

# Federation: A Comparative Study of European Integration and Korean Reunification

Chol Nam Jong

ASIA PAPER  
August 2012



Institute for Security &  
Development Policy



# **Federation: A Comparative Study of European Integration and Korean Reunification**

**Chol Nam Jong**

Institute for Security and Development Policy  
Västra Finnbodavägen 2, 131 30 Stockholm-Nacka, Sweden  
[www.isdp.eu](http://www.isdp.eu)

**Federation: A Comparative Study of European Integration and Korean Reunification** is an *Asia Paper* published by the Institute for Security and Development Policy. The *Asia Papers Series* is the Occasional Paper series of the Institute's Asia Program, and addresses topical and timely subjects. The Institute is based in Stockholm, Sweden, and cooperates closely with research centers worldwide. Through its Silk Road Studies Program, the Institute runs a joint Transatlantic Research and Policy Center with the Central Asia-Caucasus Institute of Johns Hopkins University's School of Advanced International Studies. The Institute is firmly established as a leading research and policy center, serving a large and diverse community of analysts, scholars, policy-watchers, business leaders, and journalists. It is at the forefront of research on issues of conflict, security, and development. Through its applied research, publications, research cooperation, public lectures, and seminars, it functions as a focal point for academic, policy, and public discussion.

The opinions and conclusions expressed are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Institute for Security and Development Policy or its sponsors.

© Institute for Security and Development Policy, 2012

ISBN: 978-91-86635-38-1

Printed in Singapore

Distributed in Europe by:

Institute for Security and Development Policy  
Västra Finnbodavägen 2, 131 30 Stockholm-Nacka, Sweden  
Tel. +46-841056953; Fax. +46-86403370  
Email: [info@isdp.eu](mailto:info@isdp.eu)

Distributed in North America by:

The Central Asia-Caucasus Institute  
Paul H. Nitze School of Advanced International Studies  
1619 Massachusetts Ave. NW, Washington, D.C. 20036  
Tel. +1-202-663-7723; Fax. +1-202-663-7785  
E-mail: [caci2@jhudig.admin.jhu.edu](mailto:caci2@jhudig.admin.jhu.edu)

Senior Editor: Bert Edström

Editor: Elliot Brennan

Editorial correspondence should be addressed to Dr. Bert Edström at: [bedstrom@isdp.eu](mailto:bedstrom@isdp.eu)

# Contents

Executive Summary ..... 5

Preface ..... 6

Experience from the Study of the European Integration Process..... 7

Korea’s Reunification and Federation ..... 14

Comparative Analysis of European Integration and Korea’s  
Reunification ..... 19

Concluding Remarks..... 25

About the Author ..... 27



## Executive Summary

It can be said that the history of Europe constitutes an unbroken chain of wars and conflicts for thousands of years. Throughout history, many Europeans tried to achieve permanent peace. A large number of politicians and scholars have asserted that the unification of Europe is the best way to ensure the peace in the region. After the Second World War, European countries began to examine the source of war. It was concluded that nationalism was the root cause of war, and this gave birth to functionalism as a solution to the perennial form of how to avoid war. The process of European integration started with the foundation of the European Coal and Steel Community in 1952. Following its foundation, integration developed. With its evolution into the current European Union, "unity of diversity" has arrived. In light of the experiences from the European integration, it is evident that the best way to ensure peace on the Korean Peninsula is to achieve reunification through federation. It is because the federal system is a special form of power, which ensures the co-existence of the differences of systems existing in the north and south of Korea. In the case of the European Union, it could advance successfully only by guaranteeing the various interests of different member states, and for this reason, adopted the federal form. In this way, the proposal for the establishment of the Democratic Federal Republic of Koryo aims at achieving the reunification of Korea while allowing the co-existence of the specific traits and autonomies of different social systems in the north and the south.

## Preface

The European history for thousands of years was a history of endless wars, which inflicted severe damage on Europe. Of course, there were periods of “peace” such as Pax Romana and Pax Britannica, but they were, in all respects, no more than a relationship between domination and subordination or a risky peacekeeping based on the equilibrium of forces between big powers. Consequently, the desire for peace grew stronger among Europeans. An expression for this is Immanuel Kant’s idea of “perpetual peace.”

In the 20th century two world wars made Europeans realize the disasters caused by war, which made them begin to understand the need for building up an integrated Europe in order to achieve durable peace.

On May 9, 1950, the then French Foreign Minister Robert Schuman proposed a plan for jointly managing the coal and steel industries of France and West Germany. This proved a prelude to the European integration process. Europe began to embark on the road toward putting an end to the history of war and achieving durable peace.

Schuman’s idea of European integration was an attempt to relieve the competition spirit that had existed historically between Germany and France, as well as work out a theoretical basis based on that cooperation in the functional fields may lead to the wide-ranging integration.

The process of European integration that started with the foundation of the European Coal and Steel Community grew and evolved into the European Union. Thus, it accomplished not only economic integration, but also political integration to some extent, and advanced far ahead toward a federation by opening up borders and unifying currencies.

In integrating different states and nations with similar ideologies and systems, the unification of Europe embodies factors fundamentally different from the reunification of Korea in which a nation was divided because of different ideologies and systems. However, a common aspect is that it may serve as the best way to ensure peace. In this paper, a comparative study is made of the two entities with a focus on proving that Korea’s reunification should be achieved through federation in view of the experience of Europe that has advanced far ahead towards a federation while overcoming differences in the aspects of interests of different states and nations.

# Experience from the Study of the European Integration Process

## Origin of the Idea of European Integration

As the history of Europe has recorded an unbroken chain of wars and conflicts for thousands of years, many Europeans have since long tried to achieve permanent peace. A number of politicians and scholars tried to find a way to ensure peace in Europe. One example was the proposal for the establishment of a Confederal Christian Republic by Pierre Dubois, a French jurist and diplomat, in 1306. Claiming that war had become an endemic in Europe, he asserted that peace should be brought to Europe by founding a confederal republic based on Christian principles.

Later on, many ideas on the European unification were presented, including the “Grand Design” proposed by Maximilien de Bethune duc de Sully (1560–1641), the *Essay towards the Present and Future Peace of Europe* by William Penn (1644–1718) and the *Project to Establish Perpetual Peace in Europe* by Abbé de Saint-Pierre (1658–1743).

Besides, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Jeremy Bentham and other thinkers asserted that unification was a way towards peace and, in the 19th century, Victor Hugo and other intellectuals started to develop a new concept of a “United States of Europe.” All of them regarded the European integration as a way to prevent war and achieve lasting peace. It was because they realized that the unification by the supremacy of one party cannot bring about durable peace and that only the unification based on co-existence of various nations can produce lasting peace.

Nationalism that began to spread in Europe in the 19th century grew stronger with the unification of Italy in the 1860s and of Germany in 1871 as a momentum, and aggravated hostilities between states that triggered a scramble for colonies among powers.

Napoleon’s dream of a European confederation and Adolf Hitler’s idea of “Lebensraum” were based on their wild ambitions to dominate Europe by force. For this reason, 20th century Europe had to suffer from the disasters of the two world wars.

Europeans began to study the source of wars and came to the conclusion that contesting systems of nationalism tend to lead to war and, on the basis of this insight, tried to seek ways to overcome it. In 1943 David Mitrany published his *A Working Peace System*, where he analyzed the institutional competition between states that gives rise to war and asserted that functional cooperation is the solution. That is, if cooperation is promoted in the functional sphere by the integration of techniques and experiences, it will spill over to wider spheres and, eventually, create an atmosphere of permanent cooperation between states. Mitrany argued that spreading functional cooperation from one sector to several other fields would gradually weaken the competitive spirit but, on the other hand, also incite an atmosphere of cooperation and, in the long run, establish “a working peace system.”

Mitrany’s theory on functionalism served as a theoretical basis for European integration and was later developed into neo-functionalism, playing an important role in developing the theories of the European integration.

Neo-functionalists, among them Ernst Haas, developed a functional view based on Mitrany’s ideas and worked out a comprehensive theory not only on the process of integration of the European Coal and Steel Community but the European integration process as a whole.

They focused their studies on policy fields and analyzed the spill-over effect as falling into three areas: what Mitrany called the technical/functional effect, the political effect and the geographical effect.

The neo-functionalist analysis downplayed the role of nation states in the process of European integration and instead maintained that interest groups and supranational institutions would play a more important role. That is to say neo-functionalists saw the coincidence of interests as the driving force for the creation of supranational institutions transcending national or state boundaries in the context of pan-European policies.

As seen above, functionalism is significant in that it provided a theoretical framework for analyzing the process of European integration transcending the differences of a state and a nation.

### **The U.S. Strategy for World Domination and its Implications for European Integration**

Before the outbreak of the First World War, Europe gained control over world trade and banking and financial sectors. Its political and military

might was powerful enough to make people think of Europe as the world's nexus. However, the wars over centuries destroyed tremendous amounts of wealth in Europe, and the Second World War, which claimed the lives of 40 million, devastated many cities in Europe.

By the end of the Second World War, Europe had lost its influence. Instead, the United States and the Soviet Union were to emerge as super-powers. Unlike the First World War, the Soviet Union and the United States as victorious nations were involved in an ideological conflict, creating a new international order – i.e. the Cold War world order, characterized by the U.S. strategy for world domination which exerted great influence on the European integration process. Although it was a process of integration among European countries, it was difficult to advance without the support of the United States, because Europe was dependent on the United States.

If the United States had interfered in the process of European integration, judging that the process may harm its interests, the history of Europe would have developed differently and the appearance of present Europe would have changed.

After the war, a power gap came into being in Europe because Great Britain and France were weakened and Germany ruined. The United States felt the need to fill the gap that was created in order to keep in check the political leverage of the Soviet Union and expand the scope of its own international influence.

For this reason, the United States backed up the European integration in a bid to create a buffer zone for protecting itself from the “threat of communism,” which coincided with the interests of the West European countries that were worried about what they saw as Soviet policy spreading into Europe.

Taking advantage of the civil war in Greece (1946–49), the United States intervened in European affairs, pursuing the well-known Truman doctrine, which was implemented through the Marshall Plan.

It is self-evident that U.S. aid from 1948 was economic compensation aimed at realizing President Truman's political goal.

Through the Marshall Plan, the United States barred political and economic leverage from the Soviet Union in Western Europe, could keep the left-wing forces in France, Italy and other countries under control and made

Western Europe merge into one bloc, thus succeeding in setting up a political and military buffer zone against Communism.

### **Experience Gained in the Process of European Integration**

The process of European integration, which started on the basis of functionalism, showed in practice that functional cooperation might lead to the formation of a federal state. After the war, the situation in European countries was different, but they had a common interest in the integration of Europe. France was in a state of flux owing to the impact of the war and the structural vulnerability of the government of the Fourth Republic established in 1946. In particular, the French fiasco in Indochina in 1954 and its defeat in the Suez Canal conflict in 1956 greatly hurt its national dignity, which made it reconsider its position in the world. It was an urgent issue for France to completely remove the threat from Germany, as both countries had fought three rounds of war in less than a century. France regarded the unification of Europe as a way to increase its influence in Europe and to check Germany and, for this reason, played a pivotal role in integrating Europe from the outset.

Meanwhile, Germany had been ruined by the war and was caught by the sense of shame of being a war provoker. Accordingly, it engaged in cooperation with France in order to recover its political face and reconstruct its economy. Italy, too, was severely destroyed by the war and, failing to achieve political stability, saw a quick succession of governments. The integration of Europe was seen as a great help in solving economic problems that Italy had at home, especially the unemployment and backwardness in the south.

In such a situation, Jean Monnet, who was in charge of the postwar reconstruction of France as the head of its General Planning Commission, presented a proposal of merging the coal and steel industries of France and Germany. This proposal was based on the idea that, as the coal and steel industries serve as the cornerstone of the defense industry, their merger would make it possible for France to effectively hinder any adventures from Germany and stamp out the root of conflicts over the fields of coal and iron ore between the two countries.

Monnet paid attention to the fact that it would be difficult to build a consensus among states because of a discord of interests, and proposed the

organization of a supranational institution, instead of an intergovernmental institution, in order to settle this problem.

Based on this proposal, Robert Schuman, the then French foreign minister, negotiated with Konrad Adenauer, the then chancellor of West Germany. It resulted in the Schuman Plan on May 9, 1950. The two countries announced that they would set up a management institution for jointly controlling the production of coal and steel.

This was the first step towards a European federation that was to make it functionally impossible for the two countries to go to war again.

The founding of the European Coal and Steel Community was a simple step, but its significance lies in that the European countries handed over part of their sovereignty to a supranational institution for the first time in history.

Starting this way, the European integration process expanded to other fields. The European Economic Community and the European Atomic Energy Community were created in 1957. It continued to spread to other policy fields, including customs, agricultural and regional policies. The member states increased in number. With efforts for European integration steadily expanding, the Schengen Treaty (1985) allowed greater freedom of movement in Europe. Even local currencies, which had been regarded as the national pride, were replaced by a common currency. Integration also spread to foreign and security policy, as well as home and justice affairs. The result was that Europe developed into a giant political and economic federation. In the true sense of the word, "a unity of diversity" was achieved. However, the drive to integrate Europe did not always go smoothly. There were occasions when it stood on the brink of ruin or threatened to fall into stagnation, when member countries failed to reach a compromise on issues that were seen as infringing upon supreme national interests.

A typical example was the case known as the "empty chair crisis." In a discussion in 1965 on common agricultural and customs policies in the European Economic Community, France had a clear understanding that the formation of a customs union would give Germany greater profits and demanded a protective policy of the agricultural sector in return for agreeing to these policies.

French farmers had been historically under strict protection from competition from abroad, and one fifth of the French population in those days

made their living on agriculture. Accordingly, the agricultural subsidy was an issue belonging to what France saw as its supreme national interests.

As the confrontation sharpened in this issue, French President Charles de Gaulle made France withdraw from the Community. This resulted in the “empty chair crisis,” which brought the efforts for European integration to the brink of ruin.

After the six-months-long standoff, the member nations held talks in Luxembourg and accepted that France could exercise its veto or adopt an independent decision on the issue related to “its supreme interests,” with the result that a compromise was reached and the community resumed its work. This is a typical example of negotiations known as the Luxembourg Compromise (1966).

Such differences of interests between the member states were also found when the European integration expanded to political fields.

When discussing the draft Maastricht Treaty (the EU Treaty), France insisted on setting up of a federal union by further strengthening the authority of supranational institutions such as the European Commission and the European Parliament.

The UK entered the process of European integration but did not want to transfer its sovereignty to the supranational institutions. Meanwhile, it held on to its view that the European integration should remain in all respects as an inter-governmental cooperation.

In the long run, the conflict between supranationalism and inter-governmentalism changed the expression of “federal union” into that of “an ever closer union among the peoples of Europe” and finally gave birth to the EU. The conflicts and friction created by the difference of interests were found at each stage of the process of integration including the establishment of a monetary union and introduction of the common currency, the abolition of the border checking system, the enlargement to Eastern Europe, and so on. On all such occasions, a compromise was made on the principle of respecting the different interests of all the member states.

After all, the UK and Ireland did not accede to the Schengen Treaty, but non-member states like Norway and Iceland were affiliated with it. Sweden, the UK and Denmark did not introduce the common currency although they were member states. In this way the efforts for integrating Europe have witnessed ceaseless challenges of differences in interests of EU member states

but kept forward the process overcoming those differences through compromise and negotiations. Credit to this goes to the ardent desire for peace and the conviction on the economic benefits from the integration.

# **Korea's Reunification and Korean Federation**

## **The U.S. Strategy for World Domination and Its Implications for Korean Reunification**

Unlike in Europe, the U.S. strategy resulted in a division of the Korean Peninsula. The United States, which had already begun to pursue a policy for domination of Pacific as a link in the chain of its strategy for world supremacy, paid considerable attention to extending its influence in the Asia-Pacific region and, especially, attached great importance to exercising domination over the Korean Peninsula which is located at a very important geopolitical vantage point.

When the defeat of Japanese imperialists became a fait accompli with the Second World War drawing to a close, the Strategic Policy Section of the Operations Bureau of the U.S. Department of the Army, according to the directive from President Harry S. Truman, worked out a plan on making the 38th parallel the "dividing line for disarming Japanese troops" between the Soviet Union and the United States and was able to bring it to a success through negotiations with the Soviet Union.

The United States, which illegally occupied south Korea under the pretension of "disarming Japanese troops," instigated south Korea to hold a separate general election in 1948 and divided the Korean Peninsula not only territorially but also institutionally. Thereafter, the United States provoked a war in Korea and, taking advantage of it, shipped huge armed forces into and around the Korean Peninsula.

The three-year-long Korean War (1950–53) inflicted untold losses in manpower and materials upon the Korean people, but its most serious after-effect was that the war instilled a feeling of hostility among the fellow countrymen of the Korean nation.

In this way, the U.S. strategy for world domination led to a division of the Korean Peninsula into north and south, turning it into the outpost of showdown in the Cold War era.

Later on, the United States advocated ideas like the Nixon Doctrine, the Ford Doctrine, the Asia-Pacific doctrine, and resorted to ceaseless moves

for arms buildup under the pretext of keeping the “balance of power” and “maintaining stability” in the Asia-Pacific region.

The ambition of the United States to claim world supremacy has always been backed up by its national security strategy. During the days of the Cold War, the “two Koreas” policy of the United States was used to check the influence of the Soviet Union in order to build up U.S. supremacy in North-east Asia. After the Cold War, the U.S. policy of maintaining the division of the Korean Peninsula was used to contain China rising as a latent threat and consolidate the U.S. position of supremacy.

To this end, the United States needs tensions on the Korean Peninsula; it has invented the new excuse of Korea’s “nuclear issue” and has engaged in an arms buildup by holding on to such more cunning methods as the “Proliferation Security Initiative” and the “expansion deterrence.”

As soon as he came into office, George W. Bush flatly discarded some positive elements of his predecessors’ policy towards the DPRK under the “ABC (Anything But Clinton)” policy by accusing the DPRK of being a part of an “Axis of Evil” and launching a theory of a pre-emptive nuclear strike against the DPRK. Pursuing a policy of “strategic patience,” the Obama administration threw roadblocks in the way of the Six-Party Talks, which had been promoted in the waning years of the Bush administration. For this reason, the United States is pushing the situation on the Korean Peninsula to the extreme limit of tension by doggedly dubbing the DPRK’s launch of a satellite as a test-fire of a long-range missile.

In this way, the United States has not only divided Korea but also kept on aggravating the situation on the Korean Peninsula. However, this not only brings benefits to the United States but also connotes a danger that will bring about irretrievably serious consequences.

### **Theory on Reunification by Means of Federation**

It is self-evident that, just like in Europe, the one and only way to ensure lasting peace on the Korean Peninsula is to achieve reunification. However, how to reunify a nation that has been divided into two different ideologies and political systems cannot be found in any established theories; nor is there a similar example.

President Kim Il Sung, who was not a proponent of any established theories but excelled in insights and wisdom, proposed a unique theory on

how to build a federal state, which allows different social systems to co-exist. It is based on a consideration of the specific conditions of Korea, which has been divided into two different systems by foreign forces. He presented the proposal for founding the Democratic Federal Republic of Koryo.

Proceeding from the specific circumstances under which different social systems exist in the north and the south, it was a proposal that gave clear answers to all theoretical and practical problems arising in forming and operating a federal state, including the feasibility and conditions for forming it, as well as structure and policy. It is the most scientific and reasonable way to bring about the reunification of the Korean nation, brought to light for the first time in the history of its division.

In general, it had been understood that the federation is a special form of power that can weld different states or nations based on the same system into an integrated whole. In accordance with this, different states or nations have been regarded as constituent units of the federal system. Because of such an understanding, no one has ever thought of the fact that a federal state can be built within the framework of a nation divided into different social systems.

By a federal system the goal of unification is, in essence, realized while the specific traits of the constituent units are kept. There are two important features of a federal system.

Firstly, it has a double power structure.

Under a federal system, the authority is split into central and regional levels because it is aimed at fully ensuring the special traits of its member states even though central authorities were organized on the basis of common interests of the member states or regions. This means that these special traits cannot continue to be national or territorial alone, but may become a difference in systems as well. If a federal system can ensure the special characteristics of different states or nations, it can guarantee the co-existence of different social systems. Consequently, a federal system with a double power structure becomes a form of state structure that can ensure the special traits of states.

Secondly, it is, in the long run, an integrated whole, although it embraces states or nations with authority and autonomy to a certain degree.

A federal state is seen as an aggregate of states with a considerable extent of authority and autonomy but, internationally, it is seen as one country.

This is a point quite different from an association based on a simple international convention. Therefore, the proposal for reunification by the establishment of a federation serves as a way to achieve Korea's reunification, while ensuring the specific traits and autonomies of different social systems existing in the north and the south.

As each nation has its own characteristics, so has a social system. In the same way a nation tries to preserve its own special traits, a social system tries to maintain its independence. Thus, the realities of Korea where different social systems exist in the north and the south require that the specific traits and independence of those systems be guaranteed. To this end, it is necessary to firmly rely on the factors for ensuring reunification and, at the same time, not to ignore the special traits of each region.

In a situation where different social systems have long existed in the north and the south, in order to achieve the national cohesion and reunification it is important not to allow the ideology and system of one side to dominate.

If one side regards its ideology and system as supreme and tries to force them on the other side, it will inevitably lead to confrontation and conflict, which will lead to further aggravation of the division, thus making it impossible to achieve reunification. This has been proved in practice by the efforts for Korea's reunification.

The theories of "unification through victory over communism" and "unification of systems" advocated by the successive authorities of south Korea since the beginning of Korea's division have been used to carry out the U.S. strategy for world domination, thus inviting the tragedy of fratricidal war. These theories incited nothing but the ideological and institutional showdown between the north and the south by implanting the hostile and confrontational feelings in the minds of the fellow countrymen.

The slogans on "no nukes, opening and 3,000 dollars" and "three-stage unification," asserted by the present south Korean ruler are very foolish and absurd as they are aimed at realizing "unification by absorption" through the change of system in the north. The south Korean authorities drove inter-Korean relations, which had been developing favorably, toward a total collapse. However, a touch-and-go situation is prevailing again on the Korean Peninsula.

All these facts clearly show that the only way to achieving a peaceful reunification of the Korean Peninsula is to realize reunification through a federation on the basis of allowing the different ideologies and social systems to exist in the north and the south.

# **Comparative Analysis of European Integration and Korea's Reunification**

## **Comparative Analysis of Federation in Europe and Korea**

Comparing the European integration with the Korean reunification, there are both essential differences as well as common features. The essential difference resides in the elements of forming a federation. The European unification process is an integration pursued by several states on the basis of the commonness of their systems, whereas the proposal for Korea's reunification through a federation is a theory of reunifying a country that has been divided into different political systems.

In other words, the commonness of social systems in Europe served as the main factor for integration, and the differences of the interests among the member states were the special characteristics that made the process result in a federal structure. However, in the proposal for Korea's reunification, the homogeneity of the nation serves as the fundamental factor for the realization of reunification, while the difference of systems in the north and the south becomes a special trait when Korea is reunified through the federation.

In other words, European integration involves diverse states and is based on the commonness of systems, whereas Korea's reunification is the one of two systems based on the homogeneity of the nation.

The process of European integration proved that only when the supreme interests of each member state are respected and a policy for co-existence and joint prosperity is mapped out could the efforts for integration make smooth progress.

The integration of Europe took on the form of a union – not an association or a federation – by integrating different interests from all member states into one, and its unique structure reflects this.

The EU has not only a double power system in which a political structure co-exists on the European and the national levels, but also a multilayered system of government in which political actors at regional, sub-national, national and supranational levels participate in the decision-making process in many policy areas.

In the initial period of European integration, states and governments played an important role in policy-making and most of the policies were made through negotiations and compromise between states. Therefore, in many cases policies reflected the interests of big countries. Small countries were given compensation in return for sacrificing their interests. However, as the process deepened, the authority of the governments of member states was gradually transferred to the EU's institutions. A system under which local governments and interest groups participate in policy-making came into being, thus precipitating power sharing.

Eventually, the multilayered subjects representing supranational, national and regional interests came to share complementary and overlapping political power, thus the interests of the people were more fairly reflected in policy-making and this promoted the integration of Europe. In view of this, the unification of authorities is surely possible in Korea as it is a homogeneous nation; herein resides the feasibility of the proposal for its reunification through federation.

The proposal for founding the Democratic Federal Republic of Koryo does not violate the interests of the north and the south, since it is based on the prerequisite that the ideologies and social systems of both sides will be recognized and tolerated in order to ensure the co-existence of both.

The proposal also stipulates that the composition, function, working principles and duty of a unified government are to represent the interests of people from all walks of life in the north and the south in a fair way. Furthermore, it calls for maintaining the principle of cohesion and cooperation of the nation as a whole.

As the unified government of the federal state, the supreme national federal assembly and the federal standing committee shall discuss and make impartial decisions in political affairs, national defense, foreign affairs and other matters of common concern related to the interests of the country and the nation as a whole, as well as promote the coordinated development of the nation and realize unity and cooperation between the north and south.

Under the guidance of the federal government, the regional governments in the north and the south shall pursue an independent policy within limits that are consistent with the fundamental interests and demands of the whole nation, as well as strive to narrow down the differences between the north and the south in all spheres and achieve the balanced development of

the nation. In this way the proposal makes it possible to affect power sharing of the federal state on an equal footing and manage the federal government in a correct way.

In particular, giving due consideration to the actual conditions of the north and the south, the DPRK's proposal of a low-level federation envisages that the authorities in defense, diplomacy, legislation and economic management will remain intact in the existing governments and will be gradually transferred to the federal government. This was the main point agreed upon by the north and south in terms of the method of reunification through the June 15 Joint Declaration.

What is common in the process of European integration and in the reunification of Korea is the people's desire for peace. European peoples have experienced the catastrophic consequences of war and could achieve a durable peace by eradicating the root cause of war and integrating Europe.

Korea has not been involved in aggression against any other country, but has been a battlefield of big powers, and has had to endure colonial slavery and been engaged in a fratricidal war. This is why the Korean nation's aspiration and desire for peace are more ardent than any other nation; the reunification of the country is the supreme task for the Korean people, which cannot wait one day longer.

Even if there is a difference in ideology and the system between the north and the south, it is nothing in comparison with the ardent wish of Korean people for peace and reunification.

### **Impact of Korea's Reunification on Europe**

European countries have had colonies in Asia but lost their influence in the region after the Second World War and did not pay attention to the region – they were too busily engaged in postwar rehabilitation and development of their societies and economies.

The European Union, which regained its economic power with the formation of the single market in 1992, felt the need to further expand the scope of economic relations and consequently, became interested in Asia as it started to emerge as a center of the world economy.

In 1994, the EU published its *Toward a New Asia Strategy*, which was its first ever regional policy plan concerning Asia. The region was identified as a potential leader of world economic growth and development in the 21st

century. The report pointed out the need to strengthen the European position in this region. In particular, the Northeast Asian region was defined as an important strategic partner for Europe.

Through the Asia-Europe Summit, which was held for the first time in 1996, the EU started its policy of engagement in Asia.

Since then the double framework of regional cooperation in Asia – such as APEC, led by the United States, and ASEM, led by the EU – has been established. However, the United States remained the most influential actor in the military and security fields in Asia. Europe's role was limited to the economic field.

Through the European Commissions communication titled *Europe and Asia: Strategic Framework for Enhanced Partnership* (2001), the EU revised its Asia strategy. The first key point was strengthening the EU's engagement with Asia in the political and security fields.

This can be seen as an expression of the EU's will to increase its political influence to be on par with the economic power that it has built up. It was an attempt to blot out the EU's image of being an "economic giant, political dwarf."

The Korean Peninsula is located in a delicate and odd geographical position, sandwiched between big powers; it holds an important position for peace and security in Northeast Asia. If the Korean Peninsula is reunified and stands neutral and independent, it can check possible conflicts between neighboring big powers. However, if it remains divided and maintains confrontations, it would give big powers the excuse to continue to fight and become further drawn into that fight.

In actuality, the United States is staging the large-scale Team Spirit and Key Resolve joint military exercises to foment war fever under the pretext of the situation on the Korean Peninsula. Recently, it advanced a plan of establishing a missile defense system based on the tripartite military alliance of U.S.-Japan-south Korea and U.S.-Japan-Australia.

The DPRK's satellite launch for peaceful purpose was taken by the U.S. as another excuse for such a machination. However, this is stirring up concern and repulsion on the part of China and Russia. They are bolstering their military cooperation in order to cope with it.

At present, China has enough political and economic power to enter into an arms race with the United States. This has increased the danger that

a new arms race will be triggered and a new Cold War in Northeast Asia will reappear. Thus, the more tense the situation on the divided Korean Peninsula, the further the military influence of the United States will expand and, consequently, the narrower the space of engagement of Europe based on economic cooperation will become.

On the contrary, if Korea is reunified and peace is ensured in Northeast Asia, the U.S. military presence would lose its significance and the safety of the EU's economic concessions would rather be ensured; thus, the economic relations between the two regions would be expanded and developed.

If the railway project linking the Korean Peninsula and Siberia could be realized, the economic ties between Northeast Asia and Europe would be closer; this would bring colossal economic profits to both.

Most European countries established diplomatic relations with the DPRK during the June 15 Reunification Era. This fact confirms that Korea's reunification can make a positive contribution to the development of political relations. Accordingly, the reunification and peace of the Korean Peninsula will create a favorable environment for the EU to increase its economic influence and consolidate its political position

Although the EU is geographically far from Northeast Asia and not directly involved in settling the Korean Peninsula issue, it can exercise great influence in ensuring peace and security in Northeast Asia.

What is most important for the EU if it aspires to make a tangible contribution to ensuring peace and security on the Korean Peninsula and in Northeast Asia is to maintain impartiality.

If the EU keeps to the dualistic mindset of the Cold War era – with its attempt to impose Western-style values on the DPRK on the pretext of promoting “human rights” and “democracy” – it would instigate confrontation and conflict on the Korean Peninsula, which is divided into different social systems. It would create an obstacle in ensuring peace and security on the Peninsula.

If European countries sincerely wish peace and stability on the Korean Peninsula and a reunification of Korea, they should keep a fair standpoint and make efforts to realize the DPRK's proposal for replacing the armistice agreement, which is a leftover of the Cold War, with a peace treaty and approach constructively the efforts of the Korean people to build an economically developed country.

In particular, they should not blindly follow the U.S. strategy to slander and check the DPRK's nuclear energy and space development programs for peaceful purposes. Rather, they should make a positive contribution to the efforts of the Korean people to develop science and technology aimed at improving of the people's living standards through technological exchanges and cooperation in these fields. This will enable the EU to naturally raise its influence in the Northeast Asia and change its traditional image as an "economic giant, political dwarf."

## Concluding Remarks

It is the common desire of all peoples to live in a peaceful world. As shown in this paper, in the light of the experience gained from the integration of Europe, the only way to achieve lasting peace on the Korean Peninsula is to reunify the country by means of a federation. Accordingly, only when the Democratic Federal Republic of Koryo proposed by President Kim Il Sung is established is it possible to overcome the difference in systems between the north and the south and reunify the Korean Peninsula in a peaceful way. This was proved by the June 15 Reunification Era.

Kim Jong Il, Chairman of the DPRK National Defence Commission, provided the three charters for national reunification, the basis of which is the proposal for founding the Democratic Federal Republic of Koryo, and opened up the June 15 era of Reunification with his prominent leadership ability and strong power of execution.

The June 15 era of reunification made it possible for the north and the south to reach an agreement on the ideas of reunification on the basis of the ideal of “by our nation itself” for the first time since Korea was divided. Inter-Korean relations characterized by distrust and confrontation were transformed into relations of reconciliation and cooperation, which resulted in the agreement on many measures to build confidence and ensure security that had previously seemed impossible.

It clearly showed that Korea’s reunification can be achieved and peace in Northeast Asia be ensured only when the north and the south advance forward under the banner of the three charters for national reunification, the June 15 North–South Joint Declaration and the October 4 Declaration.

Kim Jong Un, the Supreme Leader of our Party, State and Army as well as the First Chairman of the DPRK National Defense Commission, now stands at the helm of our people in its march to brilliantly accomplish national reunification, true to the instructions of President Kim Il Sung and Chairman Kim Jong Il. He clarified: “Our Party and the government of the DPRK will join hands with anyone who sincerely wishes the reunification of the country and peace and prosperity of the nation, and make responsible and persevering efforts to realize the historic cause of the country’s reunification.”

As long as we follow the leadership of Comrade Kim Jong Un and work for the great idea of independence and peaceful reunification, Korea will surely be reunified in near future.

## **About the Author**

Chol Nam Jong is a Researcher at the Institute for Disarmament and Peace, Pyongyang. He was a guest researcher at ISDP between May 2 and May 31, 2012.