

NORTH KOREAN HUMAN RIGHTS

The evidentiary weight of North Korean defectors' testimony depicting crimes against humanity has drawn considerable interest from the international community in recent years. Despite the attention to North Korean human rights, what remains unexamined is the rise of the transnational advocacy network, which drew attention to the issue in the first place. Andrew Yeo and Danielle Chubb explore the "hard case" that is North Korea and challenge existing conceptions of transnational human rights networks, how they operate, and why they provoke a response from even the most recalcitrant regimes. In this volume, leading experts and activists assemble original data from multiple sources in various languages, including North Korean sources, and adopt a range of sophisticated methodologies to provide valuable insight into the politics, strategies, and policy objectives of North Korean human rights activism.

Andrew Yeo is Associate Professor of Politics and Director of Asian Studies at The Catholic University of America in Washington DC. He is the author of *Activists, Alliances, and Anti-US Base Protests* and coeditor of *Living in an Age of Mistrust: An Interdisciplinary Study of Declining Trust and How to Get it Back*. He received his PhD in Government from Cornell University.

Danielle Chubb is Senior Lecturer in International Relations and a member of the POLIS research network at Deakin University in Victoria, Australia. She is the author of *Contentious Activism and Inter-Korean Relations*. Before arriving at Deakin in 2012, she worked as a Research Fellow at Pacific Forum CSIS in Honolulu, and completed her PhD in International Relations at The Australian National University.

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-42549-0 — North Korean Human Rights
Edited by Andrew Yeo , Danielle Chubb
Frontmatter
[More Information](#)

North Korean Human Rights

ACTIVISTS AND NETWORKS

Edited by

ANDREW YEO

The Catholic University of America

DANIELLE CHUBB

Deakin University, Victoria



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-42549-0 — North Korean Human Rights
Edited by Andrew Yeo, Danielle Chubb
Frontmatter
[More Information](#)

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

University Printing House, Cambridge CB2 8BS, United Kingdom
One Liberty Plaza, 20th Floor, New York, NY 10006, USA
477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia
314–321, 3rd Floor, Plot 3, Splendor Forum, Jasola District Centre,
New Delhi – 110025, India
79 Anson Road, #06–04/06, Singapore 079906

Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge.
It furthers the University's mission by disseminating knowledge in the pursuit of
education, learning, and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

www.cambridge.org
Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781108425490
DOI: 10.1017/9781108589543

© Andrew Yeo and Danielle Chubb 2018

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception
and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements,
no reproduction of any part may take place without the written
permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2018

Printed in the United States of America by Sheridan Books, Inc.

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

NAMES: Yeo, Andrew, 1978– editor. | Chubb, Danielle L., editor.
TITLE: North Korean human rights : activists and networks / edited by Andrew I. Yeo,
The Catholic University of America and Danielle Chubb, Deakin University, Victoria.
DESCRIPTION: New York : Cambridge University Press, [2018] | Includes
bibliographical references and index.
IDENTIFIERS: LCCN 2018009834 | ISBN 9781108425490 (alk. paper)
SUBJECTS: LCSH: Human rights – Korea (North) | Human rights – Korea (North) –
International cooperation. | Human rights workers – Korea (North)
CLASSIFICATION: LCC JC599.K7 N68 2018 | DDC 323.09513–dc23
LC record available at <https://lccn.loc.gov/2018009834>

ISBN 978-1-108-42549-0 Hardback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of
URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication
and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain,
accurate or appropriate.

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-42549-0 — North Korean Human Rights
Edited by Andrew Yeo , Danielle Chubb
Frontmatter
[More Information](#)

For our children, Joshua and Joyce, and
Jarrah and Karri

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-42549-0 — North Korean Human Rights
Edited by Andrew Yeo , Danielle Chubb
Frontmatter
[More Information](#)

Contents

<i>List of Figures</i>	page ix
<i>List of Tables</i>	xi
<i>Notes on Contributors</i>	xii
<i>Foreword</i>	xv
<i>Preface and Acknowledgments</i>	xxiii
<i>Note on Transliteration</i>	xxix
<i>List of Abbreviations</i>	xxx
1 Adaptive Activism: Transnational Advocacy Networks and the Case of North Korea	1
<i>Danielle Chubb and Andrew Yeo</i>	
PART I DOMESTIC DISCOURSE AND ACTIVISM	29
2 A Prisoner's Dilemma of Movement Nationalization: North Korean Human Rights in South Korea, 1990–2016	31
<i>Jacob Reidhead</i>	
3 North Korean Human Rights Discourse and Advocacy in the United States	61
<i>Andrew Yeo</i>	
4 Linking Abductions Activism to North Korean Human Rights Advocacy in Japan and Abroad	85
<i>Celeste L. Arrington</i>	
5 North Korean Human Rights Discourse and Advocacy: The European Dimension	109
<i>Rajiv Narayan</i>	

	PART II TRANSNATIONAL NETWORKS	129
6	NGOs As Discursive Catalysts at the United Nations and Beyond: An Activist's Perspective <i>Joanna Hosaniak</i>	131
7	Human Rights Diffusion in North Korea: The Impact of Transnational Legal Mobilization <i>Patricia Goedde</i>	154
8	The Politics of Networking: Behind the Public Face of the Transnational North Korean Human Rights Movement <i>Danielle Chubb</i>	177
	PART III NORTH KOREAN VOICES	199
9	The Emergence of Five North Korean Defector-Activists in Transnational Activism <i>Jay Song</i>	201
10	North Korea Responds to Transnational Human Rights Advocacy: State Discourse and Ersatz Civil Society <i>Sandra Fahy</i>	224
11	Breaking Through: North Korea's Information Underground and Transnational Advocacy Networks <i>Jieun Baek</i>	249
12	Conclusion: The Contentious Terrain of North Korean Human Rights Activism <i>Andrew Yeo and Danielle Chubb</i>	272
	<i>Index</i>	291

Figures

1.1	Mechanisms for change in North Korean human rights	page 19
2.1	Prisoner's Dilemma of movement nationalization	35
2.2	North Korean human rights actor network, as observed in South Korean news media, 1990–2016	38
2.3	Periodization of North Korean human rights discourse network as observed in South Korean news media, 1990–2016	40
2.4	North Korean human rights news article counts in <i>Chosun Ilbo</i> and <i>Hankyoreh</i> , 1990–2016	42
3.1	Articles referring to North Korean human rights in the <i>New York Times</i> , <i>Wall Street Journal</i> , and <i>Washington Post</i>	66
3.2	Number of words allocated to discussion of economic and political rights in US State Department human right reports on North Korea	67
4.1	What issues related to North Korea interest you?	86
8.1	Hyperlink analysis of the North Korean human rights network	187
8.2	Organizations and normative frameworks	191
9.1	Kang Chol Hwan's networks	205
9.2	Shin Dong Hyuk's networks	207
9.3	Networks of Kim Joo Il and Park Ji Hyun	209
9.4	Park Yeon Mi's networks	212

10.1	COI and associated nations	230
10.2	COI and collocated words	231
10.3	US and ROK descriptive words of behavior and character	232
10.4	Quality of life words: ROK and USA	233
10.5	Defector references and related words	240
11.1	Relationship between North Korean human rights transnational advocacy networks and information networks	258
11.2	Mechanisms linking human rights advocacy, information flows, and human rights change	260

Tables

1.1	Sample of North Korean human rights organizational actors by country	<i>page 4</i>
4.1	Main Japanese NGOs and state actors active on North Korean human rights	94
6.1	UN General Assembly voting records on the resolution of the situation of human rights in the DPRK, 2005–11	143
6.2	UN Commission on Human Rights voting record on the resolution on the situation of human rights in the DPRK, 2003–5	143
6.3	UN Human Rights Council voting records on the resolution on the situation of human rights in the DPRK, 2008–11	144
8.1	Hyperlink analysis starting points	185
8.2	Key to identifying nonstarting point organizations	186
9.1	Thematic keywords of the North Korean defector-activists	214

Notes on Contributors

Celeste L. Arrington is Korea Foundation Assistant Professor of Political Science and International Affairs at the George Washington University. She specializes in comparative politics, with a focus on law and social movements, the media, policymaking processes, transnational activism, historical justice, and the Koreas and Japan. She is the author of *Accidental Activists: Victim Movements and Government Accountability in Japan and South Korea* (2016). She has been a fellow at Princeton's Law and Public Affairs Program, the Institute for Advanced Study, and Harvard's Program on US–Japan Relations. She received her PhD from the University of California, Berkeley.

Jieun Baek is a PhD candidate in Public Policy at the University of Oxford. Previously, she was a research fellow at the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs at Harvard University where she wrote *North Korea's Hidden Revolution: How the Information Underground is Transforming a Closed Society* (2016). Baek also worked at Google, where, among other roles, she served as Google Ideas' North Korea expert. She received both her BA and MPP from Harvard University.

Danielle Chubb is Senior Lecturer in International Relations and a member of the POLIS research network at Deakin University in Victoria, Australia. She is the author of *Contentious Activism and Inter-Korean Relations* (2014), which examines the historical evolution of South Korean discourse over the issues of human rights, democracy, and unification. Danielle received her PhD from The Australian National University.

Sandra Fahy is an Associate Professor of Anthropology in the Faculty of Liberal Arts at Sophia University, Tokyo, Japan. She is the author of *Marching through Suffering: Loss and Survival in North Korea* (2015), among other publications. Her forthcoming book is titled *Without Parallel: Our Style Human Rights and North Korea*. She received her PhD in

Anthropology from the School of Oriental and African Studies at the University of London, and her MA in Interdisciplinary Anthropology, History, and Literature from York University.

Patricia Goedde is Associate Professor at Sungkyunkwan University, School of Law, in Seoul, Korea. She has published in journals including *Human Rights Quarterly*, *Fordham International Law Journal*, *Clinical Law Review*, and *Korea Observer* on topics related to human rights in North Korea, the North Korean legal system, public interest law clinics, refugee advocacy, and due process rights for detainees. Goedde also serves on the board of directors for the Korea Human Rights Foundation. She received her PhD and JD from the University of Washington School of Law, and is a licensed attorney of the Washington State Bar Association.

Joanna Hosaniak is Deputy Director of Citizens' Alliance for North Korean Human Rights (NKHR) in Seoul, where she has worked since 2004, and Lecturer at the Underwood College, Yonsei University. Hosaniak led international advocacy to establish the UN Commission of Inquiry for the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) and the UN Panel of Experts on Accountability for the DPRK. Born in Warsaw, Poland, Hosaniak received her MA in Korean Studies from Warsaw University and her PhD in International Studies from Sogang University, South Korea, where she studied the issue of addressing past crimes in the former communist countries in Europe.

Rajiv Narayan is Director of Policy at the International Commission Against the Death Penalty, and Senior Consultant Adviser at the Rafto Foundation. Prior to that, he worked for 13 years at Amnesty International, researching and reporting extensively on North Korea, South Korea, and Japan. He was also a visiting professor at the Graduate School of International Studies at Yonsei University in Seoul, South Korea. He received his PhD from the University of London.

Jacob Reidhead is a PhD candidate in Sociology and Korea Studies at Stanford University. His research models informal political organization in South Korea and studies the coevolution of these political networks alongside domestic debates on North Korea policy. In 2008, he was a Food Monitor for aid being sent to North Korea for Mercy Corps. He has an MA in Sociology from the University of Washington, an MS in Statistics from The Ohio State University, and a BS in Mathematics from Arizona State University.

Jay Song is Senior Lecturer at the Asia Institute of the University of Melbourne, Australia, and Global Ethics Fellow of the Carnegie Council for

Ethics in International Affairs in New York. Prior to her current positions, she was the Director of Migration and Border Policy at the Lowy Institute (Sydney) and Assistant Professor of Political Science at Singapore Management University. She is the author of *Human Rights Discourse in North Korea: Post-Colonial, Marxist and Confucian Perspectives* (2010). She received her PhD in Politics and International Studies from the University of Cambridge.

Andrew Yeo is Associate Professor of Politics, Director of Asian Studies, and a Fellow at the Institute for Policy Research and Catholic Studies at The Catholic University of America in Washington DC. He is the author of *Activists, Alliances, and Anti-US Base Protests* (2011) and coeditor of *Living in an Age of Mistrust: An Interdisciplinary Study of Declining Trust and How to Get it Back* (2017). His research interests include international relations theory, East Asian regionalism, the formation of beliefs and worldviews, civil society and social movements, and Korean politics. Yeo received his PhD in Government from Cornell University and his BA with distinction in Psychology and International Studies from Northwestern University.

Foreword

These things shall be: a loftier race
Than e'er the world hath known shall rise
With flame of freedom in their souls
And light of knowledge in their eyes

At about the time that I was taught to sing the above hymn at school, written by John Addington Symonds,¹ I received from my teacher a copy of the newly adopted *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* (UDHR).² It had been brought into effect at a meeting of the recently created General Assembly of the United Nations. In the chair at the time was Dr. H. V. Evatt, the chief Australian delegate. He had been a judge but when war came he resigned, entered politics, and became a leading minister in the government of Australia. He was elected the third president of the UN General Assembly. He had played an important role in the negotiations that led to the adoption of the UN Charter in 1945. He was one of the Charter Generation. Presiding in the General Assembly on December 10, 1948, he declared the UDHR adopted. He said it was a “Magna Carta” of the new age.

Hymns were not normally sung in Australian public schools. However, Addington’s hymn was approved as sufficiently secular because it contained few references to God. Its sentiments were particularly attractive to the Charter Generation.

The Charter Generation was inspired by feelings of idealism. Those feelings grew out of the terrible state of the world in 1945. The huge loss of human life, the destruction of cities and economies, the disclosure of the Holocaust, and the widespread crimes against humanity instilled a commitment to

¹ J. A. Symonds (1840–93) “These Things Shall Be” (1891). See https://hymnary.org/text/these_things_shall_be_a_loftier_race.

² UN General Assembly A(iii) of December 10, 1948 (UDHR).

building a better world. Likewise, the detonation of nuclear weapons over Hiroshima and Nagasaki, Japan, in August 1945, with unprecedented loss of life and suffering, propelled the United Nations with a great sense of urgency. The mushroom cloud, caused by the detonation of the nuclear weapons, burned an eidetic image into our minds. Unless the world could respond to the challenges, and build a better global order, the dangers and the continuation of conflict and further crimes against humanity seemed likely to become the terminal heritage of humankind.

It was in this atmosphere that the United Nations Charter³ was adopted. Originally, it was intended to include a bill of universal rights. However, the drafters ran out of time. A drafting committee was thus created to do the drafting. That committee was chaired by Eleanor Roosevelt, widow of the wartime president of the United States of America. It included many important scholars, including René Cassin (France) and P. C. Chang (China). The senior officer of its secretariat was John Humphrey of Canada. I came to know Professor Humphrey in the 1980s when we both served in the International Commission of Jurists in Geneva. It was he who wrote the first version of the UDHR, including the stirring words of the first article:⁴

All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood.

In the world of the Charter Generation, where ideals were mixed with practical necessities, universal human rights definitely had a vital place. Human rights were listed among the first preambular objectives of the United Nations Organisation. They became one of the pillars upon which the Organisation was to be based. The Charter Generation envisaged peace and security that would be guarded and upheld by the Security Council. They accepted special voting rights for the designated great powers.⁵ Following the successful prosecution of the War by the Allies, it was expected that those powers would act responsibly and protectively, as a result of from their special position and extra powers. They would help to protect the world from endless involvement in destructive wars.

According to this view, the General Assembly, where all nations had equal voting rights, would reflect the wisdom and broad directions of humanity, expressed by the nation states. Those states would themselves recognize that the UN Charter was established in the name of the “Peoples of the United

³ UN Charter, June 26, 1945, 59 STAT. 1031; TS 993, entered into force October 24, 1945.

⁴ UDHR, Art 1. ⁵ UN Charter Art 27.3 (“veto” provision).

Nations.”⁶ The UDHR specifically envisaged the treaty law that was later to evolve, converting the language of the UDHR into binding legal requirements. It was expected that the nations would faithfully fulfill these obligations. Special procedures were developed and the Human Rights Council (HRC) evolved from the Human Rights Commission. By procedures designed for the scrutiny of state conduct, including by the later developed system of Universal Periodic Review (UPR), it was hoped that every nation would be subjected to regular, neutral, and expert scrutiny. Their conduct would be measured against the established standards of the United Nations.

The Charter Generation certainly envisaged that nation states, at home, would foster knowledge of, and commitment to, universal human rights. They would do so through the participation of active civil society organizations, both national and international, and by free exchange of knowledge and opinions resulting from enhanced travel, dialogue, broadcasting, and other media. When the world was concerned about the state of human rights for peace and security, the United Nations could be relied on to intervene prudently. Blue helmets would guard transitional or dangerous circumstances. The nonproliferation of nuclear weapons would be upheld by international law. And the International Court of Justice would lay down requirements for peace, security, and justice, including by the destruction of nuclear armaments and the prohibition on the use, or threat of use, of such weapons.⁷

These were some of the ideals that, it was hoped, would protect the world against the repetition of war crimes, genocide, and crimes against humanity. Such crimes, along with damage to the environment, unyielding poverty, and other dangers, would threaten the very survival of the human species if they were not addressed. The Charter Generation believed that the world would embrace a new legal order:

Nation with nation, land with land
 Unarmed shall live with comrades free.
 In every heart and brain shall throb
 The pulse of one fraternity

Sadly, although much has been achieved, the dreams that accompanied the Charter have not been attained. During and after the Cold War, the special voting rights of the great powers were misused. The Security Council was log-jammed and often incapable of enforcing peace with justice. The General

⁶ UN Charter begins, “We the Peoples of the United Nations”

⁷ International Court of Justice, Advisory Opinion on the Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons (1996) 2 ICJ 2.

Assembly became too frequently bogged down in global and regional geopolitics. The Human Rights Commission, and then the HRC, on many occasions fell victim to regionalism, and often radically different notions of the meaning of human rights and how to attain them.

While many civil society organizations – both national and international – arose and worked with the HRC and its officeholders, some were opposed to a global consensus on human rights. Some saw the UDHR, treaty law, and the HRC itself as Western inventions enforcing Western values. Specifically, some rejected steps that would try to render accountable the perpetrators of international crimes. In many countries, national and international civil society organizations faced hostile retaliation from their own states. Ordinary citizens would often fail to express, or even hear, voices raised to condemn violations of human rights and to demand redress. While international human rights bodies have sprung up and played a most useful role in stimulating, supporting, implementing, and enforcing the United Nations human rights machinery, often that machinery has been fragmented. Commonly, it has been poorly funded. Sometimes it is targeted by hostile laws designed to undermine such operations. Occasionally, such bodies are in conflict with each other, because of different values, distinctive methodologies, or mutual jealousy.

Yet many civil society organizations, both national and international, are dedicated to universal human rights. They share a common objective to end crimes against humanity and human rights abuses and to render those responsible answerable for such wrongs. They aim to progress from mere condemnation to active accountability. But all too often this presents an impossible challenge. The consequent failures and weaknesses have imperiled still further the dreams of the Charter Generation.

This book seeks to place under scrutiny a particular case: human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (North Korea). It seeks to examine the work of national and international civil society organizations. It chronicles the people who have escaped from great wrongs and shared their stories. It describes the United Nations agencies and institutions in order to extract practical and theoretical lessons presented by the case of North Korea. Inevitably, that case offers lessons both for the states themselves and for the global community.

The editors and authors of this book are too young to have been members of the Charter Generation. Nevertheless, they reveal themselves, for the most part, as practical and worldly enough to accept the importance of international human rights doctrine. They understand and accept the grave departures shown to exist in North Korea. They see the need for the international

community to be more successful in tackling the established instances of human rights violations than it has been in the past.

On March 21, 2013, at its 22nd session, the HRC established a Commission of Inquiry on Human Rights in DPRK (COI). There was no call for a vote on the proposal. This was the only time that this has occurred in the creation of such a COI.⁸ On May 7, 2013, I was appointed to chair the COI. I joined Marzuki Darusman of Indonesia, the Special Rapporteur on DPRK, who under the HRC resolution, was *ex officio* a member. Sonja Biserko of Serbia, an expert on crimes against humanity and genocide, was the third member. In accordance with our mandate, the COI resolved to adopt a novel, transparent, and technologically friendly methodology.⁹ The COI report was produced within the timeframe set by the HRC. It was presented to that body on February 7, 2014.

Denied cooperation with or admission to North Korea, the COI had to rely on the testimony of escapees who had fled to the Republic of Korea (South Korea). Most of them gave their testimony openly, in public. Filmed images of such evidence was uploaded to the Internet. There is a great deal of attention given in this book to the evidence of these “defectors” concerning conditions in North Korea. As explained, there have been occasional cases of false or exaggerated testimony. This had led to criticisms of the testimony as a whole.¹⁰ However, given the refusal of North Korea to cooperate and the fearsome punishments imposed on suspected enemies of the state within North Korea, the use of such escapee testimony was unavoidable and indeed essential.

Criticism by North Korea of the COI’s witnesses was to be expected. However, the so-called scholarly criticism strikes me as mostly unpersuasive. The testimony before the COI is available on the Internet for the whole world to see and evaluate. Having sat through hours of this testimony, as it was given, I believe that it was overwhelmingly truthful and convincing. The picture disclosed is shocking. The human rights abuses that are revealed need to be addressed urgently.¹¹

The impediments that North Korea placed in the way of gathering reliable and accurate evidence of its wrongdoings were partly physical (limitations on movement within and out of the country). But they were also partly

⁸ C. Henderson (ed.) *Commissions of Inquiry: Problems and Prospects* (Oxford/Bloomsbury: Hart Publishing, 2017), xi.

⁹ A/HRC/25/crp.1.

¹⁰ Jay Song, “Unreliable Witnesses: The Challenge of Separating Truth from Fiction When It Comes to North Korea,” available at www.policyforum.net/unreliable-witnesses/.

¹¹ G. J. Evans, *The Responsibility to Protect – Ending Mass Atrocity Crimes Once and for All*. Washington DC: Brookings Institution Press, 2008.

technological (the deprivation of telephone, postal, or other telecommunications; the absence of radio, television, film, and other media). And they were also partly psychological (a number of escapee witnesses described saturation propaganda, and many spoke of the overwhelming pressures imposed by one-sided information, adulatory of the regime). The report was powerful and convincing. The proof of the pudding lies in the very strong votes that followed in the HRC, the General Assembly, and even, when it was placed on the agenda by a procedural resolution, the Security Council.¹²

Until recently, I did not know of the effort that went into the initial adoption of the HRC resolution, creating the COI. That effort naturally engaged key member states of the United Nations, in both the HRC and the General Assembly. However, a number of important member states did not, at first, support the creation of a COI. Most significantly, South Korea and Japan, two crucial players, were opposed. It was only the indefatigable work of international civil society organizations, mostly based in Geneva, which pursued the idea relentlessly, that won success. I pay tribute to the efforts of many of the nongovernmental actors, including especially one of the chapter authors of this book, Joanna Hosaniak of Citizens' Alliance for North Korean Human Rights (NKHR) based in Seoul (see Chapter 6).¹³ The way civil society secured a COI that would speak to the world of great wrongs is an exciting story showing the intelligent and effective interaction between governmental and nongovernmental players.

Some of the writers in this book raise what they see as the “core challenge” arising from the modalities of UN human rights procedures (including COI reports). They suggest that the procedures commonly undermine the practical attainment of improvements in the human rights landscape of a country such as North Korea. If a country is totalitarian in its government and controls strictly any access to witnesses and places of oppression, why would it ever agree to submit voluntarily to accountability for proved wrongs? Does such a process (whether in the International Criminal Court, a special tribunal, or anywhere else) not threaten the very continuance of the regime in the country concerned? Would they ever agree to this? Why would they not resist it and obstruct it?

Still, noncooperation does not exempt humanity from the obligation to investigate, record, reveal, and prosecute crimes against humanity and human

¹² M. D. Kirby “United Nations Report on North Korea and the Security Council: Interface of Security and Human Rights” (2015) 89 *Australian Law Journal*, 714.

¹³ M. D. Kirby “North Korea and the Madonna of Czestochowa” in *The University of Notre Dame Australia Law Review*, 19, 2017: 1–13.

rights violations as can be proved to the requisite standard of proof.¹⁴ The COI having received a mandate from UN HRC, we did not enjoy the luxury of ignoring the testimony or declining to provide its report. As an appeal to history and as a record for the later establishment of truth, UN mandate-holders are obliged to do their best. They must not be deflected. They should not gild the lily in the hope that a “soft” report might gain a tiny measure of improvement. In accordance with the UN Charter, each of the goals of the Organisation has to be pursued at the same time – peace and security, but also human rights. The national and transnational civil society organizations described in this book are bound to develop a professional expertise in seemingly paradoxical thinking and in contradictory strategies.

There is now considerable objective evidence that the publication of the COI report on North Korea did in fact produce some important changes within that country. The improvements may be seen in the moves by North Korea to participate, for the first time, in the procedures of Universal Periodic Review in the HRC.¹⁵ Yet it goes further than this. This year the international community obtained a rare insight into the thinking of the upper echelons of North Korea’s officialdom. Their Deputy Ambassador in London, Thae Yong-ho, disappeared from his post and turned up in Seoul. His subsequent interviews are all the more powerful because they are understated. In a 2017 talk for the Center for Strategic and International Studies in Washington DC, he advocated insistence on human rights and security in North Korea while at the same time urging an increase in dialogue between the two Koreas. His perspective appears close, in some respects, to that of the newly elected president of the Republic of Korea, Moon Jae-in. Several of the contributions to this book help to enlighten non-Koreans about the internal political disagreements within South Korea concerning the best way to make progress in dealings with the North and in achieving improvements on the ground. This is enlightenment of great value.

The United Nations is imperfect because it is a human institution. The COI on North Korea was also, no doubt, flawed in particular ways. Had there been more time for the preparation of its report, it might have been a little different. Whether, as some authors in this book have suggested, the report took North Korea to a different level on the “spiral” theory or the “boomerang” theory, by which human rights processes are theorized, the

¹⁴ The standard of proof adopted by the COI is explained in the COI report A/HRC/25/crp.1 at 15–17, paras 63–78.

¹⁵ Sun-young Choi, et al., *The UN Universal Periodic Review and the DPRK: Monitoring of North Korea’s Implementation of Recommendations*, Database Center for North Korean Human Rights (NKDB), Seoul, 2017.

world is a better place for the disclosures that the COI presented to the HRC and the world. The openness of the COI procedures would have been much less effective if there had been no national and transnational organizations to energize, follow-up, and insist upon the scrutiny of human rights abuses and to demand accountability for the wrongs.

I congratulate the civil society organizations described in this book. They have made the United Nations' human rights enterprise more useful and practical than it would otherwise have been. I acknowledge the criticisms ventured and the questions asked in this book. They are essential to continuing the task envisaged by the aspirations of the UN Charter. It is important to have the range of perspectives collected in this book – not only for the case of North Korea, but for all other countries facing serious human rights challenges. However, North Korea is a very special case. This is partly because of its recent developments in the technology of nuclear weapons and in the creation of sophisticated missiles that could deliver those weapons over great distances. Unless the world responds effectively to the peril that is presented by North Korea, the dangers to human survival are great. But if the perils on the part of North Korea are not resolved, larger dangers will surely present before too long from other countries. And unless the crimes against humanity and other human rights abuses found by the COI in North Korea are not addressed effectively, peace and security on the Korean peninsula cannot be assured.

Just as the UN Charter envisaged, universal human rights, peace and security, and international justice are intimately intertwined. That is why the COI report on North Korea remains highly relevant to the world today. It is why the transnational organizations described in this book remain crucial for finding the solutions – and for questioning those adherents to the idealism of the Charter who presume to offer some of the ways forward.

The Hon. Michael Kirby AC CMG*
Sydney, Australia
December 10, 2017

* Chair of the United Nations Human Rights Council's Commission of Inquiry on Human Rights Violations in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (2013–14); Justice of the High Court of Australia (1996–2009); President of the International Commission of Jurists (1995–98).

Preface and Acknowledgments

The grave situation of North Korean human rights has drawn significant attention from activists and policymakers around the world. Numerous NGO reports, journalistic accounts, and personal narratives of defectors have helped shape our understanding of the human rights situation in this closed society. Perhaps for these reasons, then, the scholarly literature on North Korean human rights has remained relatively thin. The weight of evidence chronicling human rights abuses is already extensive, and the closed nature of the country also poses additional barriers for scholars seeking to conduct original and reliable research on North Korea.

Nevertheless, we expect scholarship on North Korean human rights to grow. In particular, the rising number of North Korean defectors in the past two decades has opened a small window through which to peer into North Korea. Specifically, defectors' insights and testimonies have enabled researchers to systematically collect information pertaining to human rights abuses and assess the prospects for social and political change in North Korea.

While the role of defectors has been heralded as a positive development for both North Korean human rights advocacy and scholarship, as social scientists we must still critically examine the evidence we collect and how it is collected, and then weigh it against potentially confounding or contradictory information. Doing so provides a level of assurance that we retain some degree of objectivity in our analysis and are not simply confirming our own biases. To that end, a special issue of *Critical Asian Studies* on North Korean human rights, led by Christine Hong and Hazel Smith, has pushed scholars to think much more critically about North Korean human rights while advancing alternative perspectives which together challenge, if not undermine, the dominant narrative of human rights. Although we disagree with some of their findings (which we address in the Conclusion to this volume), we acknowledge their work upfront to highlight scholarly debate in the inquiry

of North Korean human rights, even as facts on the ground – gross human rights violations taking place in North Korea – remain undeniable. With the exception of the North Korean regime, very few people will deny that such abuses exist. As we argue in our book, however, what one does with those facts, how they are interpreted, and how one responds to the knowledge of human rights violations is politically contested.

This book is fundamentally about the politics of North Korean human rights and the advocacy networks which have advanced this issue domestically and internationally. We do not focus on North Korean human rights in and of themselves – which, as discussed above, have been well-documented by NGOs, activists, and defectors (and in a forthcoming book, *Without Parallel: North Korea's "Our Style" Human Rights* by our close collaborator Sandra Fahy) – but rather on the North Korean human rights transnational advocacy network. As such, the primary actors in our book are the activists, NGOs, states, lawmakers, and intergovernmental institutions which comprise the network. Our book is aimed at revealing different coalitions and cleavages within domestic and transnational networks, as well as the relationship between human rights actors and the North Korean regime. Unique to this network is the role of North Korean defectors who, in the absence of civil society inside North Korea, provide valuable information about rights abuses and lend greater credibility to the transnational advocacy movement. As such, in addition to studying North Korean human rights movements, this book seeks to expand our theoretical understanding of transnational advocacy networks, including their efficacy and limits.

Beyond scholarship, this book is a reflection of transnational friendships. It came to fruition out of our overlapping scholarly and personal interests in North Korea. Two other friends, Sandra Fahy and Jay Song, have been close collaborators with us on this project from its inception. Although their names do not appear on the book cover, their influence, particularly as it pertains to the inclusion of discourse and human rights, is apparent throughout the volume.

Our project originated out of a conversation in November 2014 between one of the editors (Andrew) and Jay Song about the need to explore network ties between North Korean human rights defectors, activists, and NGOs. The conversation continued online as the two then roped in Danielle and Sandra to discuss how one might understand the emergence and trajectory of North Korean human rights advocacy by way of examining the evolution of human rights discourse. During dozens of email conversations and Skype conference calls connecting us across four different time zones (Washington, Singapore, Tokyo, and Melbourne), the four of us developed a research grant

proposal in early 2015, with Andrew and Danielle as coprincipal investigators. The group was awarded a two-year research grant from the Korea Foundation in April 2015.

This project was a major commitment in terms of time, resources, and energy, and we (Andrew and Danielle, speaking now as coeditors of this volume) would not have pulled through were it not for our close collaboration and friendship. As with any coedited project, it helped to share the burden of writing, editing, event planning, and chasing up contributors. Sitting at opposite sides of the International Date Line, we literally worked on this project around the clock, with Danielle signing off at night just as Andrew started for the day. We were also fortunate in that our intellectual approaches to the study of transnational advocacy movements aligned fairly closely, thus avoiding the potential for sharp intellectual disagreements. Beyond the practical and intellectual rewards of coediting, however, what made this collaboration truly special was the understanding and transparency we shared and the encouragement we offered to one other in our perpetual struggle to obtain the optimal work–life balance in our respective lives. It is a true blessing to join forces with a collaborator who values productivity, but who also understands the great importance of family.

Needless to say, the successful completion of this multiyear project required the support of a much wider network beyond the two of us. We are grateful to the Korea Foundation, and, in particular, the efforts of Ms. Seayoun Lee, who remained a strong advocate of this project from the start to its finish. Frankly, this project would not have become a reality without her guidance and representation on our behalf, and the generous financial support from the Korea Foundation which followed.

Despite the close camaraderie developed over the past several years, it is hard to believe that we (the volume editors) have met in person only twice in our lives. Although in the digital age much work can be conducted via cyberspace (at this point, we have exchanged thousands of emails and chat messages, communicating almost daily over the past six months), it still cannot replace the value of direct interaction. We therefore benefited immensely from two meetings held at different stages of the project, allowing us and our contributors to present draft papers and circulate ideas. In June 2015, we organized a closed, two-day workshop in Melbourne, Australia, hosted by the Alfred Deakin Research Institute for Citizenship and Globalisation (ADI) at Deakin University. The workshop, held in the depths of a Melbourne winter, would not have been possible without the terrific administrative support we received from ADI. We extend our gratitude especially to Cayla Edwards, for her ongoing support and advice, as well as ADI director

Fethi Mansouri, who opened our workshop and has been supportive of this endeavor since its inception. Thanks also to Jo Collins, whose able administrative support ensured, among other things, that all our participants caught the right flights at the right times. We are grateful to have had the able research assistance, during the workshop, of Julia Richardson, whose notetaking was enhanced by her knowledge of transnational activism. Moreover, we are particularly thankful to our external discussants, David Hundt, Roland Bleiker, and Leonid Petrov, who took time out of their busy schedules to read our papers, attend the workshop, and provide feedback and advice on the project in its early days. Beyond the workshop, extra research assistance was provided by Michael Hatherell, who wrangled with the Issue Crawler software to help with developing intranetwork maps for this project, which form the core of the analysis in Chapter 8.

In October 2016, we held a much larger public conference in Washington DC, hosted by the Institute for Policy Research and Catholic Studies (IPR) at The Catholic University of America, to disseminate our findings and facilitate a broader policy discussion on North Korean human rights activism. The next day, we held a closed, internal workshop with only our paper contributors to provide/solicit feedback on draft papers and move forward with plans toward book publication. We are grateful to all those who served and provided useful feedback in their capacity as panel chair, discussant, and/or roundtable participant at our Washington conference. This group includes Jennifer Hadden, Tsveta Petrova, Celeste L. Arrington, Victor Cha, Roberta Cohen, Kathy Moon, Greg Scarlatoiu, Frank Jannuzi, and Marcus Noland. We want to especially thank Stephan Haggard, who not only delivered the keynote address at the conference, but, as a true mentor among junior colleagues, stopped by our book workshop the following morning to listen in and provide invaluable advice on putting together a coedited volume. We extend our deep thanks to the staff at IPR, including Woinisnet Negash, Lydia Andrews, and Dan Petri, who worked closely with Andrew behind the scenes for months to plan and execute our international conference. The numerous compliments we received regarding our conference reflect their hard work. Accolades also go to Nicholas Hamisevicz, who assisted with conference logistics, but, more importantly, provided research support and transcribed notes during the conference and book workshop. Likewise, Allison Kim, an undergraduate student at Georgetown University at the time, proved to be a truly amazing and highly capable research assistant. During her two-year tenure, she observed protests, compiled data, and learned new software to analyze qualitative data. Ralph Albano, Associate Provost for Research, and John Schmidt, in the office of sponsored

accounting, offered their guidance in managing our grant budget. Thank you!

We thank each of our contributors not only for their chapter contributions and commitment to our project, but also for sharing their important insights with the entire group. In addition to these authors, we recognize Mikyoung Kim, who participated in our Melbourne and Washington DC workshops, and Young Hoon Song, who joined our conversation in Melbourne. Over the past two years, our conversations and correspondences with all of our contributors, both individually and collectively, have deepened our understanding of North Korean human rights advocacy, discourse, and transnational activism. Our project would not have achieved the high standard we strived toward without their expert knowledge, input, cooperation and, most importantly, enthusiasm. This has been an outstanding team to work with, and we can only hope that all our future collaborations are as cheerful, supportive, and positive as this one. As inexperienced editors, we were probably more demanding and “hands-on” than one might anticipate for an edited volume project, so thank you for your forbearance. Nevertheless, we hope this has been as rewarding an experience for our contributors as it was for us. We certainly appreciate the good humor of our contributors during the intensive editorial process.

Several friends read and commented on different parts of the manuscript. We thank Phillip Ayoub, Jennifer Hadden (again), and our contributors Sandra Fahy and Patricia Goedde for giving us feedback and encouragement. At an earlier stage, Hyung-Gu Lynn also provided invaluable advice about building internal coherence among chapters. We also received excellent suggestions from two anonymous reviewers, which helped us frame our introductory chapter (Chapter 1) and sharpen the book’s focus on transnational advocacy.

Helping us reach the finish line have been the fantastic team at Cambridge University Press, especially our editor, John Berger in the New York office, and on the production side, Matt Sweeney and Mathivathini Mareesan. Back in Melbourne, we thank Martine Hawkes for her superb editorial support, and again extend thanks to the Alfred Deakin Institute for supporting the production of the final product. In South Korea, we are grateful to Su Min Ahn for granting us permission to use her powerful artwork for our book cover design, and thank Greg Samborski for providing us the photograph of the image.

We would be remiss not to take a moment to thank the many activists who not only dedicate much of their personal and professional lives to the cause of North Korean human rights, but who have also talked to us about their work many times over the past decade. Here, especially, we want to acknowledge

Greg Scarlatoiu, Roberta Cohen, Suzanne Scholte, Henry Song, and Joanna Hosaniak for the time they have taken to provide us with insights about the work they do through their respective organizations. This has taken many forms: conversations, emails, research interviews, and supporting our participant–observer attendance at events or meetings.

Finally, but very importantly, we thank our families, who chugged along with us for several years on this project. Our spouses will probably remember us being, at times, aloof, distracted, or absent. Our little ones (four children under the age of five, between us) will probably have early memories of us typing away in front of our computers in a major effort to meet deadlines. We hope one day our children will recognize the importance of this sort of research, which is bigger than any one of us. Andrew would like to thank Joshua and Joyce for being as patient as one might expect for any child under the age of five, and trying very hard not to interrupt Daddy during his work time. The two of you are my joy. None of this could have been accomplished, of course without Yoon’s moral support and prayers behind the scenes. Danielle also thanks her two little ones, Jarrah and Karri, who somehow never complained when Mummy had to go to work on the weekend, or sometimes couldn’t be home to tuck them into bed. And to the wonderful Bret, whose cheery patience and support has made it all possible.

Washington DC and Melbourne, Australia
September 2017

Note on Transliteration

Throughout this book we employ the Revised Romanization system of transliteration, except in cases where words or names have their own divergent, widely used spelling, such as Seoul or Kim Jong Un. For transliteration of Japanese text in Chapter 4, we use the modified Hepburn system with macrons for long vowels. For commonly referenced words or names the conventional spelling is used.

Abbreviations

AI	Amnesty International
APPG	All-Party Parliamentary Group on North Korea
CEDAW	Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women
COI	Commission of Inquiry on Human Rights
COMJAN	Investigation Commission on Missing Japanese Probably Related to North Korea
CPR	Civil and political rights
CR	Congressional record
CSIS	Center for Strategic and International Studies
CSOs	Civil society organizations
CSW	Christian Solidarity Worldwide
DFP	Defense Forum Foundation
DPRK	Democratic People's Republic of Korea
DUP	Democratic United Party
EAHRNK	European Alliance for Human Rights in North Korea
ESCR	Economic, social, and cultural rights
EU	European Union
EUFreeNK	Free North Korean Association in EU
FA	Swedish, Danish, Norwegian, and Icelandic football associations
FIFA	Fédération Internationale de Football Association
FNKR	FreeNK Radio
HRC	UN Human Rights Council
HRNK	Committee for Human Rights in North Korea
HRW	Human Rights Watch
HRWF	Human Rights Without Frontiers
ICC	International criminal court

List of Abbreviations

xxxi

ICNK	International Coalition to Stop Crimes Against Humanity in North Korea
IGOs	Intergovernmental organizations
ILO	International labor organization
INGOs	International nongovernmental organizations
JFBA	Japan Federation of Bar Association
KCNA	Korean Central News Agency
LDA	Latent Dirichlet Analysis
LFNKR	Life Funds for North Korean Refugees
LiNK	Liberty in North Korea
NED	National Endowment for Democracy
NGOs	Nongovernmental organizations
NKAHRA	North Korean Abductions and Human Rights Act
NKDB	Database Center for North Korean Human Rights
NKFC	North Korea Freedom Coalition
NKFW	North Korea Freedom Week
NKHR	Citizens' Alliance for North Korean Human Rights (also: Citizen's Alliance)
NKIS	North Korea Intellectuals Solidarity
NKnet	Network for North Korean Democracy and Human Rights
OHCHR	Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
PvdA	Dutch Labor Party
ROK	Republic of Korea
UN	United Nations
UNGA	UN General Assembly
UNSC	UN Security Council
UPP	United Progressive Party
UPR	Universal periodic review

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-42549-0 — North Korean Human Rights
Edited by Andrew Yeo , Danielle Chubb
Frontmatter
[More Information](#)
