

UPF Europe and Middle East's 4th Webinar on Prospects for Peace in Korea

Yvo Bruffaerts
November 27, 2020



Introduction:

This webinar is part of a series of programs initiated by UPF Europe and Middle East to mark the 70th anniversary of the outbreak of the Korean War. In the last two years the Korean Peninsula has again become the center of the world's attention. Is it possible to consider again a rapprochement between North and South, 70 years after the start of the Korean war? Could this lead to re-unification? We have seen flickers of hope, yet these quickly reverted to deadlock.

The peace process on the Korean Peninsula depends in great part on its powerful neighbors: China, Russia, Japan, and the United States. Without their support, reunification will be hamstrung. However, the key stakeholders are the Korean people. Divided for seven decades by ideology and a widening socio-economic gap, can North and South Korea envision a common destiny? What incentives could help overcome the past of distrust and conflict, and open a path to mutual prosperity? Can lessons be learned from the German experience of re-unification? How can Europe contribute to a rapprochement on the Korean Peninsula, and what benefits would it gain from it?

Main report:



[Mrs. Chantal Chételat Komagata, UPF coordinator for Europe \(Click for bio\)](#)

The Moderator was Mrs. Chantal Chételat Komagata, UPF Europe Coordinator.

First a video was shown commemorating the 70th anniversary of the outbreak of the Korean War, with excerpts of UPF's third Rally of Hope organized on Sunday 22 November to promote the peaceful reunification of Korea and in honor of the Korean War veterans.

Each panelist gave a 7-minute presentation, followed by a question and answer session.

The speakers were:

Amb. Marc Vogelaar, former Director for External and Public Affairs at the Korean Peninsula Energy Development Organization

Professor Glyn Ford, British academic and Labour Party politician, former member of the European Parliament

Dr. Claude Béglé, Swiss entrepreneur, founder and president of the investment company Symbioswiss

Mr. Yoshihiro Yamazaki, Liaison Director, Institute for Peace Policies for Europe and Middle East, Japan



[Amb. Marc Vogelaar,](#)
[former Director for External](#)
[and Public Affairs at the](#)
[Korean Peninsula Energy](#)
[Development Organization](#)
[\(Click for bio\)](#)

Amb. Marc Vogelaar is in favor of pragmatic solutions to the crisis on the Korean Peninsula that has lasted for more than two generations. Every nation has the right to defend itself. North Korea does not want to give up its nuclear weapons, whilst the international community wants North Korea to rejoin the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

A broad deal is needed that reconciles the international community's legitimate aim of nuclear non-proliferation with catering for North Korea's security concerns and economic needs.

A Peace Treaty should officially end the Korean War and recognize the integrity of North Korea's territory. Massive and unrestricted economic assistance needs to be put on offer.

The North Korean crisis is above all a problem of the North Korean population, which suffers under repression and international sanctions. Steps should be taken by the major stakeholders, especially China and Russia. Down the road, contributions from South Korea, Japan and the EU would be indispensable to corroborate the peace process. Kim Jong

Un should be offered a package he cannot refuse in the spirit of the co-founders of UPF who went to North Korea some 30 years ago to meet the founder of the former Korean president Kim Il Sung.

[Click here for the text of Amb. Vogelaar's intervention.](#)



[Professor Glyn Ford,](#)
[British academic and](#)
[Labour Party politician](#)
[\(Click for bio\)](#)

Professor Glyn Ford has visited North Korea about 50 times since 1997 as a politician and activist. The nuclear problem needs to be solved. Even though North Korea spends 25% of its GDP on armament, it cannot compete with South Korea, Japan or the USA and therefore would prefer not to give up its nuclear weapons, which are meant to be a deterrent.

As North Korea has a serious shortage of energy, it was very interested in the 1990s in building two light-water reactors to supply energy. The country is also short of labor, because hundreds of thousands of men serve in the armed forces. Nuclear weapons will allow thousands of them to be moved from the armed forces into industry.

North Korea does not expect that America will ease its sanctions because of Congress and its emphasis on human rights, but it hopes the UN will do so. The country also needs multilateral security guarantees from the nations in the region in the first place. The DPRK is more

interested in a comprehensive plan of action comparable to the one developed for Iran. The UN Security Council P5, the South Koreans, possibly also Japan, and maybe the European Union should be involved.

North Korea will also want a compensation for its investment in the nuclear program. Peace building on the Korean Peninsula is a long-term program, as mutual trust needs to be built.

We should not go for regime change, but encourage North Korea to change its regime.

[Click here for a transcription of Prof. Glyn Ford's Intervention](#)



[Dr. Claude Béglé, Swiss](#)
[entrepreneur, founder and](#)
[president of the investment](#)
[company Symbioswiss](#)

The next speaker, Dr. Claude Béglé, using a PowerPoint presentation, gave a perspective of North Korea that differs from the general opinion.

Many Europeans find it difficult to believe that North Korea is more normal than the media want them to believe.

It obviously is a dictatorship, where no dissidence is allowed and human rights are trampled on. Korea has the fourth biggest army in the world. Initially, it was needed for self-defense, now it is used for provocation. Kim Jong Un is very much aware of the necessity to change the country and to join the international community. The question is how North Korea, being a buffer between the USA and its allies on one side, and China and Russia on the other side, can do so.

The country is not on its knees. Twenty million people live in poverty, while probably 5 million belong to the lower and middle class, and live a relatively 'normal' life.

It is interesting to see that the shops are not empty. Because of the Juche ideology and many decades of embargoes, the North Koreans have invented ways to produce by themselves.

Much attention is given to education, with a priority on science and technology. Both in North and South Korea, people are hardworking and wish to build a learned economy and society. The military industry is giving way to light industry and investment in the field of (international) tourism. (See below Dr. Béglé's Power Point Presentation.)



[Mr. Yoshihiro Yamazaki,
Liaison Director, Institute
for Peace Policies for
Europe and Middle East,
Japan \(Click for bio\)](#)

The last speaker was Mr. Yoshihiro Yamazaki.

Since WWII, West European nations have managed to overcome a painful past. Moreover, they have consolidated their bonds under the EU's noble values, which the former communist nations of East Europe have sought to join.

Modern Europe could benefit from the shared values established through centuries of religious, national and ideological struggles. However, Japan and Korea do not share such a heritage of values so as to overcome their national sentiments and interests.

South Korea, Japan and Taiwan need to collaborate for a union of freedom-loving nations in East Asia and beyond. Here, European encouragement, if not engagement, is vital. Lessons can be learnt from Germany's unification. Russia, a natural meeting point for European and Oriental values, would be able to deploy its development plans, which include a railway system, gas pipelines and an electricity grid,

once there is peace on the Korean peninsula.

UPF's founders, Dr. and Mrs. Moon, religiously-committed anti-communists, were nonetheless cordially invited by Mikhail Gorbachev in 1990 and Kim Il Sung the next year. They advocate and practise True Love and living for the sake of others as the solution to overcome all conflicts. Their example has guided UPF since its establishment in 2005 to foster trust among different peoples, faiths and nations, calling for interdependence, co-prosperity and universal values.

[Click here for the text of Mr. Yoshihiro Yamazaki's intervention](#)

Question-and-answer session

The first question, to Dr. Béglé, was about the present North Korean economic situation being comparable to that of China in the 70s and whether North Korea should go the same way as China. Dr. Béglé said North Korea already is. China is helping a lot North Korea, but not openly, so as to not offend the US. Both the economic and political links between the two countries are very strong. North Korea is very much looking at China and Vietnam, which have not given up the Communist ideology, but have opened their economies to the world at different levels.

The next question, to Dr. Vogelaar, was whether President Elect Joe Biden's government will be different from President Trump's. He finds it difficult to answer, as Mr. Biden has not been sworn in yet. Moreover, he will not develop a policy for North Korea from day one, because of the pandemic and the challenge he faces to reunite the country, except if there were to be a military provocation from the Korean side.

The third question, for Professor Ford, was about what would be the incentives that lead to a rapprochement between North and South Korea. He said that the Korean Peninsula is probably one of the most dangerous places in the world for the moment. If there were a conflict, we would all suffer somehow in this globalized world. The consequences for our economies would be enormous. The Biden administration should not move away from the Trump policy of engagement and strategic patience. The danger is that North Korea may well do things that look like provocations, such as testing their missiles, but the rest of the world should tread carefully to allow a peaceful transition from where we are now to where we want to be.

The next question, to Dr. Béglé, was about how there can be so many goods on the North Korean market, without having a market economy and private initiative. Actually, a process of decentralization has seen the daylight. The military industry and heavy industry are centralized, while light industry and consumption goods are decentralized and customer oriented. Unlike China in the 1970s, fashion from the West is closely followed. Large numbers of smuggled products from China are available in the shops.

The last question, to Professor Ford, came from Russia: The aggressive approach by the Western nations does not allow us to trust the proposal for North Korea to disarm. Will Korea one day reunite thanks to the natural historical process, rather than by political efforts which hamper reunification? The North Koreans do not believe there will be a reunification in the foreseeable future, due to America's hostile policy. Without sanctions their economy would be able to catch up with South Korea, which would allow the North to at least relate to its neighbor in terms of economy, without the fear of being assimilated by the South.



SPEECHES

- [Speeches](#)

Written by Amb. Marc Vogelaar, former Director for External and Public Affairs at the Korean Peninsula Energy Development Organization
📅 27 November 2020



Incentives for a Rapprochement on the Korean Peninsula

UPF webinar, 27th November, 2020

A contribution by Amb. Marc Vogelaar

(spoken text prevails)

We all want peace, both on the Korean Peninsula and beyond. But the question is how to get there. That's where diplomats come in!

I do have a moral judgment on the North Korean regime, its human rights violations and the threat it poses to the region and the international community. Many people do. But many observers are better placed than me to analyze why things went wrong on the Korean Peninsula since 1953. I was trained to be a diplomat, not a scholar. Therefore, I hope to add value to our debate by suggesting a pragmatic solution that, in my experienced view, appears a viable option for making headway.

In passing let me just say that I gained personal experience in working with North Korea during the three years that I served as a director with the Korean Peninsula Energy Development Organization (KEDO) in New York, during which time I visited the country several times. I may refer to the KEDO project in a moment, because its rise - and fall - contains useful lessons for future reference.

A way out

The North Korean crisis has lasted for over two generations. Let me summarize the stalemate in 5 points:

- the Korean War has not ended; the ceasefire is fragile
- the Korean Peninsula remains divided and heavily armed
- North Korea has developed nuclear weapons and will not give them up
- the international community refuses to accept North Korea as a nuclear weapons state
- neither putting pressure on, nor striking deals with, North Korea have shown lasting results so far.

How to untie this Gordian knot? Violence is no solution. You don't end the Korean War by resuming the Korean War. Dialogue then? Yes, but a dialogue can only be productive if the deal that results is fair and proves sustainable. So, let's take a look at what might lead to a fair and lasting deal.

All tools - except one - in the diplomatic toolkit have already been put to the test. They all failed. The only option remaining is, in my view, a broad deal that reconciles the legitimate aim of nuclear non-proliferation with catering for North Korea's security concerns and economic needs. Not unlike the Agreement Framework of the mid-nineties, which led to the KEDO project, but a broader and more binding version of it.

For a start, let's try not to consider North Korea's problems as weak spots. Our objective should be to defeat North Korea, but to induce it into being an acceptable member of the international community. For Pyongyang, this implies complete, verifiable, irreversible nuclear disarmament, including intercontinental ballistic missiles. It should also rejoin the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), respect human rights and give up its illicit arms trade.

In exchange, we should pledge full and formal security guarantees. Without these Pyongyang will never give up its nuclear weapons, which the regime considers a guarantee for its survival.

The best way of reaching this compromise is to formally end the Korean War, not as a reward, but as a catalyst. A Peace Treaty would imply the recognition of the integrity of North Korea's territory by all belligerents. A formal treaty would bind signatories more strongly than a bilateral or even a multilateral agreement, like for example the nuclear deal with Iran (JCPOA).

In addition, massive and unrestricted economic assistance needs to be put on offer, which means ending (or at least suspending) international sanctions. Since the collapse of the Soviet Union, most North Koreans have rapidly become impoverished. They are narrowly kept alive by China. Although, as of late, there are some modest signs of economic recovery, the country desperately needs humanitarian aid and foreign investments. Offering the latter would create political leverage.

Such an encompassing tradeoff cannot be achieved through pressure. You don't hold a gun to the head of the one you are negotiating with. Military threats and economic sanctions seem only to have hardened North Korea's resolve to not comply with international norms.

The Agreed Framework of 1994, as a step-by-step agreement, appeared a viable alternative, since it linked political concessions and economic benefits. However, the deal collapsed because North Korea secretly continued its nuclear weapons program and because of poor implementation of the agreement, not by KEDO, but by some



RELATED ARTICLES

- [4th Webinar on Prospects for Peace on the Korean Peninsula](#)
- [Y. Yamazaki: Address to First Middle East Peace Talks](#)
- [K. Otsuka: Address to UPF Webinar](#)
- [A. Zhebin: Address to UPF Webinar](#)
- [Intervention of Mr. Yoshihiro Yamazaki in the webinar on 27 November 2020.](#)

governments that were its stakeholders.

Multilateral action

Now is the time to act. The nuclear standoff between the US and the DPRK has become as volatile as the nuclear bombs that triggered it.

The bilateral Singapore Summit of 2018 produced a joint statement with promising commitments on both sides. Incoming president Biden should build on this first step, rather than reverting to the policy of "strategic patience" of President Obama. Unlike the adventurous Singapore Summit and the rather unhelpful one that followed in Hanoi; however, the next step should be duly prepared with major stakeholders, especially China.

Down the road, contributions from South Korea, Russia, Japan and the EU would be indispensable to corroborate the peace process. Only coherent multilateral action may lead to peace, and to finding "the way to get there". Let's just hope and pray that, in the meantime, Kim Jong Un will refrain from military provocations. "Give peace a chance"!

Closing remarks

The North Korean nuclear crisis is not just a problem of the United States or of the international community. It is above all a problem of the North Korean population, which suffers under domestic repression and international sanctions. Mere containment of the DPRK won't help the people who live there.

We all are morally obliged to take up this challenge, not through violence or by just talking, but by putting an encompassing gamble on the table. Just present Kim Jong Un with a package he can't refuse! I believe such a daring approach reflects the spirit of the co-founders of UPF, who went to North Korea some 30 years ago to engage the founder of the DPRK.

And what if this gamble doesn't fly? We would just go back to square one. But at least we would have tried our level best!

Thank you.



[Login](#) | [Privacy notice](#) | [Legal notice](#) | [Disclaimer](#)

We are an international and interreligious network of individuals and organizations, including representatives from religion, government, civil society and the private sector dedicated to achieving world peace. UPF supports the work of the United Nations, particularly in the areas of interfaith peacebuilding, peace education, and the strengthening of marriage and family.

Universal Peace Federation is an NGO in General Consultative Status with the [Economic and Social Council of the United Nations](#)
We support and promote the work of the [United Nations](#) and the achievement of the [Sustainable Development Goals](#)

Copyright ©2006-2020 Universal Peace Federation. All rights reserved.

JSN Boot template designed by [JoomlaShine.com](#)



Home ▶ What we do Conferences ▶ Peace Talks ▶ 2020 ▶ Speeches ▶

Intervention of Prof. Glyn Ford at the webinar on 27 November 2020

Written by Professor Glyn Ford, British academic and Labour Party politician, former member of the European Parliament



27 November 2020

This is a transcription of Prof. Ford's intervention at the webinar on the theme "Incentives for a Rapprochement on the Korean Peninsula" on 27 November 2020 by Mrs. Chantal Chételat Komagata, UPF Coordinator for West Europe.



I've been involved with North Korea in a reasonably serious way now for over 20 years. my first trip to North Korea took place in 1997 and I've been just under 50 times to North Korea. I'm hoping to go again in spring next year when the restrictions because of the COVID pandemic ease in both China and in North Korea.

Speaking to my topic, let me say that in terms of finding a rapprochement on the Peninsula, it seems to me that I agree very much with everything that Mark said. We need to solve the nuclear problem on the Peninsula and that means we need to engage principally with Pyongyang. The bottom line is that of course they would prefer not to give up their nuclear weapons. Nuclear weapons do have two purposes. Firstly, they act as a deterrent to South Korea, Japan and the United States, and secondly, they have an economic function.

The reality is that North Korea is outspent by a factor of 6 in military terms by South Korea. South Korea spends a much smaller part of its GDP on its military than North Korea, but of course the South Korean economy is close to 50 times stronger, so two or three percent of something 50 times bigger equals 25% of the GDP that North Korea spends. In terms of South Korea, Japan and the United States, North Korea is outspent by a factor of 50, so they have lost the arms race. They've been comprehensively beaten on the arms race.

The North Korean spending on the military equipment is equivalent to that of Australia. That's why they developed their nuclear deterrent. But it also serves the second purpose: North Korea has two major problems in terms of shortages. First, there's energy, which is why they were very interested back in the mid 90s in the KEDO project, which was mentioned; it was about, in exchange for North Korea abandoning its development of nuclear weapons, to actually build two light water reactors and supply energy in North

Korea, and the second is that they're short of labour, because there are hundreds of thousands of men principally in the Korean armed forces, and nuclear weapons actually will allow probably tens if not hundred thousand to be counted out of that into industry, and if the North Korean economy is going to grow, they actually need that labour.

So, what are they looking for if we're going to have a solution? They're looking for what I call sanctions mitigation, that was mentioned by Mark. Actually, they're not looking for the easing of US sanctions, as frankly they won't get them. Any President in the United States would struggle to get Congress to actually lift layer upon layer of sanctions imposed by Congress, but mainly because a lot of them are actually tied up to human rights issues. What the North Koreans are looking for is the mitigation of UN, United Nations sanctions, which of course are not controlled by Congress or depend upon the incoming president Biden just giving the necessary instructions. They're also looking for security guarantees.

What was interesting is that, in my time in North Korea, the agreed framework was based on a letter from Bill Clinton, saying: "We're not going to attack you". It doesn't work. The North Koreans are no longer interested in a piece of paper with the current US President's signature on it. What they need is some multilateral guarantees and they are rather interested in the joint comprehensive plan of action as in Iran. We are all aware that President Trump attempted to tear that deal up, but what was interesting to the North Koreans was, unlike the agreed framework, when George Bush Senior tore it up, it was over with the joint comprehensive plan of action with Iran. Actually, the European Union, Germany, France, the United Kingdom, Russia, China said: "Hang on, it's actually exactly working in our opinion". So, it had a robustness and resilience that was missing from the agreed framework.

So, I think the North Koreans will be looking for something along those lines. It will not be exactly the same people, but it will be at the United Nations Security Council, P5, the five permanent members plus. For obvious reasons in Korea, that's likely to be the South Koreans, or almost certainly it's not going to happen without them, and it's also going to be possibly Japan, with their particular problems, because of their focus on resolving the abduction issue before the nuclear issue, and maybe the European Union.

Back with the agreed framework, the people who paid the money were actually South Korea, who paid a considerable amount before the programme was abandoned, I think 3/4, followed by Japan, that paid a billion dollars, and the gap was filled by the European Union. Note that the United States paid no money at all. And Clinton had exactly the same problems that Biden will have in the future in actually getting money. So, you will have the security guarantees.

You also need to actually have, whatever you want to call it, compensation, an industrial development programme. The North Koreans are very clear that they've spent considerable amounts of money on their nuclear weapons development and their ICBM development. They will want compensation for that, and the estimated amount needed is something between 15 and 20 billion dollars, and that will be paid by South Korea, possibly Japan, the European Union and probably not the United States. So, those are the elements that will come into a solution.

It's going to be a long-term programme. Trust building is required on both sides. For understandable reasons, neither side trusts the other at the moment. So, it will be a step by step process with various staging points on the way, from where we are now to a final resolution of the programme. Certainly, the North is looking for industrial investment apart from the compensation, but I think it's proper to focus on what they are interested in, rather than what people want to impose on them, namely their view of economic development and they're very keen to modernise.

Their economy is closer to that of China, but with the state-owned enterprises, or even Japan, with the zaibatsu, or South Korea with the chaebol. It's a form of guided state capitalism that they're interested in, rather than the free market economy of the United States, and that needs to be borne in mind. We clearly need a peace settlement of some kind. I actually think that it's not possible to have a peace treaty with the United States again because of the problems with Congress getting a 2/3 majority in the Senate; a peace treaty with North Korea is frankly unlikely.

It's not going to happen, so we need some end of war declaration, with the obvious signatories being the

real people behind the war: of course, the Chinese, it was the Chinese people's volunteers that fought, not Beijing officially. It was the United Nations that fought in the South, not the US, but I think the reality is you need an end of war declaration with South Korea, North Korea, China and the United States, with the possible addition of Russia and Japan. But it seems to me that that's the way forward. It will be a long hard road, but I agree it's a very important one. It's very dangerous, particularly for the Korean Peninsula, but also for the world, if we go down the path of what I term "regime change" as opposed to "encouraging a change of regime". I will leave it at that.

Thank you.



RELATED ARTICLES

- [Intervention of Dr. Vladimir Petrovskiy](#)
- [Intervention of Hon. Keith Best in the Peace Talk on 26-5-2020](#)
- [4th Webinar on Prospects for Peace on the Korean Peninsula](#)
- [Y. Yamazaki: Address to First Middle East Peace Talks](#)
- [K. Otsuka: Address to UPF Webinar](#)

SPEECHES

- [Speeches](#)

[Login](#) | [Privacy notice](#) | [Legal notice](#) | [Disclaimer](#)

We are an international and interreligious network of individuals and organizations, including representatives from religion, government, civil society and the private sector dedicated to achieving world peace. UPF supports the work of the United Nations, particularly in the areas of interfaith peacebuilding, peace education, and the strengthening of marriage and family.

Universal Peace Federation is an NGO in General Consultative Status with the [Economic and Social Council of the United Nations](#)

We support and promote the work of the [United Nations](#) and the achievement of the [Sustainable Development Goals](#)

Copyright ©2006-2020 Universal Peace Federation.
All rights reserved.





Home ▶ What we do Conferences ▶ Peace Talks ▶ 2020 ▶ Speeches ▶

Intervention of Mr. Yoshihiro Yamazaki in the webinar on 27 November 2020.

Written by Mr. Yoshihiro Yamazaki, Liaison Director, Institute for Peace Policies for Europe and Middle East, Japan



27 November 2020

Why Asia Needs a European Vision of Peace

Yoshihiro Yamazaki

Political feud between Japan and Korea

For the past decade or so, Japan and the Republic of Korea, that is South Korea, have been entangled in an ever-widening political feud. With the new government in Japan and diplomatic opportunities emerging around the Tokyo Olympics, there is talk about an improvement of a sort. Putting political details aside, this sorry state of affairs has convinced me that Japan and South Korea have not helped East Asia achieve what West Europe has accomplished in the past 75 years.

Following World War II, West European nations toiled to reconcile with one another out of the painful past. They have defended themselves under the NATO alliance, consolidating their bonds under the European Union's noble values. Naturally, the former communist nations of East Europe and the Balkans have sought to join in. This picture of great advancement in Europe is a far cry from East Asia, where the two leading nations are mired in bitter friction with no union of free nations in sight, while Europe has witnessed the dismantling of the Cold War regime.



East Asia's lack of common values

Why this stark discrepancy between Europe and East Asia? In my humble view, modern Europe persisted with the shared values, which were established through centuries of religious, national and ideological struggles. Japan and Korea could not deeply implant these values so as to overcome their national sentiments and interests. Thus, Japan in general did not clearly acknowledge South Korea's regional role in defending the free society. Likewise, South Korea is still tied up in a 'south-south conflict' of ideas between left-leaning liberals and right-wing conservatives.

What Europe could contribute?

Therefore, definitely Japan needs to support freedom-seeking South Korea. Besides, Japan, South Korea and Taiwan need to collaborate for a union of freedom-loving nations in East Asia and beyond. Here lies the vital role of European encouragement, if not engagement, as a harbinger of such a union of sovereign states based on the distinctive values of freedom, human rights and the rule of law.

Another instructive European case in point is Germany, this time in relation to the Korean peninsula. When East Germany sought for a union, West Germany had a distinctive edge in military strength, a vibrant economy and diverse soft powers of freedom and opportunities. Such clear advantages need to be manifested by South Korea, as it will have to be engaged in tumultuous dealings across the 38th parallel. Japan, and other freedom-seeking nations need to consider the parallel as their own line, just like the Berlin Wall was viewed in those days.

Russia's location makes it a natural meeting point for European and Oriental values, a place that permits both interaction and exchange, leading to transformation and reform in Europe and Asia, as well as Russia itself. A Russian expert on Korean affairs said that Russia has nothing to lose from a stable and peaceful Korean peninsula. He reasoned that, first, it would eliminate tension beyond Russia's eastern borders and, second, it would finally open the way to the implementation of eastern Russia's development plans through the Korean peninsula, plans which include a railway system, gas pipelines and an electricity grid.

Nuclear deterrent as a system of distrust

As for denuclearization, North Korea was virtually the only nation in East Asia without a reliable nuclear umbrella. Facing Russia and China, non-nuclear Japan and South Korea have been under America's nuclear shield. Thus, Pyongyang's leaders will never give up their nuclear status until they find dependable guarantors, especially to safeguard their puritanical nationalism. Incidentally, the Islamic Republic of Iran is taking a similar course as it is bound to defend its Islamic puritanism. After all, for the past 75 years, such nuclear deterrence has been with us around much of the northern hemisphere virtually as a system to contain, if not maintain, the structural distrust among ideologies, nations and now religions. Unless this distrust is fundamentally eliminated, we will have to live with the nuclear deterrent.

Peace drive based on True Love

UPF's founders, Dr. and Mrs. Moon, have advocated and practiced an ultimate solution to break this kind of global state of distrust based on True Love, or Living for the sake of others. Religiously committed anti-communists, they nonetheless were invited by Moscow in 1990 and Pyongyang the next year, cordially discussing matters with President Gorbachev and President Kim Il Sung. They produced important documents listing some steps aimed at eventual peace. Their example has guided UPF, since its establishment 15 years ago, to foster trust among different peoples, conflicting faiths and even hostile nations, calling for Interdependence, Co-prosperity and Universal Values.

In conclusion, Europe's engagement in extending and sharing its post-Cold War peace, unity and prosperity with Asia are highly sought after, at least, until Asia's Berlin Wall - the 38th parallel - is dismantled and both peoples of Korea unite and live happily. Thank you for your attention.



RELATED ARTICLES

- [Y. Yamazaki: Address to First Middle East Peace Talks](#)
- [First Middle East 'Peace Talks' Is Held](#)
- [U. Angelucci: Address to First Middle East Peace Talks](#)
- [G. Dizdar: Address to First Middle East Peace Talks](#)
- [K. Otsuka: Address to UPF Webinar](#)