



**Media reporting of the 2018 Inter-Korean Summit
Peace Journalism, Peace Talks and the Two Korean Leaders**

A Research Paper presented by:

Eunhye Jo

Korea, Republic of

in partial fulfilment of the requirements for obtaining the degree of
MASTER OF ARTS IN DEVELOPMENT STUDIES

Major:

**Social Policy for Development
(SPD)**

Specialization:

Conflict and Peace Studies

Members of the Examining Committee:

Dr. Dubravka Zarkov

Dr. Shyamika Jayasundara-Smits

The Hague, The Netherlands
December 2018

Disclaimer:

This document represents part of the author's study programme while at the International Institute of Social Studies. The views stated therein are those of the author and not necessarily those of the Institute.

Inquiries:

International Institute of Social Studies
P.O. Box 29776
2502 LT The Hague
The Netherlands

t: +31 70 426 0460
e: info@iss.nl
w: www.iss.nl
fb: <http://www.facebook.com/iss.nl>
twitter: [@issnl](https://twitter.com/issnl)

Location:

Kortenaerkade 12
2518 AX The Hague
The Netherlands

Contents

<i>List of Tables</i>	<i>iv</i>
<i>List of Figures</i>	<i>iv</i>
<i>List of Appendices</i>	<i>iv</i>
<i>List of Acronyms</i>	<i>v</i>
<i>Abstract</i>	<i>vi</i>
Chapter 1 Introduction: Media Representation & the Korean Society	1
1.1 The Korean Peninsula's Past and Present	3
1.2 Research Questions and Objectives	6
1.3 Media Reporting Analysis Focused on the Korean Peninsula	7
1.4 My positionality	8
1.5 Scope and Limitation	8
Chapter 2 Theoretical and Methodological Perspectives	9
2.1 Theoretical perspectives: Representation and Peace Journalism Theory	9
2.2 Methodological Strategies: Framing and Categorization	11
2.3 Data Collection	12
Chapter 3 The <i>Hankyoreh</i>'s Peace Supportive Tone, Trust & Normalization Frame	13
3.1 Media reporting of Peace Negotiations	13
3.2 Media reporting of the Two Leaders	14
3.3 Visual and Textual Representations	17
3.4 Times and Places of Peace: Understanding and Peace Orientation	20
3.5 Clear <i>us</i> , vague <i>them</i> Categorization	22
Chapter 4 The <i>Chosunilbo</i>'s Neutral and Critical Tone, Distrust Frame	24
4.1 Media reporting of Peace Negotiations	24
4.2 Media reporting of the Two Leaders	25
4.3 Visual and Textual Representation	27
4.4 Times and Places of Truths: Distrust and Distrust	30
4.5 Vague <i>us</i> , clear <i>them</i> Categorization	32
Chapter 5 Conclusion: Beyond Peace Journalism	34
<i>Notes</i>	<i>37</i>
<i>References</i>	<i>38</i>
<i>Appendices 1: 18 news articles of news coverage</i>	<i>45</i>

List of Tables

Table 2.1 Peace/conflict Journalism vs War/violence Journalism	10
Table 3.1 Conflicts: Solution versus Victory as U.S. Foreign Policy Option	22

List of Figures

Figure 3.1 The image of a skyline of Pyongyang along the Taedong River	17
Figure 3.2 The image of the prior plenary session of the KCNA	18
Figure 3.3 The image of the third inter-Korean summit	19
Figure 4.1 The image of the prior plenary session of the KCNA	28
Figure 4.2 The image of the two leaders	28
Figure 4.3 The image of North Korean leader Kim Jong-un, July 14, 2017	29

List of Appendices

Appendices 1: 18 news articles of news coverage	45
---	----

List of Acronyms

CVID	Complete, Verifiable and Irreversible Denuclearization
DMZ	Demilitarized Zone
IAEA	International Atomic Energy Agency
JSA	Joint Security Area
KCTV	Korean Central Television
KMA	Korea Meteorological Administration
KWPCC	Korean Workers' Party Central Committee
IMF	International Monetary Fund
PCOWG	PyeongChang Olympic Winter Games
UN	United Nations
UNCMC	United Nations Command Military Armistice Commission
UNSC	United Nations Security Council

Abstract

The research aims to examine the current South Korean leading media outlets' English news articles which closely deal with the third inter-Korean summit (April 27, 2018). By examining textual and visual representation, the research attempts to read the mainstream media agencies' socio-political standpoints provided to the public. Particularly, the research maps out media reporting based on 1) Stuart Hall's Representation theory – which deconstructs the old definition of representation as to re-present and reconstructs it into what stands for; and 2) Peace Journalism theory, which considers journalists as proactive agents in the conflict/war situations who can create peace opportunities rather than concentrating on war and victory. Although Cold War-oriented journalism has been prevalent in the South Korean media environment owing to the Korean War, media workers have been striving to subvert the out-of-date biased journalism. In the context of North Korea's pledge to the denuclearization process and the ongoing inter-Korean high-level dialogues, the research aims to read how the two leading media agencies present the peace dialogue to the international and domestic audience. The study makes use of framing and categorizing to analyze the reporting of the peace negotiations and the two Koreas' leaders. Finally, the research seeks to provide policy lessons beyond peace journalism.

Relevance to Development Studies

Ample historical examples prove that media practices have the capability to halt and prevent insecurity and violent conflict. Depending on who, what, where, when, how media spotlight on the events, the events become visible or hidden. Thus, media have power to, directly and indirectly, involve the political discourse on conflict resolution. Since the two Koreas only signed the armistice agreement after the Korean War, the two governments have been struggling somewhere between conflict and peace. South Korean media have been playing a pivotal role in setting public agenda – while being constantly pressured by powerful institutions. To tackle the various challenges, move on from the deadlock of the past and promote peace on the Korean peninsula, media have an expansive responsibility to represent the various aspects of the current conflict-peace scenario. More importantly, media give the societal context to the audience to encourage and participate in the political decision, leading to individuals' empowerment and the development of society. For instance, critical examining media representation in the conflict situation is a monitoring peace negotiation activity, and it enhances the good governance. Thus, when media reporting is proactively consistent to fight for seeking the voice of voiceless, it will gain constructive shifting implications. Therefore, the media reporting analysis of this historic event is a juncture at which the social and political context can be put forward to promote a further discussion on the possibility of peace rather than conflict.

Keywords

Media reporting, Representation, Inter-Korean Summit, Peace journalism, Categorization, Methodological objectivity

Chapter 1

Introduction: Media Representation & the Korean Society

Prominent media scholars have stated that the media has the power to create public views and plays a pivotal role in setting the agenda, whilst at the same times being influenced by powerful institutions such as government agencies (Bennett and Paletz 1994; Holbrooke 1999; Herman and Chomsky 2010). Scholars have studied vast amounts of media discourses to understand the social climate. Notably, the media's role in the Republic of Korea has been essential in shifting power dynamics both implicitly and explicitly. The impeachment of South Korea's President, Park Geun-hye's in March 2017 is one exemplary case. After South Korean leading news agencies broke the corruption scandal, the media appeared to have sparked the candlelight of revolution. Political discourse brought remarkable changes, which were hardly predicted to happen: President Park was ousted and after the emergency election, current President Moon Jae-in was elected in May 2017.

Another recent noteworthy case which, demonstrates the impact of the media, concerns North Korea's denuclearization deal. The South Korean public is sensitive about this issue because the deal directly brings changes to social protection, social security net, taxation system, and so on. Concerning this, the opposition party made use of falsely representing fact of unification estimate while questioning and criticizing the President Moon's approach toward North Korea. The spokesperson of the opposition party Jang Je-won briefed an estimated North Korean denuclearization abandonment cost like \$2 trillion – referring to the research findings of the US economic journal *Fortune* and British Eurizon Capital Institute. However, *Bloomberg* originally wrote the article. *Fortune* used *Bloomberg*'s full text with the title “Peace in North Korea Could Cost \$2 Trillion if History is a Guide” (Enda 2018). What is more misleading is its estimate calculation, which was not about nuclear abandonment cost, but on the estimated reunification cost.¹ Meanwhile, other South Korean media agencies produced a massive number of articles on the falsely represented news. Notably, South Korean news outlets have been working firmly within the conservatives-liberals spectrum about North Korean issues. Choi (2010) found the existence of this conservative-liberal spectrum in respect of six South Korean mainstream news agencies' articles. Therefore, it is questionable whether media reporting posits between the conservatives-liberals gamut to go beyond the Cold War-oriented lines of journalism.

The focus of this research is media representation of the third inter-Korean summit, held on April 27, 2018. 2,833 reporters from 348 agencies including South Korean and 34 overseas countries reported from the Cheongwadae² News-Press Centre to deliver information on the third inter-Korean Summit (Preparatory Committee for the 2018 Inter-Korean Summit 2018). The summit was in the spotlight all over the world. In this regard, the South Korean Press clubs and a number of journalists have reflected on their media reporting of North Korea. They admit that media outlets have a deep-seated Cold War-orientation to journalism, which is based on War/Violence Journalism. This reflective psychology drove the journalists' committee to confront and deal with the journalistic ills since long ago. Consequently, three associations – National Union of Media workers, Journalists Association of Korea, and Korean Producers and Directors' Association – organized “The reporting and production standing rules for peaceful unification and inter-Korean reconciliation, cooperation”³ (National Union of Media workers et

al. 1995). These rules aimed at preparing mutual respect and peaceful unification in order to have a better understanding of the two Koreas' respective systems and cultures. Despite their effort to make a robust initiative by proclaiming to cast off the out-of-date biased journalism, recent research (Ha and Lee 2012) shows that Cold War seated journalism is still prevalent. That is, South Korean media is entrenched in old anti-communist habitual practices, promoting distrust and confrontation of societal climates rather than encouraging a peaceful atmosphere. For these reasons, analyzing media representation of the third inter-Korean summit is a crucial task. How can this be achieved? Galtung (2013) introduce a particularly useful tool: peace journalism, which can be used analyze media representation in the Korean peninsula. Indeed, the main principles of the standing guidelines and Johan Galtung's 'peace journalism' have many commonalities.

The recent balmy breeze in inter-Korean relations is another reason to look into the current media reporting of inter-Korean relations. (Relatively) Peaceful relations on the Korean peninsula is not a comet coming out of nowhere. The so-called dramatic shift in the inter-Korean ties is the outcome of a steady policy commitment and effort to promote change in the unfavorable international and domestic environment, since the inter-Korean relations are part of international, historical and political stakeholders' dialogues. South Korean President Moon Jae-in has been expressing his political will to improve inter-Korean relations since his inauguration. He believes that enhancing the two Koreas' relation is a stepping-stone towards North Korea's denuclearization and opening up to international society. Thus, he has called attention to a sustainable, peaceful unification policy and for prosperity on Korean peninsula. Media outlets have been widely reporting on his proactive approach. Therefore, analyzing media reporting of the third inter-Korean summit has a significant role in understanding the past, the current and the future policies and politics, as well as media policies, on the Korean peninsula.

This research will map out two popular South Korean English language newspapers' reporting of the two Koreas' relations, taking Johan Galtung (2013)'s peace journalism perspective. Furthermore, the research seeks to find out how the media frames the peace negotiations and its two leaders, by analyzing both textual and visual material. Stuart Hall's theory of media representation inspired this research and plays a foundational role in my analysis of the texts and images from news articles.

The paper is organized into five chapters. In chapter 1, I present the impact of media reporting in South Korea's societal context, which serves as a justification for this research. I bring the Korean peninsula's historical background which is related to two superpowers. I state the research questions and objectives including my ethical concerns, positionality and the limitation of the research scope. In chapter 2, I indicate the theoretical perspective – representation theory and peace journalism – as well as methods, including data collection methods, content analysis as an analytical tool, and framing and categorization. In chapters 3 and 4, I answer the research questions by reflecting on the two media agencies' reporting on the summit. Lastly, in chapter 5, I summarize the findings of the research and main theoretical and policy lessons. Furthermore, I bring in policy implications, which aims to go beyond peace journalism in the current South Korean journalism context.

1.1 The Korean Peninsula's Past and Present

Proxy War: Divided Peninsula

On August 15, 1945, the Korean peninsula regained independence from Japan. The Soviet army, which participated in the war against Japan landed in Pyongyang on August 22, and American troops landed in Seoul on September 8, 1945. Two different perspectives towards the democracy of these two superpowers resulted in a stalemate, dividing Korea at the 38th parallel. There was no interchange between the two Koreas. The Soviet Union did not accept the establishment of a unified Korean government except under communist administration. Conflicting interests of the two superpowers led to a deadlock. Finally, in 1947 the US gave up the previous initiative to unify the two Koreas and accepted the partition. The United Nations (UN) voted on a bill to hold the election in Korea and composed the election committee. The Soviet Union's refusal to allow the UN to enter into the northern part of Korea resulted in elections being held only in the southern part in May 1948. The UN General Assembly acknowledged the elected South Korean government. In September 1948, general elections were held in the northern part of Korea, with Kim Il-Sung and the communists seizing power under the Soviet Union's strong protection. The UN advised withdrawal of American troops from South Korea in December 1948 (Truman 1952). The Soviet Union proclaimed that their army would withdraw at the same time, but antagonism was accumulating against the US.

The speech of Dean Gooderham Acheson, the US Minister of Defense, at the US Press Club, in January 1950, was a turning point for all powers in the Korean peninsula. The speech was a proclamation of the US's defense line from the Pacific to the Aleutian archipelago, Okinawa of Japan and the Philippines, to avert the possibility of a Stalin and Mao military offense. Acheson stressed that the *Crisis in Asia* required US intervention, and the speech aimed at building US support in South Korea. Apart from South Korea, the US planned to implement the Truman administration's new China policy after the Chinese Civil War, especially regarding the Communists' victory against the Democrats. The speech insisted that the US did not have any predatory plans in respect of Chinese territory. However, the US broke off military aid and advice to Chiang Kai-shek's government, continuing economic aid to Taiwan (Matray 2002). There were no guarantees to South Korea and Taiwan's security as the Acheson line excluded the Korean peninsula and Taiwan.

North Korean leader, Kim Il-sung wanted Stalin to mount a military offensive against South Korea. Stalin rejected his idea for three different reasons: 1) the South Korean army was much bigger than the North Korean army, 2) the presence of US armed forces in South Korea, and 3) the 38th parallel line was still valid between the US and the Soviet Union. Though Kim Il-Sung's several attempts to get Stalin's consent failed, he received substantial military support from the Soviet Union (Weathersby 1993). Stalin wanted Kim Il-Sung to wait for a better moment. However, even before the official outbreak of war, there were continuous battles between the two Koreas' armies near Mt. Songak, Kaesong – sometimes extending to Ongjin in Hwanghae province.

On June 25, 1950, North Korea invaded South Korea with a surprise attack over the 38th parallel by land and air forces. The US immediately called the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) to adopt a resolution demanding the withdrawal of North Korean troops. The UN convened to discuss the issues between the two Koreas and voted Resolution S/RES/82 (1950)

demanding immediate cessation of the fighting and withdrawal to the 38th parallel (UNSC 1950). On June 29, 1950, General MacArthur arrived in Suwon's airfield where he met with South Korean President Rhee, Syngman and a diplomat of the US embassy in Seoul and approved the destruction of North Korea's Airfield (Appleman 1992). On July 7, the UNSC sent UN troops to the Korean peninsula to fight off a North Korean invasion. The majority of the troops consisted of US soldiers and a very small percentage of fifteen other states "Australia, Belgium, Canada, Colombia, Ethiopia, France, Greece, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, New Zealand, the Philippines, Thailand, Turkey and the UK" (United States Forces Korea n.d.). Apart from that, there was medical support from five other states (Denmark, India, Italy, Norway, and Sweden) (Ibid.). Russia, China and North Korea regarded the UN's decision as unjust and boycotted the Security Council meetings.

On September 15, 1950, General MacArthur successfully led the Incheon Landing Operations, and it was a breakthrough for the South Korean military to take Seoul back from North Korea and enter the North afterwards. On October 20, South Korean military reached Pyongyang, the capital of North Korea. But on October 28, China entered the war as an ally of North Korea. The battles on the ground were joined by the air force, leading to heavy bombardments of the peninsula. As no winner was in sight, a ceasefire and peace talks were proposed, but the battles continued with France entering the war as well. Finally, on July 27, 1953, the two Koreas agreed on an armistice. However, actual peace was never signed on. Instead, the peninsula remained divided, and a Demilitarized Zone (DMZ) was created between the two countries.

Between Conflict and Peace

Since the armistice of 1953, the two Koreas have made several attempts to unify or communicate with each other. North Korea kept trying to communicate with South Korea through a number of ways – such as sending relief goods following a natural disaster in South Korea, suggesting cultural/author/students exchange programs, and holding meetings for inter-Korean politicians/financiers, especially in early 60s. Broadly speaking, North Korea had been emphasizing three things mainly: a) to unify as one Korea but exclusively under the North Korean communist system – which included the elimination of South Korean political leaders who were aligned with the US (Jeon 2002) b) isolating South Korea from the international society with a strong criticism of the US's intervention in South Korea – referred to as the US's colonization (Ibid.). North Korea resented US-South Korea and South Korea-US-Japan cooperation, proposing a US military withdrawal from the South Korean territory instead. Finally, c) weakening the anti-communism atmosphere in South Korea. In January 1968 thirty-one North Korean special force commandos tried to invade the Cheongwadae in order to assassinate President Park Jung-hee but failed. The same year, they sent about 120-armed soldiers to the East coast of South Korea. In 1969, a North Korean man hijacked a Korean Air flight and it landed in North Korea instead of its destination (Ibid.).

Notwithstanding the episodes mentioned above, the interactions between the two Koreas are ongoing – such as the inter-Korean Red Cross talks in 1971 (Song 2013) and the July 4, 1972 South-North Joint Statement – but it was purposively for the East-West détente (Lim 2010: 154). The aim was to keep pace with the international environment which was the Nixon

administration's effort (Kim 2010). After South Korea's temporary appeasement policy towards North Korea, it subsequently maintained a hardline. This intransigent policy went along with Park Jung-hee's successful October restoration in 1972 and continued throughout his term in office. In spite of the subsequent military administration, and despite the Chun Doo-hwan and Roh Tae-woo governments, had made diplomatic efforts to seek interaction with North Korea – i.e. through international sports events and the promotion of a summit – tensions persisted on the Korean peninsula. One of the sensational incidents was another Korean Air hijacking in 1987 by a North Korean man to threaten South Korea's security. Considering that a) the Presidential election was about to happen in December 1987 and b) South Korea was about to hold the 1988 Seoul Olympics, the hijacking unfolded at a very critical time. Korean people have been witnessing this cycle of conflict and peace for decades. Thus, the inter-Korean summit in 2018, is regarded as one of the political milestones in the countries' relations.

There were three critical attempts to end the war officially with the signing of the peace accord and discussing unification. The first was in the year 2000. South Korea's domestic, economic and political situations were facing a new phase, for instance, the ruling party became the minority for the first time in the general election (Ha 2001). South Korean society was in the midst of uncertainty of the future, after having suffered the Asian Financial Crisis in 1997 and received a bailout from the International Monetary Fund (IMF). In the aftermath of the financial crisis, South Korea was in the phase of restructuring its financial, corporate, labor and public sectors (Ha 2001). While South Korea was experiencing the Asian Financial Crisis, President Kim Dae-Jung (1998-2003) flew to Pyongyang for the first inter-Korean summit, between 13 and 15 June 2000. This was to a large extent “a historic, uncertain, unknown, symbolic, introductory, general and tension-reducing event” (Moon 2007: 77). It led to President Kim Dae-jung receiving a Nobel Peace Prize. The result of the first inter-Korean summit was the Joint declaration. Kim Dae-jung and the Minister of Defense of the People's Democratic Republic of Korea, Kim Jong-il agreed to find a solution for reunification by independent two Koreas' effort; ease military tensions; promote peace on the Korean peninsula; exchange separated families visits for humanitarian purposes; consolidate the South's and North's mutual trust by cooperating in cultural, sports, health, environmental and other fields; and to proceed further with meetings expeditiously. However, not much came out of it in practice.

The South Korean President Roh Moo-hyun travelled to Pyongyang overland from 2-4 October 2007 for the second summit. He became the first South Korean President to “cross the military demarcation line” (Moon 2007: 78). The second inter-Korean summit resulted in another declaration, which was considered “concrete and specific” (Moon 2007: 78) – with five broad and 45 specific items, dealing with the two Koreas' working level officers, including the countries' leaders (Moon 2007). President Roh emphasized three principles: 1) North Korea's denuclearization, 2) transition from armistice to permanent peace, and 3) reduction of military tension between the two Koreas, during the summit. North Korea's response was in agreement with President Roh's suggestions (Moon 2007). The Roh administration's aim to bring permanent peace to the Korean peninsula and its fundamental principles were not much different from the earlier Kim Dae-jung administration's policies; preventing wars on the peninsula, alleviating military tensions, and pragmatically improving relations between the Koreas. However, an additional element was North Korea's development of nuclear weapons, further complicating

attempts to reach permanent peace (Lim 2010). However, like the first summit, no further concrete results came out of this one either.

It took more than a decade for the third summit to happen. Between 9 and 25 February 2018, the PyeongChang Olympic Winter Games (PCOWG) were held in South Korea. A number of important high-level dialogues between the two Koreas and other powers were reported in the media preceding the games. Among them, the Korean Workers' Party Central Committee's (KWPPC) first Vice Director - known as North Korea's most powerful woman politician - Kim Yo-jong and representatives from the North visited South Korea to participate in the opening ceremony and delivered Kim Jong-un's autographed letter to South Korean President Moon Jae-in. Between the two Koreas, rapprochement has formed, and peace talks were re-started. During this time the media was active in releasing the news as it was happening. The summit of the two Korean leaders was held on 27 April 2018 in Panmunjom, the Joint Security Area (JSA) of South Korea and seemed to have come as a surprising result of the preparations for the Olympic Games. Although much animosity has been expressed in the months preceding the Games, talks had been held between the diplomats of the two countries, with South Korean President Moon holding peace talks and stabilization of relations with North Korea as one of his central political goals. The summit offered a great opportunity for the media to engage in reporting and ultimately representing the event and its protagonists.

1.2 Research Questions and Objectives

The main objective of this research is to analyze how media represented the relations between the two Koreas one week before, during and after the third inter-Korean summit in April 2018. The summit itself was a multi-symbolic, historic, political, economic and cultural event, not only for South and North Koreans but also for people all over the world. Furthermore, this research paper aims to promote media literacy by engaging with peace journalism and providing a theoretical perspective by applying framing and categorization as analytical tools on media texts and images. The broader objective of the present study is to analyze the extent to which the media helps to give insights into imperative realities and trends to the general public (Kellner 2003). Furthermore, this study considers the aspect of peace journalism and its potential to contribute to peace on the Korean peninsula. To achieve its objectives this research responds to the following main question:

How did two mainstream, English language South Korean media outlets represent the summit of the two Koreas?

The paper will also answer the following sub-questions:

- 1) How did the two papers frame the peace negotiations?
- 2) How did the two papers categorize the North and South Korean leaders?
- 3) To what extent did visual and textual representations work together?
- 4) In what ways are frames related to peace journalism? Are they supporting values which are promoted by peace journalism?

1.3 Media Reporting Analysis Focused on the Korean Peninsula

There is ample research regarding inter-Korean relations since North Korea is geographically the only neighboring and historically complicated sibling/enemy of South Korea, however there are not many studies on the media's representation of inter-Korean relations. The lack of media studies may be due to the fact that the inter-Korean summits to date have happened in recent times (2000, 2007, and 2018). Among these valuable studies, I would like to introduce a media studies approach, which takes as its subject North Korea, its leader and inter-Korean relations.

It took nearly half a century to hold the first historical inter-Korean summit (June 13-15, 2000) after a truce being signed in July 27, 1953. Lee's research (2000) in particular dealt with the media reporting of the first inter-Korean summit with a focus on the image of North Korea and its Supreme Leader Kim Jong-il. He unpacked prime time news channels of the three South Korean main broadcasting companies: *KBS*, *MBC*, *SBS* between June 13 and June 17, 2000. The number of summit news items was 374 out of the total 467 news items (79.66%). Reporting about the North changed to a positive tone during and after the summit, in sharp contrast with before the summit. Interestingly, there were no reports with an entirely negative tone among the 170 items. There were only five items, which were reported in a partially negative tone. The research shows that media reporting portrayed North Korea as an *open*, *modest*, and *rational counterpart*. The concept of *we-identity* was recognized regardless of the character of news. Media reporting of Kim Jong-il had a similar result. All of the 25 news items on him explicitly reported him as *amicable*, *rational*, *identical*, *moderate* and *open*. The three news channels framed three of his different features: 1) *stout* – big gestures, loud voice: 2) *polite*⁴, *delicate and thoughtful* toward President Kim Dae-jung, who was 18 years his senior, and: 3) *open and flexible* (Lee 2000). Thus, media reporting of North Korea during the first inter-Korean summit was especially promoting a positive tone towards North Korea.

Dai and Hyun (2010) researched the North Korean nuclear test media coverage of dominant media outlets: the US-based *Associated Press (AP)*, Chinese outlet *Xinhua* and South Korea's *Yonhap*. Dai and Hyun (2010) made use of the media package approach which associates framing and in-depth cultural and structural perspectives (Ibid.). The relevance of Dai and Hyun's study is twofold. On the one hand, Dai and Hyun (2010) pay direct attention to North Korean nuclear issues – which is close to my interests in reporting peace negotiations between the two leaders, including nuclear disarmament. On the other hand, the study also includes one of South Korea's leading English language news outlets. A great number of non-Korean media outlets' framing analysis and media coverage has been analyzed, but there are not many pieces of research, which deals with South Korean English language media. The result of Dai and Hyun's (2010) analysis shows a pattern whereby the more security threats appear in the media, the more supportive ground is created for the government. The study used the example of the state power of the US, to show that when the framing of terror attacks is exposed more often in the media, the state power of the US gains more leverage to exercise its power (Dai and Hyun 2010). The research also drew attention to the nuclear threat as a regional level issue and, the three agencies used the threat in different frames. Of the three agencies, the South Korean agency *Yonhap*, in particular, used the Cold War legacy frame. Notwithstanding Herman and Chomsky's arguments that the anti-communist trend has weakened after the collapse of the Soviet Union and the physical absence of communist states (Herman and Chomsky 2010: XVII), one of the South Korean leading news agencies kept the Cold War legacy alive, showing the "reemerging confrontation of

old ideological and military rivalry established during the Cold War era” (Dai and Hyun 2010: 313). In the meantime, *AP* used a domestic *War on Terror* framework, while *Xinhua* used a negotiating and conflict-solving framework.

1.4 My positionality

I posit myself as a cautious and critical Korean reunification supporter for the long-term goal. Considering that I specialize in Conflict and Peace Studies, as well as majoring in Social Policy for Development, I aim for my research paper to contribute to promoting media literacy for international readers. Besides that, I would like an opportunity to review the current media representation in two leading media agencies and find out the policy implications. I am also interested in peace journalism and its practical uses regarding inter-Korean relations in the conflict and peace context. I am not subscribing to, nor supporting either of the two media agencies I analyze here.

1.5 Scope and Limitation

While both agencies initially started publishing in Korean, they subsequently included regular publication in English, Chinese and Japanese. The present study will focus on the English version of the two major South Korean newspaper agencies. Thus, the intended readership is different from their Korean language publications. Readership is considered as the audience of a newspaper and may have different characteristics, such as class, gender, place of residence etc. I have contacted each agency to inquire whether they have valid readership research. Unfortunately, such research was not conducted due to a shortage of budget and human resources of the media agencies.

Chapter 2

Theoretical and Methodological Perspectives

2.1 Theoretical perspectives: Representation and Peace Journalism Theory

Representation Theory

Stuart Hall's seminal work on representation theory (1997) inspired this research. Thus, throughout the paper, his theory will be the canvas of the research work. Hall tried to subvert the old definition of representation as re-present; to present, to image, purporting the accuracy with the new definition of *what stands for*.

Representation is the production of meaning through language. In representation, constructionists argue, we use signs, organized into languages of different kinds, to communicate meaningfully with others. Language can use signs to symbolize, stand for or reference objects, people and events in the so-called 'real' world. But they can also reference imaginary things and fantasy worlds or abstract ideas which are not in any obvious sense part of our material world. [...] Meaning is produced within language, in and through various representational systems which, for convenience, we call 'languages'. Meaning is produced by the practice, the 'work' of representation (Hall 1997: 28).

Hall insists that representation is an interpretation of image, it is intellectual power work – that is, it is on all occasions linked to power plays. On that account, representation is the process of producing and exchanging meanings which are *not fixed/stable*, but *changeable* depending on culture, language, signs and images we use. Applying his theory to the analysis of the media representation of the third inter-Korean summit will mean having a good grasp of the meaning-producing processes. He notes that representational strategies are the most important function of representation with linguistic, social, cultural and psychoanalytic grounds (Ibid.). The relation of the two Koreas represents the complexities faced by multiple sides. Even though the two Koreas are technically at war, the two different countries are from one dynasty. Thus, their relation is fluid enough to consider the two Koreas simultaneously as having *one/same* or *similar* cultures and *two/different* cultures, depending on *actors, actions, time/place* or *social events* by *multi-actors* and *internal/international environment*. Hence, analyzing the production of difference, present in the South Korean mainstream media outlets, contributes to understanding what role power plays among diverse actors on the Korean peninsula – one of which is the media. For that reason, the question of us/them in media representation will be central, aided by the analytical tool of categorization.

Peace Journalism Theory

As noted earlier, public perception can be affected by the media. The impact of media can classify conflicts differently according to certain political and societal climates (Bläsi 2004). The news media are mostly prompted to focus more on events than processes. Unusual, dramatic and conflict aspects can "make [the] negotiation process more difficult" (Wolfsfeld 1997: 64). Peace activities are hard to pass through the gatekeepers considering that violent conflicts provide more short-term incidents, happenings and events. On the contrary, peace is a long-term process.

Therefore, it is appropriate to shed light on the current media reporting of the conflict situation on the Korean peninsula, particularly through the Peace Journalism theory.

Peace Journalism tenets coined by the renowned conflict and peace studies scholar, Johan Galtung, contributes to understanding the peace-keeping and peace-making process towards a peaceful settlement of conflicts (Hanitzsch 2004). According to the author, peace journalism is about how the press can transcend peace news when reporting them from conflict zones. Hence, peace journalism is the central analytical starting point as it offers – official and unofficial - policy guidance for journalists reporting political crises and (violent) conflicts. “Peace journalism stands for truth as opposed to propaganda and lies, but is not 'investigative journalism' in the sense that it uncovers lies only on 'our' side. Truth holds for all sides – just like exploration of the conflict formation – and gives voice ('glasnost') to all” (Galtung and Fischer 2013: 97). As mentioned in the previous chapter, mass media have shaped in manifold ways the two Koreas’ relation and the two Korean leaders. The present research looks at the textual and visual data through peace journalism theoretical perspective. The research then views this data using four different Peace Journalism lenses, namely, *Peace/Conflict-oriented*, *Truth-oriented*, *People-oriented*, and *Solution-oriented*. The aim is to examine whether and to what extent the selected media outlets are peace journalism-oriented and to address any policy implications that can follow the analysis. In addition, peace journalism corresponds well with framing as a second analytical method used in this research (next to categorization).

Table 2.1
Peace/conflict Journalism vs War/violence Journalism

Peace/conflict journalism	War/violence journalism
<p><i>I. Peace/Conflict-oriented</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explore conflict formation; x parties, y goals, z issues; general “win-win” orientation • Open space, open time; causes and outcomes anywhere also in history/culture • Making conflicts transparent • Giving voice to all parties; empathy, understanding • See conflict/war as problem, focus on conflict creativity • Humanization of all sides; more so the worse the weapons • Proactive: prevention before any violence/war occurs • Focus on invisible effects of violence (trauma and glory, damage to structure/culture) 	<p><i>I. War/Violence-oriented</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on conflict arena, two parties, on goal (win), war general zero-sum orientation • Closed space, closed time; causes and exists in arena, who threw the first stone • Making wars opaque/secret • “Us-them” journalism, propaganda, voice, for “us” • See “them” as the problem, focus on who prevails in war • Dehumanization of “them”; more so the worse the weapon • Reactive: waiting for violence before reporting • Focus only on visible effect of violence (killed, wounded and material damage)
<p><i>II. Truth-oriented</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expose untruths on all sides • Uncover all cover-ups 	<p><i>II. Propaganda-oriented</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expose “their” untruths • Help “our” cover-ups/lies
<p><i>III. People-oriented</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on suffering all over; on women, aged, children, giving voice to the voiceless • Give name to all evil-doers • Focus on people peacemakers 	<p><i>III. Elite-oriented</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on “our” suffering; on able-bodied elite males, being their mouth-piece • Give name of their evil-doer • Focus on elite peacemakers

IV. *Solution-oriented*

- Peace = non-violence + creativity
- Highlight peace initiatives, also to prevent more war
- Focus on structure, culture, the peaceful society
- Aftermath: resolution, re-construction, reconciliation

IV. *Victory-oriented*

- Peace = victory + ceasefire
- Conceal peace-initiative, before victory is at hand
- Focus on treaty, institution the controlled society
- Leaving for another war, return if the old flares up

Source (Galtung 2003: 178)

2.2 Methodological Strategies: Framing and Categorization

Framing and Categorization Analysis within Peace Journalism Values

The research is concerned with studying how South Korean major news media highlighted the two Koreas' relations in their English language platforms⁵. The present research carefully examines whether the values of peace journalism exist in the selected newspapers' texts and images. The research questions are examined by applying two specific analytical tools: *framing* and *categorization* – which allow an engagement with the political and ideological representation of texts and images. The linguistic reflection is used to probe the relationship between textual and visual representations. With regards to framing Entman notes a:

frame is to select some aspects of a perceived reality and make them more salient in a communicating text, in such a way as to promote a particular problem defining, causal interpretation, moral evaluation, and/or treatment recommendation for the item described (Entman 1993: 52).

Entman explains that frame “defines the problem and agent with what costs and benefits, diagnose causes, make moral judgments, and suggest remedies” (Ibid.). There are two models of framing: deductive and inductive. The deductive model applies general premises – such as a certain number of framing exists in representing news – to reach logical conclusions. Reliable framings should be set out as the prerequisite of the research in order to carry out the deductive methodology – e.g., Iyengar (1990)'s thematic and episodic frame research. On the contrary, the inductive model analyses all the samples. Framing is then extracted afterwards from the analysis of loosely set frames. Since it can be difficult to replicate its application to all the samples (Semetko and Valkenburg 2000), the inductive model is based on a small sample study. This approach has the merit of possibility to extract more frames. This research applies the inductive model, focusing on a relatively small number of texts and images.

The present study pays attention to the boundaries between *us* and *them* – or *similarity* and *difference* – known as the *us and them categorization* (Leudar et al. 2004). Such categorization is useful in the lexical choices for labeling. The *categorization* is defined as the work of classifying protagonists into specific groups – since categories can be used to seek justification of action by categorized members. “Categorization provides moral accounts of past actions and prepare the ground for the future violence – presentations and actions are closely related” (Leudar et al. 2004: 244).

This study cautiously scrutinizes how the leaders of the two Koreas and other actors of the negotiations are reported on by the use of language and images. Such classification was often witnessed in the media coverage, especially during international sports events' broadcasting (Lee and Maguire 2011; Cho 2009).

2.3 Data Collection

The Hankyoreh and the Chosunilbo

The *Hankyoreh* was independently inaugurated in 1988 by journalists who had been dismissed from previous workplaces in the media sector. Because of its work to fight for freedom of expression and full-fledged democracy, the *Hankyoreh* explicitly promotes the “peaceful coexistence and national reconciliation between South and North Korea” (“The *Hankyoreh*’ n.d.). In contrast with traditional Korean newspapers, the agency is not owned by a specific person, family, or large enterprises, but by approximately eight hundred shareholders. The *Chosunilbo* – founded in 1920 – has been one of the leading conservative newspaper agencies in South Korea with the largest circulation. Initially, the agency was critical towards the Japanese government while Korea was under Japanese colonization in 1930s and 1940s. Because of progressive articles against the Japanese government to fight for Korean citizens’ freedom, the editor and the publisher were arrested, and the *Chosunilbo* was suspended for a certain time. Since the publisher changed to Bang Eung-mo, the agency’s political alignment became conservative (“The *Chosunilbo*’ n.d.).

Sampling

The research uses the data extracted from each of the publishers’ English web services. I used the key-word for search - ‘Korean summit’, on each website, from April 20 until May 4 of 2018. Note the summit took place on April 27, 2018. The result of the key-word search ‘Korean summit’ within the selected research period produced 77 articles in the *Hankyoreh* and 54 articles in the *Chosunilbo*. Among these, I excluded editorials, interview special articles as well as re-published articles from other media outlets – e.g., the *VOA* news from the *Chosunilbo* websites. Such a selection has been made to focus solely on the two media outlets’ own contributions. While the range of topics covered in the 131 articles is wide, I focused on nine articles in each media outlet that have addressed the same/similar contents or events. For instance, I selected articles from both agencies that focus on the Korean leaders. Furthermore, I chose articles reporting on the inter-Korean summit day (i.e. 27 April) and North Korea’s announcement of the two-track policy changes plan. The present study carefully analyzes these 18 news articles based on a set of questions that support the investigation into framing and categorization: who the actors of reported news are; what they are doing (what are their actions); how the actions are described; and in what time and place are the actors and actions situated. Particular attention is given to the use of language.

Chapter 3

The *Hankyoreh*'s Peace Supportive Tone, Trust & Normalization Frame

The research shows that the *Hankyoreh* frames North Korea as a *trustable counterpart*, and *our companion*. Undoubtedly, every article is written along the same line, with Peace Journalism values. An April 20th article (Appendix 1.1) delivers President Moon's viewpoint of North Korea as an actor who has a strong will to change the current standoff. Another article published April 23rd (Appendix 1.2) is charged with optimistic and critical views about North Korea's denuclearization announcement as a strategic change of the regime. The article also reports the US and the South Korean government's reactions as transparent informants. An article published April 25th (Appendix 1.3) makes obvious use of a supportive tone in respect of President Moon through the journalist's own interpretation of the current administration's difficulties and strategic plans on the inter-Korean relations. It is worth observing what the journalist's stand point is on understanding the Basic Agreement (1991) and is particularly thought-provoking to describe North Korea's historical understanding of the agreement. Two more articles, published April 27th (Appendix 1.5) and 28th (Appendix 1.6) respectively closely cover the third inter-Korean summit. They make frequent use of the two leaders' direct quotes from their introductory remarks at the summit.

In general, the articles explicitly focus on President Moon's promising and optimistic predictions and on the sincere support to North Korea's willingness to denuclearize. Similarly, the April 26th (Appendix 1.4) and 30th articles (Appendix 1.8) clearly present President Moon's hardworking character in exploring peace formation by referring to every relevant party as well as to the peaceful Korean peninsula goals, denuclearization issues and the general win-win – bustling to share North Korea's sincerity over denuclearization while appealing to cooperation among the neighboring countries. The April 30th article (Appendix 1.7) about Chairman Kim's invitation plans for experts and journalists at the nuclear site is laden with pro-peace actions by linking journalist's positive opinion with the image of the two leaders' beaming smiles. Finally, the May 1st article (Appendix 1.9) covers the one-on-one talk between two leaders based on President Moon's voice.

3.1 Media reporting of Peace Negotiations

The learned Russian scholar of Korean Studies, Georgy Toloraya (2018) addresses the design and modality of the peace and security system in the Korean peninsula. He started to unravel the problem of peace with the questions: "Who has to make peace with whom? And is the goal to build a new peace regime or reconfigure previous arrangements?" (Toloraya 2018, no page). Due to their implications, these questions serve as the starting point to read the news articles in order to understand the media reporting of the peace negotiation process. Through an analysis of media reporting, the reader will have an idea about *who is doing what, how, where and when?*

Then, who should be sitting at the peace process table?

The Armistice Agreement “was signed by Lt. General William K. Harrison, Senior Delegate, United Nations Command Delegation, and by General Nam Il, Senior Delegate, delegation of the Korean People’s Army and Chinese people’s Volunteers, at 10.00 a.m, 27 July 1953” (UNCMC 1953). What this demonstrates is that, *South Korea is not an official signatory of the armistice agreement*. In this regard, President Moon’s role in bringing the multiple stakeholders to the negotiation table is reported as intrinsic and pragmatic. The *Hankyoreh* reports that President Moon brings the US, Japan, China, Russia and the international community to the dialogue for the purpose of bringing about permanent peace in the Korean peninsula. Two articles report about the US’s positive responses following North Korea’s announcement (Appendix 1.4 and 1.8).

What to bring to the peace negotiation table

The *Hankyoreh* explicitly introduces President Moon’s peace negotiation plan by directly quoting his remarks (Seong 2018). An April 20th article (Appendix 1.1) describes the procedure as securing the North’s will for complete denuclearization while furthering discussions with North Korea and the US. President Moon’s plan is reported as a strategic way to bring an end to the armistice status, end the Korean War and a step towards the signing of a peace agreement. An article published on April 23rd (Appendix 1.2) brings attention to the North’s policy changes in respect to their economic development plan while giving up the nuclear program. An April 25th article (Appendix 1.3) gives an introduction of the details about the previous summits, which brought large-scale projects. Meanwhile, the articles note that this summit cannot guarantee discussions about economic cooperation since the international sanctions against North Korea are still heavily underway. However, the article mentions an anonymous news source clearly stating that the future plans will be about economic cooperation:

Most government officials and experts agree that if the inter-Korean and North Korea-US summits get the ball rolling toward denuclearization, sanctions will be loosened as the agreements are implemented, which will raise the opportunity to discuss economic cooperation as a major agenda item at another future inter-Korean summit (Lee 2018b, see Appendix 1.3).

All these articles coherently report an explanation of the current summit’s limitation regarding the financial situation as a result of sanctions.

3.2 Media reporting of the Two Leaders

The nine *Hankyoreh* articles directly promote peace in the Korean peninsula by repeatedly mentioning a couple of important points. Each article supports President Moon’s enthusiastic work to achieve peace on the Korean peninsula while dealing with North Korean leader Kim Jong-un and other world leaders without disregarding his awareness of public opinion (Seong 2018, see Appendix 1.1).

How is Moon Jae-in categorized by the Hankyoreh?

The analysis shows that the South Korean President Moon Jae-in is the most engaged figure reported in achieving peace with ‘North Korean leader Kim Jong-un’ in the Korean peninsula.

President Moon is described as *consistently* fighting for peace by working with different partners, reaching the successful inter-Korean summit on April 27, 2018, and taking the necessary follow-up measures. Six articles explicitly describe his proactive approach and appeal to the North's sincerity and seriousness about complete denuclearization. The inter-Korean summit is then seen as the first step towards the creation of a peaceful peninsula (articles published on April 20th, 25th, 26th, 27th, 28th and 30th).

Every article (with the exception of the article published April 23rd) refers to President Moon with: "I" (when quoting him directly), "he", "Moon", "President Moon", "President Moon Jae-in", "the South Korean President". Furthermore, the *Hankyoreh* reports President Moon as a pair with Chairman Kim in the April 28th article (Appendix 1.6). His dominant actions are reported as "emphasizes/emphasized (repeatedly)", "suggested", "saying/said", "predicted", "remark", "stated", "hinted", "cautioned", "expected to meet", "explained", "telephone call", "told", "replied", "mentioned", "will be meeting", "expected to tell and ask".

"I[Moon] believe the two summits will be successful, and the complete denuclearization and establishment of permanent peace on the Korean Peninsula will come faster, when the press harnesses public opinion and serves as a guide for peace on the peninsula" (as cited in Seong 2018, see Appendix 1.1).

Moon is also expected to tell Li⁶ about his and Kim's commitment to the denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula and ask for Li's support (Yoo and Seong 2018, see Appendix 1.8).

He is reported as actively engaging with his counterparts about North Korea. Furthermore, the use of silent verbs such as "consider" and "believing" shapes the readers' fundamental idea of Moon's thoughtfulness and positive regard of his counterparts.

As the excerpts above demonstrate President Moon Jae-in is depicted as tirelessly speaking, proposing, appealing, meeting and establishing the necessary conditions needed for cooperation, while exposing North Korea's sincerity to other (potential) listeners. Through the use of active verbs such as: "appealed", "plan to propose", "establishing", "forming", "focusing", "views", "restore and actualize", "based", "enlists", President Moon is reported as an *active* communicator and *strong-willed* person who creates a peaceful climate.

His [Moon's] plan to propose establishing a liaison office at Panmunjeom⁷ and forming a joint inter-Korean committee in various areas is aimed at laying the groundwork for realizing his longstanding goal of peaceful coexistence and shared prosperity for South and North – as witnessed in his declaration that the "ultimate goal is inter-Korean prosperity" (Lee 2018b, see Appendix 1.3).

A May 1st article (Appendix 1.9) reports President Moon as a *people person*. The article explicitly humanizes him and places him at the center of the togetherness with his staff – i.e. as an actor who is not seeking formalities as the traditional leader of the state. The use of interactive words used in describing President Moon – i.e. "joined along the clapping", "facing onslaught of questions summit related from his advisers", "smiling bashfully", "added to uproarious laughter" – creates a narrative where the President is seen as both a humble and vigorous communicative leader. Moon's optimistic attitude towards people and situations is most evident in articles about the pedestrian walk which took place during the one-on-one talk with Chairman Kim along the DMZ which otherwise symbolizes its division, war and segregation.

Bad things are never entirely bad. If we do a good job of preserving the Demilitarized Zone, it will come back to us in the end as a major asset (Seong and Seo 2018, see Appendix 1.9).

President Moon's remark above refers to division and war – the well-preserved ecosystem of the DMZ. The article brings forth his character to convey and share his determined messages concerning the North. He is reported as willing to share and open the informational resources obtained due to his position and authority as the President. Finally, the article depicts President Moon's willingness to make peace by starting with what Galtung calls "negative peace – i.e. the absence of organized collective forms of violence" (Galtung 1967: 306). For President Moon, this is represented as a step towards preventing the conflict and creating the possibility for "positive peace – i.e. overcoming of structural/cultural violence" (Demmers 2017: 60) in the Korean peninsula.

How is Kim Jong-un depicted by the Hankyoreh?

Since North Korean leader Kim Jong-un is not a proactive speaker – as compared to President Moon Jae-in – and is physically less accessible, the articles widely use three approaches: using indirect quotes from key South Korean political or academic figures or North Korea's *Rodong Sinmun Daily's* releases, direct quotes from Chairman Kim's remarks or reporting the journalist's interpretative opinion.

Chairman Kim is introduced as "he", "Kim", "Kim Jong-un", "North Korean leader Kim Jong-un", "the top leader". An article published April 20th (Appendix 1.1) reports Chairman Kim and North Korea as having a ready-to-talk and appropriate attitude – which was demonstrated by using by President Moon's remarks "showing a proactive commitment" and "not irrationally demanding". This representation aims to *normalize* the North from *closed* to *communicable* similar to other *normal* actors in the world. Comparably, the April 23rd article (Appendix 1.2) describes the North Korean leader using motivated and will-driven verbs – i.e. "officially announced", "declaring", "is determined to bring", "is committed to bring", "has steadily pushed" – this elucidates the *where* and *when*. Presenting additional occasion details – where and when – gives more insights into the actor. In other words, it justifies that the actor has the authority to act, "officially announced", "[Kim's] remarks [became] the official end of two-track". By stoutly emphasizing Kim's words relating to actions – since he promised to do something – immediate reactions on representation will be one of three: he *will keep it* or *will not keep it* or *well, let us see how it will go*. In this regard, the journalist hints his standpoint with a number of phrases:

This can be seen as a preemptive measure to build trust given the suspicion that remains in various parts of the international community about Kim's commitment to denuclearization leading up to the inter-Korean and North Korea-US summits. This is also evidence that Kim is determined to bring about successful results in these two summits. [...] The same can be said for the explicit declaration of the two goals of "creating an international environment that is well-suited for the construction of a socialist economy" and "defending the peace and stability of the Korean Peninsula and the world." [...] The process of implementing those agreements is likely to coincide with the relaxing of sanctions against the North by the UN and other parts of the international community and the expansion of North Korea's access to the international economic system (Lee 2018a, see Appendix 1.2).

As it is noticeable, the article provides a supportive and argumentative voice toward Chairman Kim. However, it inclines towards *being supportive*. Thus, the *Hankyoreh*'s media reporting throws weight behind Chairman Kim.

3.3 Visual and Textual Representations

The normalization frames

The photograph below (figure 3.1) makes use of “images of the real” (Van Leeuwen and Jewitt 2004: 23) when reporting on Pyongyang. “Photographs are often thought of as ‘images of the real’, as images that show things exactly as they might also be seen in reality with the naked eye” (Ibid.).

Figure 3.1
The image of a skyline of Pyongyang along the Taedong River



“Caption: The skyline of Pyongyang along the Taedong River is partially covered in fog on a recent morning”
Source (Kim, 2018) used in the *Hankyoreh*'s April 23rd article (Appendix 1.2)

The image represents the ordinary skyline of the urban city with a bit of morning fog along the river. Without paying attention to the caption of the image, it would not be easy to recognize the city. The depiction of the image of Pyongyang as a *modern apparently peaceful city* which, contributes to challenging the perception of North Korea as an *alien world* or being of a *different membership category*. This photograph does not represent any image of *dictatorship*, *communism*, *socialism* nor *venue for active nuclear power development*. In other words, the image plays a part in *normalizing* Pyongyang – and consequently North Korea. Therefore, Pyongyang is framed under the same membership categorization as *us*. The figure 3.2 represents another *Hankyoreh*'s visual representation aimed at normalizing the North's system by showing the ordinary decision-making process of the government administration.

The four photographs in one frame (figure 3.2) all show the voting system among participants exercising their rights by a show of hands. The left upper photo shows a group of

people (members of Korean Workers' Party Central Committee) sitting on identical red-colored chairs. In front of each person, are identical microphones and notes indicate that participants hold an equal vote. The raised hands of participants are also showing that they are like each other. Having photographers there documenting the process indicates a level of transparency from the administration. As this auditorium looks like those in other states. Which is another element that reinforces the *us* categorization.

Figure 3.2
The image of the prior plenary session of the KCNA



"Caption: he KCNA reported on Apr. 21 that the Central Committee of the North Korean Workers' Party had voted to halt further nuclear and missile testing during a plenary session held the previous day. (*Yonhap News*)"
Source (*Yonhap News*, 2018) used in the *Hankyoreh*'s April 23rd article (Appendix 1.2)

The right upper photo portrays three people - the President of the Presidium of the Supreme People's assembly, Kim, Young-nam, North Korean leader, Kim Jong-un, and the Vice-chairman of the State Affairs Commission, Choe Ryong-hae (from left to right) - raising their right hands. In this case as well, there are white notes in front of each of them, but only two microphones are located facing the centrally seated Kim Jong-un. The left lower photo shows a similar decision-making procedure among the members. Two clearly different hierarchies are visible from the different height, color, and width of tables as well as the direction of tables – however this is the case in many auditoriums across the world. The right lower photo shows the symbol of North Korea with the portraits of two previous North Korean leaders - Kim Il-sung and Kim Jong-il, the national flag and pine trees representing the DPRK peoples' vital and tireless spirit.

It is a general custom in many countries to hang significant politicians' portraits, an emblem, national flags or other national and political symbols in the offices of the institution. So, this does not signal North Korea as very different from other countries. What is interesting is that male participants are extremely dominant throughout the four photos. Kim Yo-jong, one female delegate is visible sitting in the second row of chairs. But that too is the case for many parliaments, indicative of the subpar representation of women in parliaments globally. To sum up, figure 3.2 shows a more or less normal decision-making process of the government, normalizing North Korea and enforcing the 'they' are like 'us' representation.

Peace orientation in visual representation

An April 27th article (Appendix 1.5) allows space for both leaders' peaceful introductory remarks by making use of direct quotes – 193 words directly quoted by Kim and 209 words from Moon appear in the 933-word article. Both leaders' introductory remarks create a favorable and peaceful societal climate. The remarks used by Chairman Kim such as “truly”, “continue”, “resolve”, “the starting point”, “a signal flare”, “new history”, “peaceful”, “prosperous North-South relations” stands for pro-peace and confirms an ongoing commitment to engage and further peace relations.

Kim went on to say he “approached this meeting with the mindset that we are standing at the starting point and firing a signal flare to create the momentum so that a new history can be written in terms of peaceful and prosperous North-South relations (Seo 2018, see Appendix 1.5).

The *Hankyoreh* article releases his introductory remarks in their entirety. Both Chairman Kim and President Moon's remarks are intrinsically “peace-oriented” and “solution-oriented” (Galtung 2003: 178). In this instance as well, the article makes use of a humanized approach by reporting how Chairman Kim shared his personal feelings and realized the lost eleven years since the second inter-Korean summit (2007). Kim is reported as not only addressing his willpower to replenish a blank decade between the two Koreas but also as requesting the utmost joint effort. Indeed, the article shed light on both leaders' closer steps to the peace intention with “highlighted peace initiatives” (Ibid.).

Figure 3.3

The image of the third inter-Korean summit



“Caption: The inter-Korean summit is held at the House of Peace in Panmunjeom on Apr. 27. Clockwise from left are National Intelligence Service Director Suh Hoon, President Moon Jae-in, Blue House Chief of Staff Im Jong-seok, Vice Chairman of the North Korean Workers' Party Central Committee Kim Yong-chol, North Korean leader Kim Jong-un, and Kim Yo-jong, First Vice Director of the Central Committee of the North Korean Workers' Party. (by Kim Kyung-ho, staff photographer)”

Source (Kim 2018) used in the *Hankyoreh*'s April 27th article (Appendix 1.5)

Figure 3.3 complements this *peace-oriented*, *humanizing* aim of the article visually, by presenting a photo of the smiling key Korean stakeholders taken in a close framing angle as to involve the reader in the peace summit. Notably, the artwork in the background displays Mt. Kumgang which is well-known to Koreans as an important symbol of reunification for separated families. The artwork was specifically installed for the third inter-Korean summit and replaced the painting

of South Korea's Mt. Halla. Furthermore, the blue carpeting is used to signify *one Korea*. It is noteworthy that the article directly mentions Korea's oneness and the composition of the picture complements and supports this sentiment. Lee and Maguire's study (2011) likewise, note that providing the oneness gives readers the opposite effect of the us-them categorization. Building on the Blue House's explanation helps the reader to have more trust in the summit's positive atmosphere. Finally, the facial expressions of all six participants produce a congenial atmosphere.

3.4 Times and Places of Peace: Understanding and Peace Orientation

Times used to understand the other party

One of the important aspects of Galtung's discussion on peace journalism relates to time-openness, the ways history is recalled, and the ways in which the past, present and future are related. Those need to be oriented towards findings solutions to the conflict, rather than focusing on periods of violence and conflict, or as noted in Galtung "who threw the first stone" (Galtung 2003: 178). Regarding the references to time, there are a number of historical incidents between North and South Korea, and North Korea and the international community. Out of many possibilities, the *Hankyoreh* selected specific periods: 1991-2 focusing on North Korea's distrust towards the rest of the world.

The general secretary of the Soviet Union's Communist Party Gorbachev (1985-91) – facing the collapse of the communist regimes – kept proclaiming the necessity of introduction of economic reform and freedom of information in the 1980s. The two Koreas were closely affected by the Soviet Union's new positionality in the world. South Korea's effort to build diplomatic relations and establish a trade office in the communist countries – e.g., Poland, Russia, and China – came to be known as the *North Diplomacy Policy*, employed by President Roh Tae-woo. President Roh held the 8th inter-Korean high-level talks from September 16-17, 1992. The two sides already agreed on three agreements related to the implementation of the Basic Agreement – signed December 13, 1991 and entered into force on February 18, 1992. It is the "Agreement on Reconciliation, Non-Aggression, and Exchanges and Cooperation between two states" (Basic Agreement 1991), which postulates that South and North Koreas recognized and respected each other's domestic system of governance. The agreement came shortly after the two Koreas were admitted to the UN on September 17, 1991. Hence, the commitments to abide by the UN Charter provisions led the two Koreas to sign the Basic Agreement in order to promote peace on the Korean peninsula. However, North Korea breached the agreement: two exemplary cases are the two battles of Yeonpyeong in 1999 and 2002.

With regards to an approach of looking at the past by focusing on the future, the article published April 25th (Appendix 1.3) addresses North Korea's stance towards the 'Basic Agreement' by providing the historical and political backdrop. The subtitle "North Korea's painful memory of the 1991 Basic Agreement" (Lee 2018b, see Appendix 1.3) is contrasted with President Moon's approach aimed at restoring and actualizing the 1991 Basic Agreement as seen in his statements "[...] the most comprehensive and concrete of the agreements reached by South and North Korean authorities at any time" and describing it as "regular, ongoing, permanent dialogue to keep inter-Korean relations on a solid footing" (Ibid.). Notwithstanding

North Korea's previous hostility to the 1991 Basic Agreement (which did not lead to the expected level of dialogue), Kim Jong-un is reported as the figure who would like to rekindle lost relations between the two Koreas and "reconfigure inter-Korean relations as a normal relationship between two sovereign states" (Ibid.).

Changes of the symbol of Place: Panmunjom, war, armistice and peace

Before the outbreak of the Korean War, Panmunjom was a small and quiet village. However, the Korean War brought international tensions from the neighbors and superpowers to the Korean peninsula. The United Nations Command and the Communist Forces arrived near Gaesung to discuss the negotiation process. Since then, Panmunjom became the symbol of division and negotiation of war. However, the *Hankyoreh* articles shed new light on the symbol of Panmunjom, primarily through President Moon's introductory remarks and reflections on the summit, especially on April 27th and 28th which are laden with elements of peace journalism.

Moon went on to say that the meeting venue at Panmunjeom "became a symbol of peace rather than a symbol of division the moment Chairman Kim crossed over the Military Demarcation Line for the first⁸ time in history" (Seo 2018, see Appendix 1.5).

The *Hankyoreh*'s reporting (Kim 2018, see Appendix 1.6) of the Panmunjom Declaration (April 27, 2018) allows readers to know that the two Korean leaders agreed to pursue "permanent peace, prosperity and unification" (Panmunjom Declaration 2018). On the one hand, this peace-oriented reporting promotes the development of inter-Korean relations to gain reader's empathy, and on the other is seen as "laying important groundwork in advance of US-North summit" (Kim 2018, see Appendix 1.6).

The *Hankyoreh*'s journalist practice incorporates peace journalism values – providing context and background of the event (Hanitzsch 2004) and is very much in line with Article 2(2) of the Development of Inter-Korean Relations Act.

The development of inter-Korean relations shall be promoted in accordance with the principles of transparency and confidence, on the basis of the national consensus, and inter-Korean relations shall not be exploited as a means to fulfill political or partisan purposes (Article 2 (Basic Principles) (2) Development of Inter-Korean Relations Act, Ministry of Unification, Government of the Republic of Korea 2018).

Moreover, the April 27th article describes the two leaders as having agreed to "carry out their respective roles and responsibilities" (Ibid.). In those reports, the *Hankyoreh* is also following peace journalist principles as stressed by Galtung who notes that key stakeholders in political conflict should "strengthen positive peace and weaken the sources of violence" (Galtung 2015: 323). Regarding this, it is noteworthy to recall that Galtung's suggestions for US foreign policies (see table 3.1) include 'normalization': precisely what the *Hankyoreh* did.

Finally, Galtung notes that "Reporting peace is by definition positive as it is about human fulfillment. Both should be reported to better understand how the world works: to be more realistic and less 'realist'" (Galtung 2015: 332). The Panmunjom Declaration on Peace, Prosperity and Reunification of the Korean peninsula of April 27 reflects the unanimous desire for peace, prosperity and reunification. In respect of denuclearization, Article 3(4) of the said Declaration envisages complete denuclearization of the entire peninsula.

Table 3.1
Conflicts: Solution versus Victory as U.S. Foreign Policy Option

Conflict	Constructive: Solution-Oriented (To do)	Destructive: Victory Orientation (Avoid)
Korea	Work towards Peace Treaty with normalization between the United States and North and South Korea; work on U.S., North Korea and the Korean Peninsula as nuclear free zones	Beware of further polarization against and marginalization of North Korea; beware of United States South Korea military exercises; stop breaking agreements.

Source (Galtung 2015: 326)

3.5 Clear *us*, vague *them* Categorization

Leudar et al. (2004) analyze the *us* and *them* membership categorization by studying the public addresses of former President of the US, George W. Bush, the former Prime Minister of the UK, Tony Blair, and Al Qaeda's Osama bin Laden, shortly after the 9/11 attacks in 2001. Through the membership categorizations research, Leudar et al. found that there was *justification for violence* in speeches by all three of the leaders and concluded that the *us*/*them* categories are a "standardized relational pair" (Leudar et al. 2004: 245). Leudar et al. (2004: 243) state that, "We are interested in not only how these presentations of the happenings vary, but also how they are coordinated in arguments by the participants separated in time and space" (Ibid. 243).

The *Hankyoreh*'s representation of the Korean Summit defies this confrontational and oppositional categorization, based on "standardized relations pair" (Ibid. 245) – one part's action aims at invoking the other's reaction. The nine *Hankyoreh* articles present North and South Korean actors *together striving for peace*. Broadly, all stakeholders are reported as *one huge us*. *We* – is used to show the willing power of both sides to cooperate and share each other's efforts to put forward peace. In this broad *us* membership, the solidarity between each member is reported slightly differently. As witnessed so far, the *Hankyoreh* reports that inter-Korean relations are either very tight or as meant to be tight. The two Koreas are represented as sharing a set of common goals and exerting concerted actions to achieve these goals.

Whereas social groups define themselves, their name(s), their nature(s) and their boundary(s), social categories are identified, defined or delineated by others. To a certain extent, most social communities can be characterized or defined in both ways. Each side of the dichotomy is implied in the other and social identity is the outcome of the conjunction of processes of internal and external definitions. Whether, in any specific instance, one chooses to talk about a group or a category, it will depend on the balance struck between internal and external processes in that situation. It is a question of degree (Jenkins 1994: 201).

Placing the two Koreas within *one category* of *Peace Seekers* by the same measuring yardstick (the single concerted goal of peace) is the "outcome of the conjuncture of processes of internal and external definitions" (Ibid.). It is possible to identify the *internal* process with *the two leaders* – Moon and Kim – and the *external process* involving the *media agency*. The two Koreas are reported as addressing each other through the *we-identity*. Even President Moon appears to be playing a significant role as the North's spokesman delivering the North's voice from the domestic

audience to international partners. In this framework, the two Koreas' depiction belongs to the same categorization as a close *us*. As mentioned in the previous section, a couple of images together with the text compliment the theme of peace and oneness, one Korea (See figure 3.3).

Even those who appear to be outside the summit are – a bit distant – but still *us*. When it comes to introducing the limitation of the primary tasks of the inter-Korean summit, the answer seems like a formula. The two Koreas cannot move further because of a number of external environments such as the North Korea-US summit and international sanctions. Thus, it appears that *the two Koreas* are depicted as *us*, with *the US* and *the international community who takes sanctions* as *the others*.

“South and North cannot generate progress irrespective of the North Korea-US summit, nor can they reach an agreement past international sanctions, so there isn’t really a lot the two sides can agree separately,” he[Moon] said (Seong 2018, see Appendix 1.1).

“There are currently many constraints on the inter-Korean summit. South and North cannot make any separate progress irrespective of the North Korea-US summit, nor are they able to make agreements beyond international sanctions. ... It does seem clear, however, that we[the two Koreas] at least need to establish the momentum for dialogue to continue” (Lee 2018b, see Appendix 1.3).

Thus, at first glance these external forces appear as *the third party* or sometimes, even *them*. However, I categorize the US and international community as *still with us*; as all these actors are pursuing peace. Every stakeholder engaged in the summit is reported to adhere to the common goal, for peace as *Peace Seekers*.

In his[Moon’s] remarks, Moon hinted that South and North Korea and the US had already come to at least some consensus on the issues in the question (Seong 2018, see Appendix 1.1).

“It seems like there’s already some mutual trust among Moon, Kim, and Trump and a shared understanding that consideration needs to be shown to the other parties,” a former senior official said (Lee 2018c, see Appendix 1.7).

As seen above, the president of the US and other international stakeholders are backing the two Koreas’ peace negotiation progress. The other articles report the journalist’s subjective opinion about the three parties (Moon-Kim-Trump), forming *mutual trust* and *shared understanding* (Lee 2018c, see Appendix 1.7).

Within these representations of North Korea as just another normal country ready to build peace with its neighbor, and of Chairman Kim as a benevolent leader, what is totally absent is any hint of dictatorial domestic politics and policies that North Korea has been accused of by numerous human rights organizations. Bringing that up would not fit into the *us* categorization that is central to the *Hankyoreh*’s representation of the summit. Thus, this raises questions regarding the limits in optimism of peace journalism.

Chapter 4

The *Chosunilbo*'s Neutral and Critical Tone, Distrust Frame

The *Chosunilbo*'s nine news articles show North Korea as an *untrustworthy counterpart* for South Korea. In general, the news reporting tone on North Korea is thoroughly based on historical and factual perspectives. An April 20th article (Appendix 1.10) shares that President Moon supports North Korea's willingness to denuclearize in the Cheongwadae luncheon with the representatives of South Korean media. The article published April 23rd (Appendix 1.11) sheds light on North Korea's surprise strategic changes with providing a critical prediction in relation to the international political climate. An April 25th article (Appendix 1.12) lays out the two leaders' responsibility for the third inter-Korean summit since the denuclearization deal is complicatedly intertwined. Two articles published April 27th (Appendix 1.13 and 1.14) deliver the details of the third inter-Korean summit with mainly neutral and narrator tones and is partially, peace-oriented with making use of the two leaders' welcoming introductory remarks. Whilst the April 30th article (Appendix 1.15) reports North Korea's foreign experts' invitation plan for a nuclear test site shut down in May. Regarding this, mindful and skeptical experts' opinions are reported without a hitch. Another April 30th article (Appendix 1.16) explains President Moon Jae-in's brief to the third inter-Korean summit to leaders of neighboring countries. This was followed by a May 2nd article (Appendix 1.17), which stands out for its suspicion by boldly questioning North Korea's intention to partake in the international dialogue concerning the nuclear deal. Lastly, another May 2nd article (Appendix 1.18) covers the two leaders' short walk on the summit day, facilitated by a lip readers' analysis.

4.1 Media reporting of Peace Negotiations

As utilized in Chapter 3, Toloraya's modality to question the current peace discussions on the Korean peninsula is used once again, this time with respect to the *Chosunilbo*'s articles. The questions are "Who has to make peace with whom? And is the goal to build a new peace regime or reconfigure previous arrangements?" (Toloraya 2018, no page). I attempt to read the media reporting about the actors, actions, time and place from a linguistic analysis based on the *Chosunilbo*'s articles.

Who should be sitting at the peace process table?

The same actors are mentioned in the *Chosunilbo* as in the *Hankyoreh* although in a different way. The main focus, however, is no longer on the leaders of the two Koreas, but on the whole set of political leaders. The actors are: the two leaders of the two Koreas, the president of the US, Donald Trump, Japanese Prime Minister, Shinzo Abe, President of the People's Republic of China, Xi Jinping, and Russian President, Vladimir Putin. Trump is reported to deliver great support while showing a positive attitude towards North Korea but stressing what the US interests are thoroughly security issues (Appendix 1.11). The April 23rd article (Ibid.) reports Trump's immediate positive response and anticipation for the upcoming summit between North

Korea and the US following North Korea's announcement of its plan to focus on economic development instead of nuclear weapon development. The May 2nd article (Appendix 1.17) makes the involvement of the international community in the peace negotiation a necessary prerequisite. The April 30th article (Appendix 1.16) reports President Moon's briefings to neighboring counterparts, except Chinese President Xi Jinping, due to the rounds of visits to its provinces. The article includes the details that Moon and Kim agreed to meet Trump and Xi. Intriguingly, Putin is reported as the stakeholder who is attentive to the basic infrastructure implementation with two Koreas. Moreover, the article connects to President Moon's early May schedule for the trilateral summit of South Korea-China-Japan in Tokyo. The April 27th article (Appendix 1.14) reports possible signatories (as the US and China) of the agreement, which will replace the current armistice agreement.

What to bring to the peace negotiation table

The *Chosunilbo* reports that the two Koreas of today are situated in very different historical contexts than during the second inter-Korean summit (October 2-4, 2007) in terms of the state of North Korea's nuclear development and its economic sanctions. It reports President Moon's remarks at the Cheongwadae luncheon with the representatives of media (Jeong 2018a, see Appendix 1.10):

“There are not many areas that can be agreed upon by North and South Korea beyond those sanctions. The North Korean nuclear standoff must be solved so that international sanctions can be lifted, and only then can inter-Korean relations improve” (Ibid.).

In order to improve the inter-Korean relations, the April 27th article (Lee 2018, see Appendix 1.14) highlights the agreement reached by the two leaders aimed at: a) reducing military tensions between the two Koreas, b) managing reunifications of families forcibly separated by the Korean War and c) establishing a liaison office in Kaesong. The *Chosunilbo* intensively presents the current South Korean administration's principle to initiate further peace negotiation as a window of opportunity. To break the stalemate of North Korea's nuclear development, the *Chosunilbo* accentuates the international community's open participation. Primarily, the article lays stress on the need of the IAEA's unlimited access to North Korea's denuclearization verification process. This critically assessed stance is in accordance with the historical pact upon inter-Korean and North Korea international community relations. But media reporting on those issues is with a very strong critical voice of concern toward the North (to be further addressed later). In addition, the planning of multilateral talks with the US and perhaps China to changeover from the current armistice agreement to declaring an end to the Korean War is introduced (Appendix 1.14).

To sum up, the articles of the *Chosunilbo* reporting on the peace negotiations focus on four main points: improving the two Koreas relations, solving the North Korean nuclear standoff, lifting American and international sanctions and multilateral talks to replace the armistice agreement with a proper peace treaty.

4.2 Media reporting of the Two Leaders

Chairman Kim and North Korea are presented through the words of South Koreans, except the April 27th article (Appendix 1.13). The five *Chosunilbo* articles report the North's important

decision on the denuclearization issue through President Moon and other South Korean high-level officials' statements. Apart from South Korean figures' "saying", "quoted" about the North's decision, the April 30th article (Appendix 1.16) shows President Moon next scheduled to "meet and discuss" the North's denuclearization and peace treaty issues with other heads of state. Interestingly, the *Chosunilbo* made use of professional lip readers to find out what the two leaders possibly talked about while taking a walk along the DMZ – President Moon is reported to talk about nuclear facilities while Chairman Kim is reported to talk about the US and UN.

Neutrally Reported: busy Moon and unseen Kim

Since the summit was one of the ceremonial events, all eyes gazed at the same stage through mass media (Dayan and Katz 1994: 15). A keen perspective is then needed to see how media outlets make use of this opportunity through different lenses.

An April 27th article (Appendix 1.13) reports the summit factually with neutral, narrator tones, but with only partial peace journalism elements. The article delivers the media event predominantly with what the two leaders literally did and planned to do according to the schedule in chronological order.

North Korean leader Kim Jong-un walked across the heavily armed border at 9:30 am [...] posed together for the camera [...] The two leaders started their talks at 10:15 am [...] They exchanged brief opening remarks in front of the cameras before closing the doors [...] The two leaders will then go for a walk before continuing with the afternoon session (Lim 2018, see Appendix 1.13).

The *Chosunilbo* directly quotes Chairman Kim's remark about the lost eleven years since the second inter-Korean summit. The article allows readers to look at Chairman Kim's attitude toward the summit – sincere, decisive and pledged – as if this time would be different, not like the past. This article is the only one where peace journalism can be said to exist among all examined the *Chosunilbo*'s articles:

"It has taken 11 years for this to happen ... Walking here I wondered why it has taken so long...Through today's meeting, I[Kim] hope we won't go back to square one again and non-implementation of what we agree won't happen again" (as cited in Lim 2018, see Appendix 1.13).

Moreover, it is noteworthy to look at prospecting of a positive result of the current summit, which conjugates with the upcoming summit between the North and the US. "If that can be achieved, it will lay the groundwork for a summit between Kim and U.S. President..." (Ibid.). Since the US is a crucial partner, it is also necessary to see how the media report the US's response and its positionality toward the summit. The article directly quotes the White House message that it will demand the North's complete denuclearization. It is logical to consider that the summit can bring fruitful results or end up with failure. However, the *Chosunilbo*'s critical frame of President Moon is found as below:

If the inter-Korean summit fails to elicit some kind of commitment by the North to scrap its nuclear weapons, Moon could face criticism for giving Kim some much-needed breathing space as international sanctions are intensifying (Lim 2018, see Appendix 1.13).

By such pessimistic anticipation of a possible failure of the summit the article overburdens President Moon's political and diplomatic role since he is carrying all the responsibility to make North Korea give up its nuclear weapon program. Consequently, the result of the summit lies

solely on President Moon's capability to handle the North. In this context, Chairman Kim is unseen and hidden and all political responsibility – and doubt into his capacities – are placed on President Moon.

Media reporting of President Moon's clear stance and no comments on political alignment

Overall in the articles South Korean figures have a clear role in delivering the North's stance. An April 20th article (Appendix 1.10) mainly focused on President Moon's support of North Korea's denuclearization, considering the aftermath of the following inter-Korean summit. The international community's request for complete, verifiable, irreversible and demonstrable denuclearization is plainly reported. Cheongwadae issued in a press release the full texts of President Moon's opening and closing remarks on the Cheongwadae webpage (Moon 2018). Consequently, the different angles used by the two media agencies are evident, as reflected on in discussion on Hall's perspectives (Chapter 2).

Both media agencies commonly report, 1) North Korea's willingness to scrap nuclear weapons, 2) that there are no unreasonable request conditions from the North Korea, such as demanding the US troops' withdrawal from South Korea, 3) President Moon's opinion of North Korea's intention towards the US, 4) that there are no different meanings of denuclearization in two Korea's views, 5) the limitations on what two Korea can do through this summit, and 6) President Moon's advice request from media groups. Different media reporting came up with regards to President Moon's request regarding media agencies' political preferences, while the *Hankyoreh* focused on Moon's call for bipartisanship to media representatives – appealing to the comparison with the second inter-Korean summit – the *Chosunilbo* omits to mention President Moon's appeal to the media's cooperation *across the ideology-oriented approaches*. Instead, it provides the entourage list of South Korean government officials and direct communication line updated details between the two leaders. According to Cheongwadae's press released data, one of the main topics of discussion dealt with going 'beyond political alignment' of the media agencies.

4.3 Visual and Textual Representation

Neutral reporting

After North Korea announced that their national strategic plan had changed from the two-track policy to a single economic development plan, North Korean state-run *Rodong Sinmun Daily* published a news article with 19 photos⁹. Among those, the *Chosunilbo* makes use of this image, and the caption provides the source as *Rodong Sinmun Daily*. This same image is used in the *Hankyoreh*'s four photos frame (figure 3.2). The difference in the use is that the *Chosunilbo* focuses visually on the three key persons, but textually only on Kim: "Kim Jong-un and other senior officers" (Lim and Kim 2018, see Appendix 1.11). It is recognizable that they are under the decision-making process by show of hands. The *Chosunilbo*'s caption functions to complement what the decision-making process is for. The article delivers North Korea's newly announced national plan with an informative and matter-of-fact tone; however, a doubting and unconvinced voice remains in the background. Some unidentified, anonymous source is keen to be seen, yet, visual reporting does not work in that way.

Figure 4.1
The image of the prior plenary session of the KCNA



"Caption: North Korean leader Kim Jong-un (center) and other senior officials raise their hands during a Workers Party Central Committee meeting in Pyongyang on Friday, in this photo released by the state-run *Rodong Sinmun* daily on Saturday"
Source (*Rodong Sinmun Daily* 2018) used in the *Chosunilbo*'s April 23rd article (Appendix 1.11).

Many figures appear in the image (figure 4.2). There are many unfocused, unknown, indistinct people far behind the main protagonists: President Moon Jae-in and Chairman Kim Jong-un. These people appear as the background of the main image. By recognizing figures' badges, nametags, electronic gadgets, the viewers can recognize these people's tasks. Moon is clearly smiling, Kim has more ambiguous face. They are isolated from the others – showing the wait-and-see-if-this-works-out attitude. The image is taken almost at the same angle with the point of view of viewers.

Figure 4.2
The image of the two leaders



President Moon Jae-in (left) and North Korean leader Kim Jong-un pose in front of the Peace House in the truce village of Panmunjom on Friday. /*Newsis*
Source (*Newsis* 2018) used in the *Chosunilbo*'s April 27th article (Appendix 1.13).

One photographer with the camera strap (EOS), in front of the two leaders, bend his body to take photos of the two leaders. He is using the low angle, and he might aim to deliver the different power relations between the two leaders and the target image viewers (Kress and Leeuwen 2006: 124). The image-producer (including photographer's shots, writers' picks, and chief editors' approvals to place images for each of new articles) make use of several elements to induce a specific response from the viewers: size of a frame, angle, resolution, compositions of elements, etc. (Rodrigues 2013).

Distrust frame in the visual representation

The image (figure 4.3) shows the (assumed) nuclear warheads, and (assumed) facilities, two military officers who are standing at the right edge of the photo, Chairman Kim Jong-un is standing and looking at the side in front of the nuclear warhead. He is looking somewhere towards his right, thus not into the camera.

Figure 4.3

The image of North Korean leader Kim Jong-un, July 14, 2017



North Korean leader Kim Jong-un (left) stands in front of a mobile missile launcher in an underground facility on July 14, 2017, in this screen grab from [North] Korean Central Television.

Source ([North] Korean Central Television 2017) used in the *Chosunilbo*'s May 2nd article (Appendix 1.17)

It is assumed that the setting is inside a tunnel, which is widely reported in the news article (Kim 2018, see Appendix 1.17). The caption from this screenshot image from 14 July 2017 reads: "Kim Jong-un stands in front of the missile launcher in an underground facility which is the nuclear site". The resolution of the photo is very low so the photo is of a terrible quality, as if taken clandestinely and in hurry. Importantly, this low resolution also impacts representation. According to Takahashi and Watanabe (2015:169) "Blurred images might also induce negative affective response to the visual environment such as fear or uncanniness". This blurred image makes viewers feel uncomfortable and the depicted protagonists appear uncanny and opaque. This visual representation has more than two image producers. The caption of the image states that the *Chosunilbo* acquired this image from the North Korean Central Television broadcaster (KCTV). In other words, there are two different attempts of producing this image. Firstly, the North Korean image producer tried to convey a specific meaning to its audience. Secondly, the *Chosunilbo* grabbed this image to use it in their May 2nd article (Appendix 1.17). The image supports the prevalent distrust framings of the *Chosunilbo*'s articles. This example demonstrates how images in visual reporting can be manipulated, through the use of captions, in order to change their meaning.

4.4 Times and Places of Truths: Distrust and Distrust

I know what you did in the past: distrust

The *Chosunilbo* stood on the same historic pages - the year 1991-2 and 2008, the nuclear sites - as did the *Hankyoreh*, but times and places are reported with contrasting tones. The *Chosunilbo*'s critical standpoint toward North Korea's denuclearization verification process stresses on the necessity to grant experts unlimited accesses to known and suspected facilities. This kind of journalist's opinion is rooted in North Korea's experience. The article refers to the past and particularly to the events of February 1992 and June 2008 regarding North Korea's attitudes toward inspection from the international community. The *Chosunilbo* problematizes North Korea as the party which breached what it had promised, agreed and notified to other parties.

The May 2nd article (Appendix 1.17) reports on North Korea's doubtful willingness to denuclearize by defining the current progress as "a bumpy road" (Kim 2018, see Appendix 1.17). The journalist straightforwardly brings the issue of North Korea's unknown nuclear development level as a negative contributing factor to the peace process and unification:

The problem is that the international community does not have an accurate estimate of their amount or locations...(Ibid.).

It is conspicuous that reports elaborating on North Korea are distrust-oriented in a considerable manner.

North Korea has *long been allergic* [author's emphasis] to IAEA inspectors. North Korea agreed in a joint declaration with South Korea to forgo nuclear reprocessing and uranium enrichment facilities. The same year it submitted to the IAEA a list of its nuclear facilities and fissile materials, but an ensuing inspection revealed that it repeatedly reprocessed fissile materials and enriched more plutonium than it admitted. North Korea rejected requests for further inspections and kicked the IAEA inspectors out (Ibid.).

Drawn-out six-party talks also failed to get North Korea to agree to international inspections. In June 2008, the North blew up the cooling tower of the Yongbyon nuclear plant in a publicity stunt in front of foreign journalists but rebuffed a U.S. request for unlimited inspection of all its nuclear facilities (Ibid.).

The *Chosunilbo*'s timeframe regarding North Korea hardly moves beyond the year 1992 and 2008. The series of historical events are their *starting point*, which contradicts Chairman Kim's remarks in his introductory speech in which he stated that *the summit is the starting point* – to examine the North's willingness to denuclearize, as a way of offsetting the North's previous declaration in 1992 which it ended up breaking in both 1992 and 2008. The article outspokenly presents the journalist's opinion that North Korea *needs to* or *must allow* unlimited access to external experts in order to inspect in detail its nuclear development specifications and capabilities – including the related human resources, otherwise it cannot be trusted.

Denuclearization: past oriented

Throughout the nine *Chosunilbo* articles, two different nuclear sites are mentioned: Punggye-ri and Yongbyon site. Following the third inter-Korean summit the North's leader Kim Jong-un promised South Korea's President Moon Jae-in that it would dismantle the Punggye-ri nuclear

test facility in May 2018 through a series of controlled explosions. The North's leader made good on his promise to detonate explosives while international reporters (but not experts) were watching. The site was built by the leader Kim Jong-il far from the capital Pyongyang but only 2 kilometers from Hwasong concentration camps. The Yongbyon site is North Korea's primary nuclear facility and consists of an experimental nuclear power plant, a radiochemical laboratory, a nuclear fuel rod fabrication plant (Director General 2017), a light water reactor (LWR) and other small-scale construction and refurbishments (Nikitin 2009: 1).

The April 30th article (Appendix 1.15) introduces a 2008 event after the North pledged to invite international inspectors to witness the demolition process of the cooling tower in the Yongbyon site. In return, the US withdrew North Korea from the list of "State Sponsor of Terrorism: repeatedly provided support for acts of international terrorism" (US Department of State 2017, no page). However, soon the North continued its nuclear weapons development program. The *Chosunilbo* lists six nuclear tests occurring between 2006 and 2017 at the first and second tunnel in Punggye-ri. The article states Chairman Kim's comment as quoted by South Korean Cheongwadae Spokesman, Yoon Young-chan, as contradicting a number of news sources. According to Yoon's message to reporters, Kim commented that the conditions of the tunnels were good. However, experts' opinions were to the contrary. According to the first transparent news source – the Korea Meteorological Administration (KMA) – the land in the Punggye-ri site was seen to go down 3 cm, while on other tests there was more ground surface disturbance and reporting the earthquake on the "last Monday" (Jeong 2018c, see Appendix 1.15). Considering the article was written on Monday, April 30, last Monday referred to was in fact April 23, 2018. It is the same day that Chairman Kim Jong-un announced an invitation to external experts; thus, an additional information source (KMA 2018) gives more impetus to the readers to interpret Chairman Kim's comment as untrue.

Apparently mindful of media reports that the *test site is obsolete anyway* [author's emphasis]. Kim said, "some say that we are terminating facilities that are not functioning, but you will see that we have two more tunnels that are bigger than the existing ones and that they are in good condition." Yoon quoted Kim as saying (Ibid.).

But the article articulates that the closure of the test site did not constitute any meaningful loss to North Korea since the test site did not function properly anyway:

When North Korea announced its decision to shut down the test site, it said nuclear development is "complete" and the test site "has completed its mission". In other words, it had *nothing to lose by shutting it down* [author's emphasis] (Ibid.).

The article then directly quotes US President Trump: "Things are going very well" (Ibid.) and "We're not going to get played" (Ibid.). This supportive yet critical comment from the head of a superpower country upholds the *Chosunilbo*'s pungent criticism of North Korea's April 30th announcement. Arguably, the article does support war journalism values by "exposing their untruths and seeing 'them' as the problem" (Galtung 2003: 178) setting the agenda on who dominates the current conflict mood (Ibid.). However, the article's matter-of-fact style functions to present the *Chosunilbo* as simply giving neutral, factual, historical information. Importantly, the article acts as a reminder and enhances the reader's factual understanding of how the North has been dealing with the international request regarding its nuclear infrastructure. In other words, it warns the reader not to trust Kim and North Korea. This is recognized as a limitation of peace journalism and will be discussed in the following chapter.

4.5 Vague *us*, clear *them* Categorization

It is hard to recognize in the *Chosunilbo*'s reporting who is encompassed within the *us*, but it is obvious *who is not*: North Korea. Four articles either mention or highlight North Korea's past insincerity and double-face attitude, for example, while pledging to open its nuclear facilities to external experts and inviting them in 2008, North Korea suddenly changed approaches as soon as it reached its objectives. It did not continue to cooperate and kept postponing negotiation talks with the international community. These are the types of episodes that the *Chosunilbo* stresses in its reports. Since the *us* is not clearly articulated, the following analysis will introduce a clear *them* membership.

Them: North Korea

After the official *Rodong Sinmun Daily*'s release of the (North) KWPPC's announcement, the *Chosunilbo* reported the North's denuclearization plan with a very focused tenor on the North (Lim and Kim 2018, see Appendix 1.11). The title of the article, "How Significant Is N. Korea's Surprise Nuclear Freeze?" (Ibid.), brings attention to the nuclear freeze, while providing an overall neutral and skeptical view towards the announcement. The timing of the denuclearization announcement is regarded as surprising since the announcement was made just before the summits with South Korea and the US. The North's stance is reported together with zooming in on the skeptical experts' opinions and journalists' critical points. The article elucidates that the NKWP's announcement does not guarantee the regime's final direction as to whether the entire nuclear program will be abandoned. The previous statement is a strong critical point which should be assessed in its historical context with the highlighted part that North Korea alludes to its global status as a nuclear state. In the May 2nd article (Appendix 1.17) reporting of the six-party talks, North Korea is depicted as *them*; meanwhile, the US, International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), (international) inspectors, other parties of the six-party talks are illustrated in the same categorization, their actions described as promoting a common goal. North Korea does not align with this common action. Interestingly, even South Korea's positionality does not specifically appear. Except for one anonymous and one named source – respectively: US Secretary of State Mike Pompeo and other officials – no other sources were mentioned (Appendix 1.17).

Vague us

Then, who is considered *us*? The *us* is not clearly articulated. So far, the membership has been categorized by the value of *who are the peace promoters*. With this question, *us* can regard all the stakeholders who have participated in the multi-stakeholder talks to halt North Korea's nuclear weapons development for the sake of seeking peace. As stated above, North Korea is categorized as a clear *them*. Then, every stakeholder who is mentioned – South Korea, the US, Japan, Russia, China, the international nuclear inspectors, the international community who imposed economic sanctions toward North Korea – may be categorized as *us*. However, presented experts' opinions hint at intricate ideas about the arguments of the article. Expecting North Korea's denuclearization is groundless, according to an anonymous source, and "some pundits" with a particularly interesting expression "cloudy crystal balls" apparently following the US's reasoning (Lim and Kim 2018, see Appendix 1.11).

Some pundits, staring intently into these cloudy crystal balls, fear that Kim may offer to scrap only long-range intercontinental ballistic missiles capable of striking the U.S. mainland and that Trump could accept the proposal as he seeks to win votes for the Republican Party in upcoming mid-term elections (Ibid.).

The plausible explanation is that the forthcoming US presidential elections can affect the scope of the denuclearization negotiations with North Korea. So, apparently, the US actually does not thoroughly fit with the *us* categorization, and thus, the *us* categorization is just *vague*, as “a collection of categories but it is not a closed collection” (Leudar et al. 2004: 249). As witnessed historically, domestic and international politics are often intertwined. Domestic politics recurrently make use of international security threats to take the helm of state affairs. This bold expression can be a contributing factor to make the conflict not transparent but questionably *opaque/secret* for the media readership (Galtung 2003: 178).

Chapter 5

Conclusion: Beyond Peace Journalism

This research paper has explored South Korean leading media agencies' English language newspaper reporting of the third inter-Korean summit (April 27, 2018). The inter-Korean dialogue has actively started since early 2018 to prepare the unified Korean team participation at the 2018 Olympic Games. Considering that the latest North Korean nuclear provocation took place just in September 2017, PyeongChang 2018 opened the sluice for plain sailing over the peninsula very quickly. The unexpected inter-Korean dialogue brought large media attention to South Korea, particularly in light of the dramatic political changes. Following the international focus on the two Koreas' peace negotiation process and the two leaders, South Korean press clubs traditionally reiterated a Cold War-oriented journalism. In this context, it is important to value the 1995 media workers' initiative aimed to cast off the old journalism style, when they proclaimed to contribute to the Korean peninsula's peace through "The reporting and production standing rules for peaceful unification and inter-Korean reconciliation, cooperation" (National Union of Media workers et al. 1995). Therefore, the analysis of South Korean leading agencies' English media reporting is worth examining. Moreover, the research aimed to analyze the social context through media reporting, contributing to the promotion of media literacy for international and domestic readership. Finally, I engage with policy implications arising out of the present media reporting on the peace negotiation process and the two leaders.

The analysis presented in the research demonstrates that peace journalism elements are evident in the *Hankyoreh* while it has a limited presence in the *Chosunilbo*. The *Hankyoreh* reports the peace negotiation process and the two Korean leaders with critical and cautious standpoints, but dominantly covers and concludes with peace, truth, solution-oriented and humanized approach. Additionally, the *Hankyoreh* uses normalizing framing to define North Korea and its leader Kim Jong-un, as being within the *us* membership both in textual and visual representations. On the contrary, the *Chosunilbo* delivers the third inter-Korean summit more objectively with a matter-of-fact narrative tone. However, skeptical, untrustworthy and past-focus reporting prevails throughout the news articles with categorizing the North and its leader Kim as *them* – both textually and visually. Also, the *Chosunilbo* does not explicitly categorize its positionality toward President Moon's policy. Some elements of peace journalism – humanized approach – are nonetheless present but only in textual representation.

Understanding the timelines was one of the stark contrasts between the two agencies; 1991-2 and 2008 were frequently mentioned. The *Chosunilbo* presented the timeline of the 1992 and 2008 events in which North Korea broke its pledge to the international community, reminding readers of North Korea's untrustworthy past. Contrarily, the *Hankyoreh* provides a different interpretation of the 1991-2 and 2008 events. Notably, it gives the international context surrounding the signing of the 1991 Basic Agreement between the two Koreas, while it clarifies the differentiating factors between the 2008 and 2018 denuclearization commitment.

As previously mentioned, the two leading media agencies attach certain values to inter-Korean relations and the two leaders. This research has shown that the *Hankyoreh* and the *Chosunilbo* delivered reports about the historical media event somewhere between doubtful-

pessimistic and openly optimistic spectrum. The articles taken into consideration demonstrate that the *Hankyoreh* generally adheres to peace journalism values; meanwhile the *Chosunilbo* limitedly presents peace journalism orientations and shows several aspects of war journalism (Galtung 2003). I strongly agree that the achievement of peace journalism brings forward journalists' proactive roles in peace/conflict/war/violence. However, being future oriented, positive and open may not be just a matter of peace journalism, but actually structured intentional reporting aimed at manufacturing consent, whereby newsmakers may intentionally omit unpleasant facts or silence the negative aspects of the truth. For instance, the *Hankyoreh* never mentions human rights abuses and concentration camps, and its April 26th article reported the upcoming summits as following:

If the string of summits between South and North Korea, South Korea and the US, and North Korea and the US create a virtuous cycle, the summit among the three parties that Moon mentioned could become a real possibility, bringing the Korean Peninsula to the peak of a giving spring (Kim 2018, see Appendix 1.18).

The three countries' past and prospective future relations have never been easy. However, the author optimistically depicts them in full blossom, by disregarding a detailed reporting of the negotiations. In a way, promoting peace journalism values could make use of news as a politicizing tool, due to their selectiveness since media reporting is the product of representation. As Schudson said "All representations are selective" (as quoted in Hanitzsch 2004: 488), indeed, journalists are involved in media reporting processes with their own opinions at least at two stages; first when deciding what to report, and second on how to report it. To overcome politicization of media reporting, I assert that Ward's methodological objectivity (1998) can provide a complementary model of reporting capable of improving the peace journalism model.

Ward's definition of methodological objectivity (1998) would be an additional practical guide to South Korean media agencies and media outlets at large.

What objectivity requires is an active mind that uses its mental powers in ways that reduce the distortion of reports caused by wishful thinking, bad reasoning, petty feelings, and personal interests (Ward 1998: 122).

Methodological objectivity "reject[s] inaccuracy, lying and misinformation" (Schudson 2001: 150). Let us think of the very fundamental reason why readers subscribe to newspapers. Why do journalists go to conflict/war zones, and take high physical and psychological risks? Why did Chairman Kim Jong-un invite journalists to the nuclear site shut down? There are many possible reasons to answer these questions, however, the first reason is: because ordinary readers have limitations to access places where the news is happening – they rely on media to be there. So, newsmakers have a primal responsibility to deliver the news.

In the Korean context, as considered in the present research, integrating the objective reporting approach within peace journalism, not only allows for preventing reckless and over-optimistic perspectives, but also prevents the (re-)production of North Korea's vicious rumors and fake news. The division of the two Koreas hampered the interaction of inter-Korean media so far – even though there have been several attempts to have cooperation programs. However, much of the intractable problem exists with South Korean media agencies/journalists. Since North Korea is one of the opaqueness and closed-off countries in the world, producing un-verified news or reporting based on personal assumptions about North Korea seems to be one of the journalistic practices.

Checking facts takes time.¹⁰ There are situations when truth and facts will never be possible to verify. Thus, as stated in “The reporting and production standing rules for peaceful unification and inter-Korean reconciliation, cooperation” (National Union of Media workers et al. 1995), media need to deal with sources carefully and prudently. Or, as Ersoy states:

Media must pay greater attention to the linguistic approach used, especially regarding conflict-oriented events. As much care should be taken in use of adjectives as in word choice. The fundamental duty of the press in this respect is to deliver the event that has occurred (Ersoy 2016: 260).

Notwithstanding the media agencies’ effort to provide prompt and grounded reporting, the media need to be aware of their significant role in society. The reality we face “is formed through the represented and the representable” (Meijer 1993: 368.). Therefore, news reporting of the event implies the journalists’ enormous professional responsibility.¹¹ Since peace negotiation entails many phases and involves multiple stakeholders, media workers need a patient and cautious approach to its news production. It is difficult for the press to maintain such great patience considering that the media prefers the drama or the event rather than a long, tedious process. Nevertheless, sensationalism should be avoided in sensitive contexts of war and conflict. Thus, consistent energy in respect of the whole process of reporting is additionally required in order to render representation that neither aids war mongering, nor infantilizes its audience.

Notes

¹ “The analysis is based on the assumption that Korea is unified” (Enda 2018).

² Cheong Wa Dae is the presidential work place and residence of the Republic of Korea. The *Hankyoreh* writes it as Blue House.

³ As translated by the author from the original title: 평화통일과 남북화해·협력을 위한 보도·제작준칙.

⁴ Age, seniority, status is the important determinant in social norm, culture and etiquette in Korean society.

⁵ Both media agencies’ English news articles also provide Korean articles with the function of “this article reads in Korean” on the website.

⁶ Chinese Premier, Li Keqiang

⁷ The *Hankyoreh* writes Panmunjom as Punmunjeom.

⁸ As a North Korean leader

⁹ Available at April 21st articles’ images

http://www.rodong.rep.kp/ko/index.php?strPageID=SF01_01_02&iMenuID=1&iSubMenuID=5

¹⁰ One example was about North Korean key figure’s fake news. Many South Korean media outlets reported of Hyun, Songwol’s execution on August 2013 – Unhasu orchestra members were machine-gunned to death because they violated the law by videotaping pornography and sold videotapes. Surprisingly, Hyun, Songwol visited South Korea at the last PCOWG 2018 and the third inter-Korean summit official dinner in the same year with the North Korean first lady, Ri, Solju. It took almost four and half years to ascertain the truth about reporting of her death.

¹¹ Notwithstanding contrastive dissimilarity between German and Korean peace processes, Germany has been frequently mentioned as a comparable peace process for Korea’s. I would like to pay attention on West German publicly-owned press, ARD played a key role to build trust East and West Germans while peace process has been underway. West German journalism sought the objective and critical media reporting about East Germany in the 1970s. Media agency (ARD) regarded East German people as one of their audiences and tried to provide helpful information to them, e.g., Wolfgang Klein; Hesse (Kim and Shim 2011: 100) did not address ideological superiority nor criticize East German social system. West German media outlets gained the confidence from the East German people naturally (Ibid. 172). Trustworthy media interaction between two Germanys brought familiar sentiment to German people – being aware & being familiar to mutual understanding. Establishing present German was not from only the media’s achievement, but it is unavoidable that media functioned in instituting at the German Peace process. I would like to suggest as society’s integrational spirit as the consideration for newsmakers in the Korean peninsula.

References

- Appleman, R.E. (1992) *The U.S. Army and the Korean War: South to the Nakdong, North to the Yalu*. (2 vols.). Washington, D.C.: Center of Military History US Army.
- Basic Agreement (1991) (South and North Korea), opened for signature 13 December 1991, entered into force on 18, February 1992.
- Bennett, W.L. and Paletz, D.L. (1994) *Taken by Storm: The Media, Public Opinion, and US Foreign Policy in the Gulf War*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bläsi, B. (2004) 'Peace Journalism and the News Production Process', *Conflict & Communication Online* 3. Available at: http://www.cco.regener-online.de/2004/pdf_2004/blaesi.pdf (Accessed: 10 May 2018).
- Cho, Y. (2009) 'Unfolding Sporting Nationalism in South Korean Media Representations of the 1968, 1984 and 2000 Olympics', *Media, culture & society* 31(3), pp. 347-364.
- Choi, H. (2010) 'A Study on the Diversity of Korean Newspapers: Analyzing the Tendencies of Covering Three Major Issues', *Korean Journal of Journalism & Communication Studies* 54(3), pp. 399-426.
- Dai, J. and Hyun, K. (2010) 'Global Risk, Domestic Framing: Coverage of the North Korean Nuclear Test by US, Chinese, and South Korean News Agencies', *Asian Journal of Communication* 20(3), pp. 299-317.
- Dayan, D. and Katz, E. (1994) *Media Events: The Live Broadcasting of History*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Demmers, J. (2017) *Theories of Violent Conflict an Introduction*. 2nd edn. New York: Routledge.
- Director General. (2017) Application of Safeguards in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. IAEA Board of Governors General Conference edn. Vienna: International Atomic Energy Agency.
- Enda, C. (2018) 'Peace in North Korea Could Cost \$2 Trillion if History is a Guide', *Bloomberg, Politics*. 10 May 2018. Available at: <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2018-05-10/peace-in-north-korea-seen-costing-2-trillion-if-history-a-guide> (Accessed: 21 October 2018).
- Entman, R.M. (1993) 'Framing: Toward Clarification of a Fractured Paradigm', *Journal of communication* 43(4), pp. 51-58.
- Ersoy, M. (2016) 'War–peace Journalism in the Turkish Press: Countries Come to the Brink of War', *International Communication Gazette* 78(3), pp. 247-266.
- Galtung, J. (1967) 'On the Future of the International System', *Journal of Peace Research* 4(4), pp. 305-333.

- Galtung, J. (2003) 'Peace Journalism', *Media Asia* 30(3), pp. 177-180.
- Galtung, J. (2015) 'Peace Journalism and Reporting on the United States', *Brown Journal of World Affairs* 22(1), pp. 321-334.
- Galtung, J. and Fischer, D. (2013) 'High Road, Low Road: Charting the Course for Peace Journalism', in Galtung J. *Pioneer of Peace Research*, pp. 95-102.
- Ha, S. and Lee, M. (2012) 'A News Frame Analysis by the South Korean Press on the Livelihoods of a North Koreans', *Korean Journal of Communication & Information* 5, pp. 222-241.
- Ha, Y. (2001) 'SOUTH KOREA IN 2000 A Summit and the Search for New Institutional Identity', *Asian Survey* 41(1), pp. 30-39.
- Hall, S. (ed.) (1997) *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*. London: Sage.
- Hanitzsch, T. (2004) 'Journalists as Peacekeeping Force? Peace Journalism and Mass Communication Theory', *Journalism Studies* 5(4), pp. 483-495. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616700412331296419> (Accessed: 13 May 2018).
- Herman, E.S. and Chomsky, N. (2010) *Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media*. London: Random House.
- Iyengar, S. (1990) 'Framing Responsibility for Political Issues: The Case of Poverty', *Political Behavior* 12(1), pp. 19-40.
- Jenkins, R. (1994) 'Rethinking Ethnicity: Identity, Categorization and Power', *Ethnic and Racial studies* 17(2), pp. 197-223.
- Jeon, H. (2002) '북한의 대남정책 특징 (Characteristics of North Korea's Policy Toward South Korea)', *Korea Institute for National Unification Institutional Repository* 8, pp. 1-72.
- Jeong, W. (2018a) 'Moon Says N.Korea Willing to Scrap Nuclear Weapons' *The Chosunilbo*, Politics. 20 April. Available at: http://english.chosun.com/site/data/html_dir/2018/04/20/2018042000998.html (Accessed: 15 July 2018).
- Jeong, W. (2018b) 'Summit Statement on Denuclearization Left to Leaders' *The Chosunilbo*, Politics. 25 April. Available at: http://english.chosun.com/site/data/html_dir/2018/04/25/2018042501187.html (Accessed: 15 July 2018).
- Jeong, W. (2018c) 'N.Korea to Invite Experts to Shutdown of Nuclear 'Test Site' *The Chosunilbo*, North Korea. 30 April. Available at: http://english.chosun.com/site/data/html_dir/2018/04/30/2018043000777.html (Accessed: 15 July 2018).
- Jeong, W. (2018d) 'Moon Briefs World Leaders on Inter-Korean Summit' *The Chosunilbo*, Politics. 30 April. Available at:

- http://english.chosun.com/site/data/html_dir/2018/04/30/2018043001202.html (Accessed: 15 July 2018).
- Jeong, W. (2018e) 'What did Moon and Kim Talk about Alone?' *The Chosunilbo*, Politics. 2 May. Available at: http://english.chosun.com/site/data/html_dir/2018/05/02/2018050201052.html (Accessed: 15 July 2018).
- Kellner, D. (2003) *Media Spectacle*. London: Routledge.
- Kim, B. (2018) 'President Moon Expected to Meet with Trump again in mid-May' *The Hankyoreh*, North Korea. 26 April. Available at: http://english.hani.co.kr/arti/english_edition/e_northkorea/842250.html (Accessed: 15 July 2018).
- Kim, J.E. (2018) 'South and North Korea Commit to Goal of a Nuclear-Free Korean Peninsula' *The Hankyoreh*, North Korea. 28 April. Available at: http://english.hani.co.kr/arti/english_edition/e_northkorea/842507.html (Accessed: 15 July 2018).
- Kim, J.M. (2018) 'Verifying N.Korea's Denuclearization could be a Bumpy Road' *The Chosunilbo*, North Korea. 2 May. Available at: http://english.chosun.com/site/data/html_dir/2018/05/02/2018050201038.html (Accessed: 15 July 2018).
- Kim, Y. (2010) 'North-South Korean Relationship in Kim Dae Jung-Roh Moo Hyun Government', *Memory & Future Vision* 22(0), pp. 109-141.
- Kim, Y. and Shim, Y. (2011) *Unification and Journalism: Germany's experience*. Seoul: Korea Press Foundation.
- Korea Meteorological Administration (Last updated 2018) *International Earthquake Report*. Available at: http://www.kma.go.kr/eng/weather/current_state/information.jsp?eqk=eqk_web_3_20180423043117.xml&x=28&y=13 (Accessed: 24 September 2018).
- Kress, G. and T. Van Leeuwen (eds) (2006) *Reading Images: The Grammar of Visual Design*. (2 edn) London: Routledge.
- Lee, H. (2018) '2 Koreas Promise a New 'Age of Peace'' *The Chosunilbo*, Politics. 27 April. Available at: http://english.chosun.com/site/data/html_dir/2018/04/27/2018042702556.html (Accessed: 15 July 2018).
- Lee, J. (2018a) '[News Analysis] Economic Development Becomes a Priority for North Korea' *The Hankyoreh*, North Korea. 23 April. Available at: http://english.hani.co.kr/arti/english_edition/e_northkorea/841712.html (Accessed: 15 July 2018).
- Lee, J. (2018b) 'President Moon Views Summit as Establishing Momentum for Ongoing Dialogue' *The Hankyoreh*, North Korea. 25 April. Available at

- http://english.hani.co.kr/arti/english_edition/e_northkorea/842030.html (Accessed: 15 July 2018).
- Lee, J. (2018c) '[News Analysis] Kim Plans to Invite Experts and Journalists to Witness Nuclear Test Site Shutdown' *The Hankyoreh*, North Korea. 30 April. Available at http://english.hani.co.kr/arti/english_edition/e_northkorea/842704.html (Accessed: 15 July 2018).
- Lee, J.W. and Maguire, J. (2011) 'Road to Reunification? Unitary Korean Nationalism in South Korean Media Coverage of the 2004 Athens Olympic Games', *Sociology* 45(5), pp. 848-867.
- Lee, W. (2000) 'Image Analysis of North Korea & Chairman Kim Jong-Il during the Inter-Korean Summit', *Korean Society For Journalism And Communication Studies* 31, pp. 26-34.
- Leudar, I., Marsland, V., and Nekvapil, J. (2004) 'On Membership Categorization: 'us', 'them' and 'doing Violence' in Political Discourse', *Discourse & Society* 15(2-3), pp. 243-266.
- Lim, M. (2018) 'Leaders of 2 Koreas Meet at Border' *The Chosunilbo*, Politics. 27 April. Available at http://english.chosun.com/site/data/html_dir/2018/04/27/2018042700858.html (Accessed: 15 July 2018).
- Lim, M. and Kim, J. (2018) 'How Significant is N.Korea's Surprise Nuclear Freeze?' *The Chosunilbo*, Politics. 23 April. Available at http://english.chosun.com/site/data/html_dir/2018/04/23/2018042301129.html (Accessed: 15 July 2018).
- Lim, S. (2010) 'Transfer of Power and Change of North Korea Policy: Focusing on Lee Myung-Bak Administration', *Journal of Korean Politics* 19(2), pp. 135-165.
- Matray, J.I. (2002) 'Dean Acheson's Press Club Speech Reexamined', *Journal of Conflict Studies* 22(1).
- Meijer, M. (1993) 'Countering Textual Violence: On the Critique of Representation and the Importance of Teaching its Methods', *Women's Studies International Forum* 16(4), pp. 367-378.
- Ministry of Unification, Government of the Republic of Korea (2018) *Development of Inter-Korean Relations Act*, Available at: http://elaw.klri.re.kr/eng_mobile/viewer.do?hseq=32776&type=part&key=1 (Accessed: 23 October 2018).
- Moon, C. (2007) 'Comparing the 2000 and 2007 Inter-Korean Summits', *Global Asia* 2(3), pp. 76-88.
- Moon, J. (2018) 'Opening Remarks by President Moon Jae-in at a Luncheon with Chief Executives of Korean Media Organizations' *Remarks: Cheng Wa Dae*. 19 April. Available at: <http://english1.president.go.kr/BriefingSpeeches/Speeches/27> (Accessed: 23 October 2018).
- National Union of Media workers, Journalists Association of Korea and Korean Producers & Directors' Association (1995) *Reporting and Production Standing Rules for Peaceful Unification and Inter-Korean Reconciliation, Cooperation* (평화통일과 남북화해·협력에 위한 보도제작준칙).

- Available at: <http://www.kpda.co/new/sub/company/regulation/regu01.html?tb1=6> (Accessed: 22 October 2018).
- Nikitin, M.B. (2009) 'North Korea's Nuclear Weapons: Technical Issues', No. RL34256. Washington D.C.: Congressional Research Service. Available at: <http://www.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/a513528.pdf> (Accessed: 24 October 2018).
- Panmunjom Declaration for Peace, Prosperity and Unification of the Korean Peninsula 2018 (South and North Korea), opened for signature 27 April 2018, submitted to the United Nations General Assembly on 6 September 2018 (S/2018/820).
- Preparatory Committee for the 2018 Inter-Korean Summit (2018) *Record 2,833 Domestic, Foreign Reporters Covering Latest Inter-Korean Summit*. Available at: <http://www.korea.net/Government/Briefing-Room/Press-Releases/view?articleId=3316> (Accessed: 12 May 2018).
- Rodrigues, R.C. (2013) 'Photographic Image: Thematization of its Discourses', *Journal of Signal and Information Processing* 4(4), pp. 414-422.
- Schudson, M. (2001) 'The Objectivity Norm in American Journalism', *Journalism* 2(2), pp. 149-170.
- Semetko, H.A. and Valkenburg, P.M. (2000) 'Framing European Politics: A Content Analysis of Press and Television News', *Journal of Communication* 50(2), pp. 93-109.
- Seo, Y. (2018) 'Leaders of South and North Korea Meet for First Summit in 11 Years' *The Hankyoreh*, North Korea. 27 April. Available at: http://english.hani.co.kr/arti/english_edition/e_northkorea/842405.html (Accessed 15 July 2018).
- Seong, Y. (2018) 'President Moon Emphasizes that North Korean Committed to Denuclearization' *The Hankyoreh*, North Korea. 20 April. Available at: http://english.hani.co.kr/arti/english_edition/e_northkorea/841451.html (Accessed 15 July 2018).
- Seong, Y. and Seo, Y. (2018) 'Moon Shares Behind-the-Scenes Story of Inter-Korean Summit with Top Secretaries and Aides at Blue House' *The Hankyoreh*, North Korea. 1 May. Available at: http://english.hani.co.kr/arti/english_edition/e_northkorea/842848.html (Accessed: 15 July 2018).
- Song, E. (2013) *Inter Korean Relations Chronology*. Seoul: Korea Institute for National Unification.
- Special Report of the United Command on the Armistice in Korea* (1953) S 3079. United Nations Repository, Available at: http://repository.un.org/bitstream/handle/11176/84548/S_3079-EN.pdf?sequence=2&isAllowed=y (Accessed: 22 October 2018).
- Takahshi, K. and Watanabe, K. (2015) 'Effects of image blur on visual perception and affective response', *Knowledge and Smart Technology (KST)*, 2015 7th International Conference on, 28-31 January 2015. IEEE, pp.169-172.

- The Chosunilbo (n.d.) *About Us*. Available at: http://english.chosun.com/dhtml/f_1abtus.html (Accessed: 31 March 2018).
- The Hankyoreh (n.d.) *Introduction*. Available at: <http://english.hani.co.kr/arti/ENGLISH/introduction.html> (Accessed: 31 March 2018).
- Toloraya, G. (2018) *Designing A New Peace and Security System in Korea*. Available at: <https://www.38north.org/2018/09/gtoloraya090718/> (Accessed: 7 September 2018).
- Truman, H.S. (1952) 'Statement by the President on the Decision to Withdraw U.S. Forces from Korea, 1947-1949'. Available at: <https://www.trumanlibrary.org/publicpapers/index.php?pid=2257> (Accessed: 7 May 2018).
- United Nations Security Council (1950) *Complaint of Aggression upon the Republic of Korea*. Security Council Resolution. S/RES/82. Available at: [http://www.un.org.eur.idm.oclc.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/82\(1950\)](http://www.un.org.eur.idm.oclc.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/82(1950)) (Accessed: 24 April 2018).
- United States Forces Korea (n.d.) *United Nations Command*. Available at: <https://web.archive.org/web/20130312233107/http://www.usfk.mil/usfk/content.united.nations.command.68> (Accessed: 2 November 2018).
- US Department of State (Last updated 20 November 2017) *State Sponsors of Terrorism* Available at: https://www.state.gov/j/ct/list/c14151.htm?mod=article_inline (Accessed: 23 September 2018).
- Van Leeuwen, T. and Jewitt, C. (eds) (2004) *The Handbook of Visual Analysis*. London: Sage.
- Ward, S.J. (1998) 'An Answer to Martin Bell: Objectivity and Attachment in Journalism', *Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics* 3(3), pp. 121-125.
- Weathersby, K. (1993) *Soviet Aims in Korea and the Origins of the Korean War, 1945-1950: New Evidence from Russian Archives*. (8 vols.). Washington, D.C.: Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars.
- Wolfsfeld, G. (1997) 'Promoting Peace through the News Media: Some Initial Lessons from the Oslo Peace Process', *Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics* 2(4), pp. 52-70.
- Yoo, K. and Seong, Y. (2018) 'Diplomatic Efforts Toward Denuclearization are Accelerating' *The Hankyoreh*, North Korea. 30 April. Available at: http://english.hani.co.kr/arti/english_edition/e_northkorea/842706.html (Accessed: 15 July 2018).

(Images)

- Kim, C. (2018) *The image of a skyline of Pyongyang along the Taedong River*. Available at: http://english.hani.co.kr/arti/english_edition/e_northkorea/841712.html (Accessed: 15 July 2018).

- Kim, K. (2018) *The image of the third inter-Korean summit*, Available at:
http://english.hani.co.kr/arti/english_edition/e_northkorea/842405.html (Accessed: 15 July 2018).
- Newsis. (2018) *The image of North Korean leader, Kim Jong-un*, Available at
http://english.chosun.com/site/data/html_dir/2018/05/02/2018050201038.html (Accessed: 15 July 2018).
- Newsis. (2018) *The image of the two leaders*, Available at
http://english.chosun.com/site/data/html_dir/2018/04/27/2018042700858.html (Accessed: 15 July 2018).
- Rodong Sinmun Daily. (2018) *The image of the prior plenary session of the KCNA*, Available at:
http://english.chosun.com/site/data/html_dir/2018/04/23/2018042301129.html (Accessed: 15 July 2018).
- Yonhap (2018) *The image of the prior plenary session of the KCNA*. Available at:
http://english.hani.co.kr/arti/english_edition/e_northkorea/841712.html (Accessed: 15 July 2018).

Appendices 1: 18 news articles of news coverage

The Hankyoreh

- 1.1 (April 20th) President Moon emphasizes that North Korea committed to denuclearization
available at http://english.hani.co.kr/arti/english_edition/e_northkorea/841451.html
- 1.2 (April 23rd) Economic development becomes a priority to North Korea
available at http://english.hani.co.kr/arti/english_edition/e_northkorea/841712.html
- 1.3 (April 25th) President Moon views summit as establishing momentum for ongoing dialogue
available at http://english.hani.co.kr/arti/english_edition/e_northkorea/842030.html
- 1.4 (April 26th) President Moon expected to meet with Trump again in mid-May
available at http://english.hani.co.kr/arti/english_edition/e_northkorea/842250.html
- 1.5 (April 27th) Leaders of South and North Korea meet for first summit in 11 years
available at http://english.hani.co.kr/arti/english_edition/e_northkorea/842405.html
- 1.6 (April 28th) South and North Korea commit to goal of a nuclear-free Korean Peninsula
available at http://english.hani.co.kr/arti/english_edition/e_northkorea/842507.html
- 1.7 (April 30th) Kim plans to invite experts and journalists to witness nuclear test site shutdown
available at http://english.hani.co.kr/arti/english_edition/e_northkorea/842704.html
- 1.8 (April 30th) Diplomatic efforts toward denuclearization are accelerating
available at http://english.hani.co.kr/arti/english_edition/e_northkorea/842706.html
- 1.9 (May 1st) Moon shares behind-the-scenes story of inter-Korean summit with top secretaries
and aides at Blue House
available at http://english.hani.co.kr/arti/english_edition/e_northkorea/842848.html

The Chosunilbo

- 1.10 (April 20th) Moon Says N.Korea Willing to Scrap Nuclear Weapons
available at
http://english.chosun.com/site/data/html_dir/2018/04/20/2018042000998.html
- 1.11 (April 23rd) How Significant is N.Korea's Surprise Nuclear Freeze?
available at
http://english.chosun.com/site/data/html_dir/2018/04/23/2018042301129.html
- 1.12 (April 25th) Summit Statement on Denuclearization Left to Leaders
available at
http://english.chosun.com/site/data/html_dir/2018/04/25/2018042501187.html
- 1.13 (April 27th) Leaders of 2 Koreas Meet at Border
available at
http://english.chosun.com/site/data/html_dir/2018/04/27/2018042700858.html
- 1.14 (April 27th) 2 Koreas Promise New 'Age of Peace'

available at

http://english.chosun.com/site/data/html_dir/2018/04/27/2018042702556.html

- 1.15 (April 30th) N.Korea to Invite Experts to Shutdown of Nuclear Test Site

available at

http://english.chosun.com/site/data/html_dir/2018/04/30/2018043000777.html

- 1.16 (April 30th) Moon Briefs World Leaders on Inter-Korean Summit

available at

http://english.chosun.com/site/data/html_dir/2018/04/30/2018043001202.html

- 1.17 (May 2nd) Verifying N.Korea's Denuclearization Could Be a Bumpy Road

available at

http://english.chosun.com/site/data/html_dir/2018/05/02/2018050201038.html

- 1.18 (May 2nd) What Did Moon and Kim Talk About Alone?

available at

http://english.chosun.com/site/data/html_dir/2018/05/02/2018050201052.html

President Moon emphasizes that North Korean committed to denuclearization

Posted on : Apr.20,2018 18:30 KST Modified on : Apr.20,2018 18:30 KST

Withdrawal of US troops from Korean Peninsula not under discussion at present



South Korean President Moon Jae-in meets with the presidents of 46 media companies prior to lunch at the Blue House on Apr. 19. (Blue House Photo Pool)

President Moon Jae-in said on Apr. 19 that North Korea was “expressing its commitment to complete denuclearization to the international community,” adding that upcoming inter-Korean and North Korea-US summits will need to be used to “end the armistice regime that has persisted for 65 years and proceed to a declaration of the [Korean] war’s end and signing of a peace agreement.”

Moon’s remarks came during a luncheon at the Blue House that day with 46 presidents from 48 media companies, including the *Hankyoreh*.

“With North Korea proclaiming its status as a nuclear power, some people have predicted that it will try to negotiate with the US at the level of a freeze or a ban on nuclear proliferation, but North Korea is expressing its commitment to complete denuclearization,” he said.

“I don’t think they’re on a different page from us in terms of the denuclearization concept,” he added.

Appendix 1.1

The *Hankyoreh* (April 20th, 2018)

22 Moon went on to say that North Korea was “not specifying conditions [for
23 denuclearization] that would be unacceptable to the US, such as withdrawing US
24 Forces Korea.”

25 “They have only talked about an end to hostile policies toward North Korea and security
26 guarantees for themselves,” he said. It is the first time Moon has directly stated that
27 North Korea did not demand the withdrawal of USFK.

28 With North Korea adopting a proactive stance on denuclearization, Moon predicted the
29 upcoming inter-Korean and North Korea-US summit would yield results in broader
30 terms.

31 “It doesn’t seem that it will be that difficult to reach basic agreement in broader terms
32 through the inter-Korean and North Korea-US summits, whether it’s denuclearization,
33 [South and North Korea] establishing a peace regime in the event of denuclearization,
34 normalizing North Korea-US relations, or international assistance for North Korea’s
35 economic development,” he said.

36 In his remarks, Moon hinted that South and North Korea and the US had already come
37 to at least some consensus on the issues in the question.

38 “North Korea is showing a proactive commitment to dialogue, and we have been fully
39 sharing information, discussing things, and coordinating with the US,” he said.

40 On Apr. 18, US President Donald Trump said South and North Korea have his
41 “blessing” in their discussions on ending the Korean War. But Moon cautioned, “If you
42 look at things objectively, we have only just crossed the threshold of dialogue.”

43 “Beyond the inter-Korean summit, the first-ever summit taking place between North
44 Korea and the US needs to succeed before we can talk about dialogue being a
45 success,” he said.

46 Moon also repeatedly emphasized the importance of the inter-Korean summit playing
47 a guiding role for the success of the later North Korea-US summit.

48 “South and North cannot generate progress irrespective of the North Korea-US summit,
49 nor can they reach an agreement past international sanctions, so there isn’t really a lot
50 the two sides can agree separately,” he said.

51 “The inter-Korean summit needs to provide a good beginning, and momentum has to
52 be generated for continued dialogue based on the outcome of the North Korea-US
53 summit,” he suggested.

54 Moon also appealed to the press to cooperate across divisions of “progressive” and
55 “conservative.”

Appendix 1.1

The *Hankyoreh* (April 20th, 2018)

56 “I don’t think the ultimate goal of South and North Korea’s prosperity is a ‘conservative’
57 or ‘progressive’ issue,” he said.
58 “I believe the two summits will be successful, and the complete denuclearization and
59 establishment of permanent peace on the Korean Peninsula will come faster, when
60 the press harnesses public opinion and serves as a guide for peace on the peninsula.”
61 By Seong Yeon-cheol, staff reporter

[News Analysis] Economic development becomes a priority for North Korea

Posted on : Apr.23,2018 17:16 KST Modified on : Apr.23,2018 17:16 KST

“We will no longer need any nuclear tests or ICBM launches,” says Kim Jong-un



The skyline of Pyongyang along the Taedong River is partially covered in fog on a recent morning.

North Korean leader Kim Jong-un officially announced that he has changed the focus of the regime’s strategy from nuclear weapons to the economy. This important shift of strategic direction was officially announced prior to the inter-Korean and North Korea-US summits on Apr. 20, during the third plenary session of the 7th Central Committee of the Korean Workers’ Party (KWP), a key leadership body in the North Korean regime. “We have observed the brilliance of the historical achievements illuminated by our party’s strategic course on simultaneously building the economy and a nuclear arsenal. The ‘two-track’ course has concluded in a great victory,” Kim said. This marks the official end of the “two-track” development of nuclear weapons and the economy, which was adopted during a plenary session of the KWP Central Committee on Mar. 31, 2013.

Appendix 1.2

The *Hankyoreh* (April 23rd, 2018)

19 Considering that the “two-track” course was the North Korean government’s strategic
20 foundation that brought the Korean Peninsula to the brink of war last year through
21 frequent missile test launches and six nuclear weapon tests, declaring the conclusion
22 that this course is sure to have a major impact on circumstances on the Korean
23 Peninsula. In addition to this, Kim said that “the party’s [new] strategic course is to
24 focus all of its energy on building a socialist economy.” This declaration means that
25 the crux of the state’s development strategy is shifting from nuclear weapons to the
26 economy.

27 Kim’s strategic shift has become the subject of global attention because it comes prior
28 to the inter-Korean and North Korea-US summits. This attention has focused on Kim’s
29 declaration that “we will no longer need any nuclear tests, mid- and long-range or
30 intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM) test launches, and as a result the mission of
31 the northern nuclear test site has come to an end” and on the KWP Central
32 Committee’s subsequent decision to shut down the nuclear test site at Punggye Village
33 and to halt nuclear tests and ICBM missile tests as of Apr. 21.

34 This can be seen as a preemptive measure to build trust given the suspicion that
35 remains in various parts of the international community about Kim’s commitment to
36 denuclearization leading up to the inter-Korean and North Korea-US summits. This is
37 also evidence that Kim is determined to bring about successful results in those two
38 summits.

39 Shortly after this was reported by the Korean Central News Agency (KCNA) on Apr.
40 21, US President Donald Trump said “This is very good news for North Korea and the
41 World - big progress! Look forward to our Summit.”

42 The Blue House also said that it “welcomes North Korea’s decision, which represents
43 significant progress toward the denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula and will
44 contribute to creating a very positive environment for the success of the inter-Korean
45 and North Korea-US summits.”

Appendix 1.2

The *Hankyoreh* (April 23rd, 2018)



The KCNA reported on Apr. 21 that the Central Committee of the North Korean Workers' Party had voted to halt further nuclear and missile testing during a plenary session held the previous day. (Yonhap News)

Experts caution that Kim may be reinforcing North Korea's status as a nuclear power

But some critics in the US and other areas point to Kim's emphasis on the "completion of the state nuclear force" and the "conclusion of the weaponization of nuclear weapons" as the reason for the termination of the "two-track" policy and argue that this was less of a statement of genuine commitment to denuclearization and more of a declaration of the possession of nuclear weapons designed to reinforce the North's status as a nuclear power state. To be sure, Kim did not explicitly state that he was giving up nuclear weapons. This is leading to a major divide in how experts are interpreting Kim's decision and measures. But the majority viewpoint is that this is a significant preliminary trust-building step by the North.

On Apr. 22, Kim Yeon-cheol, professor at Inje University, said that it is necessary to remember that Kim Jong-un has repeatedly said that "denuclearization was the dying wish of our ancestors, and our unchanging stance is working to achieve denuclearization," both when South Korea's special delegation visited the North on Mar. 5 and when he held a summit with Chinese President Xi Jinping on Mar. 26.

Appendix 1.2

The *Hankyoreh* (April 23rd, 2018)

“It was because North Korea has clearly stated its commitment to denuclearization that the inter-Korean summit was planned, that an agreement was reached on the North Korea-US summit and that the North Korea-China summit was held. Ultimately, North Korea’s action can be interpreted as a preemptive measure designed to build trust and create the conditions for the denuclearization negotiations,” Kim Yeon-cheol said.

“While things are still uncertain, this can be seen as Kim Jong-un crossing the Rubicon. His decision and measures mean that he will be going ‘all in’ on the economy in the future,” said a former senior official who is familiar with analyses of North Korea.

Former Unification Minister Lee Jong-seok placed particular emphasis on the fact that Kim had unilaterally decided to shut down the Punggye Village nuclear test site. For one thing, there is no precedent of a nuclear power state shutting down a nuclear test site and declaring it will not carry out any more nuclear tests. On top of that, shutting down the Punggye Village site was a major concession that Kim could have offered Trump during their summit. This shows how committed Kim is to bringing the inter-Korean and North Korea-US summits to a successful conclusion.

“The devil is in the details”

“It generally takes more than 15 test launches to secure the accuracy and safety of ICBMs. By declaring that it’s halting test launches before reaching that point, the North is making a friendly overture to the US, which has regarded those tests as a grave security threat. This is a rather encouraging buildup to the two summits,” said another veteran expert, who wished to remain anonymous.

“We mustn’t forget that the devil is in the details. Since it’s not clear whether North Korea’s declaration of the end of the ‘two-track’ course is based on shutting down its nuclear program or on the completion of its nuclear program, the crucial question is how to convince the North to shut down that program during the inter-Korean and the North Korea-US summit,” this expert added.

Considering that Kim Jong-un has steadily pushed for the “marketization” of the North Korean economy since he took power in 2012, attention should also be paid to the section of the plenary session’s decision statement that promises to “push for dialogue and closer ties with our neighbors and the international community.”

The same can be said for the explicit declaration of the two goals of “creating an international environment that is well-suited for the construction of a socialist economy” and “defending the peace and stability of the Korean Peninsula and the world.” During the upcoming inter-Korean and North Korea-US summits, there will be agreements of various importance between South Korea, North Korea and the US in regard to

Appendix 1.2

The *Hankyoreh* (April 23rd, 2018)

100 denuclearizing the Korean Peninsula, establishing a permanent peace regime,
101 resolving military hostility and guaranteeing the security of the North Korean regime.
102 The process of implementing those agreements is likely to coincide with the relaxing
103 of sanctions against the North by the UN and other parts of the international community
104 and the expansion of North Korea's access to the international economic system.
105 Furthermore, Kim's decision and measures largely suggest that he hopes to use the
106 two summits to ease the international community's concerns in exchange for resolving
107 military hostility to guarantee the security of the North Korean regime and unlocking
108 the door to becoming a member of the international economic system.
109 By Lee Je-hun, senior staff writer

President Moon views summit as establishing momentum for ongoing dialogue

Posted on : Apr.25,2018 16:21 KST Modified on : Apr.25,2018 16:21 KST

International sanctions on North Korea restrict economic cooperation projects that typified previous summit agreements



A paper dove sculpture created from messages in 43 different languages expressing the world's wish for peace is displayed at the entrance to the Korea Exhibition Center in Goyang, Gyeonggi Province on Apr. 24. (by Kim Bong-gyu, staff photographer)

“There are currently many constraints on the inter-Korean summit. South and North cannot make any separate progress irrespective of the North Korea-US summit, nor are they able to make agreements beyond international sanctions. . . . It does seem clear, however, that we at least need to establish the momentum for dialogue to continue.”

These remarks were made by President Moon Jae-in during an invitational luncheon for media company presidents at the Blue House on Apr. 19. At the time, the remarks

Appendix 1.3

The *Hankyoreh* (April 25th, 2018)

were seen as a formality intended to quiet excessive media hopes for the upcoming Apr. 27 inter-Korean summit. They weren't.

Instead, the remarks encapsulated Moon's heartfelt opinions and strategy regarding historic improvements in inter-Korean relations - the third of three main agenda items given by the Blue for the summit, alongside denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula and establishment of permanent peace. The "we at least need to establish the momentum for dialogue to continue" part was the key element.

Moon based his determination primarily on the fact that stiffer sanctions by the UN and international community in response to North Korea's nuclear and missile development programs have ruled out the possibility of the upcoming summit producing the kinds of large-scale economic cooperation projects that emerged from the first two inter-Korean summits in 2000 and 2007. This does not mean he is giving up on the idea of economic cooperation.

Most government officials and experts agree that if the inter-Korean and North Korea-US summits get the ball rolling toward denuclearization, sanctions will be loosened as the agreements are implemented, which will raise the opportunity to discuss economic cooperation as a major agenda item at another future inter-Korean summit. It's this position that has informed summit preparatory committee chairman Im Jong-seok's repeated confirmations that economic cooperation "is not a major part of this summit's agenda."

But Moon's focus is not confined to the practical constraints that sanctions pose. His plan to propose establishing a liaison office at Panmunjeom and forming joint inter-Korean committee in various areas is aimed at laying the groundwork for realizing his longstanding goal of peaceful coexistence and shared prosperity for South and North – as witnessed in his declaration that the "ultimate goal is inter-Korean prosperity."

This approach is especially significant in its attempts to restore and actualize the system based on the 1991 Basic Agreement. Based on the results of senior-level inter-Korean talks, the Basic Agreement (Agreement on Reconciliation, Non-aggression and Exchanges and Cooperation between the South and the North) is the most comprehensive and concrete of the agreements reached by South and North Korean authorities at any time, including the first and second inter-Korean summits. It has been called a "canon" for peaceful inter-Korean coexistence – but it has been regarded as a dead letter after failure to implement its terms.

An old Korean saying goes, "When you've tripped and fallen, use it to take a break." Since there is no way of avoiding the constraints of sanctions, a better approach than

Appendix 1.3

The *Hankyoreh* (April 25th, 2018)

wasting effort toward an agreement on new cooperative efforts might be to restore and actualize the Basic Agreement system and achieve progress in establishing regular, ongoing, permanent dialogue to keep inter-Korean relations on a solid footing. That's the essence of Moon's message about establishing momentum for continued dialogue.

North Korea's painful memory of the 1991 Basic Agreement

But for North Korea, the Basic Agreement is a painful memory. While it has stressed the importance of the July 4 Joint Statement of 1972, the June 15 Joint Declaration of 2000, and the October 4 Summit Declaration of 2007 as major inter-Korean agreements, it has avoided mentioning the Basic Agreement. Pyongyang remembers that agreement as a defensive decision it made to protect its regime and avoid being absorbed into the South as the former Soviet republics and other "existential socialist states" were adopting new regimes in the early 1990s.

Even after the Roh Tae-woo administration's early-'90s proposal to establish a permanent Seoul-Pyongyang liaison mission was reduced to the creation of a Panmunjeom liaison office, that office's functions were downgraded to the level of a direct phone line. Similarly, the suspension of joint political, military, and economic committees as permanent meeting groups between inter-Korean authorities after just a few meetings was due in some part to Pyongyang's half-hearted attitude.

But the administration and experts have concluded that as Moon's counterpart in the talks, Kim Jong-un actually would like to reconfigure inter-Korean relations as a normal relationship between two sovereign states – unlike his father and grandfather with their constant calls for "reunification of the fatherland."

United Front Department director Kim Yong-chol, who has played a key role working on behalf of Kim Jong-un to prepare for the inter-Korean and North Korea-US summits with Moon's representative, National Intelligence Service director Suh Hoon, was a member of the North Korean delegation to the senior-level inter-Korean talks in the 1990s. Shortly after the Basic Agreement's adoption, Kim Yong-chol reportedly complained that the document was "yours [South Korea's], not ours."

But a quarter-century has passed since then – and, most importantly, the top leader is hewing to a different position. A former senior administration official sounded a hopeful note on Apr. 24, predicting that "if an agreement is reached at the summit to establish a liaison office at Panmunjeom, that will be a historic achievement on par with any agreement from the first or second summits."

By Lee Je-hoon, staff reporter

President Moon expected to meet with Trump again in mid-May

Posted on : Apr.26,2018 18:20 KST Modified on : Apr.26,2018 18:20 KST

Two heads of state to discuss results of inter-Korean summit



President Moon walks in the presidential garden with Im Jong-seok, Blue House Chief of Staff, and Jang Ha-sung, Blue House Policy Chief of Staff, after having lunch with Blue House employees on Apr. 25. (provided by Blue house)

South Korean President Moon Jae-in and US President Donald Trump will be meeting again in the middle of next month. Chronologically speaking, this will be somewhere between the inter-Korean summit on Apr. 27 and the North Korea-US summit that is likely to happen in late May or early June. During their summit, Trump and Moon are expected to discuss the results of the inter-Korean summit, which will involve the discussion of the denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula and a peace regime, and to talk about strategies for the success of the North Korea-US summit.

If the string of summits between South and North Korea, South Korea and the US, and North Korea and the US create a virtuous cycle, the summit among the three parties that Moon mentioned could become a real possibility, bringing the Korean Peninsula to the peak of a giving spring. The Blue House announced on Apr. 25 that this had been discussed during a meeting between Blue House National Security Office

Appendix 1.4

The *Hankyoreh* (April 26th, 2018)

Director Chung Eui-yong and White House National Security Advisor John Bolton in Washington on Apr. 24.

“Chung Eui-yong, who is currently visiting the US, met with John Bolton at 3 pm on Apr. 24, and the two exchanged views for about an hour. Chung and Bolton finished aligning their views about preparations for the inter-Korean summit, including ways for the two sides to closely cooperate on achieving the goal of the denuclearization on the Korean Peninsula,” said Senior Secretary to the President for Public Relations Yoon Young-chan during the daily briefing.

“The two of them also agreed for Moon and Trump to speak on the phone shortly after the inter-Korean summit and discuss the results, and they deliberated a way to arrange a meeting between Moon and Trump prior to the North Korea-US summit,” Yoon added. Since Chung is on the official list of figures who are supposed to accompany Moon to the inter-Korean summit on Apr. 27, his visit to the US was unexpected. Chung had met Bolton, the newly appointed National Security Advisor, in Washington on Apr. 12, less than a fortnight earlier.

“Chung Eui-yong’s visit to the US reflects the president’s wish not only for the success of the inter-Korean summit but also for the success of the North Korea-US summit. Continuing deliberations are necessary for the North Korea-US summit to be successful,” said a senior official at the Blue House.

“South Korea and the US are in close contact about what is being discussed by South and North Korea given regular fluctuations, so meeting face-to-face can make for better understanding than speaking on the phone,” the official said. It can be inferred that the situation had reached the point where senior officials from the Blue House and the White House needed to engage in urgent face-to-face deliberations about the specific agenda items that are being arranged by South and North Korea prior to the summit, including denuclearization and a declaration of the end of the Korean War.

This may have been related to the declaration of the end of the war that Moon mentioned during a phone call with Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo Abe on Apr. 24.

“Declaring the end of the war is not something that can be resolved through dialogue between South and North Korea alone; to be successful, there at least needs to be an agreement between South Korea, North Korea and the US,” Moon said. This means that Moon may have needed a preliminary consultation with the US before proposing a declaration of the end of the war and a summit with South Korea, North Korea and the US during his meeting with Kim Jong-un on Apr. 27.

By Kim Bo-hyeop, staff reporter

Leaders of South and North Korea meet for first summit in 11 years

Posted on : Apr.27,2018 14:48 KST Modified on : Apr.27,2018 14:48 KST

For the first time, the Panmunjeom Joint Security Area became a symbol of peace rather than division



The inter-Korean summit is held at the House of Peace in Panmunjeom on Apr. 27. Clockwise from left are National Intelligence Service Director Suh Hoon, President Moon Jae-in, Blue House Chief of Staff Im Jong-seok, Vice Chairman of the North Korean Workers' Party Central Committee Kim Yong-chol, North Korean leader Kim Jong-un, and Kim Yo-jong, First Vice Director of the Central Committee of the North Korean Workers' Party. (by Kim Kyung-ho, staff photographer)

The leaders of South and North Korea sat down at the table for the first inter-Korean summit in 11 years at 10:16 am on Apr. 27, 2018. South Korean President Moon Jae-in and North Korean leader Kim Jong-un sat across from each other and chatted as they looked upon a painting of Mt. Kungang hanging opposite the entrance to the second-floor meeting site and prepared for the summit. From the entrance, Moon could be seen sitting on the left and Kim on the right.

A total of six chairs were set up for attendees. Around Moon were Chief of Staff Im Jong-seok and National Intelligence Service director Suh Hoon; around Kim were Korean Workers' Party Central Committee first vice director Kim Yo-jong and United Front Department director Kim Yong-chol. Both leaders appeared in good spirits throughout their six-minute-long introductory remarks.

Kim was first to deliver his introductory remarks.

Appendix 1.5

The *Hankyoreh* (April 27th, 2018)

24 “It has taken 11 years to reach this meeting, and as we were walking I found myself
25 wondering why it took so long, why the journey was so difficult,” he said.

26 “I truly experienced a flood of emotions walking those 200 meters, thinking that we can
27 make sure those lost 11 years do not go to waste if we continue as you said before,
28 meeting periodically to resolve issues and join our minds and wills,” he added.

29 Kim went on to say he “approached this meeting with the mindset that we are standing
30 at the starting point and firing a signal flare to create the momentum so that a new
31 history can be written in terms of peaceful and prosperous North-South relations.”

32 He also called for “answering the hopes of the hopeful ones by speaking frankly about
33 our issues and interests to produce a good outcome, making this an occasion for us to
34 adopt a positive mindset, looking to the future and walking hand in hand with purpose
35 rather than returning to the starting point as we have done in the past.” Moon could be
36 seen nodding along to Kim’s remarks.

37 Kim also made jokes and talked about Pyongyang naengmyeon (cold noodles).

38 “There’s been a lot of talk about the dinner this evening. Well, I’ve brought some
39 naengmyeon from Pyongyang,” he said, before jokingly adding, “I suppose that’s too
40 far, isn’t it?” His remarks brought laughs from both sides.

41 Moon went on to begin his introductory remarks while Kim listened, his hands folded
42 on the desk.

43 “The weather is sunny, as if to celebrate today’s meaning,” he said.

44 “Spring is in full swing on the Korean Peninsula. The whole world is watching the
45 Korean Peninsula’s spring,” he continued.

46 “The world’s eyes and ears are on Panmunjeom. The hopes of South and North
47 Korea’s people and Koreans living overseas are very high. And I believe the
48 responsibility on us weighs that much heavier.”

49 Moon went on to say that the meeting venue at Panmunjeom “became a symbol of
50 peace rather than a symbol of division the moment Chairman Kim crossed over the
51 Military Demarcation Line for the first time in history [by a North Korean leader].”

52 “With the expectations around the world so high, I would like once again share my
53 respects for Chairman Kim’s resolution in creating this situation,” he said, bringing a
54 large nod from Kim.

55 “I hope that we can be so generous today in having a dialogue and reach an agreement
56 that will offer a gift to the Korean people and all the people of the world who want
57 peace,” Moon continued.

Appendix 1.5

The *Hankyoreh* (April 27th, 2018)

“Since we have all day to talk today, let us speak fully about all the things we have not been able to for the past 10 years,” he added.

Kim Yo-jong could be seen leaning her head to the right in Moon’s direction to listen, her hands folded on her knees.

The backs of the chairs where the two leaders sat were emblazoned with the image of the Korean Peninsula flag, a symbol of South and North Korea’s “oneness” complete with a depiction of the Dokdo islets. Hanging in the meeting room was a large painting of Mt. Kumgang measuring 681 cm across and 181 cm in height.

The original painting in the room showed Mt. Halla on Jeju Island, but this was replaced for the summit with a work by painter Shin Jang-sik. Repairs and renovation work were carried out inside the meeting site between Apr. 6 and 20. The overall design was made to recall the traditional hanok style of Korean architecture, with traditional windows placed in the walls on both sides.

“It is meant to express the hope that this summit ushers forth a solid relationship of trust between South and North that lasts as long as the traditional windows,” the Blue House explained.

The blue carpeting in the meeting site was said to have been chosen to reflect the natural conditions of the Korean Peninsula’s landscape.

By Seo Young-ji, staff reporter

South and North Korea commit to goal of a nuclear-free Korean Peninsula

Posted on : Apr.28,2018 15:38 KST Modified on : Apr.28,2018 15:38 KST

Panmunjeom Declaration lays important groundwork in advance of US-North Korea summit



South Korean President Moon Jae-in and North Korean leader Kim Jong-un pose for a commemorative photograph after jointly planting along a pine tree in the vicinity of the Military Demarcation Line in Panmunjeom following their summit on Apr. 27. (by Kim Kyung-ho, staff photographer)

In their Apr. 27 “Panmunjeom Declaration for the Peace, Prosperity, and Unification of the Korean Peninsula,” South Korean President Moon Jae-in and North Korean leader Kim Jong-un said they had “confirmed the common goal of realizing, through complete denuclearization, a nuclear-free Korean Peninsula.” Denuclearization had been the main agenda item among three determined beforehand by South and North Korea for the summit, as well as a major focus of attention ahead of the North Korea-US summit. If the “complete denuclearization” agreed to by Moon and Kim represents a comprehensive methodology, then the “nuclear-free Korean Peninsula” could be said to represent the final goal. While the declaration did not include technical or specific terms, the two leaders can be viewed as having laid important groundwork for a successful North Korea-US summit.

The two leaders also said in the declaration that the South and North Korean sides would “carry out their respective roles and responsibilities” while sharing “the view that

Appendix 1.6

The *Hankyoreh* (April 28th, 2018)

the measures being initiated by North Korea are very meaningful and crucial for the denuclearization of the Korean peninsula.”

“South and North Korea agreed to actively seek the support and cooperation of the international community for the denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula,” they declared, signaling that Moon and Kim plan to continue cooperating closely as they work on a solution to the issue.

With the two leaders believed to have discussed an even more concrete and comprehensive solution on the denuclearization issue than what was included in the Panmunjeon Declaration, the big focus for observers now is on what happens next. Moon and Kim had a “closed-door meeting in the open” at their summit, spending around 40 minutes walking along a pedestrian bridge over the Panmunjeon wetlands. During their walk, the two are likely to have shared their feelings and held intensive discussions on ideas for denuclearization, normalization of North Korea-US relations, and the adoption of a peace agreement in place of the current armistice agreement and establishment of a permanent peace regime on the Korean Peninsula. The more general language used in their declaration that day was seen as a strategic move reflecting the upcoming summit set to take place between Kim and US President Donald Trump in May or early June.

In addition to the abandonment of “future nuclear weapons” including the Punggye Village nuclear test site shutdown, which was announced by Kim at a Korean Workers’ Party Central Committee plenary session on Apr. 20, the matters of present and past nuclear capabilities are a key bargaining chip for Kim in his attempts to secure guarantees from Trump on his regime’s security.

“They sent a positive signal by including ‘complete denuclearization’ [in the declaration],” said University of North Korean Studies professor Koo Kab-woo.

“In terms of ‘CVID’ [complete, verifiable, and irreversible denuclearization], the ‘verifiable’ and ‘irreversible’ parts are matters to be negotiated with the US,” he added. Indeed, Trump and other figures in his administration have recently been using the term “complete denuclearization” instead of “CVID” – a move that has many curious about the reasons for the change.

By Kim Ji-eun, staff reporter

[News Analysis] Kim plans to invite experts and journalists to witness nuclear test site shutdown

Posted on : Apr.30,2018 17:19 KST Modified on : Apr.30,2018 17:19 KST

North Korea aims to “transparently ensure the suspension of nuclear testing”



South Korean President Moon Jae-in and North Korean leader Kim Jong-un are all smiles as they shake hands during their summit at Panmunjeom on Apr. 27. (Photo Pool)

North Korean leader Kim Jong-un’s announcement of plans to shut down the “northern (Punggye Village) nuclear testing site” and invite South Korean and US experts and journalists to North Korea is being seen as intended to stress his commitment to implementing denuclearization according to greater standards of transparency through upcoming negotiations with the US.

Announced during Kim’s Apr. 27 summit at Panmunjeom with South Korean President Moon Jae-in, Kim’s plan can be seen as having the additional goal of providing the inter-Korean summit with a robust outcome to increase the odds of a scheduled summit

Appendix 1.7

The *Hankyoreh* (April 30th, 2018)

with US President Donald Trump going ahead and producing a successful result. Key to this is his declaration of plans to increase transparency going ahead.

To begin with, by allowing Moon to announce the message, Kim increased the South Korean President's stature in the upcoming denuclearization and peace regime establishment process – an immediate implementation of Article 3-4 of the Panmunjeom Declaration stating the two sides' plan to "actively seek the support and cooperation of the international community for the denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula." Second, by emphasizing transparency in the denuclearization process, Kim acknowledged skepticism about his commitment to denuclearization among the international community – especially US experts and members of the press. In effect, he was sending observers the message, "Trust me."

A Blue House senior official praised Kim's message on Apr. 29 as "stating his commitment to approaching things in a proactive, preemptive way during the North Korean nuclear verification process to be discussed going ahead." Special presidential advisor on unification, foreign affairs and national security Moon Chung-in said it "implies that the ICBM and nuclear weapon abandonment process expected to take place through future discussions with the US will proceed in a transparent way."

Indeed, Kim decided on and announced plans to "shut down [North Korea's] northern nuclear test site" during the third plenary session of the 7th Workers' Party of Korea Central Committee on Apr. 20. The newest details to be announced are the shutdown date in May and the invitation of South Korean and US experts and journalists to attend. First, the May shutdown down means the North Korea will be providing the international community with an actual example of denuclearization being put into practice ahead of the North Korea-US summit, which is reportedly to be held the same month.

It also suggests a certain consideration for Trump by helping improve his position domestically amid opposition from White House advisors and a concerted attack by US strategists and media since his decision to meet with Kim for a summit. The invitation extended to South Korean and US experts and journalists, for its part, was a choice made by the North to "transparently ensure the suspension of nuclear testing," as the plenary session decision put it. The message is that even if no formal inspections or verification takes place, the North is willing to shut its nuclear site down openly with US experts in attendance.

Notably, the invitation was extended to experts not only from the US – which Kim has referred to a "party to the hostile relationship that drove us to possess nuclear

Appendix 1.7

The *Hankyoreh* (April 30th, 2018)

capabilities” – but also from South Korea. This could be taken as a signal that Article 3-4 of the Panmunjeom Declaration announcing South and North Korea’s agreement to “carry out their respective roles and responsibilities” for the denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula will be not remain at the level of rhetoric.

“It’s the declaration of a partnership between the South and North Korean leaders, where Chairman Kim fulfills his denuclearization ‘responsibility’ while President Moon enlists the international community’s cooperation and support on the regime security guarantees that the North wants and the process of establishing permanent peace on the Korean Peninsula, including normalization of North Korea-US relations,” said a source familiar with the summit discussions on this section of the declaration.

Indeed, a Blue House senior official said the two sides would “hold discussions to decide” matters such as the timing of the nuclear test site shutdown and South Korean and US experts who are to observe it on site. Although South Korean government officials and journalists did visit the scene of the demolition of North Korea’s Yongbyon reactor cooling tower on June 27, 2008, they were doing so as representatives of parties to the Six-Party Talks – a rather different situation in terms of format and content.

Kim calls for frequent meetings to build trust with the US

Denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula is unlikely to become a reality simply through shows of “good will” and unilateral measures by Kim. For that reason, it’s important to consider Kim’s rhetorical question to Moon – “Why would we possess nuclear weapons while struggling to survive?” – and his proviso calling for “frequent meetings to build trust with the US and a promise of nonaggression and an end to the Korean War.”

“It seems like there’s already some mutual trust among Moon, Kim, and Trump and a shared understanding that consideration needs to be shown to the other parties,” a former senior official said.

“There is something Kim is definitely seeking to achieve through denuclearization, and the many complex and sensitive issues related to the procedures, methods, and timeline are going to require long discussions between the North and the US,” the official added. It will take more than a few words to explain how North Korea plans to put an end to both its “past nukes” (weapons and intercontinental ballistic missiles) and “present nukes” (nuclear facilities), or how that process is to be closely tied to US guarantees on the regime’s security, normalization of relations, and the implementation of an aid program by the US and international community for the North’s economic reconstruction.

By Lee Je-hoon, senior staff writer

Diplomatic efforts toward denuclearization are accelerating

Posted on : Apr.30,2018 17:25 KST Modified on : Apr.30,2018 17:25 KST

President Moon calls leaders of neighboring countries' to report on inter-Korean summit results



After the leaders of South and North Korea released their Panmunjom Declaration for Peace, Prosperity and Unification of the Korean Peninsula on Apr. 27, diplomatic efforts toward denuclearization have been accelerating once more. South Korean President Moon Jae-in had a series of phone calls with US President Donald Trump on Apr. 28 and Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo Abe and Russian President Vladimir Putin on Apr. 29 as he gears up for the frenzied summit diplomacy that will unfold in May.

During his phone calls with Trump, Abe and Putin, Moon explained the results of the inter-Korean summit. In Moon's phone call with Trump, the two leaders agreed that it would be best to hold the North Korea-US summit as soon as possible to maintain the momentum from the success of the inter-Korean summit. Moon's telephone call with Chinese President Xi Jinping will take place at a later date because of scheduling conflicts related to Indian Prime Minister Narendra Modi's visit to China.

During his phone call with Abe, Moon told the Japanese Prime Minister that Kim Jong-un had declared his willingness to engage in dialogue with Japan at any time. Abe responded that Japan would create an opportunity for dialogue with North Korea and that if necessary he would ask Moon for assistance, to which Moon replied that he would be happy to take steps to build a bridge between North Korea and Japan. It is notable that Moon mentioned South Korea's role as a mediator between North Korea and Japan, since this suggests that Moon and Kim had an in-depth discussion about historical issues and about the normalization of diplomatic relations between North Korea and Japan.

Appendix 1.8

The *Hankyoreh* (April 30th, 2018)

29 Moon's quick action indicates his determination to translate the positive outcome of the
30 inter-Korean summit into success at the North Korea-US summit. It can also be seen
31 as an attempt to shore up confidence and support from Korea's neighbors, which will
32 be necessary for the denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula and for the
33 establishment of a peace regime prior to the North Korea-US summit. If the North
34 Korea-US summit is pushed forward to May, this is likely to only accelerate the
35 discussion of denuclearization that was triggered by the inter-Korean summit. Before
36 that happens, Moon faces the challenge of narrowing the gap between North Korea
37 and the US in regard to the methodology of denuclearization.

38 Next month, Moon will be meeting with Chinese Premier Li Keqiang in Tokyo. While
39 this marks the resumption of a regular summit between South Korea, China and Japan
40 that was discontinued in 2015, the question of the denuclearization of the Korean
41 Peninsula will probably occupy a large part of the agenda. Moon is also expected to
42 tell Li about his and Kim's commitment to the denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula
43 and ask for Li's support. Since China is one of the parties to the armistice agreement,
44 this discussion is also likely to touch upon the declaration of the end of the war and the
45 pursuit of a peace treaty that was discussed during the inter-Korean summit.

46 Moon and Trump are also scheduled to hold a summit shortly before Trump's summit
47 with Kim, and the preceding summit could well determine the success of the one that
48 follows. During their summit, Moon and Trump will probably put the finishing touches
49 on their strategy to achieve the complete denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula.
50 With each passing day, Moon's guidance from the "driver's seat" is becoming more
51 important.

52 By Yoo Kang-moon, senior staff writer and Seong Yeon-cheol, staff reporter

Moon shares behind-the-scenes story of inter-Korean summit with top secretaries and aides at Blue House

Posted on : May.1,2018 17:18 KST Modified on : May.1,2018 17:18 KST

Blue House official reports North Korean leader Kim Jong-un mostly asked questions while President Moon spoke about the upcoming North Korea-US Summit



President Moon Jae-in speaks to North Korean leader Kim Jong-un on a bench at the far end of a pedestrian bridge in Panmunjeom during their summit on Apr. 27. (Photo Pool)

Cheers and applause rang out from attendees at a meeting with senior secretaries and aides in the small conference room on the third floor of the Blue House's Yeomin 1 Pavilion on the afternoon of Apr. 30 as President Moon Jae-in emerged from his office just next door. Smiling bashfully, President Moon joined along in the clapping.

"Who told you to do this? It's nice, anyway," he said.

The topic of the meeting – the first since last week's inter-Korean summit – was the outcome and follow-up measures for the summit, but Moon's advisers couldn't hold back their curiosity. Facing their onslaught of questions, Moon shared some behind-the-scenes stories from the summit.

Appendix 1.9

The *Hankyoreh* (May 1st, 2018)

Asked for his impression of North Korean leader Kim Jong-un, President Moon described him as “forthright and polite.” Presidential Security Service director Ju Young-hoon added, “When President Moon and Chairman Kim were getting on the elevator with their wives to go up to the dinner, Chairman Kim gestured for President Moon to go first, and when [North Korean First Lady] Ri Sol-ju made to get on, he gently took her hand so that [South Korean First Lady] Kim Jung-sook could go first.” Moon was born in 1953, while Kim was born in 1984. (In Korean culture, age and seniority are big determinants of professional norms and social etiquette.)

Moon also talked about his meeting with Kim on a bench at Panmunjeom’s pedestrian bridge, which was broadcast around the world without audio.

“During our stroll on the pedestrian bridge, we were so focused on talking that I wasn’t able to look back, but when I saw the footage at the Blue House after the meeting I thought it was nice to see,” the South Korean president recalled.

“It was really pleasant to see the landscape with the sounds of birds. I didn’t know it was that nice,” he added to uproarious laughter from attendees. “Bad things are never entirely bad. If we do a good job of preserving the Demilitarized Zone, it will come back to us in the end as a major asset,” he continued.

A Blue House senior official explained, “On the pedestrian bridge, it was apparently mostly Chairman Kim asking questions and President Moon speaking ahead of the North Korea-US summit.”

Moon also shared an example of a “wise answer to a foolish question” concerning the hotline between the two leaders. During their encounter, Kim “naively” asked, “Will you really pick up the phone any time I call?” to which Moon replied, “That’s not how it works. We have our staffers set a time beforehand, and then one of us calls the other,” a Blue House senior official reported.

Kim, a well-known fan of basketball, was also quoted as suggesting that the sport be used to initiate inter-Korean sports exchange.

“Chairman Kim suggested starting with basketball rather than Seoul-Pyongyang football [matches] when we do inter-Korean sports exchange,” Moon said.

In response, Kim was quoted as saying, “We were strong back when we had Ri Myung-hun, who was the tallest player in the world [at 235 cm], but we’ve been weak since he retired.”

“I don’t think we’d be much of a match for South Korea. There are a lot of players over 2 meters in South Korea, aren’t there?” he reportedly continued.

Trump can have the Nobel Prize, we’ll “take the ‘peace’”

Appendix 1.9

The *Hankyoreh* (May 1st, 2018)

55 Moon further provided the back story behind the “Mt. Baekdu earth” used for
56 the planting of a commemorative tree on Cattle Drive Road above the Military
57 Demarcation Line (MDL) at Panmunjeom, relating the details as he heard from
58 North Korean State Affairs Commission Secretariat Director Kim Chang-son.

59 “He told me that since Mt. Baekdu is covered entirely in volcanic ash, there isn’t
60 any soil between Baekdu Bridge and the Janggun Peak ridge, so they pulled
61 some mangyongcho, which is a type of grass that grows at high altitudes, and
62 shook out the dirt from its roots to bring there,” Moon explained.

63 “So they didn’t just bring a few shovelfuls of dirt. It was soil that they put a lot
64 of care into,” he added.

65 When asked by an adviser whether Kim had come prepared with his plan to
66 revise North Korea’s “Pyongyang time zone,” Chief of Staff Im Jong-seok
67 recalled, “[Workers’ Party of Korea first vice director] Kim Yo-jong was there at
68 the time, and she said, ‘This is the first I’ve heard about it myself.’”

69 During the Apr. 30 meeting, Moon heard about a congratulatory telegram sent
70 by former President Kim Dae-jung’s widow Lee Hee-ho, who said Moon had
71 “accomplished a great thing” and suggested he should be awarded the Nobel
72 Peace Prize.

73 “The ‘Nobel Prize’ is something [US] President Donald Trump should get. We’ll
74 take the ‘peace,’” a Blue House senior official quoted him as saying.

75 In a report on the summit’s outcome to Democratic Party leader Choo Mi-ae and
76 others at the National Assembly earlier that morning, Minister of Unification Cho
77 Myoung-gyon quoted Kim Jong-un as making a firm pledge of nonaggression.

78 “To use weapons would be to stab our own eyes with our own hands,” Kim was
79 quoted as saying.

80 By Seong Yeon-cheol and Seo Young-ji, staff reporters

Moon Says N.Korea Willing to Scrap Nuclear Weapons

• By Jeong Woo-sang

April 20, 2018 10:25

President Moon Jae-in on Thursday said North Korea is willing to denuclearize "completely" and is not setting any conditions that the U.S. cannot accept like withdrawal of U.S. troops from South Korea.

The international community is seeking the "complete, verifiable and irreversible" scrapping of North Korea's nuclear program.

Moon made this claim over lunch with the heads of South Korea's major news outlets. All North Korea is calling for is "the end of hostile policies" against it, "followed by a guarantee of security," he added. "It would be correct to think that is why North Korea wants to hold talks with the U.S."

"I don't think denuclearization has different meanings for South and North Korea. The North is expressing a will for a complete denuclearization," he said.

But he warned that the difficulty lies in finding a "specific method to achieve denuclearization" and asked the assembled editors to offer good ideas.



President Moon Jae-in (center) meets with the heads of media outlets at Cheong Wa Dae in Seoul on Thursday. /Yonhap

Appendix 1.10

The *Chosunilbo* (April 20th, 2018)

20 Moon compared the 2007 summit between then-President Roh Moon-hyun and then-leader Kim
21 Jong-il with his own upcoming meeting with Kim Jong-un. "North Korea's nuclear weapons and
22 missiles have evolved to a level that cannot be compared to those days, while strong international
23 and U.S. sanctions are underway," he said.

24 "There are not many areas that can be agreed upon by North and South Korea beyond those
25 sanctions. The North Korean nuclear standoff must be solved so that international sanctions can
26 be lifted, and only then can inter-Korean relations improve."

27 Meanwhile, Cheong Wa Dae said a hotline connecting the leaders of North and South Korea will
28 open on Friday, but they are unlikely to communicate yet.

29 It also said Moon will be accompanied to the summit by six key officials -- his Chief of Staff Im
30 Jong-seok, national security adviser Chung Eui-yong, National Intelligence Service chief Suh Hoon,
31 Unification Minister Cho Myoung-gyon, Defense Minister Song Young-moo and Foreign Minister
32 Kang Kyung-wha.

How Significant Is N.Korea's Surprise Nuclear Freeze?

• By Lim Min-hyuk, Kim Jin-myung

April 23, 2018 11:01

North Korea on Friday announced it is halting all nuclear and missile tests and shutting down its nuclear test site, but that does not guarantee the regime will eventually give up its nuclear program altogether.

U.S. President Donald Trump welcomed the announcement, calling it "very good news for North Korea and the World -- big progress!" He added, "Look forward to our summit."

It is surprising for North Korea to make the announcement before planned summits with South Korea and the U.S. have even got underway.

North Korean leader Kim Jong-un made the announcement during a Workers Party Central Committee meeting and said the North will pursue economic growth and peace instead.

According to the official Rodong Sinmun daily, Kim said his country no longer needs to conduct nuclear tests or test intercontinental ballistic missiles because it has fulfilled its goal of developing the weapons.

Appendix 1.11

The *Cbosunilbo* (April 23rd, 2018)



North Korean leader Kim Jong-un (center) and other senior officials raise their hands during a Workers Party Central Committee meeting in Pyongyang on Friday, in this photo released by the state-run Rodong Sinmun daily on Saturday.

The North said the halt is "an important process for global nuclear disarmament" -- the term used internationally for the process of decreasing the sizes of their nuclear weapons stockpiles.

That also assumes that the North is somehow already a nuclear power and able to negotiate with its counterparts on an equal footing.

It added the North will "join international efforts to halt nuclear tests," which also suggests that it wants to be recognized as a nuclear power by alluding to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, which was created to curb competition among nuclear-armed states.

Still, it signals a change from the North's previous negotiating tactics, when it took small incremental steps in exchange for concessions including oil and food aid and then reversed them as soon as it got what it wanted.

But it is still too early to celebrate since North Korea can always reverse itself if it is dissatisfied with the speed of easing sanctions.

Appendix 1.11

The *Chosunilbo* (April 23rd, 2018)

33 Kim's true intentions will only become clear after the two summits with South Korean President
34 Moon Jae-in and Trump.

35 Some pundits, staring intently into these cloudy crystal balls, fear that Kim may offer to scrap only
36 long-range intercontinental ballistic missiles capable of striking the U.S. mainland and that Trump
37 could accept the proposal as he seeks to win votes for the Republican Party in upcoming mid-term
38 elections.

39 One former high-ranking diplomat said, "We have now entered uncharted waters, so it is especially
40 important for South Korea and the U.S. to maintain close cooperation and communication."

Summit Statement on Denuclearization Left to Leaders

• By Jeong Woo-sang

April 25, 2018 11:21

The leaders of North and South Korea will work out their final joint statement on the question of denuclearization at the summit itself rather than hammering it out in advance.

Officials from the two sides have been preparing a joint statement to be announced after their summit on Friday, but the part about denuclearization has been left out.

A senior Cheong Wa Dae official said Tuesday, "Most of the terms will be agreed beforehand, but some will be decided by reflecting the results of the summit."

North and South Korea have prepared an agreement on two of the three main agenda items, which are the establishment of a peace treaty formally ending the Korean War and improving cross-border relations. But they failed to narrow their differences over the scrapping of North Korea's nuclear weapons.

"A large portion of the agreement should be negotiated by the leaders themselves during the summit," a senior government official told reporters Tuesday.

This is relatively rare in international summit diplomacy, which is mostly for show while the details have already been worked out behind the scenes and leaders sit around aimlessly exchanging pleasantries.

"North Korea has always been reluctant to discuss sensitive issues during working-level talks, saying such matters should be discussed at higher levels," the official added.

Appendix 1.12

The *Chosunilbo* (April 25th, 2018)



Vehicles take officials to Panmunjom in Paju, Gyeonggi Province on Tuesday. /Newsis

The summit starts on Friday morning with a group meeting followed by a one-on-one summit and dinner. President Moon Jae-in and North Korean leader Kim Jong-un will talk face-to-face for about three hours.

Moon has already claimed the North is willing to denuclearize "completely," but no direct comments from Kim have been reported.

The two leaders have also set up a hotline that could come in handy if they fail to reach agreement on Friday. But a high-ranking Cheong Wa Dae official said, "A phone call between the two leaders would be mainly symbolic, so is it really necessary?"

Asked whether there will have to be any follow-up visit by a South Korean envoy to the North, the official said, "Overall plans for the summit are going ahead without a hitch, so we need to wait and see if another high-level meeting is needed or we have to fine-tune some issues through other forms of contact."

Leaders of 2 Koreas Meet at Border

• By Lim Min-hyuk

April 27, 2018 09:36

North Korean leader Kim Jong-un walked across the heavily armed border at 9:30 a.m. Friday morning for a historic meeting with President Moon Jae-in in the truce village of Panmunjom.

Smiling broadly, they shook hands across border and posed together for the camera in turn on each side of the military demarcation line. They inspected a South Korean honor guard and moved on to the Peace House. Before vanishing into a meeting room, Kim signed a visitor's book saying, "A new history starts now. In an era of peace, at the starting point of history."

The two leaders are expected to announce a joint statement around 6:30 p.m. This is only the third summit between leaders of the two Koreas. President Kim Dae-jung met with North Korean leader Kim Jong-il in 2000 and President Roh Moo-hyun also met Kim in 2007. But this is the first time that a North Korean leader has crossed the border and set foot on South Korean soil.



President Moon Jae-in (left) and North Korean leader Kim Jong-un pose in front of the Peace House in the truce village of Panmunjom on Friday. /Newsis

Appendix 1.13

The *Chosunilbo* (April 27th, 2018)

- 17 Top of the agenda is the denuclearization of North Korea, and the two leaders will work out their
18 final joint statement on the question at the summit itself, while the rest has been hammered out in
19 advance.
- 20 South Korea does not expect a massive breakthrough. Cheong Wa Dae Chief of Staff Im Jong-
21 seok, who is in charge of preparing for the summit, told reporters on Thursday, "The summit would
22 be a success if we could stipulate North Korea's clear willingness to scrap its nuclear weapons and
23 accurately confirm that this means complete denuclearization on the Korean Peninsula."
- 24 If that can be achieved, it will lay the groundwork for a summit between Kim and U.S. President
25 Donald Trump in late May or June.
- 26 The White House said Wednesday that it will keep pressuring North Korea until it takes "concrete
27 steps toward denuclearization." If the inter-Korean summit fails to elicit some kind of commitment
28 by the North to scrap its nuclear weapons, Moon could face criticism for giving Kim some much-
29 needed breathing space as international sanctions are intensifying.

Appendix 1.13

The *Cbosunilbo* (April 27th, 2018)



30

31 President Moon Jae-in (right) and North Korean leader Kim Jong-un walk together in the truce village of
32 Panmunjom on Friday.

33 The two leaders started their talks at 10:15 a.m., 15 minutes earlier than planned, and will break
34 for lunch and continue talking in the afternoon.

35 They exchanged brief opening remarks in front of the cameras before closing the doors. "It has
36 taken 11 years for this to happen," Kim said. "Walking here I wondered why it has taken so long...
37 Through today's meeting, I hope we won't go back to square one again and non-implementation of
38 what we agree won't happen again."

Appendix 1.13

The *Cbosunilbo* (April 27th, 2018)

39 A government source said the lunch break gave participants time to "reflect on the contents and
40 come up with responses."

41 The two leaders will also plant a pine tree in the afternoon. Im said the tree "symbolized peace and
42 prosperity" and will be planted on the military demarcation line, "which had symbolized division and
43 confrontation."

44 It will be planted on a route taken by Hyundai Group founder Chung Ju-yung when he drove a herd
45 of cattle back to his ancestral home in North Korea. The two leaders will then go for a walk before
46 continuing with the afternoon session.

47 At 6:30 p.m., the two leaders will sit down to dinner together, eating dishes that reflect their personal
48 histories like rösti from Switzerland, where Kim went to school, and fish from Moon's hometown of
49 Busan, before the summit ends.

2 Koreas Promise New 'Age of Peace'

• By Lee Hyun-yi

April 27, 2018 20:24

President Moon Jae-in and North Korean leader Kim Jong-un on Friday evening ended their historic summit with a broad commitment to work toward "complete" denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula.

The agreement came in a joint statement that was strong on principles but vague on details after the two leaders had spent most of the day deep in discussion.

"There will be no more war on the Korean Peninsula and a new age of peace has opened," they said before sitting down to dinner in the truce village of Panmunjom.



South Korean President Moon Jae-in (right) and North Korean leader Kim Jong-un shake hands after reading a joint statement in the truce village of Panmunjom on Friday. /Newsis

The two leaders agreed to push for multilateral talks involving the U.S. and possibly China to replace the armistice that halted the Korea War with a proper peace treaty within this year. The two Koreas technically remain at war.

Efforts to reduce military tensions will include a complete halt to hostilities, including a stop to propaganda broadcasts and distribution of leaflets.

Appendix 1.14

The *Cbosunilbo* (April 27th, 2018)



South Korean President Moon Jae-in (left) and North Korean leader Kim Jong-un take a walk in the truce village of Panmunjom on Friday.

The two sides also vowed to hold further talks on humanitarian matters like reunions of families separated by the Korean War on the occasion of Liberation Day on Aug. 15. They also pledged to set up a liaison office in the North Korean border town of Kaesong.

At 9:30 a.m., Moon welcomed Kim, who walked across a graveled strip of border and briefly invited Moon to step over the line into North Korea as the two leaders held hands. They inspected an honor guard decked out in historical costume before sitting down for talks with a small entourage in a specially refurbished meeting room.

Appendix 1.14

The *Chosunilbo* (April 27th, 2018)

At the end of the day, which also saw the two leaders plant a pine tree symbolizing peace and prosperity and take a walk together out of earshot of the press and other officials, Moon said their agreements will be a "great present to the entire world."

"The two leaders held serious and honest discussions on ways to denuclearize the Korean Peninsula, establish permanent peace and develop South-North Korea relations," said presidential spokesman Yoon Young-chan.

Moon will visit Pyongyang in the fall to reciprocate Kim's visit and Kim also said he could visit Cheong Wa Da if he is invited.



The South and North Korean leaders pose with their wives before dinner in the truce village of Panmunjom on Friday. /Newsis

The evening is given over to a dinner attended by both leaders and their wives. Kim's wife Ri Sol-ju arrived at Panmunjom around 6:15 p.m. with another score of North Korean officials, including Hyun Song-wol, the head of the Samjiyon Orchestra that staged performances in South Korea during the Pyeongchang Winter Olympics in February.

Appendix 1.14

The *Chosunilbo* (April 27th, 2018)



Attendees including the South and North Korean leaders react after watching a performance at a dinner party in the truce village of Panmunjom on Friday. /Newsis

The menu features dishes symbolic of the two leaders' personal history, including rösti from Switzerland, where Kim went to school, and fish from Moon's hometown of Busan. The dessert will be adorned with a map of the Korean Peninsula in turquoise icing.

N.Korea to Invite Experts to Shutdown of Nuclear Test Site

• By Jeong Woo-sang

April 30, 2018 10:02

North Korean leader Kim Jong-un promised President Moon Jae-in on Friday to shut down a nuclear test site in Punggye-ri next month and invite international inspectors to watch, Cheong Wa Dae spokesman Yoon Young-chan said Sunday.

Kim said during the inter-Korean summit that he will "carry out the closure of the northern nuclear test site in May" and invite South Korean and U.S. experts and journalists to make the closure transparent, Yoon told reporters.

Just a few days ahead of the inter-Korean summit, North Korea pledged to halt nuclear tests and intercontinental ballistic missile launches and close down the underground test site in Punggye-ri.

Apparently mindful of media reports that the test site is obsolete anyway, Kim said, "Some say that we are terminating facilities that are not functioning, but you will see that we have two more tunnels that are bigger than the existing ones and that they are in good condition," Yoon quoted Kim as saying.

The closure was not on the official agenda, but Kim seemed keen to underscore his willingness to scrap his nuclear weapons.



Visitors look toward North Korea from the Imjingak Pavilion in Paju, Gyeonggi Province on Sunday. /Newsis

The North has a bad track record when it comes to making such pledges. Back in 2008, North Korea invited South Korean and U.S. journalists to the Yongbyon nuclear plant to witness the demolition of the cooling towers. In response, the U.S. removed North Korea from its list of terrorism-sponsoring states, but the North soon rebuilt the plant and continued developing nuclear weapons.

Appendix 1.15

The *Chosunilbo* (April 30th, 2018)

27 The North conducted six nuclear tests in Punggye-ri, the first in 2006 at tunnel No. 1, which
28 apparently collapsed after the test. The second to sixth nuclear tests (2009-2017) were conducted
29 in the second tunnels. Signs of an implosion and about a dozen aftershocks were detected around
30 the tunnel after the sixth nuclear test last year.

31 Experts have contradicted Kim and said the entire underground layer is at risk of collapsing. The
32 Korea Meteorological Administration last October said the ground in Punggye-ri has subsided up
33 to 3 cm, and any additional nuclear tests could cause it to collapse entirely.

34 Last Monday there was an earthquake in the area measuring 2.3 on the Richter scale.

35 When North Korea announced its decision to shut down the test site, it said nuclear development
36 is "complete" and the test site "has completed its mission." In other words, it had nothing to lose by
37 shutting it down.



38

Appendix 1.15

The *Chosunilbo* (April 30th, 2018)

39 President Moon Jae-in (left) talks with North Korean leader Kim Jong-un on a footbridge in the truce village
40 of Panmunjom on Friday.

41 Cheong Wa Dae also revealed some off-the-record remarks Kim made during the summit. It quoted
42 him as saying, "Although I am inherently resistant toward America, people will see that I am not the
43 kind of person who fires nukes at South Korea, the Pacific or America," he said. "Why would we
44 keep nuclear weapons and live in difficult conditions if we often meet with Americans to build trust
45 and they promise to end the war and not invade us?"

46 Meanwhile, U.S. President Donald Trump said he could meet with Kim in the next few weeks.
47 "Things are going very well" with North Korea, he said, but added, "We're not going to get played."

48 White House National Security adviser John Bolton said Sunday in an interview with Fox News,
49 "We have very much in mind the Libya model from 2003, 2004. And so, we'll want to test North
50 Korea in this first meeting for evidence that they have made that strategic decision."

Moon Briefs World Leaders on Inter-Korean Summit

• By Jeong Woo-sang

April 30, 2018 12:59

President Moon Jae-in on Saturday and Sunday spoke to the leaders of the U.S., Japan, and Russia on the phone to brief them about Friday's summit with North Korean leader Kim Jong-un.

Moon will also meet the leaders of the U.S., China, Japan and Russia from next month to discuss North Korea's denuclearization and a possible peace treaty formally ending the Korean War.

Moon talked first with Trump for 75 minutes Saturday, the longest conversation they have had so far. He reportedly raised the possibility of a trilateral summit with Kim to discuss the peace treaty.

Moon and Kim agreed they will have to meet with both Trump and Chinese President Xi Jinping to declare a formal end to the war. But Moon and Trump did not go into detail due to the many variables, chiefly whether Trump and Kim can reach an agreement on denuclearization.



President Moon Jae-in (right) talks on the phone with Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo Abe at Cheong Wa Dae in Seoul on Sunday.

Appendix 1.16

The *Chosunilbo* (April 30th, 2018)

17 On Sunday, Moon talked with Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo Abe, telling him, "I'm ready to build
18 a bridge between Pyongyang and Tokyo," according to Cheong Wa Dae.

19 The same afternoon Moon talked with his Russian counterpart Vladimir Putin, who stressed the
20 need to take advantage of the success of the inter-Korean summit to launch economic cooperation
21 projects between the two Koreas and Russia.



22
23 President Moon Jae-in (right) and North Korean leader Kim Jong-un embrace each other after signing a joint
24 statement at the Peace House in the truce village of Panmunjom on Friday.

Appendix 1.16

The *Chosunilbo* (April 30th, 2018)

- 25 Putin said connecting railways, gas pipelines, and electric power transmission between Russia and
26 the Korean Peninsula via Siberia will contribute to the stability and prosperity of the Korean
27 Peninsula.
- 28 Putin invited Moon to Russia on a state visit in June, when the World Cup is held.
- 29 Moon will talk with Xi "in a few days because Xi is currently on a tour of the Chinese provinces," a
30 Cheong Wa Dae official said.
- 31 Moon is to meet Abe and Chinese Premier Li Keqiang separately on the sidelines of a trilateral
32 Korea-China-Japan summit in Tokyo in early May.
- 33 No date for another summit with Xi has been set, but Xi is expected to visit Pyongyang soon to
34 reciprocate Kim's surprise visit to Beijing in late March.
- 35 Moon is also going to meet Trump in early May, ahead of Trump's meeting with Kim, which is now
36 expected later next month.

Verifying N.Korea's Denuclearization Could Be a Bumpy Road

• By Kim Jin-myung

May 02, 2018 10:50

U.S. Secretary of State Mike Pompeo and other officials have warned against undue optimism about the North Korea-U.S. summit, saying the aim remains the "complete, verifiable, and irreversible dismantlement" of North Korea's nuclear weapons.

They insist the North must grant "unlimited" access to international inspectors.

That means North Korea must scrap not only its nuclear test site in Punggye-ri, but also its Yongbyon nuclear plant as well as any uranium-enrichment facilities. A crucial part of the process is verification, which means Pyongyang must disclose all its nuclear weapons, fissile materials, facilities, technology and researchers.

Inspectors also need to visit other facilities that are suspected of involvement in the North's nuclear weapons program.



North Korean leader Kim Jong-un (left) stands in front of a mobile missile launcher in an underground facility on July 14, 2017, in this screen grab from [North] Korean Central Television.

The problem is that the international community does not have an accurate estimate of their amount or locations, so international inspectors must be granted access to any suspect facility in the North.

The International Atomic Energy Agency must be allowed to conduct inspections at any time and at any place to prevent North Korea from resuming its nuclear development.

Appendix 1.17

The *Cbosunilbo* (May 2nd, 2018)

22 North Korea has long been allergic to IAEA inspectors. In February 1992, North Korea agreed in a
23 joint declaration with South Korea to forgo nuclear reprocessing and uranium-enrichment facilities.
24 The same year it submitted to the IAEA a list of its nuclear facilities and fissile materials, but an
25 ensuing inspection revealed that it repeatedly reprocessed fissile materials and enriched more
26 plutonium than it admitted.

27 North Korea rejected requests for further inspections and kicked the IAEA inspectors out.

28 Drawn-out six-party talks also failed to get North Korea to agree to international inspections. In
29 June 2008, the North blew up the cooling tower of the Yongbyon nuclear plant in a publicity stunt
30 in front of foreign journalists but rebuffed a U.S. request for unlimited inspection of all its nuclear
31 facilities.

What Did Moon and Kim Talk About Alone?

• By Jeong Woo-sang

May 02, 2018 10:53

President Moon Jae-in and North Korean leader Kim Jong-un spent about half an hour deep in discussion during an unaccompanied afternoon stroll in the border truce village of Panmunjom last Friday.

Broadcasters filmed them with long lenses, but no audio is available. But Japanese broadcaster NTV put a lip reader on the case who noticed that Moon repeated the words "nuclear facilities" and "Trump," while Kim uttered the words "U.S." and "United Nations."

The Chosun Ilbo also asked three lip readers, who said Moon began the conversation by saying, "Rather than keeping our relations severed, let us hold more dialogue in a positive direction."



President Moon Jae-in (left) talks with North Korean leader Kim Jong-un on a footbridge in the truce village of Panmunjom last Friday.

Kim led the conversation after the two leaders sat down on a bench, saying, "The North Korea-U.S. summit must yield positive results and I want to take things step by step to eliminate any problems."

Appendix 1.18

The *Chosunilbo* (May 2nd, 2018)

- 17 Kim also seemed to be asking Moon for his opinion on the U.S.' intentions. Moon responded with
18 large hand gestures.
- 19 Kim could be seen repeating the words "U.S.," "Trump" and "nuclear weapons." One expert said it
20 is difficult to see exactly what they were saying from this distance, "but the comments appear to
21 have been made while the two leaders were talking about the U.S.' suspicions about North Korea's
22 willingness to scrap its nuclear weapons."
- 23 Cheong Wa Dae declined to give details but denied there was any mention of closing nuclear test
24 sites during the conversation.
- 25 Moon and Kim spoke privately for another 10 minutes after returning to the Peace House, according
26 to Unification Minister Cho Myoung-gyon.
- 27 Moon presented Kim with a book and USB stick with his vision for a new pan-Korean economic
28 system.
- 29 Another Cheong Wa Dae official said, the president "delivered his ideas of the type of cross-border
30 cooperation that will be possible if the U.S.-North Korea summit bears fruit and inter-Korean
31 exchanges go into full swing."