

면지

- 표지와 동일 -

알린 웨어(PNND 글로벌 코디네이터) 초청 토론회

핵 없는 세상과 한반도 핵문제



■ 일시 및 장소 : 2013년 6월 19일(수) 오후 2시~4시, 국회 의원회관 2층 제1세미나실

■ 주최 : PNND Korea(공동대표: 이미경·정의화), 국회 한반도평화포럼(대표: 김동철)
국회 생활정치실천의원모임(대표: 이미경)

토론회 진행순서

▷ 1부 : 사전행사

▷ 사회 : 국회의원 홍익표 (PNND Korea 간사의원)

14:00~14:20	▷ 인사말 국회의원 이미경, 국회의원 정의화 (PNND Korea 공동대표) 국회의원 김동철 (국회 한반도평화포럼 대표)
-------------	---

▷ 2부 : 토론회

주제발표

14:20~15:00	▷ 발제 〈핵 없는 세계와 한반도 핵문제 - PNND의 역할〉 : 앨린 웨어(PNND 글로벌 코디네이터)
-------------	--

지정토론

15:00~15:20	▷ 토론 1. 서재정 (존스홉킨스대 국제대학원 교수) 2. 피터 백 (아시아재단 한국지부 대표)
15:20~16:00	질의응답

■ ■ 약력

앨린 웨어(PNND 글로벌 코디네이터)
서재정(존스홉킨스대 국제대학원 교수)
피터 벡(아시아재단 한국지부 대표)

■ ■ 발제

A nuclear free world and nuclear issue on the Korean Peninsula:
Issues and roles for parliamentarians

핵 없는 세계와 한반도 핵문제 - PNND의 역할

앨린 웨어(PNND 글로벌 코디네이터)

■ ■ 발제 참고자료

■ ■ 토론

1. 서재정(존스홉킨스대 국제대학원 교수)
2. 피터 벡(아시아재단 한국지부 대표)

•• 알린 웨어(PNND 글로벌 코디네이터) 초청 토론회 〈핵 없는 세상과 한반도 핵문제〉

약 력

- 앨린 웨어(PNND 글로벌 코디네이터)
- 서재정(존스홉킨스대 국제대학원 교수)
- 피터 벅(아시아재단 한국지부 대표)





알린 웨어(Alyn Ware)

Alyn Ware is a New Zealand born political analyst, nuclear disarmament expert, peace educator and nuclear abolition campaigner. He is co-founder of a number of organisations, networks and initiatives including:

- *Abolition 2000 Global Network to Eliminate Nuclear Weapons* – which has grown to include more than 2000 organizations in over 90 countries;
- *World Court Project* which achieved a decision from the International Court of Justice in 1996 on the illegality of the threat or use of nuclear weapons;
- *Middle Powers Initiative* which has brought together influential governments to advance a nuclear disarmament framework in multilateral forums;
- *Model Nuclear Weapons Convention* which has been circulated by the UN Secretary-General as a guide to nuclear disarmament negotiations
- *Nuclear Abolition Forum*, a website and periodical to facilitate dialogue on the process to achieve and sustain a nuclear-weapons-free world.
- *Parliamentarians for Nuclear Nonproliferation and Disarmament*, a global network of influential parliamentarians from around the world, for which Alyn serves as the Global Coordinator;
- *Basel Peace Office*, which brings together key international and Swiss organisations to advance the security of a nuclear-weapons-free world.

Alyn has served on the NZ Department of Education Peace Studies Guidelines Advisory Board, NZ Public Advisory Committee on Disarmament and Arms Control, World Future Council, and as the Executive Director of the Lawyers Committee on Nuclear Policy (US) and Consultant for the International Association of Lawyers Against Nuclear Arms.

Alyn has won a number of awards including the Right Livelihood Award (Sweden), United Nations International Year for Peace Award (New Zealand), Winston Churchill Memorial Trust Award (New Zealand), Alliance for Nuclear Accountability Award (USA) and Tom Perry Peace Award (Canada).

His Books include:

- *Our Planet in every Classroom*, co-authored with Annie Doherty
- *Securing our Survival: The Case for a Nuclear Weapons Convention*, co-authored with Merav Datan, Felicity Hill and Juergen Scheffran; and

- *PNND/IPU Handbook for Parliamentarians: Supporting Nuclear Nonproliferation and Disarmament*, co-edited with Rob van Riet.

알린 웨어는 핵감축을 위한 의원 네트워크'(Parliamentarians for Nuclear Nonproliferation and Disarmament) PNND) 글로벌 코디네이터로 활동하고 있다. 또한 그는 뉴질랜드 출신 정치 분석가, 핵군축 전문가, 평화 교육자, 그리고 핵 폐기 캠페인 활동가이다.

알린 웨어는 여러 단체, 네트워크, 연구소의 공동 설립자이기도 하다. 예를 들어 90 여개 국가, 2000 여개 단체들이 소속된 네트워크로 성장하고 있는 <핵무기 폐기를 위한 글로벌 네트워크 Abolition 2000(Abolition 2000 Global Network to Eliminate Nuclear Weapons)>, 1996 년 핵무기 위협 혹은 사용의 불법성에 대한 국제사법재판소의 판결을 얻어낸 <국제사법재판소 프로젝트(World Court Project)>, 다자간 회의에서 핵군축 논의를 진전시키기 위한 영향력 있는 국가들의 모임인 <중견국가이니셔티브(Middle Powers Initiative)>, UN 사무국의 핵군축 협상 지침서로 통용되고 있는 <핵무기 협약(안)(Model Nuclear Weapons Convention)>, 웹사이트와 정기간행물을 통해 핵무기없는 세상을 만들고 지속하기 위한 과정에서 대화를 촉진하는 <핵폐기 포럼'(Nuclear Abolition Forum)>, 전세계 영향력 있는 의원들의 글로벌 네트워크 <핵감축을 위한 의원 네트워크(Parliamentarians for Nuclear Nonproliferation and Disarmament)>, 핵무기 없는 세상의 안보 개선을 위해 핵심 국제단체와 스위스 주요단체 네트워킹하고 있는 <바젤 평화 사무소(Basel Peace Office)> 등이 있다.

알린 웨어는 뉴질랜드 교육부 평화교육가이드라인 자문위원회, 뉴질랜드 군비통제 및 군축 공공자문위원회, 세계미래회의 등의 위원, 미국 핵 정책을 위한 변호사위원회의 사무총장, 핵무기에 반대하는 국제변호사협회 자문위원을 역임하고 있다.

또한 대안적 노벨상인 스웨덴의 바른생활상(Right Livelihood Award), 뉴질랜드의 국제평화의 해 상(United Nations International Year for Peace Award) 및 윈스턴 처칠 기념재단 상(Winston Churchill Memorial Trust Award), 미국의 핵무기책무동맹 상(Alliance for Nuclear Accountability Award) 그리고 캐나다 톰페리 평화상(Tom Perry Peace Award)등을 수상하였다.

대표 저서로는 <모든 교실에 있는 우리세상>(Annie Doherty 공저), <우리의 생존을 보장하기: 핵무기 협약 사례 중심으로>(Merav Datan, Felicity Hill, Juergen Scheffran 공저), <핵감축을 위한 의원국제포럼/국제의회연맹 의원들을 위한 핸드북: 핵 비확산과 감축 지원>(Rob van Riet 공동편집장) 등이 있다.



J.J. Suh is currently Associate Professor at SAIS, Johns Hopkins University and Executive Committee member of Center for Peace and Disarmament at People's Solidarity for Participatory Democracy(PSPD). He has previously served as Assistant Professor in Department of Government at Cornell University and on the Presidential Commission on Policy Planning (Republic of Korea). An expert on the U.S.-Korea relations, U.S. policy toward Asia, international relations of East Asia, international security, and IR theory, he is currently working on regional orders in East Asia, human security, and North Korea.

He has authored and edited numerous journal articles and books, including *Power, Interest and Identity in Military Alliances* (2007); *Rethinking Security in East Asia: Identity, Power and Efficiency* (2004); *Truth and Reconciliation in the Republic of Korea: Between the Present and Future of the Korean Wars* (2012); *Origins of North Korea's Juche: Colonialism, War, and Development* (2012); "The Imbalance of Power, the Balance of Asymmetric Terror: Mutual Assured Destruction (MAD) in Korea," "Changes in U.S. Military Strategy and the U.S.-Korea Alliance," "The Two-Wars Doctrine and the Regional Arms Race: Contradictions in U.S. Post-Cold War Security Policy in Northeast Asia," and "War-Like History or Diplomatic History? Historical Contentions and Regional Order in East Asia."

He is recipient of numerous grants and fellowships including Fulbright-Hays Faculty Research, SSRC-MacArthur Foundation Fellowship for Peace and Security in a Changing World, Smith Richardson Foundation grant, and East West Center fellowship. He was visiting professor at Seoul National University, research professor at Yonsei University, visiting scholar at MIT and visiting fellow at University of California, Irvine. He received his Ph.D. and Master in political science from University of Pennsylvania and B.A. in physics from the University of Chicago.

서재정 교수는 존스홉킨스대학 국제대학(SAIS) 부교수이자 참여연대 평화군축센터 실행위원으로 활동 중이다. 서재정 교수는 또한 코넬대학 행정학 조교수직과 대한민국 대통령 자문정책기획위원을 역임하였다. 한미관계, 미국의 아시아 정책, 동아시아 국제관계, 국제 안보 및 국제관계 이론의 전문가로서, 그는 현재 동아시아 정세, 인간안보, 북한에 대한 연구에 천착 하고 있다.

서재정 교수의 저서로는 <한미동맹은 영구화하는가 : 군사동맹과 군사력, 이해관계 그리고 정체성(*Power, Interest and Identity in Military Alliances*, 2007;

한글번역본 2009)>; <아시아 안보의 재인식(*Rethinking Security in East Asia: Identity, Power and Efficiency*, 2004)>; <한국전쟁의 진실과 화해(Truth and Reconciliation in the Republic of Korea: Between the Present and Future of the Korean Wars, 2012)>; <북한 주체의 기원: 식민주의, 전쟁 및 경제개발 (Origins of North Korea' s Juche: Colonialism, War, and Development (2012)> 등이 있다.

또한 “힘의 불균형과 비대칭적 공포의 균형”(The Imbalance of Power, the Balance of Asymmetric Terror: Mutual Assured Destruction (MAD) in Korea), “미국 군사전략과 한미동맹의 변화”(Changes in U.S. Military Strategy and the U.S.-Korea Alliance), “양대전쟁과 지역 군비경쟁: 미국 동북아시아 안보정책의 모순 ” (The Two-Wars Doctrine and the Regional Arms Race: Contradictions in U.S. Post-Cold War Security Policy in Northeast Asia), “전쟁사인가, 외교사인가: 동아시아 역사분쟁과 지역질서 ” (War-Like History or Diplomatic History? Historical Contentions and Regional Order in East Asia) 등 다수의 책과 학술지의 저자이자 편집자로 활동하였다.

서재정 교수는 풀브라이트-헤이즈 교수연구, 변화하는 세계의 평화안보를 위한 SSRC-맥아더 장학재단, 스미스 리차드슨 장학재단, 동서장학센터와 같은 많은 기관으로부터 그의 연구를 지원받았다. 또한 서울대 객원교수, 연세대 연구교수, MIT 객원연구원, 어바인시의 캘리포니아 주립대 객원 연구원을 역임하였다. 그는 펜실베이니아 대학에서 정치학 석박사 학위를 받았고 시카고 대학에서 물리학을 전공하였다.



피터 벡(Peter M. Beck)

Peter M. Beck became the Korea Representative for the San Francisco-based Asia Foundation in January 2012. He serves on the Korea Foundation's Publications Board and the Korean American Educational Commission.

Previously, he held fellowships at the Council on Foreign Relations, Stanford University and the East-West Center in Honolulu. He served as the executive director of the U.S. Committee for Human Rights in North Korea and opened the International Crisis Group's Northeast Asia office in Seoul (2004 – 2007). He was also the Director of Research and Academic Affairs at the Korea Economic Institute in Washington, D.C (1997 – 2004).

He has taught at American University, Georgetown University, the Naval Post Graduate School, EwhaWomans University, and Yonsei University. He has served as an advisor to the International Republican Institute and as a member of the Ministry of Unification's Policy Advisory Committee. He has also been a columnist for Joongang Sunday, Donga Ilbo, Weekly Chosun, and The Korea Herald. He has published over 100 articles, including in Asian Survey, Encyclopedia Britannica, Foreign Policy, Mother Jones, Oxford Analytica, The Wall Street Journal, and Yale Global. He has also testified before Congress.

He received his B.A. from the University of California at Berkeley, completed the Korean language program at Seoul National University, and conducted his graduate studies at U.C. San Diego's Graduate School of International Relations and Pacific Studies.

피터 벡 대표는 2012 년 1 월 아시아재단 한국지부 대표로 부임하였다. 피터 벡 대표는 한국국제교류재단의 편집위원과 한미교육위원단의 위원으로도 현재 활동하고 있으며, 중앙일보에 칼럼을 연재한 바 있다.

한국 대표로 부임하기 전 피터 벡 대표는 외교협회와 스탠포드 대학 그리고 호놀룰루에 있는 동서문화센터에서 펠로우로 연구활동을 하였으며, 북한인권위원회 사무총장직을 역임하였다. 2004 년에서 2007 년까지 서울에 소재한 국제위기감시기구 동북아시아지부 사무소장으로 재직하였으며,

1997 년부터 2004 년까지 미국 워싱턴 DC 에 소재한 한미경제연구소에서 연구실장으로 활동하였다.

피터백 대표는 아메리칸대학교, 조지타운대학교, 미국해군대학원, 그리고 이화여자대학교와 연세대학교에서 강의를 하였다. 이와 더불어 국제공화연구소 자문위원과 통일부 정책자문위원, 동아일보, 위클리 조선, 코리아 헤럴드 등 주요언론사칼럼리스트로 활동하였으며, 아시안 서베이, 브리태니카 백과사전, 포린폴리시, 마더존스, 옥스포드애널리티카, 월스트리트 저널, 예일 글로벌 등에 100 여 편 이상의 논문과 칼럼을 기고하였다.

피터백 대표는 UC 버클리대학교에서 학사학위를 취득하였으며 서울대학교에서 한국어 과정을 이수하였고, UC 샌디에고 국제관계•태평양연구 대학원 과정을 수료하였다.

•• 알린 웨어(PNND 글로벌 코디네이터) 초청 토론회 〈핵 없는 세상과 한반도 핵문제〉

발 제

A nuclear free world and nuclear issue on the Korean Peninsula:
Issues and roles for parliamentarians

핵 없는 세계와 한반도 핵문제 - PNND의 역할

알린 웨어(PNND 글로벌 코디네이터)



A nuclear free world and nuclear issue on the Korean Peninsula: Issues and roles for parliamentarians

Alyn Ware, June 2013

On 5 April 2008, President Obama announced in Prague a vision and commitment to seek a world without nuclear weapons. It was this vision and commitment, primarily, that earned Obama the Nobel Peace prize.

Four years later, are we any closer to a nuclear-weapons-free world? Is such a world indeed possible? Or was President Obama's vision merely an attention-catching pipe-dream? And what part in either the obstacles or solutions to a nuclear-weapons-free world are being played out now in North-East Asia?

Indeed, Obama has faced considerable hurdles and set-backs in implementing the vision to-date. He was able to negotiate a reduction in nuclear stockpiles with Russia, but the price tag Republicans demanded for ratifying new START Treaty was an extra \$14 billion annually (on top of the annual nuclear weapons budget of \$56 billion) to be spent on modernizing the U.S. nuclear weapons complex – something seemingly at odds with the commitment for nuclear disarmament.

In addition, President Obama has been unable to persuade the US Congress to ratify the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, and the next round of negotiations with Russia appears to be stalled. On the multilateral front, negotiations on next steps such as a treaty on fissile materials have been blocked for nearly two decades in the Conference on Disarmament, and there has been little progress in addressing the regional nuclear threats in the Middle East or the nuclear weapons and missile program of the Democratic Peoples' Republic of Korea.

Yet, in spite of this, a new wave of optimism for a nuclear-weapons-free world is emerging in the dawn of Obama's second term as President, and in light of new international initiatives at the United Nations.

No longer shackled by the need of a first-term President to shape policy to ensure re-election, Obama has more freedom to take bold steps – and appears to be doing so. He is, for example, considering unilateral cuts in US nuclear stockpiles – something that would not require a treaty with Russia or ratification by the Senate. Chuck Hagel, his appointee as Secretary of Defence, is a member of Global Zero, a network of states-people and policy-makers who endorse phased reductions in nuclear stockpiles culminating in a nuclear-weapons-free world by 2030.

In the US Congress, Ed Markey, Co-President of Parliamentarians for Nuclear Nonproliferation and Disarmament(PNND), has generated considerable traction for his

SANE (Sensible Approach to Nuclear Expenditure) Act which proposes significant cuts in nuclear stockpiles and spending, based on the Global Zero plan, in order to help stimulate the economy and support environmentally sustainable enterprises.

The Global Zero plan is also gaining attention and support around the world. Earlier this year nearly 390 Members of the European Parliament – over half of the parliament - signed a declaration jointly organised by Global Zero and (PNND) supporting the Global Zero plan.

However President Obama cannot deliver a nuclear-weapons-free world by himself. He cannot drastically reduce the US stockpiles when there is a perception that the weapons are required to defend US allies in Europe (NATO) and in North East Asia (Republic of Korea and Japan). Nor can the US move to eliminate their nuclear weapons while other States still have them.

Thus, in order for there to be real progress, there needs to be attention to regional processes to reduce and eliminate the role of nuclear weapons, undertaken concurrently with a global process for nuclear abolition.

North East Asia is critical in this equation for a number of reasons.

Firstly, the United States is committed to defending Japan and the Republic of Korea, including through nuclear deterrence. If there is a perception that the US requires a number of readily available nuclear weapons specifically for the NE Asian region – including for a possible first-use against the DPRK, then this will hamper efforts by President Obama to reduce nuclear stockpiles and lower the role of nuclear weapons. On the other hand, if it is perceived that the US can adequately protect Japan and the ROK focusing more on a mix of political approaches and conventional weapons systems (including anti-missile defenses), then President Obama is freer to advance significant nuclear weapons cuts.

This was clearly demonstrated during the development of the US Nuclear Posture Review in 2008-2009. Some US Republicans and a few maverick Japanese voices warned that any significant reduction in nuclear stockpiles coupled with the proposed decommissioning of the US Tomahawk cruise missiles, would leave Japan vulnerable and could lead to them developing their own nuclear bomb. However, the majority view from Japan – as indicated, for example, in a letter to President Obama from 204 Japanese parliamentarians from across the political spectrum, was that Japan could be adequately protected – and in fact would support - a less provocative US nuclear posture involving reductions in stockpiles and a move to *sole purpose for nuclear weapons*, i.e. that the only role for nuclear weapons should be to deter other nuclear weapons. This was thus reflected in the final 2009 Nuclear Posture Review, under which President Obama agreed to the decommissioning of the Tomahawk cruise missiles, lowering the role of nuclear weapons to ‘primary purpose’ to deter other nuclear weapons (with a

commitment to move to sole purpose) and emphasizing non-nuclear approaches to strengthening the security of allies.

A second reason that North East Asia is critical in the equation is the challenge the nuclear weapons program of the DPRK puts to the current nuclear non-proliferation regime. The fact that the DPRK, a technologically backward country, has managed to develop a nuclear weapons program despite almost universal opposition, UN Security Council imposed sanctions and controls on technology assistance, indicates the near impossibility of preventing a country going nuclear if they decide it's in their national interests – at least under the current global regime which does not prohibit nuclear weapons outright nor place comprehensive controls on all nuclear facilities. In fact, the decision of the DPRK to withdraw from the NPT and develop nuclear weapons for deterrence could be argued as a right open to any country, at least as long as other countries have nuclear weapons which are considered to threaten them. The alternative, which makes more sense and has stronger political and legal merit, is to affirm a non-discriminatory prohibition on nuclear weapons, i.e. prohibited for everyone.

There are many developments pointing in this direction – including the International Court of Justice Advisory Opinion of 1996 which affirmed that the threat or use of nuclear weapons would generally be in violation of international law; the UN resolution adopted annually by the UN calling for negotiations on the prohibition and elimination of nuclear weapons under a nuclear weapons convention; the 5-point plan put forward by the UN Secretary-General in 2008, the resolution adopted by the Inter Parliamentary Union by consensus in 2009 supporting the UN Secretary-General's plan, the 2011 resolution adopted by the Council of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies on the incompatibility of nuclear weapons with international humanitarian law; the decision of the United Nations last year to establish an Open Ended Working Group to take forward multilateral nuclear disarmament negotiations, and just two months ago the decision by the Inter Parliamentary Union to focus its peace and security program for 2013-2014 on "Towards a Nuclear Weapons Free World: The Contribution of Parliaments."

A global focus on nuclear disarmament provides an opening to engage with the DPRK. Where-as they are adamantly resisting any calls to unilaterally roll back their nuclear weapons program, the DPRK is supportive of many of the above global nuclear disarmament initiatives. They supported the general concept of illegality of nuclear weapons in the ICJ case and voted in favour of the UN resolutions calling for a nuclear weapons convention and establishing the Open Ended Working Group.

However, it would be a mistake to wait until negotiations begin on comprehensive global nuclear disarmament to engage more concretely with DPRK on rolling back their nuclear weapons program. Although they are not open to unilateral measures, they may be open to a non-discriminatory regional approach that lowers the role of nuclear weapons by all States in the region and meets key security issues that gave rise to their

reliance on nuclear weapons and on the reliance on extended nuclear deterrence by the ROK and Japan.

A strategy to address such nuclear threats in the North-East Asian region can be found in the proposal for a North-East Asian nuclear weapon-free zone (NWFZ). A draft treaty was released in 2008 by Katsuya Okada, the then Chair of the Democratic Party of Japan's Parliamentary Disarmament Group, who went on to become Japan's Foreign Minister. It has been the subject of a number of academic and parliamentary meetings in Japan and South Korea since then.

Based on a '3+3 formula'ⁱ, the draft treaty proposes that North Korea give up its nuclear weapons and become subject to verification, but not unilaterally. Under the treaty the other five nations; South Korea, Japan, Russia, China; and the United States, would also have to decrease the role of nuclear weapons in their security doctrines:

- Japan and South Korea would commit to not allowing nuclear weapons on their territories and to not threatening North Korea with nuclear weapons being used by the U.S. in their 'defence'
- The U.S., China and Russia would commit to not deploying nuclear weapons on the territories of Japan, South Korea or North Korea
- The U.S., China and Russia would commit to not using or threatening to use nuclear weapons against Japan, South Korea or North Korea.

The proposal provides a 'win/win/win/win' approach to enhance the security of all States in the region. North Korea would receive binding guarantees, particularly by the United States, that nuclear weapons will not be used against them. Japan and South Korea would receive binding guarantees, particularly by China and Russia, that nuclear weapons will not be used against them. The proposal thus provides the most realistic approach to persuading North Korea to give up its nuclear weapons capability. Tensions between China, Russia and the U.S. would be reduced through decreasing the role of nuclear weapons in their doctrines. Furthermore regional tensions regarding the islands in the South and East China Seas would be reduced, as the possible threat from nuclear weapons would be taken off the table.ⁱⁱ

The proposal draws from other nuclear weapon-free zones established in Antarctica, Latin America and the Caribbean, the South Pacific, South-East Asia, Africa and Central Asia. It is nonetheless uniquely designed to address the specific security environment in North-East Asia.

Already the proposal has received considerable political and civil society support. 93 parliamentarians from Japan and South Korea have endorsed a *Joint Statement by Parliamentarians of Japan and the Republic of Korea on Denuclearization of Northeast Asia*, which supports the establishment of a North-East Asian NWFZ. Endorsers include

former foreign ministers and other high-level parliamentarians from both government and opposition parties.ⁱⁱⁱ In Japan, mayors and other heads of over 400 local authorities have supported a statement to create a nuclear weapon-free zone in North-East Asia.^{iv}

At the global level, one of the most important conceptual and political developments has been the release in 2008, by UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon of a Five-Point Plan for nuclear disarmament. This envisions achieving a nuclear-weapons-free world through a global nuclear abolition treaty to be negotiated concurrently with interim measures including nuclear stockpile reductions, establishing additional nuclear-weapons-free zones, strengthening controls on nuclear materials, providing non-nuclear security assurances, and making progress on complementary disarmament issues including on other weapons of mass destruction, missile control and conventional disarmament. The UN Secretary General's proposal has been supported worldwide, including in a unanimous resolution in 2009 of the Inter-Parliamentary Union, representing 160 national parliaments and 10 regional parliaments.

Recognising the vital role of parliamentarians in implementing the political aspiration and legal obligation to achieve a nuclear-weapons-free world, the UNSG sent a letter to every parliament in February 2010 in which he noted that:

*Parliamentarians and parliaments play a key role in the success of disarmament and non-proliferation efforts. Parliaments support the implementation of treaties and global agreements contributing to the rule of law and promoting adherence to commitments. They adopt legislation that increases transparency and accountability, thus building trust, facilitating verification and creating conditions that are conducive to the further pursuit of disarmament. At a time when the international community is facing unprecedented global challenges, parliamentarians can take on leading roles in ensuring sustainable global security, while reducing the diversion of precious resources from human needs. As parliaments set the fiscal priorities for their respective countries, they can determine how much to invest in the pursuit of peace and cooperative security. Towards this end, parliaments can establish the institutional infrastructures to support the development of necessary practical measures. I would therefore like to take this opportunity to encourage all parliamentarians to join in efforts to achieve a nuclear-weapon-free world... . I salute **Parliamentarians for Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament** for its related efforts and for its work towards building support for a nuclear weapon convention.*

This inspired numerous parliaments to adopt resolutions supporting the UNSG's plan. These resolutions, along with a global parliamentary declaration supporting a nuclear weapons convention, were presented to the UNSG and the States Parties to the NPT in May 2010. This may have been influential in moving the States Parties to agree that:

"All States need to make special efforts to establish the necessary framework to achieve and maintain a world without nuclear weapons. The Conference notes the Five-Point Proposal for Nuclear Disarmament of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, which proposes inter alia the consideration of negotiations on a nuclear weapons convention or a framework of separate mutually reinforcing instruments backed by a strong system of verification";

The IPU followed up its 2009 resolution by developing a *Handbook for Parliamentarians on Supporting Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament*, which was launched in October 2012 and circulated to every parliament in the world, as well as to the United Nations representatives of every country in New York and Geneva. The handbook provides an update on key nuclear nonproliferation and disarmament issues, underscores the important role that parliamentarians play in the achievement of nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament commitments, gives examples of effective parliamentary action in a range of countries (nuclear-armed States, non-nuclear States and allies of nuclear weapon States) and provides recommendations for additional parliamentary action.

A difficulty in making significant progress on multilateral nuclear disarmament is the fact that the Conference on Disarmament – the world's primary negotiating body for multilateral disarmament – has been blocked from making undertaking any significant work for nearly two decades – since the negotiation of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty in 1996.

Numerous efforts to unblock the process have been attempted but so far have not been able to overcome the problems – arising primarily from a clash between a step-by-step approach and a comprehensive approach to nuclear disarmament and compounded by the rules of procedure which allow any one country to veto any decisions whether on substance or process.

Thus, in 2012 the UN General Assembly adopted resolution A/RES/67/56 under which it decided to establish an open-ended working group to develop proposals to take forward multilateral nuclear disarmament negotiations for the achievement and maintenance of a world without nuclear weapons. The open ended working group (OEWG) commenced its work in May 2013, and already demonstrates a capacity to provide a forum for governments to bridge the different approaches and reach some common ground to move forward. The OEWG could indeed 'open the door' to effective deliberations and negotiations to achieve a nuclear-weapons-free world.

It is thus appropriate and timely that the Inter Parliamentary Union in March 2013, decided to extend its focus and adopt a work program on the topic "Towards a Nuclear Weapons Free World: The Contribution of Parliaments". As such, the IPU was invited to

address the UN Open Ended Working Group in May 2013 in order to discuss how parliaments and governments could collaborate to achieve this important goal.

Now that there is a diplomatic process, the primary barriers to making progress are insufficient political will and the continued adherence to nuclear deterrence, including extended nuclear deterrence.

Regarding political will, action by parliaments will be vital – in order to elevate the importance and value of the OEWG and to ensure that constructive proposals for nuclear disarmament – such as those found in the UNSG's five-point plan, do get discussed, developed, negotiated and implemented. Parliamentarians should raise this in their parliaments, encourage full support for the OEWG, and call on their governments to highlight the OEWG and the proposals being discussed – at the highest level – in particular at the UN High Level Meeting on Nuclear Disarmament to be held on 26 September 2013.

Regarding the adherence to nuclear deterrence, if the sole purpose of nuclear weapons is to deter other nuclear weapons, then it would be possible to achieve a nuclear weapons free world under a nuclear weapons convention that assured that all nuclear weapons would be destroyed.

However, lack of confidence in the possibility to achieve a water-tight nuclear abolition regime prevents most (but not all) nuclear weapon States and their allies from supporting comprehensive nuclear disarmament proposals such as a nuclear weapons convention.

Thus, in order to build confidence in the security of a nuclear-weapons-free world, it is important to enhance non-nuclear security and phase out nuclear deterrence. As such, in 2009 a number of leading parliamentarians from countries under extended nuclear deterrence, including Japan and the Republic of Korea, released a paper arguing how nuclear deterrence could be phased out.

They argued firstly that the key security issues in the 21st Century are non-military threats which require international collaborative and non-military responses. These security threats include climate change, poverty, the spread of diseases, resource depletion and financial crises. The provocative approach of nuclear deterrence prevents rather than assists the global collaboration required to meet these security issues.

Secondly, the military threats that continue to exist can be better met by non-nuclear means. Nuclear weapons have no role in civil wars. Nor can nuclear weapons deter terrorists. International aggression is better prevented and responded to by collective action under United Nations authorization than by the threat or use of nuclear weapons.

And the threat of a nuclear attack by a rogue state is also best addressed by either UN collective response, or if necessary by conventional military force.

Thirdly, regional security is better met by security mechanisms and mutually-beneficial economic and trade relationships rather than nuclear deterrence. International security mechanisms include the United Nations Security Council, International Court of Justice, International Criminal Court and various arms control and disarmament treaties. Regional security mechanisms in Europe, for example, include the European Union, Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe, Conventional Forces in Europe Treaty, and the NATO partnership program.

In short, there is now sufficient rationale, political support and diplomatic opportunities for regional and global nuclear disarmament initiatives to be negotiated, including a North-East Asian NWFZ and a global treaty or package of agreements to achieve a nuclear-weapons-free world. It is the role of parliamentarians – working in conjunction with civil society – to ensure that political leaders take up this call and dedicate their countries to the task.

i The 3+3 formula would involve three intra-zonal States (Japan, South Korea and North Korea), and three ‘neighbouring’ nuclear weapon-States (China, Russia and the United States). The ratification of all six States would be required for the treaty to enter-into-force.

ii As such there is some talk about also inviting Taiwan to join a North-East Asian nuclear weapon-free zone. However, the complications regarding the status of Taiwan might preclude this. China might not be agreeable to Taiwan joining the treaty as a State. Taiwan and the U.S. might be hesitant for Taiwan to join the treaty in any other status.

iii “NE Asia NWFZ – moving toward sustainable regional security”, *PNND Update*, 32 (April 2012). <http://www.gs institute.org/pnnd/updates/32.html#13>.

iv “The heads of more than 400 local authorities express support for a Northeast Asia Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone”, *Peace Depot*, August 13, 2012.

핵무기 없는 세상과 한반도 핵 문제: 국회의원의 역할과 과제

2013 년 6 월, 앨린 웨어(Alyn Ware)

오바마 미 대통령은 2008 년 4 월 5 일 프라하에서 핵무기 없는 세상을 구축하겠다는 비전과 약속을 천명했다. 사실상 이 구상으로 인해 오바마 대통령은 노벨 평화상 수상자가 되었다.

4 년이 지난 지금, 세계는 핵무기 없는 세상에 한층 가까워졌는가? 그런 세상이 실제로 실현 가능한가? 그렇지 않다면, 오바마 대통령의 비전은 한낱 관심이나 끌어보자는 망상에 불과한가? 현재 동북아에 핵무기 없는 세상 구현함에 있어 어떤 장애물이 존재하고, 어떤 해법이 이행되고 있는가?

실제로 오바마 대통령은 오늘날까지 본인의 비전을 실행함에 있어서 상당한 장애와 난관에 봉착해있다. 러시아와 핵군축 교섭 착수에는 성공했지만, 미 공화당은 신 전략무기감축(START) 협정 비준 조건으로 기존 560 억 달러 핵무기연간예산에 더해, 미국의 핵무기 생산시설 현대화를 위한 140 억 달러 추가 예산 편성을 내걸었고, 이는 핵군축 구상과는 상반되는 행보로 비춰진다.

오바마 대통령은 또한 미의회가 포괄적 핵실험금지조약을 비준하도록 설득하는데 실패했고, 러시아와 추가 군축협상 또한 교착상태에 있다. 다자분야에서도, 유엔 군축회의(Conference on Disarmament)는 20 년 가까이 핵분열물질 생산금지조약 등에 대한 차기 단계 협상을 진행하지 못했고, 중동지역의 역내 핵 위협이나 북한의 핵무기 미사일 프로그램 대응에 있어서도 거의 진전이 없는 상태이다.

그럼에도 불구하고, 핵무기 없는 세상이라는 새로운 희망의 물결이 오바마 2 기 행정부의 시작과, 유엔의 새로운 국제 구상 제안과 함께 부상하고 있다.

이제는 재집권을 위한 정책 마련에 주력할 할 필요가 없어진 오바마 대통령은 대담한 조치를 취할 수 있는 여유가 생겼고, 또한 이미 그렇게 행동을 취하고 있는 듯하다. 일례로, 오바마 대통령은 러시아와의 협약이나 상원 비준이 필요 없는 미 단독 핵군축을 검토 중이다. 오바마 대통령이 임명한 척 헤이글 미 국방장관은 핵무기 없는

세계(Global Zero) 회원으로, Global Zero 는 2030 년까지 핵무기 없는 세계를 실현하기 위한 단계적인 핵군축을 지지하는 정치인 및 정책 입안자들의 모임이다.

미 의회에서도, ‘핵 감축을 위한 의원네트워크(PNND)’의 공동의장인 에드 마키 의원은 Global Zero 계획에 입각해 핵 무기고와 예산의 상당한 감축을 제안하는 ‘합리적인 핵 예산 접근 법안(SANE Act)’을 강도 높게 추진 중이며, 이 법안은 경제에 활력을 불어넣고, 환경적으로 지속 가능한 기업을 지원하는 것을 목표로 한다.

Global Zero 계획은 세계적인 관심과 지지를 받고 있다. 올해 초, 유럽의회 절반 이상에 해당되는 약 390 명의 의원이 Global Zero, PNND 와 공동으로 마련한 Global Zero 계획 지지 선언에 서명했다. 그러나 오바마 대통령 혼자서는 핵무기 없는 세상을 실현할 수 없다. 유럽과 동북아 내(內) 미 동맹국인 NATO, 대한민국, 일본을 방호하기 위해서 무기가 필수적이라는 인식이 남아있는 한, 미 무기고를 획기적으로 줄이기란 어렵다. 또한 다른 국가들이 여전히 핵무기를 보유하고 있는 상황에서 미국만 핵무기를 폐기할 수도 없는 노릇이다.

따라서, 실질적인 진전을 일궈내기 위해서는, 세계적인 핵 철폐와 아울러 핵무기 역할을 축소, 제거하는 역내 절차를 동시에 이행하는데 주목해야 한다.

동북아는 이 과정에서 다음과 같은 여러 가지 이유로 매우 중요하다.

첫째, 미국은 핵 억지 등을 통한 대한민국 및 일본 안보공약을 이행하고자 한다. 미국이 특히 동북아 지역에 대해 즉각적으로 사용 가능한 여러 대의 핵무기를 보유해야 하고, 이는 북한을 공격하는 데 최초로 사용하게 될 가능성이 있다는 인식이 존재하는 한, 핵 군축과 핵무기 역할 축소를 위한 오바마 대통령의 노력은 힘든 과정이 될 것이다. 반면에, 미국이 정치적 접근과 대(對)미사일 방위 등 재래식 무기 시스템 조합에 의존해 대한민국과 일본을 적절히 지킬 수 있다는 의식이 확산되면, 오바마 대통령은 상당한 핵 감축을 보다 자유롭게 추진할 수 있을 것이다.

이는 2008-2009 미 핵 태세 검토보고서(NPR) 작성 과정에서 여실히 입증되었다. 일부 미 공화당 의원들과 소수의 일 의원들은 상당한 핵 군축과 미 토마호크 순항미사일 폐기가 동시에 진행된다면, 일본의 안보가 위험에 처하게 되고, 결국 일본은 자체적인 핵무기 개발을 할 수 밖에 없다고 경고의 목소리를 높였다. 그러나, 초당적인 204 명의 일본 의원들이 오바마 대통령에게 보낸 서신에서 보여지듯이, 핵 군축 및 핵무기 단일역할론(대(對)핵 억지력이 핵무기의 유일한 역할이라는

개념)으로의 이행을 골자로 하는 도발수위를 낮춘 미 핵 태세로도 일본이 적절히 보호될 수 있다고 보고, 이를 지지하는 것이 일본의 지배적인 입장이다. 결국 이러한 견해가 2009 년 최종 미 핵 태세 검토보고서에 반영되었고, 오바마 대통령은 토마호크 순항미사일 폐기, 대(對)핵 억지로 핵무기 '주요 목표' 축소(유일한 목표로 축소 약속), 동맹국 안보공약 강화를 위한 비(非)핵 접근방식 강조에 동의했다.

둘째, 북한의 핵무기 프로그램을 현 핵 비확산 체제에 포함시켜야 하는 도전과제가 있기 때문에 동북아의 역할은 매우 중요하다. 기술적으로 퇴행하고 있는 북한이 소수를 제외한 국제사회의 일률적인 반대에도 불구하고 핵무기 프로그램 개발에 매달렸고, 유엔안전보장이사회는 기술 지원에 제재와 통제를 가했다는 사실은, 핵무기 전면 불허나 모든 핵 시설에 대한 포괄적인 통제가 없는 현 국제체제하에서 핵보유가 국익에 부합한다고 판단한 국가의 핵 보유를 막는 것이 사실상 불가능하다는 점을 보여준다. 실제로, 북한이 NPT 에서 탈퇴하고 억지력을 갖추기 위해 핵 무기를 개발하기로 결정한 것은, 어느 국가든 자국에 위협이 되는 국가들이 핵무기를 보유하고 있는 한 취할 수 있는 옳은 결정이라고 옹호될 수도 있다. 보다 합리적이고 강력한 정치적, 법적인 장점을 지닌 대안은 차별 없는 전면적 핵 무기 금지를 천명하는 것이다.

이를 위한 다양한 진전들이 있었다. 1996 년 국제사법재판소는 핵무기 위협 또는 사용은 국제법에 일반적으로 위배된다는 권고적 의견을 내놓았다. 유엔은 핵무기 협약에 따라 핵무기 금지 및 폐기에 대한 협상을 촉구하는 유엔 결의안을 매년 채택해왔다. 유엔 사무총장은 2008 년 핵군축 5 개항 제안(5-point plan)을 내놓았고, 국제의원연맹(IPU)은 2009 년 이 제안을 지지하는 결의안을 만장일치로 채택했으며, 적십자 위원회는 2011 년 핵무기와 국제인도법이 양립할 수 없다는 결의안을 채택했다. 유엔은 지난해 다자 핵군축 협상 진전을 위한 유엔실무그룹(OEWG)을 마련하기로 결정했고, IPU 는 약 2 개월 전 2013-2014 평화안보프로그램을 “핵무기 없는 세상을 향해: 의회의 기여”에 초점을 두기로 결의했다.

핵군축에 대한 국제적인 노력은 북한과의 관계 개선에도 물꼬를 틀 수 있다. 북한은 일방적인 핵무기 프로그램 폐기에 대한 요청에는 응하지 않고 있지만, 상기 국제 핵군축 구상에 대해서는 대부분 지지를 표명했다. 북한은 국제사법재판소가 내놓은 일반적인 핵무기 불법성 의견을 지지하며, 핵무기협약 촉구 및 OEWG 진행을 위한 유엔 결의안에 찬성표를 던졌다.

그러나 북핵 폐기를 위한 구체적인 과정을 제시하는 포괄적 국제 핵군축에 대한 협상이 시작될 때까지 기다리는 것은 바람직하지 않다. 북한은 일방적인 조치에는 불응하지만, 역내 모든 국가의 핵무기 역할 축소, 대한민국과 일본의 확장핵억지(extended nuclear deterrence) 의존, 북한의 핵무기 개발을 초래한 주요 안보 문제 해결을 목표로 하는 비차별적 역내 접근은 받아들일 것이다.

이러한 동북아내 핵 위협 등의 문제에 대한 대응전략은 동북아비핵지대(NWFZ) 구상에도 담겨있다. 본 구상은 2008 년 당시 일 민주당 의회군축그룹(PDG) 의장이자 2009 년 외무상을 역임한 오카다 가쓰야 의원이 발의했고, 이후 한국과 일본에서 학계 및 의회 회의 주제로 수 차례 채택되었다.

협약 초안은 '3+3 해법'¹에 기초해, 북한이 핵 프로그램을 포기하고 검증을 받되, 일방적인 이행을 강요하지 않는다. 대한민국, 일본, 러시아, 중국, 미국 등 5 개국도 자국 안보 구상에서 핵무기 역할을 축소해야 한다.

- 한국과 일본은 자국 영토에 핵무기를 허용하지 않고, 자국의 '방호'를 위해 미국이 사용하는 핵무기로 북한을 위협하지 않을 것을 약속한다.
- 미국, 중국, 러시아는 한국, 북한, 일본 영토에 핵무기를 배치하지 않을 것을 약속한다.
- 미국, 중국, 러시아는 한국, 북한, 일본에 핵무기로 위협하거나, 핵무기를 사용하지 않을 것을 약속한다.

본 구상은 역내 모든 국가의 안보를 강화하는 '원/원/원/원' 접근방식을 제시한다. 북한은 자국에 대한 주변국, 특히 미국의 핵무기 비사용이라는 법적 구속력이 있는 약속을 수용할 것이다. 한국과 일본은 자국에 대한 중국과 러시아의 핵무기 비사용이라는 법적 구속력이 있는 약속을 수용할 것이다. 본 구상은 결국 북한이 핵 보유력을 포기하도록 설득하는데 있어 보다 현실적인 접근방식을 제공한다. 중국, 러시아, 미국은 자국 안보 구상에서 핵무기 역할을 축소함으로써 상호 긴장 완화를 도모할 수 있다. 또한 남지나해 및 동지나해상의 열도를 둘러싼 역내 갈등도 해소함으로써, 핵무기 위협 가능성도 배제²할 수 있을 것이다.

본 구상은 남극대륙, 중남미, 카리브해, 남태평양, 동남아, 아프리카, 중앙아시아에 이미 구축된 비핵지대에서 착안했음에도 불구하고, 동남아 고유의 안보환경에 대응하기 위해 특별히 고안되었다.

이미 정치권과 시민사회의 상당한 지지도 얻고 있다. 한-일 국회의원 93%가 동북아 비핵지대(NWFZ) 구축을 지지하는 ‘동북아 비핵화를 위한 공동성명’에 서명했다. 여기에는 양국 정부와 야당출신 고위급 국회의원과 전 외무장관도 포함ⁱⁱⁱ된다. 또한 시장 등 400 여명의 일 지방자치단체장들도 동북아 비핵지대 구축에 대한 지지의사를 표명^{iv} 했다.

반기문 유엔사무총장이 2008 년에 발표한 핵군축 5 개항 제안도 국제사회 차원에서 가장 중요한 개념적, 정치적 진전 중 하나이다. 본 구상은 국제 핵 폐기 조약 협상을 통해 핵무기 없는 세상을 구현하되, 핵군축, 비핵지대 추가구축, 핵물질 통제 강화, 비핵안보 보증, 대량살상용무기, 미사일 통제 및 재래식 무기 군축에 대한 포괄적 군축 문제 진전 등 5 개 임시 조치들을 동시에 추진하는 것을 골자로 한다.

이 유엔 사무총장의 구상은 160개국 의회 및 10개 지역 의회로 구성된 IPU가 2009년 만장일치로 결의안을 채택하는 등 세계적인 지지를 받아왔다.

핵무기 없는 세상을 만들기 위해서는, 정치적인 열망과 법적 의무 실천에 있어 의원들의 역할이 막중하다는 인식하에, 반기문 유엔 사무총장은 2010 년 2 월 다음과 같은 서한을 모든 국회에 전달했다.

의원과 의회는 군축과 비확산 노력의 성공에 주요한 역할을 수행합니다. 의회는 조약 및 국제 협정의 이행을 지지함으로써 법치 구현에 기여하고 공약의 이행을 장려하게 됩니다. 의회는 투명성과 책임성을 강화하는 법안을 채택하여 신뢰를 쌓고 검증을 촉진 시키며 군축추진에 도움이 되는 여건을 조성하게 됩니다. 국제사회가 전례 없는 도전에 직면하고 있는 현 시점에서 의원들은 지속 가능한 국제 안보의 확보 및 인류의 필요 충족을 위한 귀중한 자원의 전용을 줄이는데 주도적 역할을 할 수가 있을 것입니다. 의원들은 개별 국가의 재정적 우선순위를 결정하는 만큼 평화와 협력적 안보 추진에 얼마나 투자 할 것인지도 결정할 수 있습니다. 의원들은 이에 필요한 구체적 방안 마련 지원을 위한 제도적 기반도 조성할 수 있습니다. 그렇기 때문에 저는 이 기회를 빌려 모든 의원들이 핵무기 없는 세상을 만들기 위한 노력에 동참해줄 것을 독려하는 바입니다. (중략) 저는 **PNND** 가 관련 노력과 핵무기 협약에 대한 지지세 확보를 위해 진행하는 일들에 대해 경의를 표합니다.

본 서한은 다수의 의회가 유엔사무총장의 계획을 지지하는 결의안을 채택하게 되는 계기가 되었다. 각 의회의 결의안과 핵무기협약을 지지하는 국제 의회 선언은 2010 년 5 월 유엔사무총장과 NPT 당사국에 전달되었다. 이는 당사국들이 다음과 같이 합의하도록 영향을 미쳤다.

“모든 국가는 핵무기 없는 세상을 구현하고 유지하는데 필요한 기본 틀을 마련하기 위한 특별한 노력을 기울여야 한다. 군축회의는 핵무기 협약 및 강력한 검증 시스템에 기초한 별도의 상호 보완적 제도의 기본 틀에 대한 협상 고려를 특별히 제안한 유엔사무총장의 핵군축을 위한 5 개항 제안에 주목한다.”

IPU는 2009년 결의안 후속 조치로, 『핵 비확산과 군축지지 의원 책자』 작성에 착수해 2012년 10월 발간하고, 뉴욕과 제네바에 있는 유엔 각국 대표 및 세계 모든 의회에 배포했다. 본 책자는 최신 핵 비확산 및 군축 주요 문제를 다루고, 핵 비확산 및 군축 약속 이행에 있어 의원 역할의 중요성과, 핵무기 보유국, 비보유국, 동맹국 등 여러 국가에서 의회의 효과적인 모범사례를 제시하며, 의회차원의 주요 행동에 대한 권고안을 제공한다.

다자핵군축에 있어 상당한 진전을 일궈내는데 있어서, 군축을 위한 주요 국제 다자 협의체인 군축회의(Conference on Disarmament)가 1996년 포괄적 핵실험금지조약 협상 이후 약 20년간 실질적인 작업을 진행하지 못했다는 점이 난관으로 남아있다.

교착상태를 해소하기 위해 다양한 노력이 시도되었지만, 문제 해결에는 역부족이었다. 주로 핵군축에 대해 단계적인 접근과 포괄적 접근 간의 충돌로 인한 마찰이 발생했고, 어느 국가나 결정 사항이나 과정에 대해 거부할 수 있는 이행 규칙도 이에 일조했다.

이로 인해, 2012년 유엔총회는 결의안 67/56을 채택하고, 핵무기 없는 세상 구축 및 유지를 위한 다자 핵군축 협상 이행 구상을 마련할 실무그룹(OEWG) 마련을 의결했다. OEWG는 2013년 5월 작업에 착수해, 정부간 서로 다른 접근방식에 가교역할을 하는 포럼을 진행함으로써 이미 가능성을 입증하고, 진전을 위한 공동의 기반을 마련했다. OEWG는 실제로 핵무기 없는 세상을 만들기 위한 효과적인 협상 진행과 협의안 마련의 ‘마중물 역할’ 한 것이다.

따라서, IPU가 초점을 확대하고, 2013년 5월 “핵무기 없는 세상을 향해: 의회의 기여” 주제하에 구체적인 프로그램을 채택하기로 결정한 것은 시의적절하다. IPU는 또한 2013년 5월 이 주요한 목표 달성을 위해 의회와 정부가 할 수 있는 협력방안을 논하는 유엔OEWG 회의에 초대받았다.

외교적 절차측면에서는 정치적 의지 부족, 확장핵역지 등 핵 억지력 고수하는 것 등이 진전에 있어 주요한 장애물이다.

정치적 의지에 있어서, OEWG의 중요성과 가치를 증대하고, 유엔사무총장의 5개항 제안 항목 등 핵 비확산을 위한 생산적 구상이 논의, 개발, 협상, 실행될 수 있도록 함에 있어서 의회는 실로 막중한 역할을 맡고 있다. 의원들은 자국 의회에 이러한 구상들을 제기하고, OEWG에 대한 전면적인 지지를 장려하며, 자국 정부가 OEWG에 집중하고, 2013년 9월에 열릴 핵군축 고위급회담 등 국제 고위급 회의에서 논의될 수 있도록 촉구해야 한다.

핵 억지력 고수에 관해서는, 핵무기의 유일한 목적이 대(對)핵 억지력이라고 본다면, 핵무기 전면폐기를 보증하는 핵무기 협약하에 핵무기 없는 세상을 구현할 수 있을 것이다.

그러나 한치의 예외도 없는 핵 전면폐기 체제 달성이 불가능하다는 인식으로 인해, 대다수 핵무기 보유국 및 동맹국들은 핵무기 협약 등 포괄적인 핵군축 구상 지지를 기피하고 있다.

따라서 핵무기 없는 세상에서 안보가 가능하다는 신뢰를 구축하기 위해서는, 비핵방식의 안보구축과 핵 억지 단계적 철폐를 강화해야 한다. 이에 대해, 한국, 일본 등 확장핵억지하에 있는 국가의 대표적 의원들은 2009년 핵 억지 단계적 철폐 방안을 주창하는 보고서를 발표했다.

해당 의원들은 첫째 21세기의 주요 안보 문제가 국제 협력과 비군사적 대응이 필요한 비군사적 위협이라는 점을 지적했다. 기후변화, 빈곤, 질병 확산, 자원고갈, 금융위기 등이 안보 위협으로 부상하고 있다는 것이다. 핵 억지력을 통한 도발적 접근 방식은 이러한 비재래식 안보 문제 해결에 필요한 국제 협력에 도움이 되기 보다는 방해가 된다.

둘째, 지속되는 군사 위협은 비핵방식을 통해 보다 효과적인 대응이 가능하다. 핵무기는 내전에서 무용지물이다. 또한 테러분자들을 억지할 수도 없다. 국가간 침공도 유엔 승인하의 공동행동을 통해 보다 효율적으로 방지하거나 대응할 수 있다. 불량국가의 핵 공격 위협 또한 유엔 공동 대응이나 필요 시 재래식 군사력을 통해 대응하는 것이 가장 효과적이다.

셋째, 역내 안보는 핵 억지력보다 안보 메커니즘과 상호 호혜적인 경제 무역 관계를 통해 달성하기가 더욱 용이하다. 국제 안보 메커니즘에는 유엔안전보장이사회, 국제사법재판소, 국제형사재판소, 여러 무기 통제 및 군축 조약 등이 포함된다. 또한

유럽의 역내 안보 메커니즘은 유럽연합, 유럽안보협력기구, 유럽 재래식무기감축조약 (CFE), NATO 파트너십 프로그램 등이 있다.

결론적으로, 동북아 NWFZ, 핵무기 없는 세상을 만들기 위한 국제 협약이나 계획 등 역내, 국제 핵군축 구상의 근거, 정치적 지지, 외교적 기회가 이미 충분히 마련되어 있다. 이 목표를 향해 정치 지도자들이 소임을 다하고 국가적 차원의 노력을 하도록 촉구하는 역할은 의원들이 시민사회와 연대하여 이행해나가야 할 것이다.

i 3+3 해법은 역내 3 개국(한국, 북한, 일본)과 주변 핵무기 3 개보유국(중국, 러시아, 미국)으로 이루어 진다. 6 개국이 모두 비준할 때 본 조약은 발효된다.

ii 대만을 동북아 비핵지대(NWFZ)에 합류시키자는 논의도 있다. 그러나, 지위 등 대만을 둘러싼 문제로 인해 실현은 어려울 것으로 보인다. 중국은 대만이 국가 지위를 갖고 본 조약에 합류하는 것을 찬성하지 않을 것이다. 대만과 미국은 대만이 비국가 지위를 갖고 본 조약에 합류하는 것에 동의하지 않을 것이다.

iii 2012 년 4 월, PNND 32 호, “동북아 NWFZ-지속 가능한 역내 안보로의 이행”
(<http://www.gsinsitute.org/pnnd/updates/32.html#13>)

iv 2012 년 8 월 13 일, 일본 시민단체 피스데포(Peace Depot), “400 여명의 지방자치단체장들이 동북아 NWFZ 에 대한 지지의사를 천명했다.”

•• 알린 웨어(PNND 글로벌 코디네이터) 초청 토론회 〈핵 없는 세상과 한반도 핵문제〉

발제 참고자료



■ 참고자료 링크

Other articles of relevance:

1. Nuclear sabre-rattling in North East Asia: Can Godzilla be tamed? Alyn Ware, Pressenza International Press Agency, 12 March 2013
2. From Prague to a Nuclear-Weapons-Free World: Is President Obama's vision now achievable? Alyn Ware, Pressenza International Press Agency, 5 April 2013
3. Taming Godzilla: Nuclear Deterrence in North-East Asia, *Alyn Ware, Kiho Yi and Hiromishi Umebayashi*, in *Moving Beyond Nuclear Deterrence to a Nuclear Weapons Free World*, Abolition Forum, April 2013
4. Nuclear Weapons Free World - focus of 2014 assembly of the Inter-Parliamentary Union
5. Opening the door to a nuclear-weapons-free world: UN Open Ended Working Group off to a positive start!

■ 참고자료 1

Nuclear sabre-rattling in North East Asia: Can Godzilla be tamed?

Basle, Switzerland- Posted by: Alyn WarePosted date: 12 March 2013In: Asia, International, International issues, Opinions, Peace and Disarmament



Godzilla by Ron Guyatt

This post is also available in: French, Portuguese

Godzilla, a giant monster mutated by nuclear radiation, first appears in a 1954 Japanese science fiction movie by the same name, ravaging Japan in a symbolic warning about the risks of nuclear weapons. For a couple of decades Godzilla was very popular, appearing in more than 28 films as well as many video games, novels, comic books, and a television series. Then, as a fragile détente developed in the region, Godzilla sunk below the waves of the Pacific Ocean.

In recent days Godzilla has reared his head again - threatening a nuclear conflagration. Tensions in North East Asia have risen to near boiling point. North

Korea has tested another nuclear weapon and has also tested a ballistic missile that could possibly be used to deliver such a weapon. North Korea has also threatened a pre-emptive strike on the United States and annulled the armistice agreement that put a temporary end to the 1950s Korean War.

In response the United Nations has increased sanctions against North Korea. South Korea, Japan and the United States have commenced war-game exercises to practice an attack against North Korea. In the latest tit-for-tat move, North Korea has cut the hot-line between the two Koreas, plunging the peninsula into a crisis reminiscent of the Cuban Missile crisis of 1962, which came close to a nuclear war between the United States and the Soviet Union.

So, will a game of brinkmanship force North Korea to blink and back down? Or will it push the North into even more bellicose action leading to military conflict? Are there better ways to diffuse the situation and achieve a more secure and sustainable peace with North Korea? To answer these questions, one must look beyond the rhetoric of the autocratic North Korean regime – which like a proud peacock is displayed more to impress than to reveal reality – to the rationale of their actions.

From North Korea's perspective, nuclear deterrence has become a logical response to their position as an isolated State surrounded by enemy forces and threatened in particular by the combined military might of Japan, South Korea and the United States. This includes veiled threats of 'regime change' and the possible first-use of nuclear weapons against them.

North Korea's annulling of the armistice treaty has been trumpeted as a threatening act. Yet it arose from North Korean frustration at the US, Japan and South Korea repeatedly rejecting its requests for a peace treaty to officially end the 1950-53 Korean War.

The decision by North Korea to withdraw from the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), and acquire a nuclear deterrent capacity was not made in a vacuum. Rather, it was made after the US-led invasion of Iraq. North Korea concluded that it was the elimination of Iraq's weapons of mass destruction that removed their deterrent, thus enabling a U.S. invasion. North Korea announced they therefore needed to develop their own nuclear deterrent to prevent a similar U.S. invasion of North Korea.

In this context, backing North Korea into a corner will only push them into further

actions to demonstrate their capacity to prevent an attack against their State. The latest threat of a preventive strike against the United States is taken directly out of the United States military doctrine to launch preventive strikes against States that might emerge as threats to the US.

None of this of course justifies North Korean bellicose behavior. North Korea is not 'right' in what it does, but nor is the hypocrisy of the UN Security Council in imposing sanctions on North Korean or Iranian developments while ignoring the fully developed nuclear weapons programs of the five permanent members of the Security Council (China, France, Russia, United Kingdom and the United States) and also turning a relatively blind eye to the nuclear weapons programs of those States that are not parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty (India, Israel and Pakistan).

The answer to dealing with North Korea is not to accept their sabre-rattling, but to understand it, and to find an approach that addresses their security concerns as well as those of the countries threatened by North Korea.

Such an approach has been proposed by a group of cross-party parliamentarians from Japan and South Korea. It calls for the establishment of a North East Asian Nuclear Weapon Free Zone (NWFZ) - similar to NWFZs that cover the Antarctic, Latin America and the Caribbean, the South Pacific, South East Asia, Central Asia and Africa.

A draft treaty released by Katsuya Okada (former Foreign Minister of Japan) proposes that North Korea give up its nuclear weapons and be subject to verification, but not unilaterally. Under the treaty, the other five nations, South Korea, Japan, Russia, China and United States, would also have to lower the role of nuclear weapons in their security doctrines. Specifically,

- Japan and South Korea would commit to not allowing nuclear weapons on their territories and to not threatening North Korea with nuclear weapons being used by the U.S. in their 'defense'.
- U.S., China and Russia would commit to not deploying nuclear weapons on the territories of Japan, South Korea or North Korea;
- U.S., China and Russia would commit to not using or threatening to use nuclear weapons against Japan, South Korea or North Korea.

The proposal provides a win/win/win/win approach which enhances the security of all States in the region. North Korea would receive binding guarantees, particularly by the United States, that nuclear weapons will not be used against them. Japan and South Korea would receive binding guarantees, particularly by China and Russia, that nuclear weapons will not be used against them. The proposal provides the most realistic approach to persuade North Korea to give up its nuclear weapons capability and step back from the brinkmanship game they are currently playing. Nuclear Weapon Free Zones have been successful in eliminating the nuclear threat in a number of regions. A North East Asian NWFZ provides the best possibility for reigning in Godzilla and moving to a sustainable peace in North East Asia.

Alyn Ware

Global Coordinator for Parliamentarians for Nuclear nonproliferation and

Disarmament

2009 Right Livelihood Laureate

■ 참고자료 2

From Prague to a Nuclear-Weapons-Free World: Is President Obama's vision now achievable?

Bern, Switzerland- Posted by: Alyn WarePosted date: 05 April 2013In: International, Opinions, Peace and Disarmament



This post is also available in: Portuguese

Four years today, President Obama announced in Prague his vision and commitment to seek a world without nuclear weapons. Alyn Ware, Global Coordinator for Parliamentarians for Nuclear Nonproliferation and Disarmament, reports on a number of anniversary actions, and asks whether this vision is still alive, and possible to achieve, or merely a pipe-dream that has fallen to the politics of reality.

In January 2009, the week President Obama was inaugurated, I received a call from the US Embassy in Wellington, New Zealand - my home town. The Deputy Ambassador requested a meeting with me to discuss nuclear disarmament issues. She said that President Obama had sent a directive to US embassies around the world instructing them to meet with disarmament experts to ascertain their opinions on what the US could do for nuclear disarmament.

I was somewhat surprised. Since 1984, when New Zealand decided to prohibit nuclear weapons from our country, an act that banned the visits of nuclear-capable

warships including US vessels, the US had kept New Zealand out in the cold. Our rejection of nuclear weapons and of nuclear deterrence was seen by the US as a threat to the solidarity of the West, and an encouragement of its enemies. Much of my political life had been challenging the policies of the nuclear-weapon-States including the US. Yet now I was being asked to give advice to the US? Was President Obama serious, or was this some trick? Knowing about the excellent legislative work Obama had done as a senator on this topic – and the fact that he had made nuclear disarmament a central issue in his election campaign, I erred towards believing the Deputy Ambassador.

So I took the meeting, provided a number of recommendations to the US embassy and then waited to see what the new President would do.

What followed was a series of initiatives from the US, including a ‘reset’ of the nuclear button with Russia, the acceptance by the US of New Zealand’s nuclear-free status, negotiations with Russia on the new START treaty to reduce nuclear weapons, support for a *Middle East Zone Free From Nuclear Weapons and other Weapons of Mass Destruction* (such a zone to include Israel, Arab States and Iran), a Nuclear Posture Review that lowered the role of nuclear weapons in security policy, and commitments to recognize and ratify nuclear-weapon-free zones in the Pacific and Africa.

Most significant however, was the speech that President Obama gave in Prague on 5 April 2009 – where he committed his presidency to pursuing the vision of a world without nuclear weapons. It was this vision and commitment, primarily, that earned Obama the Nobel Peace prize.

Four years later, are we any closer to a nuclear-weapons-free world? Is such a world indeed possible? Or was President Obama’s vision merely an attention-catching pipe-dream?

Indeed, Obama has faced considerable hurdles and set-backs in implementing the vision. The price tag Republicans demanded for ratifying new START Treaty was an extra \$14 billion (on top of the annual nuclear weapons budget of \$56 billion) to be spent on modernizing the U.S. nuclear weapons complex – something seemingly at odds with the commitment for nuclear disarmament. The UN-sponsored conference which was supposed to be held in 2012 to commence the process for a *Middle East Zone Free From Nuclear Weapons and other Weapons of Mass*

Destruction has not been held – due to continuing difficulties in securing Israel's agreement to attend. The nuclear threat in North East Asia is increasing (although one must take Kim Jong-un's provocative statements with a grain of salt). The possibility of Iran going nuclear lingers, and could stimulate military attack from Israel. NATO recently reaffirmed that it will remain a nuclear-weapons alliance so long as there are nuclear weapons in the world. And the other States possessing nuclear weapons – China, France, India, Pakistan, Russia and the UK – have not expressed any enthusiasm for implementing the nuclear disarmament vision any time soon.

Yet, in spite of this, a new wave of optimism for a nuclear-weapons-free world is emerging in the dawn of Obama's second term as President. No longer shackled by the need of a first-term President to shape policy to ensure re-election, Obama has more freedom to take bold steps – and appears to be doing so. He is, for example, considering unilateral cuts in US nuclear stockpiles – something that would not require ratification by the Senate. Chuck Hagel, his appointee as Secretary of Defence, is a member of Global Zero, a network of states-people and policy-makers who endorse phased reductions in nuclear stockpiles culminating in a nuclear-weapons-free world by 2030.

More than 380 Members of the European Parliament recently endorsed a declaration, organised by Global Zero and Parliamentarians for Nuclear Nonproliferation and Disarmament (PNND), which supports the Global Zero plan. Last week, the Inter Parliamentary Union, which comprises over 160 parliaments in the world including most of the parliaments of the nuclear-weapon States and the NATO allies, agreed to make the principal topic for their work over the next year “Towards a Nuclear-Weapons-Free World: The Contribution of Parliaments.” In the US, Congressman Ed Markey (a Co-President of PNND) has generated considerable traction for his SANE (Sensible Approach to Nuclear Expenditure) Act which proposes significant cuts in nuclear stockpiles and spending in order to help stimulate the economy and support environmentally sustainable enterprises.

And today, to commemorate the anniversary of Obama's Prague speech, Senator Alena Gajduskova, Vice-President of the Czech Senate, sent a letter to President Obama, endorsed by leading parliamentarians from the Czech Republic and another 10 NATO countries, calling for the implementation of the Prague Vision. The letter

highlights “NATO’s commitment to “create the conditions for a nuclear-weapons-free world” through the NATO Strategic Doctrine” and affirms a commitment to “work with our governments on paving the way by promoting mechanisms and approaches in NATO for achieving security without nuclear weapons.”

Of course, President Obama cannot deliver a nuclear-weapons-free world by himself, a fact he emphasized in his Prague speech. And until very recently it seemed that the rest of the world was unable to get its act together to commence a process for global nuclear disarmament. The Conference on Disarmament in Geneva, the world’s principal disarmament negotiating body, has been stymied and unable to undertake any disarmament work for 17 years. However, in March a new Open-Ended Working Group was established which is open to all UN member States, is unable to be blocked by any State (no State has a veto power), and is tasked to ‘take forward multilateral nuclear disarmament negotiations for the achievement and maintenance of a world without nuclear weapons.’

Of course the diplomats deliberating in Geneva will only go as far and as fast as they are directed by the governments and pushed by civil society. Now is the time to take heed of Obama’s words in Prague four years ago. We must “seek the peace and security of a world without nuclear weapons.” We must “stand together for the right of people everywhere to live free from fear in the 21st century”. “We, too, must ignore the voices who tell us that the world cannot change. We have to insist, ‘Yes, we can.’”

■ 참고자료 3

Taming Godzilla: Nuclear Deterrence in North-East Asia, Alyn Ware, Kiho Yi and Hiromishi Umebayashi, in Moving Beyond Nuclear Deterrence to a Nuclear Weapons Free World, Abolition Forum, April 2013 (관련 링크참조)

■ 참고자료 4

Nuclear Weapons Free World - focus of 2014 assembly of the Inter-Parliamentary Union

Nearly 1000 parliamentarians from approximately 150 parliaments, meeting at the 128th Assembly of the Inter Parliamentary Union (IPU) in Quito, Ecuador from Mar 22-27, agreed to the recommendation of the IPU Standing Committee on Peace and International Security for the topic "Towards a Nuclear-Weapons-Free World: The Contribution of Parliaments" to be a focus of the 130th IPU Assembly in 2014. The Assembly also agreed to the topics of "Towards risk-resilient development" (proposed by the Standing Committee on Sustainable Development, Finance and Trade) and "The role of parliamentarians in protecting the rights of children, in particular unaccompanied migrant children, and in preventing their exploitation in situations of war and conflict" (proposed by the Standing Committee on Democracy and Human Rights).

IPU, as an international organisation of over 160 parliaments (including most of the parliaments from nuclear weapons States and their allies), is the world's premier forum for parliaments and parliamentarians to engage on core issues for humanity. The fact that the issue of nuclear weapons was chosen ahead of seven other proposals indicates the increased interest in the issue by parliaments and parliamentarians around the world.

A factor in this interest could be the parliamentary education work on this issue undertaken by the Inter Parliamentary Union in partnership with Parliamentarians

for Nuclear Nonproliferation and Disarmament (PNND) over the past four years. This includes panels at IPU Assemblies, the adoption of a resolution on nuclear nonproliferation and disarmament at the 120th IPU Assembly in 2009, and the production by IPU and PNND of a Handbook for Parliamentarians on Supporting Nuclear Nonproliferation and Disarmament (available in English, French and Spanish) which has been sent to every parliament in the world.

UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon commended IPU and PNND for this educative work in an unprecedented letter sent to every parliament in 2010 highlighting the important role of parliamentarians and encouraging further action.

The IPU Assembly appointed two rapporteurs recommended by the IPU Standing Commission on Peace and International Security to coordinate the work on this topic - Ms Yolanda Ferrer Gomez (Cuba) and Mr Blaine Calkins (Canada). This will culminate in the adoption of a resolution on "Towards a Nuclear-Weapons-Free World: The Contribution of Parliaments" at the 130th IPU Assembly in Baku, Azerbaijan in 2014.



Saber Chowdhury, PNND Co-President and Chair of the IPU Standing Commission on Peace and International Security, announcing the topic for 2014 of "Towards a Nuclear-Weapons-Free World: The Contribution of Parliaments"

■ 참고자료 5

Opening the door to a nuclear-weapons-free world: UN Open Ended Working Group off to a positive start!

A new and exciting United Nations nuclear disarmament process got off to a very positive start with its first two weeks of deliberations in Geneva on May 14-24, 2013.

The Open Ended Working Group on Taking Forward Multilateral Nuclear Disarmament Negotiations, established by the United Nations General Assembly, injected a breath of fresh air into the political environment that has for the past 17 years prevented any substantive work being undertaken by the Conference on Disarmament (CD) - the world's primary multilateral disarmament negotiating body.

Under the superb chairmanship of Ambassador Manuel Dengo of Costa Rica (a country that abolished its army in 1949 and is a strong supporter of cooperative security and nuclear abolition), delegates from countries threw away the usual self-congratulatory statements and dogmatic positions that dominate the other main multilateral forums (CD, United Nations General Assembly and the Non-Proliferation Treaty Review Conferences), and instead engaged in interactive dialogue on key issues for establishing the framework and undertaking negotiations for a nuclear-weapons-free world.

As a result, delegates began to break out from the usual divisions over a disarmament focus versus a non-proliferation focus and various competing approaches to disarmament, such as step-by-step v comprehensive, and instead searched more constructively for compromise and common ground. This included ideas like *building blocks* (on work which could be undertaken simultaneously) and a *roadmap* or *framework* for a nuclear-weapons-free world.

Ambassador Dengo was able to achieve this by organising these first two weeks of the OEWG as primarily informal sessions focusing on specific issues with introductions by experts - rather than as formal sessions seeking government positions. Delegations were thus freed from the usual requirement to check any intervention/statement with their capitals, and could open up to asking questions,

putting forward undeveloped ideas, and discussing these without feeling bound by any comments made.

Another refreshing aspect of the OEWG was the openness to Civil Society Organisations to participate in the same way as the government delegates. CSOs were not confined to the usual practice in other multilateral disarmament bodies of only being able to make comments/interventions in a special session dedicated to CSO views. Rather, we could intervene with questions, reflections and proposals at any time just like any government.

In addition, there was a special session on the role of parliaments and parliamentarians in promoting and supporting multilateral preparatory work and negotiations for a nuclear weapons free world. It was organised by the Inter Parliamentary Union (which includes over 160 parliaments including most of those of the nuclear-weapon States and their allies) and Parliamentarians for Nuclear Nonproliferation and Disarmament (PNND).



OEWG session on the role of parliaments and parliamentarians, 23 May 2013

PNND Co-Presidents Sue Miller (UK, House of Lords) and Saber Chowdhury MP (Bangladesh, President of the IPU Standing Commission on International Peace and Security) spoke of the roles that parliamentarians play in representing civil society to government, and in reaching across national boundaries to build international parliamentary support. This is reflected in the IPU 2009 resolution on nuclear disarmament, the PNND/IPU Handbook that has gone to every parliament and the recent focus on the achievement of a nuclear weapons free world and the contribution parliaments can make.

In April 2013, Abolition 2000 established a Task Force on the OEWG with membership open to anyone interested in supporting multilateral nuclear disarmament negotiations to achieve a nuclear weapons convention or package of agreements to prohibit and eliminate nuclear weapons globally.

For more information see:

- Latin America: A Pope and a Nuclear Disarmament Chair
- Are you open to a nuclear-weapons-free world? Join the Abolition 2000 Task Force on the UN Opened Ended Working Group!
- Reflections on the May sessions of the OEWG and visions for successful outcome

•• 알린 웨어(PNND 글로벌 코디네이터) 초청 토론회 〈핵 없는 세상과 한반도 핵문제〉

토 론

서재정(존스홉킨스대 국제대학원 교수)



Three Failures of the Past, Three Structures of Peace*

J.J. Suh
SAIS, Johns Hopkins University

The Korean Peninsula stands today at a critical juncture between sliding back to the world of insecurity dilemma and moving forward to that of security community. It is thus critical that we understand what has contributed to the current stalemate and what may help us move forward. This commentary critically analyzes the past efforts to denuclearize the Korean peninsula in order to identify the root causes of their failure and a way to overcome them. The first section identifies the three failures of the past efforts that led to North Korea's nuclear tests, and suggests that if the three mistakes are repeated, the region will slide back to the world of insecurity. In order to create a peaceful, denuclearized Korean peninsula, therefore, a prescription is needed that tackles the three failures. The second section suggests that such a solution must entail three structures of peace that address the three failures of the past. And finally, the commentary concludes by proposing concrete measures that can be adopted in the immediate future in order to jump start the stalled negotiations and move forward to building the three peace structures.

Three Failures of the Past

The international community has tried various measures in order to denuclearize the Korean Peninsula since the early 1990 when North Korea's nuclear programs emerged as a nonproliferation concern. The UN Security Council has passed a number of resolutions that condemn Pyongyang's nuclear tests and call on other member states to implement sanctions, but they have yet to produce any positive outcomes. China and the United States, together

* This commentary is a revised version of "Three Failures of the Past, Three Structures of Peace," *Asian Perspective* 34 no. 2 (Fall 2010): 201-208.

with North Korea, South Korea, Japan, and Russia, have held multilateral discussions, known as the Six Party Talks, that have led to the freezing and disablement of the North's nuclear programs, but they have been more successful in issuing statements that identify common objectives than achieving those goals. The George W. Bush administration, especially for its first four years, tried unilateral policies that highlight military tools, such as the threat of a first strike or the Proliferation Security Initiative (PSI), but its strong arm tactics were counterproductive. The Obama administration has worked with the international community and its allies to build an international support for sanctions resolutions, only to push Pyongyang toward the second and third nuclear tests. Why has none of these efforts succeeded in denuclearizing the Korean Peninsula?

I argue that they have not succeeded because they share three common problems. The first one is the failure to recognize that the North's nuclear problem is part and parcel of the interdependence of security concerns. The Bush administration adopted the preemptive strike doctrine in response to the sense of insecurity created after 9-11, but its new strategic posture exacerbated Pyongyang's sense of insecurity.¹ Pyongyang sought to restore its security by turning to what it called "nuclear deterrent," but its response ended up exacerbating Washington's proliferation concerns. The Obama administration sought to sanction the North for launching what it feared was long-range missiles that undermined America's security; but the Kim Jong Un regime felt that it was unjustifiably punished for what it argued was a satellite launching, a punishment that undermines the North's sovereignty and security.

Their insecurity interdependence is the structural cause of the nuclear problem, and its solution requires a symmetric approach that equitably addresses the insecurity of both parties. Just as much Washington desires its nonproliferation concerns resolved, so does Pyongyang seek its security concerns addressed. One sided solution that fails to simultaneously address

¹ Suh, Jae-Jung. "The Imbalance of Power, the Balance of Asymmetric Terror: Mutual Assured Destruction (MAD) in Korea." In *The Future of Us-Korean Relations: The Imbalance of Power*, edited by John Feffer, 64-80. London; New York: Routledge, 2006.

the other's concern only exacerbates the situation because it gives all the reason for the undercut party to take countermeasures.

The second failure is the failure to acknowledge that it is because they are caught in the state of war that Washington and Pyongyang are concerned about the other's means of violence. Washington does not worry about British nuclear weapons; nor does Pyongyang worry about Chinese weapons.² It is the state of enmity that is generating the security concerns that Washington and Pyongyang have about each other. Likewise the state of enmity that exists between the two Koreas and between North Korea and Japan is the root cause of the security concerns they have about each other. While it is possible to put in place a temporary stopgap measure that deals with a particular symptom, an enduring solution would have to confront the political cause.

Finally, the third failure is the failure to address the region's power politics that complicates Pyongyang's and Washington's strategic calculations. North Korea, for example, test fired the Taepodong missile in 1998 to signal its displeasure to Washington, but ended up provoking a deep anxiety among Japanese. Washington is deploying and developing missile defense capabilities as a shield against the immediate threat of North Korea's missiles, but its move deepens Chinese suspicion about America's ultimate intention. Not only do Pyongyang and Washington have to input a high degree of uncertainty into their calculations, but their chosen policy also remains susceptible to the whims of other actors unless the regional actors reach stable expectations about one another's goals and policy directions.

Three Structures of Peace

Let's now turn to the future. If these are three critical failures of the past, what would correct them? I humbly submit that a solution would have to entail at least the following three

² Wendt makes a similar argument about the Cold War. Wendt, Alexander. 1999. *Social Theory of International Politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

components that correct the failures.

Nuclear Weapons Free Zone

Since one of the causes of the North Korean nuclear problem is the failure to address the insecurity interdependence between the United States and North Korea, a solution must address it. A good way to think about a way to do so is to critically examine the non-nuclear declaration that the North and South signed in 1991. In that declaration, the two parties pledged not to develop nuclear weapons, but no commitment was made by any of the four major powers to respect and support this pledge. This asymmetry, which subjected Korea's non-nuclear survival to the goodwill of its nuclear neighbors', was inherently unstable, and was one of the structural causes of the current "North Korean nuclear crisis." The declaration would have avoided the collapse if it had been made less asymmetric by adding a protocol – which the four nuclear powers would sign and ratify – that they guarantee no introduction, use, or threat of the use of nuclear weapons. A symmetric solution, therefore, has to have two equal parts of denuclearization: both North and South Koreas commit themselves not to engage in nuclear weapons production or related research; and their nuclear neighbors, not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against them. The first structure of peace, in short, is a nuclear weapons free Korean peninsula.³

Ending the Enmity

Given the second cause of the "North Korea nuclear problem" is the existence of the enmity between the United States and North Korea, the issue has to be confronted in order to

³ John E. Endicott and Alan G. Gorowitz, "Track II Cooperative Regional Security Efforts: Lessons from the Limited Nuclear Weapons-Free Zone for Northeast Asia," *Pacifica Review* 11, No. 3 (October 1999): 293-324; Peter Hayes and Michael Hamel-Green, "The Path Not Taken, The Way Still Open: Denuclearizing The Korean Peninsula And Northeast Asia," *The Asia-Pacific Journal*, 50-1-09, December 14, 2009; and Andrew Mack, "A Northeast Asia Nuclear-Free Zone: Problems and Prospects," in *Nuclear Policies in Northeast Asia*, UNIDIR/95/16 (New York: United Nations, 1995).

move toward the denuclearization. One of the most stable institutional methods to terminate the enmity would be to end the state of war by a set of simultaneous peace pacts between the parties to the Korean War.⁴ Washington, Seoul, and Pyongyang can, for example, adopt a set of documents that lay out a comprehensive list of measures, perhaps in a form similar to the Agreed Framework, that each commits itself to taking in order to end the state of war. Seoul and Pyongyang have already made progress on this front – they signed a nonaggression pact in 1991 and a summit statement in 2000 and 2007 – although these progresses were reversed since the sinking of South Korean naval ship, the Cheonan. Pyongyang and Washington have at various times floated the possibility of a peace treaty, but have yet to take meaningful measures to start the process to end the state of war and normalize their political relationship. The second structure of peace, therefore, is a peace treaty and the normalization of relations.

Regional Architecture of Peace

Finally, the regional nature of the North Korean nuclear problem requires a regional solution, and it would have to be institutionalized in order to provide stability. Such a regional institution may begin as a specific forum exclusively focused on the Korean peninsula, and develop into a region-wide security forum for Northeast Asia. For example, the non-nuclear declaration signed by the two Koreas and endorsed by the four surrounding powers can serve as a basis for building a regional nuclear weapons free zone that includes not only the Korean peninsula but also Japan. The multilateral regional forum may in due course start to address regional security issues such as the potential arms race in Northeast Asia, the looming tension between the United States and China, and the latent fault line between the continental powers of Asia and the maritime powers of the Pacific. As it expands its scope, it may develop into a multilateral common security organization similar to

⁴ Who are the parties to the war remains contentious. See for example, Pat Norton, “Ending the Korean Armistice Agreement: The Legal Issues,” The Nautilus Institute, Northeast Asia Peace and Security Network, Policy Forum Online, March 1997 (http://www.nautilus.org/napsnet/fora/2a_armisticelegal_norton.html).

the Organization of Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE). The final layer of the peace structure, therefore, is a regional institute of security.

Conclusion: Whither the Korean Peninsula?

Having laid out the three layers of the peace structure, I hasten to add that we should harbor no illusion that the three failures of the past will be overcome overnight and the three structures of peace will be built in a day. But the future may not be as bleak as some might imagine, for the present holds seeds of hope. The Obama administration has taken policy positions that resonate well with the three peace structures laid out above: President Obama declared the “world free of nuclear weapons” as a strategic objective; his administration sees diplomacy as “the first line of offense,” and Secretary of State Kerry has indicated the administration’s willingness to discuss ways to terminate the state of war with the North; and President Obama has made a commitment “to build a regional security infrastructure with countries in Asia that can promote stability and prosperity.” Pyongyang has, for its part, adopted a policy orientation conducive to the peace structures: it has recently declared “denuclearization” as a sacred goal left by Kim Il Sung and Kim Jong Il. It has long sought for a “peace regime”⁵; its foreign ministry proposed to “start a meeting to replace the armistice with a peace treaty this year.”⁶

If Washington and Pyongyang are pursuing policies that are not only supportive of the peace structures but also harmonious of each other’s, why is it then that their current relationship is at its lowest ebb, perhaps even worse than the worst during the Bush administration? One immediate answer lies in the deterioration of the inter-Korean relations for it has tied the hands of the Obama administration that places cooperation with allies as a

⁵ Joint Editorial, *Rodongsinmun*, *Chosŏnmin’gun*, and *Ch’ŏngnyŏnjŏnwi*, January 1, 2010.

⁶ DPRK, Foreign Ministry, January 11, 2010. Defense Commission Chairman Kim Jong-Il reiterated, in his meetings with high-ranking Chinese officials, his “country’s persistent stance to realize the denuclearization of the Korean peninsula.” Herskovitz, Jon. “North Korea’s Kim Makes Denuclearisation Pledge.” Reuters, February 8, 2010.

top priority of its foreign policies.

Another reason has to do with the vicious cycle in which Washington and Pyongyang are caught that is created by the mistrust between them and amplified by the mismatch between their concerns. First, even if they desire the same thing, peace and denuclearization, for example, it is difficult for them to reach the Pareto optimal solution because the lack of trust makes them fear the possibility of the other's defection, as game theories show. The vicious cycle between their mistrust and their failure to cooperate – they fail to cooperate because the mistrust, their mistrust gets hardened because of the failure to cooperate, *ad infinitum* – gets amplified because Washington and Pyongyang have different priorities. Washington takes non-proliferation as a priority and judges North Korea's behavior against this goal. When Pyongyang launched a rocket in April 2009, thus, it was condemned for undermining the goal by test firing a missile. But to Pyongyang, the condemnation was an affront to *Juche*, its sense of sovereign independence that it values more than anything else, as well as an attack on Kim Jong-Il's economic recovery program that privileges science and whose success was demonstrated by the "satellite launch." So it vociferously reacted – by conducting a nuclear test in May.

Driven by these competing concerns, Washington and Pyongyang were racing toward a head-on collision, but the collision was avoided by Secretary of State Kerry's visit to the region last May, creating room for creative diplomacy. While there are many issues to sort out, the heart of today's problem is how to sequence denuclearization and peace. Both, of course, are desirable. The question is which one should come first. Washington demands that Pyongyang return to the Six Party Talks and denuclearization first, whereas Pyongyang desires peace talks first. The logger jam over the sequence has the potential to give Pyongyang the time to expand its nuclear capability and put the Six Part Talks into a coma even as Washington, its allies and friends hurt the regime with the continuing sanctions.

The stalemate may be broken by an opportunity provided by any of the multilateral meetings scheduled for the rest of the year. The conference organizers should invite the leader of the United States and North Korea along with those of China and South Korea. There, the leaders can hammer out a series of agreements on denuclearization, peace, and normalization at the highest level possible. The multilateral setting of the conference provides a unique venue where the denuclearization and peace meetings can be held with little difference in the sequence of the meetings. Not only would the multilateral setting raise the profile of the meetings, but it will also increase the international pressure on the participants to abide by the agreements once they make a commitment on the international stage. So why wrangle over the ages old question of whether chicken comes before egg, when we can have both chicken and egg at the same time? It is possible to have both denuclearization and peace. It may well be the only way to have either.

과거의 세가지 실패 요인,
세가지 평화 구도*

서재정 교수
존스홉킨스대학 국제관계대학원

오늘날 한반도는 비안보 딜레마 속 세상으로 다시 빠져들 것이냐,
아니면 안보 공동체 세상을 향해 나아갈 것이냐 하는 중대한 기로에 서 있다. 따라서 현재의 교착 상태가 무엇 때문에 빚어졌고 또 한 무엇을 통해 우리가 앞으로 나아갈 수 있을지 이해하는 일은 매우 중요하다 할 수 있다.

본 기고문에서는 과거의 한반도 비핵화 노력들을 집중적으로 분석하여 이들 노력이 실패로 돌아간 근본적 원인과 이를 극복할 방안을 살펴보고자 한다.

이 글의 첫 번째 섹션에서는 과거 노력 중 북한의 핵 실험을 초래한 세가지 실패 요인에 대해 알아보고, 이들 실수가 되풀이된다면 동북아 지역은 다시 비안보 세상으로 되돌아갈 수 밖에 없음을 제언한다.

한반도의 평화와 비핵화를 실현하기 위해서는 이들 세가지 실패 요인을 해소할 해법이 필요하다.

이에 두 번째 섹션에서는 이러한 해법에는 이들 실패 요인을 시정할 세가지 평화 구도가 반드시 뒤따라야 함을 강조한다.

그리고 마지막 섹션인 결론에서는 중단된 협상을 전면 재개하고 세가지 평화 구도의 길로 나아가기 위해 당장 채택할 수 있는 구체적인 방안을 제안한다.

*본 기고문은 *Asian Perspective* Vol. 34, No. 2 (Fall 2010) pp. 201-208 에 게재된 “Three Failures of the Past, Three Structures of Peace”를 각색한 것임

과거의 세가지 실패 요인

북한의 핵개발 프로그램이 핵확산우려로 등장한

1990년대 초부터 국제사회는 한반도의 비핵화를 위해 다각적인 노력을 기울여왔다.

유엔 안전보장이사회에서는 북한의 핵실험을 규탄하고 이사국들에 경제 제재 조치를 촉구

하는 안보리 결의안을 다수 통과시킨 바 있지만,

이들 결의안은 아직 긍정적인 결과를 도출해 내지 못하였다. 중국과 미국은 북한, 남한,

일본, 러시아와 함께 이른바

6자 회담이라 불리는 다자간 협상을 진행해오며 북한의 핵 프로그램을 동결 및 불능화 시

켰으나,

이들 협상도 공동의 목표를 담은 선언문을 발표하는데 그쳤을 뿐 목표 달성이라는 성과를

거두지 못했다. 당시 미국의 조지 W. 부시 정권은 정권 초반 4년 동안 선제공격 위협이나

PSI(대량살상무기 확산 방지 구상) 등 군사적 대응에 역점을 둔 일방적인 정책을 펼쳤고,

이러한 강압적인 정책은 오히려 역효과를 초래했다.

이후 오바마 정권은 제재 결의안에 대한 국제적 지지를 얻기 위하여 국제사회 및 동맹국들

과 협력하였으나, 이러한 노력은 북한의 2차 및 3차 핵실험 강행을 부추겼을 뿐이다.

이처럼 과거 노력들이 한반도의 비핵화를 실현시키는데 모두 실패한 원인은 무엇일까?

본인은 그 이유가 이들 노력이 다음과 같은 세가지 문제점을 공통적으로 지녔기 때문이라 생각한다.

그중 첫 번째는 북핵 문제가 상호의존적인 안보우려의 특성에서 비롯된 점을 직시하지 못

한 것이다. 부시 정권은 9.11

테러 이후 증폭된 불안감에 맞서기 위해 선제공격 독트린을 채택하였지만, 이는 북한의 불안감만 키웠을 뿐이다.¹ 이에 북한은 소위 “핵억지력”에 의존하여 안보를 재구축하고자 하였으나, 이러한 북측의 대응으로 인해 미국은 핵 확산에 대해 더욱 우려하게 되었다. 오바마 정권은 북한이 미국의 안보를 위협하는 것으로 우려되는 장거리 미사일을 발사한 데 대해 제재 조치를 강구하였지만, 김정은 정권은 발사체는 장거리 미사일이라 위성이었다고 주장하며 북한의 주권과 안보를 위협하는 부당한 처벌을 받았다고 생각하였다.

이처럼 미국과 북한의 서로 맞물린 불안감이 북핵 문제의 구조적 원인이므로 이를 해결하기 위해서는 양국의 불안감을 모두 동등하게 해소하는 대칭적 접근법이 필요하다. 미국이 핵 확산 우려가 해소되기를 열망하는 만큼 북한도 안보 우려가 해소되기를 바란다. 상대방의 우려를 함께 해소하지 못하는 일방적인 해법은 오히려 상황을 악화시키는데, 이로 인해 불리해진 상대방에게는 반격을 취할 충분한 사유가 생기기 때문이다.

두 번 제 실 패는 북핵 문제가 미국과 북한이 전시 상황에 빠져 서로의 폭력 수단에 대해 우려하고 있음을 인식하지 못한 점이다.

미국은 영국의 핵무기에 대해 전혀 우려하지 않고, 북한 역시 중국이 보유한 무기에 대해 우려하지 않는다.² 미국과 북한이 서로에 대해 품고 있는 안보 우려는 적대감 때문에 생긴 것이다. 마치, 남한과 북한, 그리고 북한과 일본 사이의 적대감이 이들 국가가 서로에 대해 안보 우려를 갖게 되는 근본

¹ 서재정. "The Imbalance of Power, the Balance of Asymmetric Terror: Mutual Assured Destruction (MAD) in Korea." *The Future of Us-Korean Relations: The Imbalance of Power* 에게 재됨. John Feffer 편집. pp. 64-80. London; New York: Routledge, 2006.

² Wendt도 냉전과 관련하여 유사한 주장을 펼침. Wendt, Alexander. 1999. *Social Theory of International Politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

적원인인 것처럼 말이다.

이로 인한 특정 증상을 해결하기 위하여 임시방편적 방안을 사용할 수도 있겠지만,
지속가능한 항구적 해결을 위해서는 이러한 정치적 원인을 정면 해소해야 할 것이다.

마지막으로,
세 번 째 실패는 북한과 미국의 전략적 궁리를 더욱 복잡하게 하는 지역 내 역학정치를 해결
하지 못한 점이다. 예를 들어, 북한은 미국에 대한 불만을
1998년 대포동미사일 시험 발사로 표출하였으나,
이는 북한에 대한 일본인들의 깊은 불안감을 촉발시키는 결과를 가져왔다. 미국은 북한
미사일의 즉각적인 위협을 막는 미사일 방어 체제를 개발 중인데,
이러한 미국의 개발 움직임으로 중국은 미국의 궁극적 의도가 무엇인지 더욱의 구심을 품
게 되었다.
결국 북한과 미국은 각자의 정책 설정 시 이와 같은 높은 불확실성을 반드시 감안하여야 할
것이고,
역내 주체들이 서로의 목표와 정책 방향에 대해 안정적으로 예측하지 못하는 한 북한과 미
국이 선택한 정책 역시 다른 주체들의 변덕에 고스란히 노출되게 된다.

세가지의 평화구도

이제 미래에 대해 살펴보도록 하자.
이들 문제점이 과거의 중차대한 실패라면 이를 시정할 수 있는 방안은 무엇일까?
본인은 이러한 문제들을 시정하기 위한 해법에는 다음과 같은 세가지 요소들이 최소한 반
드시 뒤따라야 한다고 생각한다.

비핵무기지대

북핵문제의 원인 중 하나가 미국과 북한의 불안감이 서로 맞물려 있었다는 점을 인식하지 못한 것이므로 이를 해결하기 위한 해법이 요구된다.

이해법을 모색하기 위한 바람직한 출발점은

1991년 남한과 북한이 서명한 한반도 비핵화 공동 선언을 면밀히 검토하는 것이다. 이 공동 선언에서 남한과 북한은 핵무기를 개발하지 않기로 약속했지만, 당시 미국, 러시아, 일본, 중국 등 4대 강국 중 누구도 이 약속을 존중하고 지지하겠다는 서약을 하지 않았다. 한국의 비핵화 생존이 주변 핵보유국들의 선의에 달려 있는 비대칭적 상황은 본질적으로 불안정하며 현 “북핵위기”를 초래한 구조적 원인 중 하나가 되었다. 만약 당시에

4대 핵보유 강국들이 핵무기의 도입,

사용 및 이를 사용할 것이라는 위협을 절대 용인하지 않겠다는 조약을 서명하고 비준하였다면 비대칭적 상황이다 소완화되었을 것이고 남북한 간의 비핵화 선언도 파국적 결말을 피할 수 있었을 것이다.

따라서 대칭적 해법에는 양 당사자의 동등한 비핵화가 반드시 담보되어야 한다.

다시 말해,

남한과 북한 모두 핵무기 생산이나 이와 관련한 연구를 하지 않을 것을 약속하고,

주변 핵보유국들은 남한과 북한을 상대로 핵무기를 사용하거나 그러하겠다고 위협하지 않을 것을 약속하는 것이다.

요약하건대 첫 번째 평화구도는 핵무기로부터 자유로운 한반도이다.³

적대감종식

“북핵문제”의 두 번째 원인이 미국과 북한 사이의 적대감인 점을 감안할 때, 비핵화를 향한 일보 전진을 위해서는 이 역시 정면으로 해결해야 할 사안이다. 적대감을 종식시키기 위한 가장 안정적인 제도적 방안 중 하나는 한국 전쟁의 당사국들 간에 일련의 평화협정을 동시다발적으로 체결하여 전시 상황을 종료시키는 것이다.⁴ 예를 들어, 미국, 남한, 북한은 1994년 제네바 합의와 유사한 형식으로 각국이 전시 상황을 종식하기 위해 취할 조치들을 총체적으로 열거한 일련의 문서를 채택할 수 있을 것이다. 남한과 북한은 이미 이 부분에 있어 진척을 거둔 바 있다. 1991년에는 불가침 조약에, 그리고 2000년과 2007년에는 남북 정상 선언에서 명하였다. 하지만 이렇듯 순조로운 움직임도 남한의 해군 군함인 천안함 침몰 사고로 인해 역행하게 되었다. 북한과 미국은 여러 번 평화협정의 가능성이 있음을 띄워 보았지만 전시 상황 종식과 정치 적 관계 정상화 절차를 개시하기 위한 의미 있는 조치를 아직 취하지 못한 상태이다.

³ John E. Endicott and Alan G. Gorowitz, “Track II Cooperative Regional Security Efforts: Lessons from the Limited Nuclear Weapons-Free Zone for Northeast Asia,” *Pacifica Review* 11, No. 3 (1999 년 10 월): pp. 293-324; Peter Hayes and Michael Hamel-Green, “The Path Not Taken, The Way Still Open: Denuclearizing The Korean Peninsula And Northeast Asia,” *The Asia-Pacific Journal*, 50-1-09, 2009 년 12 월 14 일; and Andrew Mack, “A Northeast Asia Nuclear-Free Zone: Problems and Prospects,” in *Nuclear Policies in Northeast Asia*, UNIDIR/95/16 (New York: United Nations, 1995).

⁴ 한국 전쟁의 당사자는 누구인가에 대한 논란은 지금도 계속됨. 일례로 Pat Norton, “Ending the Korean Armistice Agreement: The Legal Issues,” The Nautilus Institute, Northeast Asia Peace and Security Network, Policy Forum Online, 1997 년 3 월 (http://www.nautilus.org/napsnet/fora/2a_armisticelegal_norton.html).

따라서, 두번째평화구도는평화협정과관계정상화이다.

지역적평화구도

마지막으로북핵문제는그지역적성격으로인해지역적해법이요구되며,
이해법은안정성을담보하기위해제도화되어야할것이다.
이러한지역적제도는한반도이슈만을독점적으로논의하는포럼의형태로시작하여이
후동북아역내안보포럼으로확대될수있을것이다. 예를들어,
남한과북한이서명하고주위
4대강국이지지하는남북비핵선언은한반도뿐만아니라일본을포함하는역내비핵무
기지대를조성하는데단초를제공할수있을것이다.
이러한다자간지역포럼은동북아내잠재적군비경쟁,
미국과중국사이에서서히고조되는긴장,
아시아대륙강국과태평양해양강국사이에잠재된대결구도등역내안보현안들의해결
에순조롭게착수할수있을것이다.
이지역포럼의범위가확대되면유럽안보협력기구인
OSCE와유사한형태의다자간안보기구로확대될수있을것이다.
따라서세번째평화구도는역내안보제도이다.

결론: 한반도는어디로?

평화의세가지요소를살펴보았으니이제과거의세가지실패가하루밤새해결되
고평화의세가지요소가하루만에구축될것이라는헛된희망을가져서는안됨을서둘러
밝히고싶다. 그렇다고미래가일각에서상상하는것만큼암울하지는않을것인데,

그이유는우리의현재가희망의씨앗을품고있기때문이다.

오바마정권은위의세가지평화구도에부합하는정책적입장을취한바있다.

오바마대통령은전략적목표로“핵무기없는세상”을선언하였고,

그의정권은외교를“공격의최전선”으로삼고있으며, John Kerry

국무장관은오바마정권이북한과의전시상황을종식하기위한방안을논의할의향이있음을시사한바있고,

오바마대통령은“아시아국가들과함께안정과번영을증진시킬수있는지역안보체제를구축”할것을약속한바있다.

북한은역시평화구도에기여할수있는나름의정책방향을채택하였다.

북한은최근“비핵화”를김일성주석과김정일국방위원장의유훈으로선언하였다.

북한은“평화체제”를오랫동안추구해왔으며⁵;북한외무성은“올해정전협정을평화협정으로대체하기위한회의에착수”할것을제안하였다.⁶

만약미국과북한이평화구도를지지하고서로에게조화로운정책을추구한다면 왜현재이들의관계는부시정권시최악의상황보다더심각할수있는상태에머물고있을까? 이답은남북관계악화에서찾을수있는데,

남북간의소원한관계로인해외교정책에있어동맹과의공조를가장중요시여기는오바마정권의두손이묶인상태이기때문이다.

또다른답은미국과북한이사로잡힌악순환의고리에서찾을수있는데,

⁵«노동신문», «조선인민군», «청년전위» 2010년 1월 1일자 공동사설.

⁶2010년 1월

11일북한인민공화국외무성.김정일국방위원장은중국고위급관료들과의회담에서북한의“한반도비핵화를실현하겠다는변치않는입장”을재차강조함. Herskovitz, Jon. "North Korea's Kim Makes Denuclearisation Pledge." Reuters 통신, 2010년 2월 8일 보도.

이악순환은서로에대한불신에서시작되었고서로우려하는바가달라더욱증폭되었다.

예를들어,

이들이평화와비핵화라는동일한목표를열망한다하더라도파레토최적화된결론을도출하기는어려울것이다.

그이유는게임의이론에서보듯이상대에대한신뢰가부족하여상대가중도에도피할가능성을두려워하기때문이다.

불신으로인해협력에실패하고협력에실패해불신이더깊어지고이렇게무한히되풀이되는악순환의고리는미국과북한의우선과제가서로다르기때문에더욱증폭된다.

미국은비확산을우선과제로삼고있고북한의행동이이러한목표에어긋난다고판단한다. 그렇기때문에북한의 2009년

4월로켓발사시미사일시험발사로비확산목표달성을저해하였다고비난받았다.

그러나북한에게있어이러한비난은주체사상,

즉북한이무엇보다중요시여기는주권독립에대한모욕이아닐수없으며,

과학에역점을두어“위성발사”라는쾌거를기록한김정일국방위원장의경제회복프로그램에대한공격이아닐수없다. 그렇기에북한은

5월핵실험을감행함으로써격렬한반응을보인것이다.

서로다른우려에사로잡혀미국과북한은정면충돌을향해질주하고있었고, 이러한충돌은 John Kerry 국무장관의지난

5월방문으로피할수있었고창의적외교의활로를연셈이다.

해결해야할사안들이많지만오늘날문제의핵심은비핵화와평화를어떻게나란히구현할수있을것인가이다. 물론이둘다바람직하다.

여기서문제는이들중무엇을우선적으로실행할것인가이다. 미국은북한이

6자회담에복귀해비핵화를먼저실행하기를요구하는반면,

북한은평화회담을먼저바라고있다.

이중무엇을먼저할것가라는이슈로고민하는사이북한은미국과미국의동맹국및우방
국들의계속되는제재에도불구하고자신의핵역량을확대하고

6자회담을의식불명상태로빠뜨릴시간을얻게될수있다.

현재의교착상태는올해하반기에예정된

6자회담을통해마련한기회를통해타개될수있다.

이회담주최인들은중국과남한의지도부와더불어미국과북한의지도자들도회담으로
초청하여야한다. 이자리에서이들은비핵화, 평화,

관계정상화에관한가장높은수준의합의를도출해낼수있을것이다.

6자회담이라는다자간논의의틀은비핵화회담과평화회담이개최순서에거의차이없
이동등하게개최될수있는유일한장을마련한다.

이러한다자간논의는회담의대외적위상을높일뿐아니라참석자들이국제적무대에서
약속을하게되면이들합의사항을필히준수하도록하는국제적압박을높이는역할을할
것이다.

때문에답과달걀같은모두동시에손에넣을수있는데답이먼저냐달걀이먼저냐하는오래
된질문을두고연쟁할필요가있겠는가?

비핵화와평화를모두실행하는일이가능할수있다.

이것이야말로비핵화나평화중하나를온전히실행시킬수있는유일한길이기도하다.

•• 알린 웨어(PNND 글로벌 코디네이터) 초청 토론회 〈핵 없는 세상과 한반도 핵문제〉

토 론

피터 백(아시아재단 한국지부 대표)



