Silence Is Complicity

By Kay Seok

The second-quarter inter-Korean summit, between the new South Korean President Roh Moo-hyun and North Korean leader Kim Jong Il produced a media frenzy. Journalists reported on every move and statement by the two leaders, including their exchange of “comfort letters.” But it is public but banned relief to do so.

Analyzing relief, one can be conspicuously missing any discussions of human rights. Given North Korea’s consistent denial of political, economic, social and cultural rights, this is remarkable. careless, since it means that both sides are unable to accept the issue of human rights.

Why aren’t human rights even mentioned during summits between North and South Korea?

At the summit, Mr. Roh and North Korean leader Kim Jong Il exchanged “comfort letters,” which were announced by both governments. The letters include statements that the two sides will cooperate in the area of human rights issues.

In an interview earlier this year, an official in Mr. Roh’s office said that the letters would be a “medium to transmit the very deep desire for rapprochement, and at the same time a very important declaration to the world.”

In fact, the letters were issued at the very beginning of North and South Korea’s Unification Minister Lee Jun-seok reportedly reported by saying that “human rights in South Korea is indirectly linked to the question of its political system, a moral and ethical issue is not the only way.” The South Korean government argued that the human rights issue should be addressed in a broader and more comprehensive context.

In the South Korean government’s view, the letters are a step towards the ultimate goal of reunification of the two Koreas.

While the letters were seen as a positive development, many human rights activists expressed concern that the letters did not address the issue of human rights sufficiently.

One of the main issues that human rights activists were concerned about was the issue of political prisoners.

In a statement made by human rights activists, they called for the release of all political prisoners and the end of political repression.

Despite the letters, many human rights activists remained skeptical about the prospects for improvement in human rights in North Korea.

The letters were seen as a symbolic gesture rather than a concrete step towards addressing the issue of human rights.
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The Nuclear Disarmament Framework

By Harold Brown and John Deutch

The end of the Cold War changed “the balance of nuclear forces” and “with the nuclear threat of the Cold War era gone,” more nations are taking steps to disarmament.

Some politicians and analysts, includ- ing Mr. Deutch, have said that the new era poses a unique opportunity to make “profound changes in our security strategy.”

However, the problem of nuclear weapons, which are considered to be the ultimate weapons of mass destruction, remains.

The U.S. must maintain a nuclear deterrent; there is no wishing these weapons away.

A nation that wishes to acquire nuclear weapons believes these weapons an effective insurance policy. The declaration by the U.S. that it will eliminate nuclear weapons in a distant future will have no direct effect on changing this calculus. Indeed, nothing that the U.S. does in the near future will directly impact this calculus. Even so, the U.S. government has recently announced its intention to reduce its nuclear arsenal.

This announcement is a significant step towards the ultimate goal of eliminating nuclear weapons.

While the U.S. nuclear arsenal is still a significant determinant of international security, the announcement is a positive development.

It is important to note that the U.S. nuclear arsenal is still a significant determinant of international security, and that the announcement is not a substitute for a comprehensive approach to nuclear disarmament.

The U.S. government has also announced its intention to work with other countries to reduce their nuclear arsenals.

These efforts are important, but they are only part of a broader strategy to address the threat of nuclear weapons.

A comprehensive approach to nuclear disarmament must include efforts to reduce the overall number of nuclear weapons, as well as efforts to reduce the threat posed by existing nuclear weapons.

The U.S. government has announced its intention to work with other countries to reduce the overall number of nuclear weapons through a combination of diplomatic efforts, economic measures, and technological initiatives.

The U.S. government has also announced its intention to work with other countries to reduce the threat posed by existing nuclear weapons through a combination of diplomatic efforts, economic measures, and technological initiatives.

The U.S. government has announced its intention to work with other countries to reduce the threat posed by existing nuclear weapons through a combination of diplomatic efforts, economic measures, and technological initiatives.