

A Study on Practical Source of Peace Island Concept and Peace-zoning Policy: Jeju Anti-military Base Movements (1988-2007)

Ko, Chang-hoon*

contents

- I. Introduction
- II. Local Contexts of Policy Confrontations between the Korean Military Bases Construction Plan and the Island Development Plan
- III. International Contexts of Conflicts from Jeju Anti-militarization Movements
- IV. Path of Jeju Island : Principles from Issues and Contexts of Three Anti-military Movements in Jeju Island (1988-2021) : World Peace Island Policy towards Republic of Jeju Island through the Jeju Special Self-Governing Province
- V. Conclusion

Abstract

The aim of this article is to illuminate some practical sources of peace island concept and contents of peace-zoning policy that have emerged from past 20 years-long movements against construction of military air forces base and navy port of Jeju island. Those nonviolent struggles let Korean government to designate Jeju Island as World Peace Island on January 27, 2005. It is natural that we can not only examine the processes of anti-military bases movements but also explore three dimensions of local, national, and international contexts of peace-zoning policy as practical sources of peace island. My argument is that Jeju Island will be expected to play a peaceful role for two

* Professor, Dept. of Public Administration, Cheju National Univ.

Koreas and Asian countries as a neutralized peacezone if it gets an international awareness of agreement on its status by international communities.

Key words : peace island, peace-zoning policy, practical sources

I . Introduction

When we think about some practical sources of Jeju Island as a Peace Island, that Korean government designated it on January 27, 2006, it is noteworthy that we can look at creation processes of peace culture and peace island concept through anti-military bases movements by islanders and for islanders since August of 1988. So, if we can touch with militarization issue of construction of naval port of 2006 in Jeju Island, naturally, it is essential to back to memory of fierce anti-militarization movements in August of 1988 in Jeju Island. It had lasted 7 months long that half of islanders had participated in those movements because they thought, if they accepted proposal of military air base at southwestern part of island by Korean government at that time, Jeju Island would be military zone. As one of chair person of anti-militarization movement groups, writer asked four open questions to Korean government as below with islanders together (September 9,1988. p.11: The Voice of Jeju Islanders. No. 8).

1. Why did Korean government designate Mt. Songak area as "National Main Military Defense Area" nullifying existing development program (1985-1991) in the Jeju Island Comprehensive Development Plan on May 6, 1988?

2. At one seminar whichhold at Cheju National University on May 15, 1988, it was raised Jeju Island military base issue in the framework of defense of Korean peninsula. As for this issue, Korean government should clarify this plan to the public.

3. In the 13th presidential election campaign of 1987, Mr. Tae-Woo Noh promised farmers and islanders that Korean government should lease or rent military air-base designated land (156,600 sq meters) to them for their life. Korean government should explain why it didn't happened now?

4. According to article of Hangyeræ newspaper (August 17,1988), one of US senators mentioned that "in case that US failed negotiations with Philippine authority

about moving of US military bases, US passed the law to permit for moving it into other areas of other countries. Did Korean government discuss with US one in handling with this issues?

In the midst of anti-militarization protests, demonstrations, and debates by islanders against Korean central government, additionally I suggested that Korean Government should designate Jeju Island as not Military Island but Peace Buffer Zone for peace and prosperity of Korean peninsula (an demonstration pamphlet : November 23, 1988). In response to overwhelming opposition of islanders, on February 27,1988, Korean government announced to postpone invitation of military air base into Jeju Island.

After 12 years later, in Spring of 2002, as soon as Korean government tried to invite naval base into the Southeastern part of Jeju Island (Hwasoon), it happened secondbig debates and confrontations between pro and anti military naval port group. Because of fierce opposition to it, Korean government decided to postpone it until approval of Jeju Islanders on it. As it was not resolved, in 2004, it proposed third trial ofKorean invitation of naval base into same place of Jeju Island. As for this issue, Mr. Tae-Hwan Kim postponed to discuss with this issue until Jeju Self-Governing Province will start on July 1, 2006 because of insufficient survey and confrontations between pro and anti groups in June of 2005.

We are just coming into a time to discuss and debate it fully for resolve of this military base issue because an age of Jeju Self-Governing Province started. Because the Korean Defense Ministry and Navy announced it would resume a naval base development project in Jeju Island, after Governor Kim Tae-Hwan expressed a conditional willingness to negotiate the stalled plan with the military, Governor Kim demanded that the project be implemented on the basis of broad consent from local residents and in such a way as not to tarnish the island's peaceful image as well. The Navy plans to develop the envisaged naval base in the southern part of the island into a strategic mobile squadron by 2020 to harbor sophisticated navy ships, such as KDX-II "stealth destroyers and KDX-III Aegis-equipped destroyers, with the investment of about 743 billion won (some \$780 million). The most likely candidate is Hwasun located in the island's southwestern part. Once a base site isselected, the Navy plans to begin construction in July of 2007 after a feasibility study on environmental, traffic and geological effects. Supporters of the plan have insisted the construction of the naval

port will bring economic benefits to local people by inducing a great amount of direct investment into the region regarding construction of infrastructure for soldiers (Korea Times: July 17, 2006).

Against proposed plan of Korean government, but, Jeju Islanders argued that there are some key criteria that should be recognized as projecting of future of peaceful Jeju Island. Most islanders want to develop Hwasoon into an international tourism port. Islanders eagerly want to construct an International Island Peace Garden on the old site of the Japanese air base in the Songak Mountain area, to be modeled after the International Peace Garden between Manitoba (Canada) and North Dakota (USA). This peace garden would foster continued tourism growth and provide a monumental symbol of peace within Asia laying forest the previous pain of war and occupation, and promoting a peaceful future for our children. This is in stark contrast to the position of the Korean Defense Ministry plan to invite the Korean Air Forces Base to Peace Island (Ko Chang hoon, 2006b).

Islanders accepted recommendation from foreign scholars in deciding its important policy directions. They prefer the Peace Island Development Plan (Int'l Tourism port and Int'l Island Peace Garden) to the Military Bases Construction Plan, so, they support that two competing policy agendas be researched, compared, and discussed openly and fully in 2007 and 2008 before final decision in 2009 through fair referendum (The 6th Peace Island Forum Policy Petition : July 7,2006).

This article has an aim to illuminate some aspects of confrontations and contests between Jeju Island military base issues and World Peace Island Policy and to explore some possibilities which it sparkle a new sign of whether JEU island will be a war-raging military island or a neutralized peace island in a future.

Firstly, it is critical for us to not only think about simultaneously why the contexts of invitation of military base into Jeju Island but also develop it into neutralized World Peace Island at local level. Through those observations and insights into different stages of struggles, choices, and decisions of islanders relating to their key policies, we can recognize how and why Jeju islanders make up their mind up in choosing their competing policy agendas for their island society.

Secondly if we have military installation and bases in Jeju Island, it effects military impact on the context and stream of security and peace of Korean peninsula and

Northeastern area internationally relating to war islands in the Pacific such as Okinawa, Guam, Saipan, and Hawaii Islands. So, in order to resolve issue of decision on whether we invite military bases into Jeju Island or reject it, they seemed to look at three kinds of context at island societies, Korean peninsula, and international world. Examining the case studies, there are cases where there are only brief explanations of the results of the case from the central government's point of view. Therefore, in this writer's judgment, it is essential that an interpretation or arguments be conducted in order to determine the circumstances that have produced the present flow of movements or policy agendas. Moreover, in interpreting the flow of movements or policy agendas and their corresponding themes and meanings, we should consider the periodic and present significance on those activities. It is possible only when this kind of interpretation exists that we can bridge the past to the present, and thereby, interpret the significance from a modern perspective that leads to future strategies towards world peace island policy.

My method depends on a phenomenological method which can not only find inter subjectivity on particular event or phenomenon of anti-military bases movements and creation of peace island policy among contemporary islanders, but also interpret several common contexts, implications, and meanings of them: sharing with common everyday life experiences and situations of island societies. It is asserted here that anti-military bases movements and their peace-promoting activities will be the real and practical foundation to create peace island concept on their way altogether from the islanders' perspective. And upon these kinds peace-promoting activities on the island to the Korean government, we can prepare the ground to create peaceful Jeju's society and develop a policy agenda toward making democracy work towards its destination as peace island beyond military bases and those militarization. This will help give Jeju islanders an important role in seeding peace around the world both now and in the future upon their experiences. This occurs through genuine activities: overcoming their deep scars, dark memories, and desperations of the dreaded historical experience.

II. Local Contexts of Policy Confrontations between the Korean Military Bases Construction Plan (Hwasoon Navy Port and Sonak Mt's Military Air Forces Base) and the Island Development Plan (Hwasoon Int'l Tourism port and Songak Mt's Int'l Island Peace Garden)

1. Historical Contexts of Conflicts between the Military Bases Construction and Anti-Military Bases Movements in the Memory and Scar of a Dark Militarization Age of Jeju Island (1910-2004)

Until the 11th century, Jeju Island was a historically independent and peaceful country named Tamna nation. After Tamna belonged to the Koryeo dynasty, it had especially lasted under a 100 year long colony of the Tuan Government of islanders: they had a four year long resistance war against the Mongolian power for keeping island peace and security by themselves. And, in 1901, they had the second bitter experience to protect the common interests of islanders against the coalition of the Korean central government and French Catholic power.

Unfortunately, under the Japanese colonial period (1910-1945), Jeju Island was used as one of the main military bases of Japan imperialism (1925-1945). After liberation, it was used as the main military camp under American military rule (August 1945-1948).

These kinds of dark militarization history left negative scars in the hearts of islanders simultaneously. And as much as they had kept bitter memories of militarization, these gave them special reasons for longing for a peaceful island in a future beyond this dark history.

It's time to think about and scrutinize three kinds of contexts from issues of three different anti-militarization movements or debates on Jeju Island. Even though it happened, anti-movements against policy agendas of the Korean government at different periods, these included the same issues and contexts of controversies and conflicts between the Korean government and Jeju Islanders. In contrast to the Korean government inviting a military air base and naval port to the southwestern area, islanders wanted to develop Jeju Island into a Peace Buffer Zone to play a peaceful role for unification of the Korean peninsula, benefit from the prosperity of Northeast Asian communities, and achieve sustainability of their island society. As the Korean

government accepted the strong drive to peace island policy, it designated Jeju Island as World Peace Island on January 27, 2005 based on an article of Jeju Special Development Law which can define Jeju Island as a world peace island in 2001.

During the first period of anti-military base movements (August 1988 - February 1989), it was a critical issue whether the Korean government invited a military airbase in the context of security of the Korean peninsula or not. Because of a fierce 7 month long anti-air base movement that half of islanders had participated in, the Korean government postponed their defense program to invite a military air base into the Songak Mountain area of the southwestern part of Jeju Island. At that time it seemed to me that the Korean government had forced islanders to accept it without fair processes of the agreement of islanders. As a result it could not to push this project through. Through anti-military base movements, islanders had an opportunity of how islanders develop their island into a more peaceful and advanced one in the future. They recognized their original destination to peace island through the development of a peace buffer zone. (Ko Chang Hoon, 2006b). It can provide theoretical and practical ground that: (1) it is recognized residents not only ask their rights to lease or rent old military base land owned by the Korean Defense Ministry but also for islanders to think about the possibility and potential of a tourism island rather than a military island within the framework of the Jeju Special Development Plan, (2) revives pride of the islanders who contributed to peace, not to conflicts and confrontations between the two Koreas, and nationally as a peace buffer zone beyond the dark memory and image of a 80 years long military island. (3) internationally, islanders want Jeju Island to play a peaceful role for prosperity of the Northeastern Asian bloc, not as a geological and strategic conflict island by military competence among Japan, mainland China, and the USA. They were sensitive of the military role of Jeju Island in the framework of defense of the Korean peninsula and Asian Defense Plan of the USA. Through those kinds of recognition and awareness, islanders could reach at a desirable alternative to the island peace buffer zone. The islanders' consensus forced the Korean government to announce the postponement of the invitation of a military air base onto Jeju Island for 12 years. In addition, Jeju islanders had experienced the tragedy of grand massacres under and after American military rule which resulted in approximately 30,000 innocent islander deaths. These scars of massacres brought islanders not to invite military bases onto Jeju Island (George Katsiaficas, 2006).

Let's me to permit pointing out some more reasons why significant anti-military movements happened on Jeju Island.

First, they suggest clear objectives of an anti-military base movement against the Korean government to people such as using the motto, "No, No, Never Military Base" in both pamphlet and on the street. Like this simple sentence, it symbolizes common objectives among islanders and people clearly. Most islanders could share with the cause why they rejected a plan to invite military bases onto Jeju Island easily. Past bitter experiences at hard times under colony of Japan and USA pushed them to reject invitation or construction of military bases on the island.

Secondly, they keep nonviolent and peaceful methods during anti-military movements such as demonstrations, marches, assemblies, and so on. They were so successful in getting strong support and solidarity from most islanders that they have formed so called peace island policy.

Thirdly, they are successful in suggesting desirable and practical alternative, Peace Buffer Zone to islanders as a whole, which improve the common interests of islanders to develop the tourism sector economically in the long term perspectives. In the Spring season of 2002, when the Korean government retried to invite the naval base onto the southeastern part of Jeju Island (Hwasoon), it happened second large debates and confrontations around the contradiction of the military island vs. peace island policy by the Korean government simultaneously between military base-supported groups and peace island oriented ones. Pro groups argue it is more realistic to invite a naval port to Jeju Island for the sake of economic prosperity and defense of national interests of the Pacific area. In contrast to this view, peace island oriented groups argued that, as the Korean government declared to develop Jeju Island into World Peace Island, it was nonsense and contradictory for the Korean government to invite the navy base onto Jeju Island (Ko Chang Hoon, 2006a)

2. Practical and Theoretical Contexts of Conflicts between World Peace Island and Military Jeju Island Policy

As islanders reached at an agreement to reject the military base, they strongly rejected plan of the Korean government to invite the military base onto Jeju Island

based on the consistency of the World Peace Island Policy by it.

Because of the fierce opposition by islanders, the Korean government could not but to postpone its plan again. As it was not resolved, in 2005, it proposed a third trial of Korean invitation of a naval port into the same location of Jeju Island. In 2005, naval authorities emphasized the logic of economic growth or contribution to Jeju Island causing from construction of Hwasoon navy port, that if Jeju Islanders will accept the plan of naval port into Jeju Island, it would contribute to the economic prosperity of Jeju Island. But islanders argue that it wouldn't contribute to economic growth as the Okinawa case showed economic stagnation rather than prosperity as a whole from the long term perspective. So, most islanders rejected the plan of the naval port at Hwasoon (Kelly Dietz, 2006).

As for this issue, as the debates and confrontations were hotter between pro and anti groups of the military navy port, Jeju Island Governor, Mr. Tae-Hwan Kim postponed discussing this issue until the Jeju Self-Governing Province commences on July 1, 2006 because of insufficient survey information and fierce confrontations between pro and anti groups in June of 2005.

As soon as it finished General election on 31st of May, 2006, it has become hotter issues to resolve it among Jeju islanders again. During 8 months (from June of 2006 to January of 2007) long debates, there were confrontations, debates, conflicts, conferences, and activities simultaneously among pro and con camps around invitation of navy port into Hwasoon port of Jeju Island. Main actors of pro camps are Korean Defense Ministry, Korean Navy, Korean Air Forces, Jeju Businessman Association, and a few local news medias of Jeju Island. As, in the summer of June, Korean Defense Ministry confirmed or judged that it got 70 % support of Jeju islanders on construction of Hwasoon naval port and submitted its 2007 year budget of Jeju Island Hwasoon Navy Port (its total amount to 13,948,000,000 Korean won = 14 million USD) to Korean National Assembly without acceptance of Jeju islanders in order to do basic feasibility research fund and compensation budget to buy land from residents. But Korean National Assembly, on 27th of December, 2006, cut 85% of budget and approved only 2,000,000,000 Korean won (2 million USD) in the government budget proposal of it, because of big fallacy it didn't have democratic processes to get acceptance from residents on it, on the condition that Korean Navy can use it for basic feasibility

research on Hwasoon navy port after it will get acceptance on using budget from Governor of the Jeju Special Self-Governing Province (Jemin Daily Newspaper : December 27, 2006). As for this issue, the Jeju Special Self-Governing Province and its County asked Korean National Assembly to nullify it without acceptance processes of residents on it simultaneously. As the result, islanders asked Jeju Government Governor to spend this budget half for basic feasibility research the military bases construction and half for the peace island development plan equally because they want to get full information and result of researches from it. They want to clarify the two policies fully : the Peace Island Development Plan (Int'l Tourism port and Int'l Island Peace Garden), and the Military Bases Construction Plan. They have argued these two policy agendas be researched, compared, and discussed openly and fully with Jeju citizens for two years (2007-2008) before their decision in 2009. it is fair that they want to have equal right to access to policy alternatives and share with contents of each alternative in detail as for right decision and choice on right alternative of future society of Jeju Island.

Secondly, the Jeju Special Self-Governing Provincial Government let Jeju Development Institute compose Task Force Study group researching on Merit and Weakness from Invitation of Navy Port into Jeju Island for three months only(September to November, 2006) in order to provide objective references to the public in resolving issue of navy port. But, on 29th of December,2006 at presentation briefing conference of report of research result on it, in a word, they can't but to confess to the public that its research report was incomplete because of short period of research, no participation of anti group, and shortage of specialty of some members of research group. As a whole, the result of research by Task Forces group is concluded too incomplete to provide enough information to the public. So, the Jeju Special Self-Governing should postpone big conference for islanders until supplement of its main contents. For example, it say that, as for possibility of coexistence of naval port and world peace island policy, it is possible to coexist sometime or it is impossible to coexist sometime, so, it was criticized as full of incomplete explanations and contradictory suggestions. Without its legitimacy of content, it is natural and democratic that the Jeju Government Governor postpone it.

Thirdly it is worthwhile to note that the Jeju Special Self-Governing Province recognizes why stream of public opinion against naval port overwhelm pro-navy poll as it expected 6 months ago conversely. In a word, it happened the table turned : poll

said anti-naval port opinion ascend from 30% at September of 2006 to 60% at December of 2006. In my opinion, it was the result of mixtures of effects of interactions of various factors: first of all, economic effects and contribution to Jeju Island economy as a whole through construction of navy port resulted as small or low as islanders expected. Rather than, if Jeju Island invite military bases into Jeju Island, it is really difficult to develop or upgrade tourism industry because of negative effects of military port on it. Clearly they recognize there are contradiction between military bases construction and peace island development plan. Negative influences of one sided push and undemocratic decision by Korean Defense Ministry and Navy have spread over on the island without any acceptance on it from islanders.

The most important fact is that Jeju islanders worrying about or coming together against push of Korean government to invite Hwasoon Navy port into Jeju Island on a undemocratic manner : Professors, teachers, artists, novelists, Catholic, and Christian priests announced their opinion on the line against Hwasoon navy port construction plan. In addition, the Jeju Special Self-Governing Provincial County organized "Special Committee for Military Bases in Jeju Island" to start their work for handling of navy port construction issue in October of 2006.

Fourthly, Jeju islanders asked themselves to unite in preparing for the Peace Island Development Plan against the Military Bases Construction Plan equally. In order to invite or found international peace organizations on Jeju Island, they will try to submit their policy petition or recommendation letter to UN Secretary, Mr. Ban Gimoon through assistance of Korean government. If islanders develop Jeju Island into a neutralized peace zone having an status to play a peaceful role for two Koreas and Asian countries independently from South Korea, it will be contributed more to world peace as world peace island rather than now(Ko Chang Hoon,2006b).

In a sum, Jeju Islanders recognize that they may reach at peace island as much as their ancestors dreamed of through their long struggles and protests against military bases construction by themselves and policy formation of peace island development. As for this, Dr. Glenn Paige evaluated Jeju Island highly as follow:

"Jeju Island traditions of" a kingdom without weapons, "three nos"(no gates, no beggars, no thieves), and the more egalitarian social role of women, provide

glimpses of non killing island capabilities(Glenn Paige. 2006)."

III. International Contexts of Conflicts from Jeju Anti-militarization Movements

1. National Contexts of Conflicts from Jeju Anti-militarization Movements : A Path to Neutralized Peace Island for Neutralization of Korean peninsula

Viewing contexts of conflicts from Jeju Anti-militarization movements nationally, we may think about national contexts of invitation of Jeju air forces base and navy port into Jeju Island in a nearer future. As Korean government decided that The number of armed forces personnel will be slashed to 500,000 from the current 680,000 by 2020 in line with amilitary reform bill under consideration at the National Assembly. The defense reform law is designed to boost South Korea's war capability by introducing advanced weapons while reducing its dependence on U.S. troops. The military is expected to exercise independent command in three to five years through the transition of wartime operational control from the U.S. military. Currently, the Army has about 560,000 soldiers, and the Navy and Marines have a combined 63,000. The Air Force has some 63,000. An additional 4.5 million are in the reserves. Even though the bill has set the target year of the military streamlining, the Defense Ministry is required to review the target number of troop cuts every three years to reflect the changing security situation on the Korean Peninsula, including North Korea's nuclear threat. The ministry plans to establish a missile command that is armed with various cutting-edge rocket systems to address the threat of rockets from the North, which are heavily deployed near the Demilitarized Zone and aimed for Seoul. The Navy plans to introduce Aegis-class destroyers and the 214-type submarines to extend its ability to watch and hit opponents' moves throughout its field of operation. The Air Force is expected to equip itself with abilities to conduct surgical strikes throughout the Korean Peninsula, (Korea Times: December 1, 2006).

It is real time to decide on whether to use Jeju Island as the strategic importance military or it as peace island to reach at neutralization of Korean peninsula. In the past

history, we know that The strategic importance of Jeju is shown by the fact that Japan's troops used Jeju as its main forward-deploying base during its colonial rule of the peninsula (1910-45). The U.S. military also used bases in the island between 1945 and 1948. According to government statistics, there are about 137 military base sites in Jeju, including 73 cave camps in the southern area, used by Japanese troops. The Air Force has also sought to have a strategic air base here since 1988 but Jeju residents have opposed it (Korea Times : July 17, 2006).

Of course, Korean navy argue that it can secure the peace and prosperity of the country in line with the rapidly changing maritime security situation in the world in which nations are seeking to extend their national claims in the sea to protect underwater resources. But, under the "Defense Reform 2020," a 15-year military reform plan announced in 2005, the military is seeking to transform its manpower-based armed forces structure into a slimmer but much stronger and agiler force employing cutting-edge weapons systems. The plan also focuses on improving the naval and air forces. The base, which will be used as a logistic hub for armed forces stationed here and inland and as a maintenance point for ships, is to harbor 19 state-of-the-art vessels and submarines (Hankuk Ilbo: April 11, 2006 and Korea Times: April 12, 2006).

But islanders believe that the naval base construction would lead to the eventual militarization of the island, which was designated as "the Island of World Peace" on Jan. 27, 2005, and would impede the island's tourism industry. They are also worried about many possible problems from the military presence here, such as environmental destruction caused by sewage from ships and the introduction of what some refer to as "low-quality" military culture onto the island (Jeong Dai-yeun, 2006).

In a word, I want to suggest to develop the island into a "Peace Buffer Zone," along with the Demilitarized Zone (DMZ) near the inter-Korean border, to play a peaceful role for reunifying the two Koreas. If we have two peace buffer zones in Jeju Island and the DMZ in Korean peninsula. We could take one more step toward a relatively neutral Korea through internal means, rather than by international efforts (Korea Times: July 17, 2006). In this vein, we can develop Hwasun port into an international tourism port and construct an international peace garden on the old site of Japanese air base in Mt. Songak, modeling after the International Peace Garden in Manitoba, Canada, and North Dakota in the United States (Ko Chang Hoon, 2002).

To make Jeju a genuine peace buffer zone, it is essential to obtain international status as a peace island as same as the example of Costa Rica in Central America region, which, in 1949, it abolished its military. The Costa Rica case showed that if people of a small country made endless efforts to build up a peace-promoting tradition, it could play a peaceful role with neighboring countries. It's time for Korean people to make a big decision regarding the making of a peaceful and neutralized Peace Island toward neutralization of Korean peninsula for the prosperity of Northeastern Asia (Marie Jacobsson, 2006 and Ko Changhoon, 2002).

2. International Context of Conflicts from Jeju Anti-militarization Movements : Is Peace-zoning Policy Supplement or Overcome Perspective of "Axis of Evil" and "Sunshine Policy" ?

If we want to view the international context of the anti-militarization movement in Jeju Island, we should consider the implication of peace and security between the two Koreas and among Pacific island areas in the future.

As of January 27, 2005, the Korean government designated Jeju Island as World Peace Island through act and policy. Islanders welcomed this idea which could pave the way for its peaceful role in the future: as Korea was regarded by the outside world that it had experienced a more shameful modern history rather than contributing to world peace. Selection of this peaceful policy, Korea should overcome conflict and shame from the dark memory of Japanese colonization and war, and tension between the two Koreas. Additionally, as the Korean central government decided Jeju Island would become a self-governing province (having special status like Hong Kong) in Korea on July 1, 2006, islanders have a higher expectation that Jeju Island will play an experimental role for peaceful relationships and to activate some warming programs. In line with this policy the Korean government wants to broaden and apply this policy to the Demilitarized Zone that symbolizes the country's division, and has remained untouched to our shame. If we select the DMZ Landmine Removal Project and push peaceful development such as environmental-friendly tourism combining the capital of South Korea with labor forces of North Korea, and with support of international societies, a peaceful Korean peninsula can be achieved. So, if we have two peace buffer

zones in Jeju Island and the DMZ, this means Korea could take one more step towards a relatively neutral Korea through internal means, rather than by international efforts (Ko Changhoon, 2006b). In my opinion, comparing the Kungang Tourism Project and Development of the Gaesung Business District by South Korean government and businessmen, those kinds of peaceful policies improve the image of Korean people who contribute to world peace positively together with people of North Korea. Considering the choices of peaceful policies, we should learn some lessons from Switzerland and Costa Rica. Switzerland had success obtaining neutrality and in playing a peaceful role around the world, responding to neighboring powers such as Germany, Austria, France, and Italy wisely with limited and excellent armed forces in the 19th and 20th centuries. The latter case showed that if people of a small country made endless efforts building up peace-promoting traditions, it could play a peaceful role with its neighboring countries. Costa Rica reached a great agreement, the abolishment of armed forces in its constitution as the result of negotiation between the Republican and Communist party from its civil war. Compared to the failure of the Korean case of struggles, confrontations, and Korean War between South and North Korean groups under 1945-1953, Costa Rica achieved a successful showcase making its democracy work by itself. Finally, it has built up its peaceful tradition as a peace nation in one of the most violence-infested areas: among neighboring countries such as Honduras, Guatemala, Nicaragua, Belize, and El Salvador (which reached the Central American Peace Code in 1987) (Ko Chang Hoon, 2002 and reference with Table 2 : Axis of Evil, Sunshine, and Peace-zoning Policy towards North Korea).

It seems to me that if one country tries to improve its peaceful tradition, it is possible for a peace island policy to apply to neighboring countries through their agreement on peace building. We can get good lesson from three successful case as lawyer, Marie Jacobsson pointed out as follow:

"Convention on the Demilitarisation and Neutralization of the the Aaland Islands was concluded in 1921, Spitz Bergen Treaty in 1906, and Antarctica Treaty in 1959, which it be used for 'peaceful purposes' only...International agreements and understandings can be strengthened by national and international agreements. (Marie Jacobsson, 2006)".

It's time for Korean people to make a great decision in making their peaceful and neutralized Korea. In my opinion, if we keep Peace Island around Jeju Island and broaden its policy into the peaceful development of the Demilitarized Zone, it will be a big step to a neutralized Korea. In this sense, the first implication of anti-military base movements was targeting at the building up of a neutral and peaceful Korean peninsula with limited and modern armed forces as a balancing spot between Western and Eastern or Northern and Southern power struggles for the prosperity of the Korean peninsula and peace between Northeastern Asian blocs. I think it is noteworthy that, on July 2006, the Jeju Provincial Government will change to the Jeju Self-Governing Province with comparative autonomy from the Korean central government. This idea will activate and prepare Koreans for the next future of a peaceful Korea titled "United Three States of Korea: North, South, and Jeju Island Korea" in the next decade (Ko Changhoon, 2006b).

It seems to me that peace island policies bring important implications to the fate and future of island societies in the Pacific. As we look at the fate of island societies, they resulted in, and left a series of scapegoats in the midst of sad and dark histories in the civilized world. Hawaii, Okinawa, Guam, Saipan, and Jeju Island transferred independent islands into provincial entities in the last millennium. In the age of the 20th century, they bitterly experienced massacre and war (Richard Herr, 2006 and Grant McCall, 2006). In the 21st century, they are still a scapegoat place to have military bases or camps even though they don't want them. The representative case will be Okinawa, as a showcase explaining the fate and future of island society. Kelly Dietz describes the Okinawan psychological mentality because of the existence of military bases in Okinawa, through voice of peace activists, below.

"The fact is, when the US is at war, Okinawa is at war...we, our land and labor, are all used to fight in US wars. Training flights increase, planes and troops depart from Okinawa day and night, they go off to fight and kill. Then they come back, psychologically traumatized. Okinawans, and mostly Okinawan women, bear the brunt of their trauma." (Kelly Dietz, 2006)

Okinawan people had a citizens' referendum on December 21, 1997 concerning a plan

to construct a massive new US military air base atop the coral reef in pristine Henoko Bay. The majority's resounding "No!" vote in the referendum should have ended the matter then and there, but it did not. Ignoring the results of the referendum, both the US and Japanese governments have pressed ahead with the new air base. In 2006, the USA announced to move Henoko Bay air base to Guam.

It seems to me that the fate of island societies composed of "island military zones" in the Pacific symbolize confrontation spots between Western and Eastern military super powers (Kelly Dietz, 2006).

IV. Path of Jeju Island : Principles from Issues and Contexts of Three Anti-military Movements in Jeju Island (1988-2021) : World Peace Island Policy towards Republic of Jeju Island through the Jeju Special Self-Governing Province

It's time to contemplate some important principles, I call these 'Peace Island Principles', resulting from 20 years of anti-military movements on Jeju Island (1988-2007). I expect it will contribute to genuine island peace at a regional level, the peaceful coexistence of two Koreas at a national level, and a desirable balance of power in the Northeastern Asia at an international level.

"In sum," non killing should be profitable." The concept of Jeju as a Peace Island supported by national, provincial, and local governments offers extraordinary economic opportunities. The people of a Jeju can become creators and exporters of nonkilling ideas, goods, arts, and experiences of great value to themselves and a violence-weary world. Diffused through information technologies these could range from Peace Island T-shirts and nonkilling TV dramas drawing upon Korean filmmaking genius, to nonkilling leadership and citizen summits." (Glenn Paige, 2006).

During the last 20 years, Jeju Island has organized three anti-military base movements.

We can categorize some characteristics such as main issues, policy alternatives, methods, local, and national and international contexts among three movements observed in Table 1.

Table 1: Contexts of Three Anti-military Movements in Jeju Island (1988-2007)

Contexts Movements	Main issues	Policy alternative	Method	Local Context	Nat'l Context	Int'l context
First Movements (Aug. 1988 ~Feb. 1989)	Mt.Songak Airbase Installation	Air Force Base VS Peace Buffer Zone	Nonviolent Demonstrations, Marches, and Policy Agenda Suggestion	Military Government Push VS Protests against Military Base	Construction of Air Forces Base VS Peace Buffer Zone Policy	Military island Vs Peace Island Policy
Second Movements (Apr. 2002 ~June. 2002)	Navy Port Construction at Hwasoon port	Navy Port with Economic Incentive VS Designation of World Peace Island	Debate, Conference, Peaceful March, Alternative Suggestions	Economic Contribution of Navy Port VS Consistency of Peace Island Policy	Construction of Navy Port VS Peace Island Policy	Context of USA Asian strategy Vs extending of peace buffer zone
Third Movements (Apr. 2005 ~Jan. 2007)	Military Bases Construction (Mt. Songak Airbase & Hwasoon Navy port)	Military Island with Modern Base (Port) VS Neutralized World Peace Island	Debates, Conferences, Alternative Suggestions, & Int'l Solidarity	Non Decision Task Forces Research on Navy Port Issue. "Special Military Bases Committee"	Military Bases Construction VS Peace Island Development Plan: Hwasoon Int'l Port & Songak Peace Garden	Neutralized Peace Island toward Neutralization of Korea (UTSK) : Korean Federalism

Source : created by author(2006).

Methods were found from the everyday life of ordinary people, as islanders had experienced violence, discrimination under Japanese military colonization (1910-1936), and the dreadful horror and traumatic tragedy of the military massacre operation from

the April Third Uprising under American military rule (August 1945-1948) and Korean martial law (August 1948-September 1954). They were anxious for nonviolent methods of protesting against plans to reinstate the Korean Air Forces base and Navy port onto Jeju Island. The adoption of consistent nonviolent struggles against military plans, not only create solidarity among citizens at the national level beyond limit of local region, but also keep the causes of anti-military movements legitimate and sustainable. During the last 20 years, Jeju Islanders have achieved their tradition of improving a peaceful culture by themselves through non violence struggles and movements.

Principle 1: Maintain non-violent methods

Non violence methods toward the genuine peace of everyday life situations of ordinary people make citizens overcome the violence of military bases and their militarization processes in island societies

Regarding feasible alternatives to people, at first islanders thought of the peace zone simply as a reaction against the military base issues during the first anti-military movements. Even though it was started as one slogan 'No Military Base in 1988, Yes Peace Zone', islanders tried to elaborate this alternative more and more through local election campaigns, conferences and research as an alternative to military bases. In 2000, after 12 years of efforts by islanders, the Korean government included one article in the Special Law for Development of Jeju Island that defined the designation of Jeju Island as World Peace Island.

When the issue of inviting the Navy port to Hwasoon was hot in the spring of 2002, islanders could suggest their feasible alternative against the plan of construction, because islanders recognized the peace island policy as a common feasible alternative at the local level. The Korean Defense ministry tried to invite the Hwasoon Navy port construction to islanders again in 2005 pursuing that, if islanders accepted this plan, it would bring positive economic effects to Jeju as a whole. Jeju islanders didn't accept this because it impeded their peace island policy to play a peaceful role in Northeastern Asia. It also didn't suggest clear evidence of future economic prosperity to islanders. As for economic benefits, they knew the Okinawan case witnessed economic predicaments rather than economic growth because of the establishment of military bases.

As confrontations among pro and anti groups against issues of military bases were

more and more inflamed, in mid-2005, the Jeju Provincial Government announced to postpone its debate and decision until the start of the Jeju Special Self-Governing Province because it judged islanders need considerable research and scrutinizing on the plan of military bases as a whole. Islanders recognized this kind decision of the governor as an act of non-decision because of the islanders' strong consensus towards a peace island policy. In my opinion, islanders successfully developed their simple slogan of "Yes, Peace Zone" into a feasible alternative as a policy agenda, with steady agreement of islanders at the local level. This is the second principle they have achieved after 20 years of efforts (Ko Changhoon, 2006a).

Principle 2: Share feasible alternatives with ordinary people

Commitments of suggesting and sharing feasible alternatives with ordinary people make policy agenda consensual against strong powers at the local level

To reach worldwide status as a peace island, the main issues should be clear for the objectives of Peace Island to be achieved, in order to get national and international agreement on it.

Even though islanders had success to reach consensus on the peace island policy against a military island by the Korean government through consistent non violence struggles at the local level, it is essential to obtain national and international agreements on their policy in order to achieve their goal.

The central Korean government designated Jeju Island as World Peace Island on January 27, 2005. Jeju Island has created the Jeju Peace Foundation in March of 2006. In addition, thorough efforts to tell the truth of the tragedy of the April Third Uprising (March 1947-September 1954) to Korean powers, islanders received an official apology from Korean President, Roh Moo Hyun in October of 2004 and April of 2006. Jeju also received support to construct the Jeju April Third Peace Park which supports peace island policy in developing Jeju Island as a center of improvement of human rights and peace for minority groups.

Internationally, Jeju Island, at first, focused on efforts for cooperative commitments on the tourism sector. It broadened its areas to the fields of environment, culture, and human rights. As for peace island policy, Jeju has recognized a significant concern on militarized Okinawa, Hawaii, and many islands in the Pacific. As it is worried about

the presentsituation of the creation of a military islands belt, such as the cases of Hawaii, Marshall Island, Guam, Saipan, and Okinawa, it will try to find a way on how to change military islands belt into a peace buffer zone.

Conflicts and tension between two Koreas still continue. Jeju has attempted to initiate and host warming programs between the two sides to foster peace and prosperity, such as many Summit talks on Jeju Island. It is a critical task for islanders to persuade the two Korean governments that it is beneficial for Jeju Island to promote peace and prosperity for the two Koreas, and the northeastern Asian bloc as a neutral peace island without military armed forces. If islanders have an agreement on the role

Table 2 : Axis of Evil, Sunshine, and Peace-zoning Policy towards North Korea

Name	Sunshine Policy	Axis of Evil Perspective	Peace-zoning Policy
Actors	Kim Daejung and his Korean democratic party group	George Bush and his neo conservative group of U.S.A	Ko Changhoon and his int'l island studies group
Contents and Characteristics	Support NK as an ethnic partner. Warming Program of Separating Families between two Koreas Mt. Keumgang Tour, Gaesung Business Project, Kyungi Railroad	Regard NK as potential enemy. Abolishment of nuclear and missile through raging attack or war the U.S. measures against the Banco Delta Asia	Recognize NK as realistic partner: Korean Federalism through Treaty: Peace-zoning Policy (Jeju Island & DMZ)
Highlight	North and South Korea Summit (June 15, 2002)	War against Iraq Trade, Financial, and Military Sanctions against NK	World Peace Island Policy (Jan. 27, 2005) : The September 19 joint statement by six parties talks (September 19, 2005).
Orientation	Peaceful Unification of Two Koreas	Breakdown of North Korea	United Three States of Korea (NK, SK, and JK) : Korean Federalism
Means	Dialogue, Détente, Assistance and Cooperation	Threatening hard rhetoric, carrot and stick policy	Commitments of DMZ Landmine Removal Project: Extending neutralized peace (buffer) zone to DMZ & Jeju Island

Source : created by author(2006).

of a neutral peace island from neighboring big countries such as the USA, mainland China, Russia, and Japan, its' peace island policy will gain momentum for getting international awareness. This would be similar to the role of Switzerland as a place of balance between Southern and Northern powers, and Costa Rica as a place of peace promotion among 6 countries in Central America. If islanders succeed with the Jeju Special Self-Governing Province in the near future, they expect it will push two Koreas into a "United Three States of Korea" (UTSK: South, North, and Jeju Island Korea), more neutral with limited and modern armed forces for peace and prosperity for the Asian community (Ko Changhoon, 2006b and Table 2: Axis of Evil, Sunshine, and Peace-zoning Policy towards North Korea).

Principle 3: Make main issue clear as one simple objective to be achieved nationally and internationally.

I have already suggested three peace island principles from three anti-military base movements on Jeju Island over the last 20 years (August 1988- July 2007). It reminds me of a dream of a famous scholar and novelist, Mr. Jiwon Park of the Chosun dynasty of the role of Jeju Island as Peace Island around 210 years ago. Surprisingly, he suggested criteria of how Jeju Island could be reached of its ideal role as Peace Island in his famous short novel titled "Biography on Hur Saeng". First of all Jeju Island should cultivate reliable manpower to construct a right society and build a sustainable economy system by themselves. After that, Jeju will be involved in business and trade with neighboring cities in Japan as one an international free city. As a result, Jeju should play a peaceful role to contribute to neighboring cities and countries as Peace Island. It's an obligation and right for islanders to reach their destination of Jeju Island as Peace Island (Ko Changhoon, 2006b).

This peace island idea shares with optimistic view of UN General Secretary, Mr. Ban Ki Moon said that the September 19 joint statement in 2005, itself a product of dialogue, has already provided all the parties in the region with the framework for engagement. Paragraph Four of the statement stipulates that "the six parties (are) committed to joint efforts for lasting peace and stability in Northeast Asia. The directly related parties will negotiate a permanent peace regime on the Korean Peninsula at an appropriate separate forum...the six-party talks is now the only multilateral security

process in Northeast Asia that brings together North Korea and the other major regional players to discuss a range of important issues. Although outstanding differences among the various participating countries still exist, for instance, in the countries' understanding of modern history, the talks may yet provide an essential foundation for the establishment of a permanent multilateral security cooperation mechanism in Northeast Asia parallels in Europe."

V. Conclusion

My main point is that it is possible that Jeju Island find its place in the sun as a World Peace Island beyond the dark historical waves of the Pacific Ocean in the 21st century. If we stop militarization processes of island societies of Northeastern Asia through the realistic movements of everyday life situations in the age of peace by world citizens and islanders, we can construct peaceful future of Jeju Island as a peace island in the Pacific. In exploring military hegemony between the US-Japan alliance and mainland China, islands are regarded as "militarized bases" for attack or defense of each other. So, its fate was always as a scapegoat after rivalry among big powers. As a result, islands were vulnerable regions to be invaded or occupied illegitimately. If we can make prospects by ourselves, the Jeju Islanders' anti-military base movements would be recognized to enjoy the right of self-determination rooted in citizenship to decide their path as citizens and subjects of building up a democratic and peaceful Asian Community. These kinds of movements and solidarity by world citizens fundamentally create a positive future for islands in Northeastern Asia. We must struggle against the illegitimacy of big powers through citizens' referendums, elections, and civil disobedience. This is in order to keep the original rights of island sovereignty, including environmental and cultural possessions, searching for ordinary happiness, and to achieve peace and security of island societies as world citizens. We can open more bright future for island societies in the midst of dark prospect of the Pacific region rather than present hard situation if we can implement these principles.

Reference

- Ban Ki Moon. (2006). For Permanent Peace Beyond the Nuclear Challenge and the Cold War (Korea Times: July 25,2006).
- Dietz, Kelly L. (2006). Peacetime Occupation and the Transformation of the State: Security and Peace in Island Societies (proceedings : 6-7, June, 2006, Seogwipo city, Korea).
- Herr, Richard (2006). The Changing Geopolitics of the Pacific Islands: Security and Peace in Island Societies (proceedings : 6-7, June, 2006, Seogwipo city, Korea).
- Jacobson, Marie (2006). the demilitarization of islands from the perspective of international law: Security and Peace in Island Societies (proceedings : 6-7, June, 2006, Seogwipo city, Korea).
- Katsifias, George (2006). Context and Logic of Human Rights Movements within Korean People's Uprisings : Cheju 1948 and 1980 : Security and Peace in Island Societies (proceedings : 6-7, June, 2006, Seogwipo city, Korea).
- Jeong Dai-Yeun. (2006). Environment as a Security: Security and Peace in Island Societies (proceedings : 6-7, June, 2006, Seogwipo city, Korea)
- Kajihiro Kyle. (2006). An Overview of the U.S. Military in Hawaii (March 6,2006) Unpublished article.
- Ko Chang-Hoon. (2006a). Jeju Island Anti-military Movements and Peace Zone Policy in the Context of Demilitarized Korea : Security and Peace in Island Societies (proceedings : 6-7, June, 2006, Seogwipo city, Korea)
- Ko Chang-Hoon. (2006b). Think about Preparation for an Age "The United Three States of Korea : NK, Sk, and JK". *The Voice of People (No.193 : Nov/Dec. 2006). pp.29-41.*
- McCall, Grant (2006). Rapanui and French militarization of French Polynesia : Security and Peace in Island Societies (proceedings : 6-7, June, 2006, Seogwipo city, Korea)
- Paige, Glenn D. (2006). Is a Nonkilling Island Society Possible? : Security and Peace in Island Societies (proceedings : 6-7, June, 2006, Seogwipo city, Korea).

[국문초록]

평화섬 개념과 평화지대 확장이론의 실제적 근원에 관한 연구: 제주 군사기지 반대운동을 중심으로(1988-2007)

고 창 훈

제주대학교 행정학과 교수

이 논문은 20년전 제주도의 송악산 군사기지 반대운동으로부터 생성된 평화섬 개념과 평화지대의 확장이론을 제시하고자 한다. 이러한 평화운동이 2005년 1월 27일 세계평화섬 지정의 한 근거이기도 하다. 따라서 본 논문은 반군사기지운동의 지역적 국가적 국제적 맥락과 그것이 갖는 평화지대의 확장적 의미를 제시한다. 이러한 평화지대의 확장이론이 남북한 간에 그리고 세계의 섬 지역 전반에 적용되고 국제사회의 지지를 받는다면 실질적인 평화론으로서의 의미를 갖는다는 것이 필자의 논지이다.

주제어 : 평화 섬, 평화지대론, 실질적인 근거