. He served as a consultant with the U.S. Department of Defense and as a member of the National Screening Committee of the Fulbright-Hays Program. He was the press attaché to the Republic of Korea Mission to the United Nations and the Korean Army press officer at the Panmunjom armistice negotiations. Oh received his Ph.D. in international relations from Georgetown University. He has authored the following five books: *Korean Politics: The Quest for Democratization and Economic Development* (Cornell University Press, 1999); *Problems of Economic Development with Democratization* (Korea Development Institute, 1990); *Emerging Roles of Asian Nations and the 1980s* (University of Nebraska, 1979); *Korea: Democracy on Trial* (Cornell University Press, 1968); and *Democracy in Korea* (Operations and Policy Research, 1962). Oh also has published numerous scholarly articles, reviews and essays on Korean, Japanese and East Asian politics in such journals as *The Journal of Asian Studies*, *The American Political Science Review* and *American Historical Review*.

Han S. Park

Professor of Political Science and Director of the Center for the Study of Global Issues, University of Georgia

Han S. Park has been on the faculty of the University of Georgia since 1970. He has focused his research on the issues of human rights, political development and East Asian politics. Park received a B.A. from Seoul National University, an M.A. in political science from American University and a Ph.D. in the same field from the University of Minnesota. He is the founder and president of a non-profit humanitarian organization, The Uniting Families, Inc., which has facilitated reuniting dispersed families. He has visited North Korea more than thirty times in the last two decades, most recently in February of 2000. As an expert analyst, Park has appeared regularly on leading television networks including ABC News, PBS and CNN International. He is currently a consultant/analyst for ABC News. His remarks on North Korea have been regularly published in major newspapers including *The New York Times*, *USA Today* and *The Asahi Shinbun* (Japan). Included in his extensive list of publications are: *Human Needs and Political Development* (Schenkman Books, 1984); *China and North Korea: Politics of Integration and Modernization* (co-authored, 1990); *North Korea: Ideology, Politics, Economy* (editor, Prentice Hall, 1995); and *The Politics of Unconventional Wisdom: The Anomaly of North Korea* (forthcoming, 2000).

Eui Hang Shin
Professor of Sociology, University of South Carolina

Eui Hang Shin is currently working on a number of projects including a comparative study of revival meetings in different ethnic immigrant churches, a study of gender inequality in major symphony orchestras in the United States, and a study of the network structures in the popular music industry in Korea. His research focuses on business, religious and voluntary organizations in Korea and in Korean American communities. Shin received a B.A. in sociology from Seoul National University and an M.A. and Ph.D. in demography from the University of Pennsylvania. He has published over thirty-five journal articles in both demography and sociology journals including *Demography*, *International Migration Review*, *American Sociologist*, *Sociological Forum* and *Social Science Quarterly*. He has edited three books: *Toward a Unified Korea*; *Korea and the World: Strategies for Globalization*; and *Korea in the Global Community*.

Ko Shioya
North American Bureau Chief, Bungei Shunju Ltd.

On his fifth assignment in the United States since 1966, Dr. Ko Shioya, serves concurrently as editor-at-large for Bungei Shunju Ltd. This Tokyo-headquartered publishing house is one of Japan's leading publishers of books and magazines including its influential flagship general-interest monthly magazine, *Bungei Shunju*, which has more than one million readers. Operating out of Manhattan, Shioya covers the political and economic relationships between the United States and Asia including U.S.-Japan, U.S.-China and U.S.-Korea relations. As a young journalist, Shioya covered the Korea-Japan diplomatic normalization talks through the ratification of a formal treaty in 1965. He was later editor-in-chief of the Japanese edition of the *Reader's Digest* before becoming independent in 1986. From 1986-1994, Shioya was frequently on assignments overseas, covering such international news as the Gulf War and the collapse of Yugoslavia for leading Japanese and Asian publications.

David I. Steinberg
Director of Asian Studies, Georgetown University

Dr. David I. Steinberg serves concurrently as a senior consultant to The Asia Foundation, Distinguished Professor of Korean Studies at Georgetown University and president of the Mansfield Center for Pacific Affairs. Previously, he was the representative of The Asia Foundation in Korea; and earlier, as a member of the Senior Foreign Service, Agency for International Development (AID), Department of State, he worked extensively on development in Asia and the Middle East. In addition to lecturing extensively at many universities and teaching at the Foreign Service Institute, where he was co-director of the Korea Area Studies program, Steinberg is the author of ten books and monographs including one translation and over eighty articles. Among these books and monographs are: *Burma/Myanmar: Issues of Authority and Legitimacy since 1988* (Georgetown University Press, 2000); *The Future of Burma: Crisis and Choice in Myanmar* (1990); *The Republic of Korea: Economic Transformation and Social Change* (1989); *Crisis in Burma: Stasis and Change in a Political Economy in Turmoil* (1985);

and *Foreign Aid and the Development of the Republic of Korea: The Effectiveness of Concessional Assistance* (1985).

William Stueck, Jr.
Professor of History, University of Georgia

William Stueck, Jr. received his Ph.D. in history from Brown University in 1977, and since then has taught at the New College of the University of South Florida, Syracuse University, Purdue University and the University of Georgia. Stueck has authored four books, the most being *The Korean War: An International History* (Princeton, 1995). During the fall semester of 1995, he was a senior Fulbright scholar at Hankuk University of Foreign Studies in Seoul. Stueck is now doing research for a historical survey of U.S. relations with Korea.

Ji Moon Suh
Professor of English, Korea University

Ji Moon Suh has been teaching at Korea University since 1978. On her sabbaticals, she has been a Harvard-Yenching scholar (1988-89) and has taught Korean literature at the School of Oriental and African Studies at the University of London (1983-84). Suh received a B.A. from Ewha Womans University, an M.A. from West Georgia College and a Ph.D. from the State University of New York at Albany, all in the field of English literature. She has received numerous awards including a Fulbright graduate degree study award (1974-78), the Republic of Korea Literature Award (1984), and the Korea PEN Translation Award (2000). Suh has contributed personal essays and opinion pieces to several leading Korean newspapers including the *Dong-a Ilbo*, *Kyonghyang Shinmun Choongang Ilbo*, *Chosun Ilbo* and *Moonwha Ilbo*, as well as *The Korea Times* and other journals and periodicals. Among her publications are *The Art of Life: A Study in the Concepts of the Training of Moral Character in Browning, Mill and Ruskin* (1986); *Faces in the Well*, a collection of essays in English (Seoul Computer Press, 1988); and *The Golden Phoenix: Seven Contemporary Korean Stories* (1998).

Bernard E. Trainor
Lieutenant General, USMC (Ret.)

Bernard E. Trainor is a highly decorated officer whose military career included a wide variety of command and staff assignments. His military staff duties dealt primarily with professional education, planning and operations. He was deputy chief of staff for Plans, Policies and Operations and Marine Corps deputy to the Joint Chiefs of Staff. After retirement from the Marine Corps, Trainor joined *The New York Times* as its military correspondent. As a journalist, he covered military matters at home and abroad and provided on-the-scene analysis of conflicts throughout the Third World. From 1990-1996, he was director of the National Security Program at Harvard University's John F. Kennedy School of Government, then assumed associate status at The Center for Science and International Affairs at the Kennedy School. In addition, he is on the editorial board of *Joint Force Quarterly* and editorial advisor to the *Naval War College Review*. Trainor is co-author of *The General's War* (Little Brown & Co., 1996), an acclaimed analysis of the Gulf War, and continues to do military analyses for both NBC news and *The New York Times*.

Nancy Bernkopf Tucker
Professor of History, Georgetown University

Nancy Bernkopf Tucker is an American diplomatic historian who specializes in American-East Asian relations, particularly United States relations with China, Taiwan and Hong Kong. She has served in the Office of Chinese Affairs, United States Department of State, and at the U.S. Embassy in Beijing (1986-87); has been a fellow at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, the United States Institute of Peace, Harvard University, and at the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences; and has served on the U.S. Department of State Advisory Committee on Historical Diplomatic Documentation. Tucker received her Ph.D. from Columbia University. She is the author of various books and articles including *Uncertain Friendships: Taiwan, Hong Kong and the United States, 1945-1992* (Twayne, 1994), winner of a 1996 Bernath Book Prize of the Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations; *Patterns in the Dust: Chinese American Relations and the Recognition Controversy, 1949-1950* (Columbia University Press, 1983); and most recently, "A Precarious Balance: Clinton and China" (*Current History*). She also co-edited *Lyndon Johnson Confronts the World* (Cambridge University Press, 1994) and has just completed *China Confidential: American Diplomats and Sino-American Relations*. Tucker frequently appears on radio and television including the Lehrer Newshour, ABC Nightline, the Today Show, CNN and NPR.

Kathryn Weathersby
Senior Research Scholar, Cold War International History Project, Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars

Since 1991, Kathryn Weathersby has conducted extensive research in Russian archives on the Soviet Union's role in the Korean War and its policy toward Korea prior to the war. She received a B.S. from Vanderbilt University and both an M.A. and Ph.D. in Russian history from Indiana University. Her research has been supported by grants and fellowships from the Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, the Social Science Research Council, the Korea Foundation, the National Endowment for the Humanities, the International Research and Exchanges Board, the Norwegian Nobel Institute, and the College of Arts and Sciences of Florida State University, where she was an assistant professor of history (1989-95). Her publications include "Perceptions and Misperceptions: The Case of Korea" in Melvin Goodman (ed.) *Perceptions and Misperceptions in the Cold War* (Pennsylvania State University Press, 2000) and "Stalin, Mao and the End of the Korean War" in Odd Arne Westad (ed.) *Brothers in Arms: The Rise and Fall of the Sino-Soviet Alliance* (Stanford University Press, 1998). Her work in progress is a book entitled *Stalin's Last War: The Soviet Union and Korea, 1945-1953*.

Xiaoming Zhang
Associate Professor, School of International Studies, Peking University

Xiaoming Zhang received a B.A., M.A. and Ph.D. in international relations from Peking University in 1985, 1988 and 1993, respectively. He joined the faculty of the School of International Studies at Peking University in 1988. In 1994, he was a fellow affiliated with the

Cold War International History Project at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars. From 1996-1998, Zhang was the director of a project entitled “China’s Relations with Her Neighbors,” which was sponsored by the Chinese Social Sciences Foundation. 1998, Zhang was a Korea Foundation Fellow affiliated with Asiatic Research Center at Korea University. During the 1999-2000 academic year, Zhang was a Fulbright visiting research scholar at the Fairbank Center for East Asia Research, Harvard University. He is the co-author of *Contemporary Sino-Korean Relations* (1998) as well as three publications in Chinese: *George F. Kennan’s Containment Policy* (1994); *The Cold War and Its Legacy* (1998); and *China’s Relations With Her Neighbors* (forth coming).

ABSTRACTS OF THE PRESENTATIONS

Panel 1: *Background: The Korean War Revisited*

Occurrence at No Gun Ri Bridge: An Inquiry into the History and Memory of a Civil War
by Bruce Cumings

I will argue that the NoGun Ri massacre is an incident that counterpoints much of the received wisdom about the nature of the Korean War, and that because of the ROK's democratization we are now getting more and more knowledge that adds up to a contrapuntal history of this war. Yet for those who wanted to look, similar evidence has been easily available for fifty-five years, particularly in widely circulated magazines like *Life* and *Collier's* from the early 1950s.

The Rationale for War in Korea
by Kathryn Weathersby

The Korean War, like the other major wars of the 20th century, cannot be adequately explained as the inevitable result of the circumstances that prevailed on each side. The division of Korea into two politically polarized, mutually hostile states clearly created explosive potential, but its postwar history, along with that of other divided states, shows that such division does not automatically lead to full-scale war. What is decisive is the perceptions and calculations that create the will to go to war. Now that the Russian archives have provided the basic outline of how and why the decision was made in the spring of 1950 to attempt a military reunification of Korea, we can examine the reasoning behind that decision and thus understand more clearly the enduring security challenges on the peninsula. The focus of this presentation is on the perceptions of the three communist leaders who made the decision to mount an offensive against South Korea—Stalin, Kim Il Sung and Mao Zedong. Their views are important not only because they precipitated the conflagration of 1950-53 but also because they shaped the North Korean leadership's primary education in statesmanship. First, the communist leaders assumed that the advanced capitalist states inherently posed a security threat to the communist bloc and that their common identity as capitalists overrode any interests they might have in restraining one another's war-fighting capacity. Stalin and Mao assumed that Japan would re-arm, with American assistance, and again threaten the Soviet Far East and China, using the Korean peninsula as the staging ground. Thus, neither the Soviet Union nor China could be secure if the southern half of Korea remained under the control of a government friendly to the United States and Japan. The question was not whether but when to subdue the South. Second, while Kim Il Sung consistently overestimated the likelihood of a quick victory, Stalin was more realistic in his calculations of the relative strengths of the two sides. Both leaders' perceptions of the other side's intentions, however, were seriously flawed. Unable to understand the different kind of relationship that existed between Washington and Seoul, they assumed that the desire of the ROK leadership to attack the DPRK reflected American intentions. Having believed in 1949 that an American-backed invasion was imminent, Stalin became more disposed to consider a military option. Third, all three communist leaders misread the signs of American willingness to intervene. They interpreted American withdrawal from the Chinese civil war as weakness, concluding that the US would not intervene in Korea since it had allowed a communist victory in China. Intelligence

regarding the US policy statement adopted in December 1949 strengthened that perception. However, they did not foresee the fear that a World War II-style invasion across the 38th parallel would evoke in the minds of world leaders and were thus surprised by the UN intervention. Fourth, the three communist leaders assumed from the beginning that the DPRK would need supplies and reinforcements from its allies. The fact that the end of the civil war in China freed PLA troops to intervene in Korea was key in persuading Stalin that the war was feasible. He thus insisted that Kim Il Sung secure Mao's approval before the invasion could proceed. Stalin made it clear to Kim that the Soviet Union would provide weapons, supplies and advisers but would under no circumstances dispatch its troops to assist the North Koreans. American global power and its commitment to Europe thus deterred Stalin from expanding the war in Korea into a global conflict even while his underestimation of US commitment to East Asia prompted him to adopt a forward strategy there.

Korean War Studies Revisited: Third Wave and Beyond
by In-Taek Hyun

Fifty-years have passed since the Korean War broke out on June 25, 1950. During the last fifty years, there have been enormous scholarly efforts to examine the origin, the process, and the outcome of the war in terms of nearly every kind of dimension. These scholarly works can be categorized into three phases or waves. The first wave includes the research works conducted in the 1950s and 1960s. The majority of them analyze and interpret the Korean War in the Cold War context. The second wave of the 1970s and 1980s has emerged as a reaction to the first one, attempting to revise the orthodox interpretation of the Korean War. The so-called 'revisionist' school focuses largely on domestic causes rather than international ones. According to this view, the Korean War was a civil war and thus the debate on who started the war has become meaningless. Since the Cold War ended, we have had access to a variety of sources on the Korean War, thereby resulting in the third wave of research. For example, the Russian Foreign Ministry archival materials, which were delivered by then President Boris Yeltsin during his visit to Seoul in 1993, contained valuable untold stories on the Korean War. The third wave refers to scholarly efforts to reinterpret and reassess the Korean War, relying on these new sources. Against this backdrop, this paper is aiming at reviewing those waves, focusing mainly on research works conducted by Koreans or published in Korea, to which American readers have paid less attention. This paper then explores where we go from here. In doing this, the future agenda for Korean War studies beyond the historical approach will be examined.

The Effects of the Korean War in the Context of the Cold War: A View Through the Prism of the Vietnam War
by Stanley Karnow

Korea and Vietnam were America's two major battlefields during the Cold War. Washington saw them within the context of the Soviet Union's drive to stretch its influence around the world. But this was a misperception. Though in both instances Communists sought to gain control of their partitioned countries, the conflicts were different, and the tendency to equate them blurred the vision of U.S. policy-makers. The genesis of the Korean War is a story I will leave to those who know it better than I do—except, it clearly started with an overt attack by the North against the South. Vietnam, by contrast, had its origins in a struggle to win independence from French

colonial rule. The Vietnamese leader, Ho Chi Minh, was a Communist, but he was also an intense nationalist and not, as often depicted, simply a Soviet surrogate. Nor was he a pawn of the Chinese, whom all Vietnamese for historical reasons fear and detest. But President Truman and his successors ignored these nuances. The outbreak of the Korean War, combined with Mao Zedong's victory in China, convinced them that they faced a global Communist threat of which Vietnam was an integral part. They were further swayed by the climate in Washington at the time, when it was a political liability to appear to be "soft on Communism." The French played on these concerns to get U.S. aid for their futile cause. After the French defeat in 1954, the Russians and Chinese were eager to improve their relations with the West. As a result, they were instrumental in reaching a settlement that divided Vietnam—and, in effect, betrayed their Vietnamese comrades. They dreaded the prospect of another Korea—where, incidentally, Mao's son was killed. Since then, the Vietnamese Communists deeply distrusted Moscow and Beijing, even though they relied on them for weapons. The United States assisted the anti-Communist government in the South—and, again, the memory of Korea influenced American advisers. Expecting the North Vietnamese to stage an invasion, as North Korea had, they equipped and trained South Vietnam's army to fight a conventional war, which failed to cope with the guerrilla tactics of the enemy at the early stage of the conflict. Korea continued to haunt Lyndon Johnson as he escalated the Vietnam commitment during the 1960s. He constantly worried that the Chinese would intervene—when, in reality, Mao was preoccupied with preparing the Cultural Revolution with the help of a faction of his army and wanted to avoid foreign ventures. Interestingly, one of the first figures he purged was an exponent of intervention in Vietnam. Thus Korea and Vietnam were parallels that did not meet. One of the lessons to be drawn from the two episodes is that each had its distinct characteristics and that analogies can be dangerous.

Panel 2: *War as Crucible: Development of Korean Nationalism and Identity*

Chuch'e Ideology: Origins, Theory, and Practice

by B. C. Koh

Chuch'e (or *Juche*) is the single most important word in the political lexicon of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK). Loosely translated as "self-identity" or "autonomy," it is all but synonymous with Kim Il Sung, who ruled the DPRK for thirty-six years and continues to reign over it as the "Eternal President," even after his death in 1994. Although the idea is said to have originated during Kim Il Sung's struggle for independence as leader of anti-Japanese guerrilla forces in Manchuria in the 1930s, it was not until December 1955, that Kim began to underscore its importance. This raises the possibility that his experience during the Korean War may have influenced his decision to accentuate *chuch'e*. Bordering on solipsistic nationalism, it could be construed as a declaration of independence after suffering from the indignities of domination by two big-power patrons, the Soviet Union and China. Not only did Kim have no choice but to depend heavily on the two neighboring great powers for the conduct of the war and, most important, for survival, but he had little or no control over the manner in which the war ended, including the conduct of armistice negotiations. In its early formulation, *chuch'e* stressed the need to "creatively adapt" the basic tenets of Marxism-Leninism to the realities of the Korean situation. In a later version, however, the *chuch'e* ideology advanced a proposition that directly contradicted the most important Marxian tenet, dialectical materialism. The former instead gives

primacy to the “ideological consciousness of the popular masses,” elevating it to the “decisive” force in making and remaking nature and society. Kim Il Sung’s exaltation of the masses is coupled with, and hence diluted by, his insistence that their creative role can be assured only by the intervention of correct leadership. In order to realize their creative potential, in this view, the masses need to be organized and their level of revolutionary consciousness needs to be raised, tasks that can only be accomplished by the Party and the supreme leader (*suryong*) of the proletariat. In terms of broad guidelines for policy, *chuch’e* mandates: (1) independence in politics; (2) self-reliance in economic capability; and (3) self-defense in military capability. It extols national pride, dignity and sovereignty. North Korea has made Herculean efforts to translate *chuch’e* into reality. Both its domestic and foreign policies have displayed Pyongyang’s obsession with *chuch’e*. Domestically, the emphasis on ideological indoctrination and the drive to construct a strikingly autarkic economic system reflected such a goal. Externally, *chuch’e* was instrumental in giving Pyongyang leverage to steer deftly between Beijing and Moscow during the years of their acrimonious dispute, which enabled the North to maximize its gains. *Chuch’e* has also affected Pyongyang’s negotiating behavior vis-à-vis Seoul, Tokyo and Washington. The DPRK’s track record both at home and in the international arena suggests, however, that *chuch’e*’s actual efficacy is strikingly limited.

Effects of the Korean War on the Social Structures of the Republic of Korea: A Sociological Analysis

by Eui Hang Shin

The primary purpose of this paper is to analyze the effects of the Korean War on various aspects of South Korean social structure. Important effects of the war may be analyzed by examining changes in the demographic processes of fertility, mortality and migration. Demographic consequences of the war are also measured in terms of changes in size, composition, and the distribution of the population. I discuss changing patterns of state-society relations for the period immediately preceding, during and following the Korean War. Prior to the passage of the National Security Law in 1948, the relationship between the Korean state and civil society could best be described as “weak state-strong society.” I examine the processes through which the Korean War once again reversed the relationship between state and society. I then analyze the militarization of society, the military subculture, and the emergence of a military elite in the social stratification system and political power structure. Finally, I investigate the effects of the war on changes in social values, religious beliefs, and the social psychology of family life.

The U.S. Bases in South Korea: Their Continuing Impact

by Katharine H. S. Moon

I will be addressing the social and political consequences of U.S. bases in Korea. I will speak to social movements and protests against particular aspects of the bases in the context of increased anti-Americanism since the 1980s. I will pay attention to comparative cases in the Philippines and Okinawa.

Changing Images of Americans in Korea

by Donald N. Clark

Over the course of the twentieth century, Koreans in the north and south have had very different experiences with Americans. In northern Korea, before World War II, there was much interaction between Koreans and missionaries from many countries and religious denominations. There was also a considerable business presence, mostly in mining. There was much conflict. Much good was also accomplished. But Americans in that period certainly left their mark on North Korea. The national division and the destruction of the war changed all that. The physical legacy of the American presence was destroyed in the bombing and only a few Americans have ever returned. The generations that experienced the earlier encounter have mostly passed away, and the memory of Americans in North Korea before the war has mostly been reduced to caricature. The first half of this paper discusses that earlier presence and how its legacy has been shaped and distorted over time. The second part of the paper treats images of Americans in South Korea, where exposure to Americans has been constant and sometimes even crucial as an influence in national life. Out of their contact with all kinds of Americans—military, official, missionary, business, and Peace Corps among other types—Koreans have spun out several paradigms of their relationship with the United States. The first one is that of "America the historic helper," an image that has been cultivated by the American and South Korean governments and seems to continue in the majority opinion. A second image is of "America the careless colossus," in which America has left huge footprints on Korea without really realizing it or having any clear interest or policy motive. A third image is that of "America the ailing giant," in which the United States is past its prime and no longer deserves the respect it gets from Koreans. In this image, the twenty-first century will be an Asian century, and America can be seen to be shrinking in its influence. A final image is one of "America the ruthless hegemon," a cynical great power that has always seen Korea, among other countries, as a place to be exploited and manipulated for selfish ends. In this paradigm the United States has shown a pattern of keeping Korea weak and subject to its strategic overlordship. Subscription to these differing paradigms varies with individuals and situations. However, when conversing about U.S.-Korean relations, it is important for Americans to realize which paradigms are in the background and to remember that Koreans themselves disagree on which one represents reality.

Panel 3: *Concordant Discord: Reviving Suppressed Memories of the Korean War*

The Trial of Sul Chungsik: Politics and the Ambiguity of Choice
by Uchang Kim

It was only in July 1988 that the general public was legally permitted access to the works of writers of Communist sympathy or those who “went over to the North (*wolpukchakka*).” As the pressure mounted from the democracy movement of the 1980s for freedom of expression and discussion of ideological issues in modern Korean history, the government’s control over mention or discussion of these writers gradually became more relaxed over a period of several years, as long as a correct “critical” distance was maintained. There was a surge of interest in left-wing writers in the late 80s before and after the lifting of the index, resulting in re-publication of the prohibited writers and studies on them. Now, with the change of fashion in the publishing industry, this interest seems to have waned considerably. One collection of critical essays that appeared in 1988 as an early response to the literary and political thaw, *Han'guk keundae rialism chakka yungu (Studies on the Writers of Modern Korean Realism)*, contains

essays dealing with Yi Kiyung, Hong Myunghi, Kim Namch'un, Han Sulya, Cho Myunghi, Hu Jun, Song Yung, Sul Chungsik, Paek Suk and Yi Yongak. But the editors of the volume, Kim Yunsik and Chung Houn, mention five more writers (Yi T'aejun, Pak T'aewon, Kim Saryang, O Changhwan and Kwun Hwan) whose inclusion would have made their collection more complete. These are all important figures in the history of modern Korean literature (though the list could be more extended), but they are also important in any study of modern Korean history, especially as it concerns the Korean War. These writers, more than those on the Southern side, were the ones who were actively involved in the issues of war, ideologically and personally. Studies of these writers would help us understand the politics of the years after the Liberation and the Korean War as more than a series of external events. As they add up to a collective picture of these individuals and their times, we will be able to see them not only as in a situation of hardship suffered but as in a situation presenting difficult moral, intellectual and political choices to the people who were involved in it. Sul Chungsik, who will be the subject of this essay, is one of these *wolpukchakka*, who chose the North in the Korean Conflict. At this stage of my study, I am not prepared to give a full treatment of the details of his life and work; I will be mostly concerned with a pattern of problematic situations that seems to lie underneath his tragic life. What strikes me at first look is the unknowability of his life—more precisely the inner dynamics of his life. This unknowability appears to be worth considering in itself as an important thematic motif in problematic situations. It is not simply that it is difficult from this distance to ascertain what transpired, what occurred in the obscurity of a person's inner life, let alone the external facts—though that is the case, too. One significant difficulty is the paucity of North Korean materials. We do not know what activities he was engaged in during his North Korean sojourn from September 1950 to August 1953. In the South, there are surviving members of Sul Chungsik's family, his friends and acquaintances, though there were also his relatives in the North, including some of the children of his brother and sister; his ancestral place was Danchun, Hamgyungpukto. I have spoken with some of them, though the interviews need to be carried out further. We will of course have to examine his own testament more closely and more extensively, but his writings on the subject are very limited. On the whole, he has not left much behind; he died relatively young. He began publishing from 1932, but there came a long break as he went to the United States to study at Mount Union College in Ohio and Columbia University. After his return, the Japanese repression forced him into silence. At the time of the Liberation, he was thirty-three, and the energy that had been long blocked seemed to burst out. He wrote feverishly and at the same time was fully active in various political and literary movements, but he was soon caught up in the Korean War. By 1953, he was dead at the age of forty-one. Most of his writings were completed in the years between 1945-1950. But the difficulty of finding out what transpired is not simply that of recovering the concrete fullness of another person's life. I feel that it comes in large part from his situation—the situation of an individual caught in a history that demanded suppression of whatever concreteness there was in his life. The movement of history in crisis or epochal history makes individual life invisible or even abolishes this invisibility, as history opens up areas of private life to the trauma of collective fortune. It is not only history, but a certain kind of politics, that makes individual life disappear as it conceives human life—a life lived at a higher level in this conception—exclusively in terms of the broad movements of forces. What I will be concerned with in the following will be this *problematik* of the invisibility of individual life in the Korean War, the ideological struggles underlying it, and probably the Korean conception of political life as well.

The Korean War: Forgotten and Remembered
by David R. McCann

In American history, the Korean War is sometimes still referred to as the “forgotten war.” Along with the War itself, histories of the 1945-1955 era in American history have tended also to overlook the process by which the Left was removed from domestic American political life, or if they do address the topic, they reflect it through the image of Joseph McCarthy, an apparition to be punctured and dismissed. While there has been a significant change in the way the Korean War has been studied and written about in recent years, notably in pursuing the indigenous origins of what historian Bruce Cumings was among the first to describe as a civil war as much as an international Cold War conflict, many aspects of that war continue to be forgotten or overlooked. One instance of this is the attention lavished upon the Kwangju uprising of 1980 as a monument to the democratization process, while the 1948-49 South Korean army campaign on Cheju Island is still relatively unknown, even though ten thousand people—and according to some estimates, as many as thirty or even sixty thousand—were killed in its course. What was the Korean War? When did it begin? What parallels may be discovered between Korean and American domestic history in the period of 1945-1955? Do the parallels extend to earlier and later decades? Some well known examples of American and Korean literature will establish the terrain for reconsidering the dimensions of the Korean War's significance in American and Korean culture.

US-DPRK Relationship: Retrospect, Prospect and Policy Recommendation
by Ok-Nim Chung

This paper examines the evolution of the U.S.-DPRK relationship since 1953, as a way of identifying a realistic and desirable U.S. policy toward North Korea. During the Cold War, the U.S.-DPRK relationship was almost a non factor—it was regarded as a “constant,” rather than a “variable,” in the U.S.-ROK alliance. The U.S. policy toward North Korea back then was either containment or even indifference, as it was perceived to be a part of U.S. policy toward the Soviet Union and China. The North Korea factor was the core of the patron-client military dependency in the U.S.-ROK relationship, inadvertently giving a good justification of political legitimacy for the military authoritarian leaders of South Korea. With the advent of the post-Cold War era, however, the Soviet Empire and the Communist bloc were no more, and as a consequence, the North Korea factor loomed larger as a key element in U.S. security policy. In regard to the U.S.-DPRK relationship, the Korean Peninsula remains a last vestige of the Cold War legacy that can be classified as a sort of “Cold War hangover” one might say. Tackling this thorny issue and devising a pragmatic solution for it requires examination into three separate analytic dimensions: 1) the security dimension, with North Korea as the main destabilizing factor in Northeast Asia; 2) the political (inter-party) dimension on the Korean Peninsula—South Korea amidst U.S.-DPRK bilateral relations; and 3) the internal dynamics (intra-party) dimension among political actors in the U.S.-DPRK relationship. North Korea, classified as a post-Cold War era rogue state by the United States, draws interest toward itself on a wide spectrum of U.S. foreign policy issues ranging from weapons of mass destruction, missile development, international terrorism and drug trafficking to refugee, human rights and international humanitarian aid. Above all, North Korea, through its numerous misbehaviors, enormously impacts the U.S.-Japan security relationship by providing justification again and again for U.S.

forward deployment in East Asia as well as its nuclear missile defense and theater missile defense programs. In addition, North Korea has recently transformed the existing bilateral U.S.-ROK alliance into an awkward triangular ROK-U.S.-DPRK dynamic, significantly complicating the previous bilateral relationships amongst the three as well as making these relationships more difficult to manage. One more area of analysis that is crucial to an understanding and resolution of the Korean situation is domestic dynamics and its linkage to foreign policy. Interestingly, the perception and approach of the U.S. toward North Korea in the post-Cold War period has not changed much from that toward the Soviet Union years ago, despite the gap in national power and contextual circumstances between the two communist countries. The U.S. foreign policy community, in regard to North Korea, is divided into hawks, doves and owls, and these divisions of opinion cause problems of coordination within the executive branch. The role of the U.S. Congress, dominated by Republicans since 1994, has added another dimension to U.S. policy toward North Korea. And likewise, the presidential election in the year 2000 will become another test in the policy arena. In order to mend its moribund economy and isolated diplomatic status, North Korea is attempting omni-directional diplomacy and a cautious opening up to the international community. By all indications, inter-Korean relations and Japan-DPRK talks seem to be moving in that direction. Nevertheless, the Pyongyang regime believes that the key to its survival lies within the security dimension as well as in the economy, and looks to the U.S.—the most able provider in both area—for assurances. The United States has a strong stake in improving relations with North Korea for stability and leverage reasons in Northeast Asia. In this sense, it is possible to foresee that a diplomatic breakthrough will be made in the year 2001 with the inauguration of a new administration in the U.S., no matter who is elected. However, such an outcome would require creative and non-conventional thought on part of the U.S., which in turn, will provide great momentum toward the goal of peace and stability without damaging its leadership status in the pursuit of the security of the Korean Peninsula.

Fourteen Months North of the Parallel: Experiences and Reflections
by Tibor Meray

Having spent fourteen months in Korea during the war, partly in Kaesong and Panmunjom and partly in Pyongyang, it is impossible for me, in fifteen or twenty minutes, to give an account, even a fragmentary one, of what I saw, experienced, lived through, thought then and think now about those things which happened half a century ago. Therefore I would like to concentrate on three clusters of topics. *First*, having arrived from Europe, which was considered to be at peace, or at least not currently engaged in warfare, the thing which struck me and remained with me from Sinuiju on the Chinese border, until I crossed the Yalu again at Antung, was the utter devastation. I had lived through during the Second World War: the siege of Budapest during which the Soviet and Germans fought virtually from house to house. Then I lived through the two Soviet aggressions against the Hungarian capital in October and November 1956. I have to say that I had never seen devastation to the extent of that which I saw in Korea in 1951 to 1953, neither before nor since. It is reasonable to say that apart from small hamlets and isolated peasant cottages, North Korea did not exist. The first question, to which I will attempt to provide an answer is this: To what extent is it reasonable or justifiable to wage quasi-total warfare that afflicts the civilian population as well and to disregard human suffering. Is this inevitable or can it be avoided and does this have an influence on the final outcome of the war? *Second*, for someone who was in Korea as a correspondent, the manipulation of truth and lies and the

freedom of the press is inevitably a central issue. On this occasion, I will deal briefly with the issue of germ warfare. However, I also will highlight the matter of prisoners of war. This is because I was the first correspondent arriving from the West who managed to obtain permission from the North Koreans to visit a prison camp; talk to American, English and Turkish POW's; and give an account to American journalists of the impressions gained at these camps, handing over lists of names and photographs. All this filled entire pages in American newspapers, and many families were able to find out for the first time whether their sons, husbands or fathers were alive. I have to add that this natural and unsuspecting gesture of mine almost wrecked my life. I told it as I saw it. However, did I see the truth about the lives of the great majority of prisoners? It transpired that the answer is no. The manipulation, however—*mutatis mutandis*—did not exist on one side only. Was the investigation at Kaesong, the result of which the armistice negotiations in August 1951 were interrupted for two months, based on truth? I was present at this event. Why did General Ridgway in Panmunjom prohibit "fraternization" between journalists who came from the South and those who came from the North? What caused the rebellion of the Western journalists against this censorship? A self-evident question arises from the above: Can objective information exist during war? To what extent does the world, and, more importantly the general public of nations at war, have a right to be acquainted with "unpleasant facts"? *Third*, from the distance of fifty years, comparing it with previous wars and considering wars fought after it, to what extent can we consider the Korean war something new? A war which at the time was unique, but has been repeated in many aspects since? In my opinion, this war represented a turning point, both in the military and political sense. Why and to what extent? At the end of my discussion I will attempt to provide answers to this.

Foreign Economic Policy Constraints of the DPRK in the Global Era: A New Breed of Ideation?
by Han S. Park

The Cold War world order was overtaken by the massive force of globalization in virtually all ideological enclaves of the world. It is the globalization that forced socialist economic systems to redirect themselves to embrace the globalization ethos and be passively engulfed by the world market system. Exceptions to the global trend are rare, and no exception is as evident as North Korea. This essay portrays North Korea's policy behavior that is defiant of the rules of globalization, and discerns the objective constraints and subjective rationale underlying such a policy posture. The imperative of system maintenance on the part of the secluded and alienated system fosters a new level of ideation in that *Juche* as a human centered ideology is seen as facing the sacred challenge of saving the human race by denouncing the law of market and global consumerism. Though such a grand aspiration may sound admirable, the challenge ahead may be insurmountable and even dangerous.

Panel 5: *U.S.-ROK Relations: Cost and Benefits of the Korean War*

The Korean War and the U.S. Relationship with Korea
by William Stueck, Jr.

This paper analyzes the impact of the Korean War on the U.S. relationship with Korea, arguing that it was the events from 1950 to 1953 that are responsible for setting the relationship on a

course that would be recognizable to us today. In military, political, and economic areas, the paper examines American involvement in Korea on the eve of the war compared to that in 1953, when the armistice was signed. In all three areas, it concludes that major changes occurred, that those changes occurred largely because of the war, and that, in general, the changes were in the direction of a greater U.S. commitment to the peninsula and greater influence on the part of the government of the Republic of Korea on American policy.

U.S. Priorities in the Cold War and Post-Cold War Eras
by Ralph A. Cossa

One is tempted to say that U.S. priorities for the Korean Peninsula have not changed significantly in the post-Cold War era, since the Cold War has not fully come to a close on the Peninsula. Preventing a renewal of conflict remains the top priority. Deterring North Korean aggression was the primary objective during the Cold War and remains so today, even if the likelihood and magnitude of conflict and the global implications if it did occur have both been reduced. The removal of the Cold War dimension of the Peninsula stand-off (i.e., the need to contain the spread of Soviet-style communism) has not reduced either the immediate consequences of conflict or the U.S. commitment, through the forward presence of American combat troops under the Mutual Defense Treaty, to deter or respond. Maintaining the viability of that treaty has remained another top priority. Nonetheless, the end of the Cold War has allowed the U.S. and Korea to more pro-actively pursue their common objective of a peaceful, stable, economically prosperous, and eventually reunified nuclear weapons-free Peninsula. It has also provided Pyongyang with some incentive to engage Seoul and Washington, now that its time-honored practice of playing Beijing and Moscow against one another no longer yields desired results. This has opened a new set of options for Washington and Seoul, and it has allowed both to introduce a new priority task of opening up North Korea, in order to reduce the risk of conflict today and set the stage for eventual reconciliation and reunification. The post-Cold War environment has also made more complex the challenge of determining how best to deal with China, which fought alongside North Korea during the Korean War and attempted to retain a "close as lips to teeth" relationship with Pyongyang throughout the Cold War, even as it shifted partners and came to side with the U.S. against the Soviet Union in the Cold War's waning years. Managing Sino-U.S. cooperation and competition on the Peninsula, as the broader relationship and overall geopolitical environment continually shifts, is another key priority. One task given insufficient priority is determining U.S. post-Cold War strategy for the Peninsula. The perception, reinforced by U.S. policy statements at the time, that Korea held a low priority in Washington helped bring about the war we are now commemorating. A failure to attach sufficient priority to maintaining a close U.S.-Korea security relationship post-reunification will mean we have failed to learn the Korean War's most important history lesson.

From Patron To Partner: U.S.-ROK Economic Relations: Past and Future
by Marcus Noland

The U.S. has been South Korea's key economic partner since the founding of the republic in 1948, and today, South Korea is America's ninth largest trade partner, accounting for roughly \$50 billion in two-way trade annually. The U.S. has played an important role in South Korea's economic development not only through direct bilateral channels, but through its leadership of

global economic institutions such as the World Bank, International Monetary Fund (IMF), and the World Trade Organization (WTO); it would be a mistake to assess the relationship solely through the prism of direct bilateral interaction. Indeed, this paper will argue that multilateral fora will be increasingly important to the future economic relationship between the two allies. This, together with South Korea's transition from developing to developed country status, means that the relationship between the U.S. and South Korea over the next fifty years, characterized by a greater degree of equality, will be very different from the hierarchical patron-client relationship that has existed for the past fifty. Recent developments, most notably the formation of the WTO and the Asian financial crisis, have set in motion a series of forces that may generate considerable change in the relationship. As South Korea has developed, bilateral trade between the U.S. and South Korea increasingly takes the form of intra-industry trade in similar products. The recent increase in foreign direct investment into South Korea is likely to accelerate and reinforce this process, as well as broaden and deepen the network of inter-corporate relations between the two countries. As a consequence the trade issues that the U.S. and South Korea confront and the modalities in which they are resolved will increasingly resemble those between the U.S. and other developed countries. In particular, multilateral fora such as the WTO are likely to play a more prominent role in the resolution of bilateral trade disputes than in the past. On the financial side, the Asian financial crisis underscored the systemic importance of large middle income countries, such as South Korea, and the need for international financial architectural reform. In addition to the public sector international financial institutions, the U.S. and South Korea are partners in the G20, the organization in which these reforms will be hashed out at the strategic level. The question remains as to whether the shift in economic policy in South Korea, away from the traditional state-centered model and toward a system rooted more firmly in open transparent market transactions that was accelerated with the assumption of the presidency by Kim Dae Jung in 1998, will continue after his term expires in 2003. While the pace of change could slow, it is hard to imagine a significant reversal of the trend that has been underway for two decades. All these considerations point to a bilateral relationship that will be marked by more genuine equality in the future than has existed in the past.

Panel 6: Korea and Her Neighbors: Future of the Korean Peninsula

Russia and the Future of the Korean Peninsula

by Alexandre Y. Mansourov

A land power of Russia fought two limited wars against maritime powers in the Korean peninsula: the first one against Japan (1904-1905) and the second one against the United States and its overseas allies fifty years later (1950-1953). These were the periods of radical domestic transformations in Korea. Both times, Russia suffered considerable setbacks and failed to achieve its primary goal, i.e., to keep the peninsula free of the expanding maritime influences hostile to its continental power. At the dawn of the new millennium, Korea is faced with the possibility of another major geopolitical shock, namely, the upcoming unification of the peninsula. Obviously, such a radical transformation of the existing political and socio-economic frameworks cannot leave Russia disinterested and passive, despite its lingering internal woes, and is sure to focus Russian attention on the peninsular affairs once again. How is a reborn free Russia, itself in transition to democracy and open markets, likely to react to Korean reunification

and to try to influence its course in the direction favoring Russian national interests? Will Moscow sit on the sidelines or actively participate in shaping the future of the Korean nation as it used to do? Will it prefer the application of force as in the past or the means of creative peaceful diplomacy? These are the big questions this work is going to address.

China-Korea Relations: A Chinese View
by Xiaoming Zhang

Korea has always been one of the most important neighbors of China over the past two thousand years due to its proximity to China and its special geopolitical location. China got involved into several wars on the Korean peninsula, including the 1950-1953 Korea War which we are now commemorating its 50th anniversary. The Chinese decision makers, and to some extent, the public as a whole, has always been following the developments of that region closely, including the recent summit between President Kim Dae Jung and “Dear Leader” Kim Jong Il. In this conference paper, I am going to elaborate on the Korea-China relations from a Chinese perspective.

Historical Patterns of China’s Relations with Korea

There are three historical patterns of China’s relations with her neighbors. And China-Korea relations is fully consistent with the historical patterns of China’s relations with her neighboring countries. The first one is “Sinocentric tributary system” from the first unification of China by Qin in 211 BC until the eve of the Opium War in 1840. China was the dominant power in East Asia, and most of her neighboring countries, including Korea, paid tributes to the Chinese emperors on regular basis. The second one is “Western-dominant system” from the Opium War until the end of the World War II. Both China and most of her neighbors became the colonies and semi-colonies of the Western powers. The Sino-Japanese war in 1894-1895 inflicted a great human suffering and humiliation upon China and drove its influence away from the Korean peninsula. From then on China’s lack of a direct role in Korea lasted for more than half a century. The third one is “Cold War system”. The Cold War imposed a great restraint on China’s relations with her neighbors. The end of the World War II and the onset of the Cold War led to the political division of the Korean peninsula. The two superpowers’ rivalry dominated the political development of the region during the Cold War. As the political ally of the Soviet Union and North Korea, China got involved a bloody war on the Korean peninsula. The PRC and DPRK had ever since been close allies against the ROK until the end of the Cold War. In the Cold War years, relations between the PRC and ROK were virtually non-existent. As for the Korea-China relations in the post-Cold War era, a new pattern of relationship is now emerging although it is too early for us to name it. Although the peninsula is still divided China has been enjoying friendly relations with both of the two Koreas since the early 1990s.

China’s National Interest on the Korean Peninsula

The Korean peninsula is the gateway or bridge between the Eurasia continent and the Pacific. And all of the neighbors of the peninsula are major powers. That geopolitical location is strategically important to China. Because the peninsula might be used by an enemy as a springboard for attacking China. China has learnt a great lesson from the history. As a result,

China has an enduring interest in this region. China would not tolerate the domination of the region by any hostile power. As an American scholar argued, “China has had historic interest in preventing any hostile power from dominating the peninsula.” The most important aspect of the Korean peninsula’s relevance to China’s national security is geopolitical. But as the Cold War came to a close, economic factors are gaining an increasing importance in determining perceptions of national security. The increasing economic interdependence between the PRC and ROK is closely connected with China’s national economic security. That is to say, China has her economic interest in the region, too. A peaceful, stable and prosperous Korean peninsula is in the interest of China and the other powers concerned. But it doesn’t mean that maintaining the status quo on the peninsula is in the best interest of China. It seems to me what China is caring much about is the way and process of reunification. A reunification on the peaceful, mutually voluntary and step-by-step basis would be appreciated by China and the other powers.

Balancing Bilateralism and Multilateralism

China needs to balance bilateral and multilateral approaches in dealing with the Korean peninsula. Bilateralism is the traditional Chinese way to deal with her relations with the neighboring countries, including Sino-Korea relations. The Chinese government is now trying to maintain a close and stable bilateral relationship with both of the two Koreas and that policy is so far basically successful. But it is not a easy task for China to keep a perfect balance between her relations with the two Koreas. On the other hand, it is also important for China to apply multilateral approach towards the Korean peninsula. The peninsula is the place where the interests of China and the other three major powers intersect. A multilateral cooperation among the parties concerned is important for the management of the regional situation. For a long time China insisted that the Korean conflict had to be settled between the two Koreas as well as between the DPRK and the US, and declined to get involved in the negotiations to establish a peace mechanism on the peninsula. China’s attitude changed in 1997 when she responded positively to the proposal of four-party talks. China joined the quadrilateral talks in 1997 in Geneva and has all along played a constructive role since then. Chinese President Jiang Zemin even made a positive response to then South Korean president-elect Kim Dae Jung’s proposal on six-nation talks on Northeast Asian security and peace in February 1998. Building a peace regime on the peninsula is conducive to China’s national interest. It is necessary for the four major powers and two Koreas to cooperate in order to establish an efficient peace-guaranteeing mechanism. Bilateralism and multilateralism are two different but complementary approaches. China has to balance the two in dealing with the Korean peninsula for her own national interest.

U.S.-Korea Relations: A Korean Perspective
by Kyong Soo Lho

For nearly a half century, the strategic partnership between the United States and the Republic of Korea (henceforth, Korea) has been instrumental to the maintenance of peace and stability on the Korean peninsula and in the Northeast Asian region. Formed at the height of the cold war to deter against renewed aggression by communist North Korea and to put into place a peninsular link in the United States' broader containment policy against the Soviet Union, the bilateral security arrangement in between Seoul and Washington has outlived the demise of the Soviet Union and the end of the cold war. And so, perhaps the first observation about the alliance

should be that it has in fact endured for so long. Arguably, the past decade should have witnessed a fairly sweeping reappraisal of the bilateral relationship which, after all, was fundamentally predicated on the need to contain a hostile, expansionist, Soviet Union. The fact that such a reappraisal did not formally take place owes to several reasons, the most important of course being the lingering North Korean security threat to peace on the Korean peninsula and Northeast Asia. Tinkering with the alliance structure in Korea, moreover, could potentially have unleashed an unwanted train of events--most especially with regard to the U.S.-Japan alliance. At the same time, however, the alliance today faces newfound challenges. In an era where Seoul and Washington are closely coordinating a parallel peace offensive toward Pyongyang, it has become increasingly difficult to vilify North Korea. And needless to say, minus a clear-cut image of North Korea as the "enemy", the security rationale underpinning the alliance is seriously weakened; if the perceived fear of North Korea continues to diminish, finding the *raison d'etre* for continued stationing of U.S. troops in Korea, at least at current levels, will become even more problematic. Much will also depend on how the relationship between the United States and China evolves in the years ahead. If the relationship becomes antagonistic, Seoul will find itself in an extremely delicate position vis-à-vis Beijing, a situation that it would clearly like to avoid at all costs. There appears to be little awareness in Washington, however, how its China policy, should it be mishandled, could have possibly adverse consequences in terms of alliance relations with Seoul and, in all likelihood, with Tokyo as well. The cautious stance taken by Seoul with respect to the acquisition of even a lower-tier Theater Missile Defense capability is but one example of Seoul's desire not to unnecessarily create frictions with Beijing. Accepting that the United States and Korea wish to remain alliance partners beyond the time when the North Korea threat is gone or greatly diminished, what new strategic rationale would justify and underpin the partnership? Whether or not a new alliance rationale can be found will critically depend on how the respective interests of the United States and Korea either converge or diverge at this juncture against an extremely fluid East Asian strategic backdrop. In this new setting, what are the United States' strategic interests in Korea? How are they tied to Washington's broader regional goals? In this period of uncertain transition, what ought to be the policy guidelines for Washington and Seoul? And beyond the politics of division on the peninsula, do the United States and Korea have common interests and objectives in the region that are better served by partnership than they are unilaterally? Questions such as these hardly arose during the past fifty years of alliance. But the simplifying logic of the Cold War era has been replaced by new complexities that need to be evaluated with respect to their near and longer term implications for the alliance.

Panel 7: Reflections on the Long-term Impact of the Korean War

The Primary and Transgenerational Impact of the Korean War

by Hesung Chun Koh

Much has been written about the Korean War, but a systematic assessment of its various cultural repercussions remains absent from the available literature; few researchers have examined the War's long-term psychological and sociological impact on family relationships and structures, especially where Korean women and children are concerned. Since this transgenerational legacy of the Korean War remains largely unmapped, unanswered questions still abound. For instance, we ask, "What have the Korean people gained from their wartime experiences, what have they

lost, and how have they evolved in response to the sociodynamic pressures of the War's immediate impact and long-term influences?" For Koreans who chose to emigrate from their native country, the intergenerational effects of the War reflect the additional cultural influences of the adopted country. We devote our analysis to the personal recollections of Korean Americans, whose college-age sons and daughters interviewed them about their wartime experiences. We also mine the novels and short stories of Korean American authors for their literary insights into relevant themes. History has often revealed that the very war that wounds and cripples a country can also serve as a watershed for survivors to reexamine their ethnic and national identity as well as family ties. From drastic psychological and social loss and upheaval, many learn to make their way towards self-renewal. An understanding of these and related issues that affect Korean Americans will perhaps remedy the noticeable gap in scholarship on the Korean War, as well as shed light on the vexing subject of intergenerational conflict.

The Forgotten ROK Soldiers of the Korean War

by John K. C. Oh

A prophesy of a complete collapse of the ROK army was made at the outset of the Korean War by none other than President Truman. He stated that "South Korean casualties as an index to fighting have not shown adequate resistance capabilities or the will to fight...a complete collapse is imminent." This grim prognosis was probably the first step in Truman's forceful advocacy for an immediate and massive military response to the stunning North Korean attack, but it also created widespread perception that the South Korean military simply disintegrated. Once the U.S. soldiers hurriedly reentered Korea in July 1950, the Korean conflict became an "American War" and a United Nations police action fought on the Korean peninsula. Consequently, in most English-language reports and books on the Korean War, the significant contributions of the Korean soldiers to the war efforts have largely been ignored, and their "casualties" figures have seldom been discussed. It is submitted that such accounts of the Korean War are as unbalanced, incomplete and unfair as calling the Korean War a "forgotten war." It is abundantly clear that the South Korean army in 1950 was outnumbered, ill-equipped, and under-trained. The army, peculiarly a product of the American Military Government, more particularly of the Korean Military Advisory Group (KMAG), was outnumbered by two-to-one. The worst imbalance, however, was that the northern army had 242 T-34 tanks, an updated version of the Russian tanks that had defeated the German army, and the southern military had no tanks or defense against the Russian tanks. Also the northern army had 172 howitzers with an effective range of about seventeen miles, while the south had 91 artillery pieces with a range of seven miles. When the northern army launched an all-out attack, the ROK soldiers had few effective defenses against the juggernaut. The first U.S. Task Force hastily thrown into Korea were routed just as rapidly as the South Koreans. General Matthew B. Ridgway observed that the South Korean soldiers were like a group of "Boy Scouts with hand weapons" trying to "stop a panzer unit." However, Gen. Paik Sun Yup wrote that most of the ROK soldiers "continued trekking southward until they found their mother units" and regrouped within days after the initial meltdown. These ROK units engaged in bloody delaying actions against the northern steamrollers, suffering heavy casualties. Everyday that delayed the North Korean thrust before the July 1 landing in Pusan of the American task force was critical. By August 1950, the ROK strength—that supposedly "collapsed"—was already some 82,000 when American ground forces numbered 47,000. In fact, the ROK units, despite the paucity of heavy armor that was slow to

arrive to them, fought every step of the way until they reached the Taegu-Pusan perimeter. Meanwhile, in the epic Inchon landing, the ROK Marine and the 17th regiment participated, a fact ignored in most English-language reports and books, including those by Gen. Douglas MacArthur and Gen. Ridgway. In fierce battles at the last defense line just north of Taegu, the ROK 1st Division, commanded by Gen. Paik, was given the task of defending the critical nineteen miles covering pivotal approaches to the wartime capital. The North Koreans evidently concentrated their attacks against ROK defense lines, roughly from Pohang to Waegwan, rather than the American and UN line from Waegwan to Masan, as the northerners knew that the ROK units had the least fire power and air support. The month-long pitched battle of Tabu-dong ended in a clear-cut victory for the ROK 1st Division, with heavy ROK casualties of 2,244 men and 56 officers. No books originally written in English even mention Tabu-dong. In the thrust northward after October 1, 1950, ROK units actually spearheaded the dash toward Pyongyang and Wonsan, both captured first by the ROK soldiers. When the Chinese army massively intervened in the war in October 1950, the Chinese too concentrated their human sea attacks on ROK forces as they still had the least firepower, air cover, and training. When battle lines were stabilized by the fall of 1951, General James Van Fleet initiated a systematic re-training program of ten ROK divisions. Subsequently, General Van Fleet could deploy re-trained ROK troops in every sector until, by the end of 1952, the ROK soldiers "constituted nearly three-fourths of the front-line troops." Casualties as an index to fighting reveal that roughly 53%, or 608,009, of the total casualties of the United Nations Command were borne by the ROK soldiers, to say nothing of the casualties suffered by the South Korean police and hapless civilians. In terms of those "killed" in action, South Koreans accounted for 70% of total deaths, or 136,858, as compared to 54,268 Americans and 3,687 other UN soldiers. However, these South Korean soldiers' contributions and sacrifices have remained largely "forgotten" in the world at large for nearly half a century.

Some Remembrances and Reflections About Korea: Before, During and After the War
by Edward L. King

June 25th marks the 50th anniversary of the start of the three years of bloody fighting in Korea, which has been largely ignored in contemporary American history and has long been unjustly called the "Forgotten War". As one who has never forgotten Korea and my service there, I want to share some personal reflections in the hope that they may perhaps encourage my fellow Americans to finally remember and recognize the sacrifices made and the many young lives lost in the United Nation's historic first successful battle in defense of democratic freedom. American presence in Korea didn't begin with the war. Troops of the U.S. Army's XXIV Corps landed in Korea on September 3, 1945, to enforce Japanese surrender and meet advancing Soviet troops at the 38th Parallel, where the war would begin in 1950 and where it ended on July 27, 1953. My first memories of Korea began shortly after my 17th birthday, when I climbed a rope ladder down the side of a troop transport into a WWII LCI (Landing Craft Infantry) and rode into Inchon harbor on a bitter cold day in 1946. I was an infantry buck private rifleman, and for the next two years I lived in and around Kaesong, spending my days and nights pulling outpost and patrol duties along the dividing line between North and South Korea, sometimes exchanging fire with Russians and North Koreans. This then was how I first came to know Korea. I can still remember the freezing winters and scorching summers, performing guard duty at places like Tosong-ni, where the railroad entered South Korea from the North and I saw dozens of

refugees—Korean and Japanese—fleeing from Manchuria and North Korea. And there were the seemingly endless days and nights of guard and patrol duty at remote, isolated outposts near Kaesong, Paekchon and Ongin, often with hair-raising cross-border confrontations. After my enlistment, I returned to the U.S. in 1948 to attend college. I told friends that I believed there would be a war in Korea. Most would say, "Where's Korea?" I too had pretty much ceased to think about Korea until the North Korean attack across the Parallel and my subsequent July receipt of orders from the Army inactive reserve recalling me to active duty. In the space of little over a month, I went from my college campus to assignment in the 34th Infantry Regiment, engaged in combat against the North Korean divisions driving toward Pusan. I was one of thousands of U.S. inactive reservists, hastily recalled to active duty with little, or no, refresher military training, rushed pell-mell into battle as individual replacements. Many did not last very long. After some recuperation time in Japan, the regiment returned to Korea for more combat. In 1952, I left Korea for the final time. I had first arrived in Korea barely 17 years old; I left shortly after my 23rd birthday. Emotionally, I felt like an old man. Korea became the crucible upon which I and many others sacrificed much of our youth. In order to survive, we were forced to quickly become mature far beyond our years. I have not yet been back. However, in my subsequent careers in the Army and as a senior foreign policy advisor on the U.S. Senate staff, I have had the opportunity to deal with many of the military and political policies that have evolved in the close bilateral relationship that exists between our two countries. As a result of these many years of experience, first fighting for Korean freedom and then working on some of the strategic and political concerns that are still present in the current situation in Korea, I believe it is time to take a fresh look at some of the long existent military and political axioms and policies that have determined the nature of our relations for the past half century. Unfortunately, the few Americans who can get beyond Vietnam and do remember the war in Korea at all, too often mistakenly recall it as ending in an ignominious draw. That was not the case. The defeat and rollback of communist aggression against the people of South Korea was a clear-cut major victory for the United States and the United Nations. It marked the first victory in the ultimate winning of the Cold War. So, let us hope that this 50th Anniversary commemorative conference will be the beginning of an awakening by the American people to an appropriate remembrance of the too-long forgotten thousands of lives lost and sacrifices made by so many of their fellow citizens, who successfully fought bravely fifty years ago to defend and preserve for South Korea and the world community, the democratic freedoms that many in today's secure prosperous nation so casually take for granted.

A Retrospective from the Trenches: The War from a Marine Lieutenant's Perspective
by Bernard E. Trainor

It is almost a half-century since I ended up on the frontlines during the second winter of the "Forgotten War." Since then, we here have had the benefit of hindsight and the course of history to help us evaluate the war. But it is useful to remember a contemporary context when making an evaluation. How was the war seen at the time by those who did the fighting? I think I am representative of that group—at least of U.S. Marine Corps junior officers. Most of us who went out to lead infantry platoons in the Korean war's second phase were high school students during World War II. We were weaned on that war. It permeated every facet of our lives. We were patriotic to a fault and largely for that reason elected to serve in the military as so many of our brothers, neighbors and cousins had done in fighting Germany and Japan. Now a new menace to

peace and democracy had emerged in the form of aggressive communism. Russia, always viewed with suspicion during the “big war,” had revealed its true colors and was sponsoring aggression in the Far East. It was our turn to fight. Neither I, nor my mates, questioned the efficacy of the war. We were defending against monolithic, Godless communism while a budding democracy in South Korea took root. Needless to say we had few geopolitical thoughts beyond that. I guess we were all idealistic Jeffersonian democrats. Born of an obedient generation, with trust and respect for authority, we never once questioned the nobility or methods of our commitment. Likewise we worshipped at the altar of “total victory”. It was our legacy from the days of the Civil War through the recent war in Europe and the Pacific. All of us were shocked and dismayed when the prime advocate of that victory, Douglas MacArthur, was summarily relieved of his command a year earlier. We were also appalled by the truce negotiations undertaken at Panmunjom. That was not the way to end a war. From our point of view, we had the enemy on the run in the autumn of 1951. With our superior firepower and mobility, we favored continuing the attack to finish them off. The peace talks had turned all that around. Now it was the North Koreans and Chinese who had the advantage. Prodigious diggers, they had deeply entrenched themselves in successive defensive lines. Any attempt at resuming the offensive if the peace talks broke down would be bloody, costly and questionable. “The “Battle for the Outposts” that ensued during those talks, from the spring of 1952 until the end of the war, made that abundantly clear. Americans suffered more casualties during that period than they did in the first half of the war. While the peace talks dragged on, our enthusiasm for “victory” eroded with the ghastly bloodletting along what is now the Demilitarized Zone. In the end we were happy to settle for a stalemate. Just getting out of Korea alive was good enough for us. Yet, we took satisfaction in having stopped the spread of communism—an accomplishment, which later prompted the country to go to war again on the mainland of Asia. The idea of total victory may have been abandoned in Korea, but we were now inspired by the rhetoric of a young and vigorous new president to bear any burden and pay any price in the cause of liberty. But that too, like total victory, proved to be an illusion which would end up, not in stalemate, but in defeat.

BIBLIOGRAPHY ON THE KOREAN WAR

The following published English-language sources constitute a select list of readings on the Korean War. It should not be construed as an exhaustive roster. I have culled it from over 700 available titles guided by the criteria that the readings should cover as many dimensions and viewpoints as possible, incorporate the most recent available findings and interpretations while keeping some of the more prominent writings of earlier decades, combine scholarly as well as popular writings, and be accessible to both the specialist and the non-specialist. In addition, being of the firm belief that works of fiction and poetry are as important as historical, military, diplomatic, and social science narratives and analyses for understanding human events, I have added a few works of “pure” literature as well.

Vipan Chandra
Professor of History
Wheaton College

Appleman, Roy E., *South to the Naktong, North to the Yaln*. Washington, DC: Office of the Chief of Military History, 1961

_____, *Escaping the Trap*. College Station, Texas: Texas A & M University Press, 1990.

_____, *Disaster in Korea*. College Station, Texas: Texas A & M University Press, 1990.

_____, *Ridgway Duels for Korea*. College Station, Texas: Texas A & M University Press, 1990.

_____, *East of Chosin: Entrapment and Breakout in Korea, 1950*. College Station, Texas: Texas A & M University Press, 1991.

Ahn, Junghyo. *Silver Stallion: A Novel of Korea*. Soho Press, Inc., 1993.

Bailey, Sydney D. “A Quaker Initiative to End the War” in *Journal of the Friends’ Historical Society (UK)* 56:2, 1990.

Bevan, Alexander. *Korea: The First War We Lost*. New York: Hippocrene, 1986.

Blair, Clay. *The Forgotten War: America in Korea, 1950-1953*. New York: Times Books, 1987.

Brady, James. *The Marines of Autumn: Novel of the Korean War*. St. Martin’s Press, 2000.

_____. *The Coldest War: A Memoir of Korea*. New York: Pocket Books, 1992.

Breuer, William B., *The Covert War in Korea*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1996.

Bureuson, David J. *Blood on the Hills: The Canadian Army in the Korean War*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999

Bussey, Charles M. *Firefight at Yechon: Courage and Racism in the Korean War*. Collingdale: Diane Publishing Co., 1998.

- Cagle, Malcom W. and Frank A. Manson. *The Sea War in Korea*. Naval Institute Press, 2000.
- Calingaert, Daniel. "Nuclear Weapons and the Korean War," in *Journal of Strategic Studies (UK)*, 11:2, 1988.
- Catchpole, Brian. "The Commonwealth in Korea: in *History Today (UK)*, 48:11, 1998.
- Chen, Jian, *China's Road to the Korean War: The Making of the Sino-American Confrontation*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1994.
- Choi, Susan. *The Foreign Student. A Novel*. New York: Harper Perrenial, 1999.
- Cotton, James and Ian Neary, eds. *The Korean War in History*. Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 1989.
- Crane, Conrad. *A Rather Bizarre War: American Airpower Strategy in Korea, 1950-1953*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2000.
- Cummings, Bruce, ed. "On the Strategy and Morality of American Nuclear Policy in Korea, 1950 to the Present," in *Social Science Japan Journal (UK)*, 2:1, 1998.
- _____, ed. *Korea's Place in the Sun: A Modern History*. New York and London: W.W. Norton and Co., 1997
- _____, ed. *War and Television*. New York, Verso, 1992.
- _____, ed. *Origins of the Korean War*. Vol I. *Liberation and the Emergence of Separate Regims, 1945-1947*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981.
- _____, ed. *Child of Conflict: The Korean-American Relationship, 1943-1953*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1983.
- _____, ed. *Origins of the Korean War*, Vol II, *The Roaring of the Cataract, 1947-1950* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990.
- Dayal, Rajeshwar. "The Power of Wisdom," in *International Journal (Canada)* 29:1, 1973-74.
- Dayal, Shiv, *India's Role in the Korean Question*. Delhi: S. Chand, 1959.
- Dingman, Roger. *The Dagger and the Gift: The Impact of the Korean War on Japan* (Imprint from the *Journal of American-East Asian Relations*, Vol. 2, No. 1) 1993.
- Dornan, Robert K., ed. *Accounting for POW-MIAs from the Korean War and the Vietnam War: Hearing Before the Committee on National Security, U.S. House of Representatives*. Collingdale: Diane Publishing Co, 1998.
- Dvorchak, Robert J. *Battle for Korea: The Associated Press History of the Korean Conflict*. Conshohocken, PA: Combined Books, Inc., 2000.
- Edwards, M. Paul. *To Acknowledge a War: The Korean War in American Memory*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing Group, 2000.

- _____. *The Inchon Landing, Korea 1950*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Publishing Group, 1994.
- Ehrhart, W.D. and Phillip K. Jason, eds. *Retrieving Bones: Stories and Poems of the Korean War*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1999.
- Endicott, Stephen and Edward Hagerman. *The United States and Biological Warfare: Secrets from the Early Cold War and Korea*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1999.
- Euwer, Robert Maxwell. *No Longer Forgotten: The Korean War and Its Memorial*. Baltimore: Gateway Press, 1995.
- Farrar-Hockley, General Sir Anthony. *The British Part in the Korean War, Vol. I, A Distant Obligation*. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1990.
- _____. *Vol. II, An Honorable Discharge*. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1995.
- Fehrenback, T.R. *This Kind of War: A Study of Unpreparedness*. New York: Macmillan, 1963.
- Foote, Rosemary. *The Wrong War: American Policy and the Dimensions of the Korean Conflict, 1950-53*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1986.
- _____. *A Substitute for Victory: The Politics of Peacemaking at the Korean Armistice Talks*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990.
- Giangreco, D.M. *War in Korea: 1950-1953: A Pictorial History*. Novato, CA: Presidio Press, 2000.
- Goldstein, Donald M. *The Korean War: The Story and Photographs*. Dulles: Brassey's, 1999.
- Goncharov, Sergei N., John W. Lewis and Xue Litai. *Uncertain Partners. Stalin, Mao and the Korean Conflict*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1993.
- Gordenker, Leon. *The United Nations and the Peaceful Unification of Korea: The Politics of Field Operations*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1959.
- Grey, Jeffrey. *The Commonwealth Armies and the Korean War*. Manchester, U.K.: Manchester University Press, 1999.
- Gupta, Karunakar, "How Did the Korean War Begin?," *China Quarterly*, 52:3, 1972.
- Haas, Colonel Michael E., USAF (Ret.). *In the Devil's Shadow: UN Special Operations During the Korean War*. Annapolis, MD. Naval Institute Press, 2000.
- Halliday, Jon, and Bruce Cumings. *Korea: The Unknown War*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1988.
- Haruki, Wada. "The Korean War, Stalin's Policy and Japan," in *Social Science Japan Journal (UK)*, 1:1, 1998.
- Heefner, Wilson A. "The Inchon Landing," *Military Review*, 75:2, 1995.
- Hickey, Michael. *The Korean War: The West Confronts Communism*. Overlook Press, 2000.

- Highsmith, Carol M. and Ted Landphair. *Forgotten No More: The Korean War Veterans Memorial Story*. Washington, D.C.: Chelsea Publishing, Inc., 1995.
- Ho Jong Ho, Kang Sok Hui and Park Thae Ho. *The U.S. Imperialists Started the Korean War*. Pyongyang: Foreign Languages Press, 1993.
- Hogan, Michael J. *Cross of Iron: Harry S. Truman and the Origins of the National Security State, 1945-1954*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Hunt, Michael H. "Beijing and the Korean Crisis, June 1950-June 1951," *Political Science Quarterly*, 107:3, 1992.
- Hwang Sun-won. "Crane." *The Stars and Other Korean Short Stories*. Translated by Edward D. Poitras. Hong Kong: Heinemann Educational Books, Ltd, 1980.
- James, D. Clayton. *Refighting the Last War: Comments and Crisis in Korea, 1950-1953*. New York: The Free Press, 1993.
- Jolidon, Lawrence. *Last Seen Alive: The Search for Missing POWS from the Korean War*. Rochester, NY: Ink-Slinger Press, 1995.
- Kaufman, Burton I. *The Korean War: Challenges in Crisis, Credibility, and Command*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1986.
- _____. *The Korean Conflict*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1999.
- Kim, Chi-Young. *The Korean War and International Law*. Claremont, California: Poug Press, 1990.
- Kim, Elizabeth. *Ten Thousand Sorrows: The Extra-Ordinary Journey of a Korean War Orphan*. Doubleday, 2000.
- Kim, Choong Soon. *Faithful Endurance: An Ethnography of Korean Family Dispersal*. Tucson, Arizona: University of Arizona Press.....
- Kim, Chull-Baum. *The Truth About the Korean War*. Seoul: Enlyoo Publishing Co. Ltd., 1991.
- Kim, Gye-Dong, *Foreign Intervention in Korea*. Aldershort, U.K.: Dartmouth Publishing Co., 1993.
- Kim, Kyoung-Soo. "The Korean War and India's Non-Alignment," *Korea and World Affairs* (South Korea), 7:4, 1983.
- Koh, B.C. "The War's Impact on the Korean Peninsula," *Journal of American-East Asian Relations*, 2:1, 1993.
- Korean and Korean-American Studies Bulletin*. Vol. 4, Nos. 2-3, 1993 (Several articles on Korean War memories).
- Korean War Research Committee, War Memorial Service-Korea, comp. *The Historical Reillumination of the Korean War*. Seoul: War Memorial Service, 1990.

- Lee, Chae Jin, ed. *The Korean War: A 40-Year Perspective*. Claremont, California: Keck Center for International and Strategic Studies, 1991.
- Lee, Daniel B. "Divided Korean Families: Why Does It Take So Long to Remedy the Unhealed Wounds" in Yun Kim and E.H. Shin, ed. *Toward a Unified Korea*. Columbia, S.C.: Center for Asian Studies, University of South Carolina, 1995.
- Lee, Steven Hugh. *Outposts of Empire: Korea, Vietnam and the Origins of the Cold War in Asia, 1949-1954*. (Toronto: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1995)
- Levi, Robin S. "Legacies of War: The United States' Obligations Toward Ameriasians," *Stanford Journal of International Law*, 29, Summer 1993.
- Lowe, Peter. *The Origins of the Korean War*. New York: Longman, 1986.
- MacDonald, Callum A. *Korea: The War Before Vietnam*. New York: Free Press, 1986.
- _____. "So Terrible A Liberation – The UN Occupation of North Korea," *Bulletin of Concerned Asia Scholars*, 23:2, 1991.
- Mansourou, Alexandre Y. *Stalin, Mao, Kim and China's Decision to Enter the Korean War, September 16-October 15, 1950: New Evidence from the Russian Archives*. Washington, D.C. Wilson Center Cold War International History Project Bulletin, 6-7, 1995.
- Matray, James I. And Kim Chull-Baum, eds. *Korea and the Cold War*. Claremont, California: Regina Books, 1993.
- Matray, James I., ed. *Historical Dictionary of the Korean War*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Publishing Group, 1991.
- _____. "Civil is a Dumb Name for War," *Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations Newsletter*, 26:4, 1995.
- _____. "Villain Again: The United States and the Korean Armistice Talks," *Diplomatic History*, 16, Summer, 1992.
- McCann, David R., and Barry St. Strauss, eds. *War and Democracy: A Comparative Study of the Peloponnesian War*. Armonk, N.Y.: M.E. Sharpe, 2000.
- McCarthy, Michael J. "Uncertain Enemies: Soviet Pilots in the Korean War," in *Air Power History*, 44:1, 1997.
- McCullough, David, *Truman*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1992.
- Merrill, John, *Korea: The Peninsular Origins of the War*. Wilmington: University of Delaware Press, 1989.
- Owen, Joseph R. *Colder Than Hill: A Marine Rifle Company at Chosin Reservoir*. Annapolis, MD: Naval Institute Press, 2000.
- Pak, Myunglim. "The 'American Boundry', Provocation, and the Outbreak of the Korean War," *Social Science Japan Journal (UK)*, 1:1, 1998.

- Pak, Sang-Seek. "Legacy of the Korean War: Its Impact on South Korea's Domestic Politics, Economic Development, and Foreign Policy," *Korea and World Affairs* (South Korea), 15:2, 1991.
- Pak, Wanso. *The Naked Tree*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995.
- _____. *My Very Last Possession and Other Short Stories by Wonso Pak*. Translated by Chun Kyung-A. Armonk, N.Y.: M.E. Sharpe, 1999.
- Paek, Sun Yup (Gen.). *From Pusan to Panmunjom*. Washington, D.C.: Brassey's, 1992.
- Peng, Dehuai. *Memoirs of a Chinese Marshall*. Beijing: Foreign Languages Press, 1984.
- Pierpasli, Paul G., Jr.. *Truman and Korea: The Political Culture of the Korean War*. Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press, 1999.
- Ra, Jong Yil. "Political Crisis in Korea, 1952. The Administration, Legislature, Military and Foreign Powers," *Journal of Contemporary History*, 27, April 1992.
- Roe, Patrick C. *The Dragon Strikes: China and the Korean War, June-December 1950*. Novato, CA: Presidio Press, 2000.
- Roskey, William. "Korea's Costliest Battle: the POW Impasse" *Parameters*, 23:2, 1993.
- Russ, Martin. *Breakout: The Chosin Reservoir Campaign, Korean 1950*. New York: Fromm International, 1998.
- Sandler, Stanley, ed. *The Korean War: An Encyclopedia*. New York: Garland, 1999.
- _____. *Korean War: An Interpretative History*. London (U.K.): UCL Press, 1999.
- _____. *The Korean War: No Visitors, No Vanquished*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1999.
- Schwartz, Barry and Todd Bayma. "Commemoration and the Politics of Recognition: The Korean War Veterans Memorial," *American Behavioral Scientist*, 42, 1999.
- Shin, Bill, *The Forgotten War Remembered: Korea, 1950-1953*. Elizabeth, N.J.: Hollym International, 1996.
- Soderbergh, Peter A. *Women Marines in the Korean War Era*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Publishing Group, 1994.
- Spiller, Harry, ed. *American POWs in Korea: Sixteen Personal Accounts*. Jefferson: McFarland & Col., Inc., Publishers, 1998.
- Steinberg, Blema S., "The Korean War: A Case Study in Indian Neutralism," *Orbis*, 8 (Winter, 1965).
- Stueck, William. *The Korean War: An International History*. Princeton University Press, 1995.

- Suh, Dae Sook. *Kim Il Sung: The North Korean Leader*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1988.
- Terry, Addison. *The Battle for Pusan: A Korean Memoir*. Presidio Press, 2000.
- Thompson, Reginald. *Cry Korea*. London and New York: White Lion Publishers, 1974.
- Thornton, Richard C. *Odd Man Out: Truman, Stalin, Mao and the Origin of the Korean War*. Dullas: Brassey's, 2000.
- Toland, John. *In Mortal Combat: Korea: 1950-1953*. New York: Morrow, 1991.
- Tomedi, Rudy. *No Bugles, No Drums: An Oral History of the Koren War*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1994.
- Tucker, Spencer, et al., ed. *Encyclopedia of the Korean War*. 3 vols. Santa Barbara, California: ABC Clio Press, 2000
- Wainstock, Dennis D. *Truman, MacArthur and the Korean War*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1999.
- War History Compilation Committee, Ministry of National Defense. *The Korean War*. 3 vols. Seoul: Ministry of National Defense, 1998-2000.
- Weatherby, Kathryn. *Soviet Aims in Korea and the Origins of the Korean War, 1945-1950: New Evidence from the Russian Archives*. Washington, D.C.: Woodrow Wilson Center (Cold War International History Project), 1993
- _____. *New Findings on the Korean War*. Washington, D.C.: Woodrow Wilson Center (Cold War International History Project), 1993
- To Attack or Not to Attach: Stalin, Kim Il Sung and the Prelude to War*. Washington, D.C.: Woodrow Wilson Center (Cold War International History Project), 1995.
- Weintraub, Stanley. *MacArthur's War: Korea and the Undoing of an American Hero*. New York: The Free Press, 2000.
- West, Philip. "The Korean War and the Criteria of Significance in Chinese Popular Culture," *Journal of American-East Asian Relations*, 1:4, 1992
- _____. "Interpreting the Korean War," *American Historical Review*, 94:1, 1989.
- West, Philip, Steven I. Levine and Jackie Hiltz, eds. *America's Wars in Asia: A Cultural Appraoch to History and Memory*. Armonk, N.Y., 1998.
- West, Philip and Suh Ji-moon, eds. *Remembering the "Forgotten War": The Korean War Through Literature and Art*. Armonk, N.Y., 2000.
- Yoo, Tae Hoo. *The Korean War and the United Nations*. Louvain, Belgium: Librairie Desbraux, 1965.
- Yu, Bin. "What China Learned from Its 'Forgotten War' in Korea," *Strategic Review*, 26, Summer 1998.

Zhang, Shu Gang. *Mao's Military Romanticism: China and the Korean Conflict, 1950-1953*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1995.

Zhang Xiaoming. "China and the Air War in Korea, 1950-1953," *Journal of Military History*, 62, April 1998.