

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF ADVANCED
INTERNATIONAL STUDIES
INTERNATIONAL BAR ASSOCIATION
DEFENCE FORUM FOUNDATION – ROBERT F. KENNEDY
HUMAN RIGHTS
THE COMMITTEE FOR HUMAN RIGHTS IN NORTH KOREA
YONSEI CENTER FOR HUMAN LIBERTY

HUMAN RIGHTS IN DPRK: ACTIONS SPEAK LOUDER THAN
WORDS

The Hon. Michael Kirby

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF ADVANCED
INTERNATIONAL STUDIES
INTERNATIONAL BAR ASSOCIATION
DEFENCE FORUM FOUNDATION – ROBERT F. KENNEDY HUMAN
RIGHTS
THE COMMITTEE FOR HUMAN RIGHTS IN NORTH KOREA
YONSEI CENTER FOR HUMAN LIBERTY

HUMAN RIGHTS IN DPRK: ACTIONS SPEAK LOUDER THAN
WORDS*

The Hon. Michael Kirby **

SPREADING KNOWLEDGE OF THE COI REPORT ON DPRK

Most keynote addresses are given up on the platform, with a little elevation. Well, I spent 34 years as a judge. I was always up on a little platform. And that's over. I'm down here with you to symbolise the fact that we're all in this together. North Korea presents a challenge to all of us. It is a challenge to the world. This is an occasion for humility not elevation.

* Based on an edited transcription of oral remarks delivered at Johns Hopkins University in Washington DC, United States of America, 27 October 2015. The oral character of the address has been retained.

** Chair of the UN Human Rights Council's Commission of Inquiry (COI) on Human Rights Violations in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) (2013-2014); Justice of the High Court of Australia (1996-2009); Special Representative of the UN Secretary-General for Human Rights in Cambodia (1993-1996).

The first thing to say, building on what Ambassador King has just said, is that my mandate is over. I have finished my mandate for the United Nations on North Korea. The report we were commissioned to prepare was delivered on time, unanimously, and within budget. When it was delivered, it was given to the international news media first, as happens immediately it's ready in the language in which it is written. Then a month later it was given formally to the Council on Human Rights.

From there, after a very strong vote of the Council on Human Rights, it went to the General Assembly's Third Committee. From there, after a very strong vote, it went to the plenary of the General Assembly, where the vote was even stronger. From there, as you know, it went to the Security Council – a most unusual step to take in relation to a human rights report. The vote was 11-2-2. Eleven states in the Security Council voted in favour of placing the report on the agenda of the Security Council. So it is there for the next three years. It can be raised on one day's notice as a matter of business in the order of business of the Security Council, of the United Nations, of the world.

That was also a very strong vote. On a show of hands, two states voted against the procedural motion – China and the Russian Federation. Two states abstained – Chad (which at the time held the Presidency of the Security Council) and Nigeria. Rwanda, another African state which was a member of the Security Council, with its own experience of grave crimes against humanity and genocide, voted in favour of the motion. Eleven votes was a very strong vote.

But there it has stood ever since in the Security Council. It has not come back to the Security Council since that day. In December of this year [2015], the United States of America will have the presidency of the Security Council. I'm hoping that, during December, the report of the Commission of Inquiry will come back into the Security Council for discussion. And hopefully some action.

This is the report [MK holds up report]. It's actually a very readable report [...] Every word of the report was weighed and balanced by me, a native English speaker, even though with a strange accent from the Antipodes. Every word is what we intended to say.

So there it is. It should be translated into Chinese. We've tried to get it translated into Chinese. China is the key to effective action on North Korea. And if the people of China, with their greatness, including their enormous self-achievement of economic progress in the last 20 or 30 years, had this report, I think it would work into the minds of the people of China. They would ask themselves, as many blogs have begun to ask, why are we supporting a country like North Korea as described in this report? Why is our government supporting such a land?

If anyone has ideas about such publication let me know. It should be at every airport. It is readable. Put a few photographs in it, a very handsome photograph of the chair of the Commission of Inquiry on the cover, and it would win a Pulitzer Prize! It should be in the public marketplace of ideas. That is something which we have to work on.

DRAWING ATTENTION TO DPRK: NOW THE WORLD KNOWS

we've had a marvellous session in this symposium so far. The two earlier sessions have been really brilliant in this dialogue. I thank Johns Hopkins University, not only for the dialogue today, but for what was done two years ago today when we sat on the stage here, as a Commission, and we heard the public hearings in the United States of America, in this very room. That became a foundation for our report.

Now, since that time and indeed since the report was accepted by the procedural motion of the Security Council, a lot has happened in our world. Much of it has been focused on what we call the Middle East. The terrible events that have been unfolding in the Middle East, and in the Arab lands, are naturally the focus of the international news media. The international news media sets the agenda of the action and attention of international leaders. It's natural that that should be so in free countries, with free media. But the result of that is that North Korea has definitely gone off the main attention of the news media and the political leaders of the world. What can we do?

We are all here because we've chosen to be here. We're here because we know how important this issue is. This, after all, is a land with at least 20 nuclear warheads; with an increasingly sophisticated missile delivery system; with increasing attention being paid by North Korea to submarine technology; and with the potential, with the miniaturisation of the 20 nuclear warheads on submarines, of harassing and troubling

countries in the Pacific and in our world, including the United States of America. If this doesn't endanger the United States of America today, very soon it will do so, with the technology upon which (as we heard in the last session) North Korea is spending its wealth, to the exclusion of the survival and life of its people. It will be a real trouble and harassment to this country. And to many others.

So, the problem that we face is keeping up attention to North Korea. I think it is fair to say that although Islamic State and Syria and Libya and Iran and all the other countries that grab our leaders' attention around the world, although they are proper matters of concern, North Korea must not go off the agenda because of the peril that it presents to itself, to its own people, to the Korean Peninsula and to the world.

The one response to the Commission of Inquiry report that is intolerable and unacceptable is to look away – again, to look away – because what we didn't know, what the international community did not know, what I did not know, before the Commission of Inquiry did its work, we now know. There is no excuse.

It is as if in the 1930s, somebody with authority had gone into the Nazi and Fascist lands, and reported on what was happening. And then we had turned away. That would have been totally unacceptable. And it's totally unacceptable today.

Therefore, we have to grab again the attention of our leaders and of the international community. We have to make sure that something is done to follow up the report of the Commission of Inquiry.

HEARING KOREAN VOICES: THE DPRK AMBASSADOR

I think it would be a good thing if more United Nations inquiries were headed by judges and ex-judges. One thing you learn as a judge is: you get a discipline in your life and also you get a dispassion. You get a sense of due process and of the obligation, even to North Korea, to make sure that you don't overreach. A United Nations Commission of Inquiry isn't a political action. It is dispassionate. It reports with dispassion and with due process. That is what we did.

One of the first things you learn in due process is that you must listen to the voice of those whom you are criticising. So although we don't have North Korea here today, let me read you two passages that will give you the voice of North Korea. The first is the voice of the diplomat who responded in the Human Rights Council to the report of the Commission of Inquiry. He said:

‘My delegation categorically and resolutely rejects what is being said. Such manoeuver is no more than a knockabout plot that has no value to consider. However, we are compelled to state our principled position since this plot, which is based on all sorts of despicable means, is going beyond the dangerous level. First, the United States and its followers including Japan, have constantly been attempting to undermine the

ideology of the DPRK and eliminate its social system, throughout years and centuries of its existence, by resorting to all sorts of plots and fabrications and are using human rights as one of the tools to achieve this objective.

Worse, the United States and other hostile forces have been more and more arbitrary in their endeavours to create an international oppressive system aimed at interfering at the internal affairs of DPRK.

Second, United States, Japan and the EU are not qualified to refer to the human rights situation of others. Those countries in question committed war crimes and crimes against humanity in the past by carrying out invasion, plundering, genocide against other countries and nations, and are now behaving as human rights judges that politically name and shame the independent states they dislike, trying to cover up their bloody history. It is particularly preposterous in the case of Japan.

In the DPRK we have a proverb saying “*mind your own business*” – which means that one needs to see his or her face in the mirror and check how nasty it is before talking about others.’

The report and the statement of the DPRK ambassador to the United Nations in Geneva following the Commission report goes on in similar vein to denounce particularly the United States and Japan and the EU. Yet since the *Charter* of the United Nations, the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* and the great treaties of the United Nations, human rights when neglected or abused, are business of us all.

Discount some of the artificiality of language. Still, it is important to note the very strong and deeply felt hostility of North Korea to the United States of America. If you read the *Washington Post* two days ago, there was a lengthy article about the surprise that President Reagan had felt when he learned, in 1983, that the Soviet Union, under Mr Andropov, [...] a successor to Krushchev in the post-Stalin era, actually thought the United States of America intended to use nuclear weapons against the Soviet Union as a pre-emptive strike. Mr Reagan felt that the United States, through history, had always been a moral country and had always acted in a democratic way. So this belief surprised him: that they actually thought that this was going to happen. Yet we now know, from the archives, that they did actually think that the United States was going to attack them. Therefore, when we listen to the voice of the representatives, of DPRK we must ask ourselves how are they seeing the issues that have been discussed today? What are they thinking about the issues that we are considering?

We have to put ourselves into their heads in order to understand them. We may think and say that much of what they are saying is simply the protection of the self-interest of a ruling elite. But the repetition of their strong belief in their social philosophy and in their kind government may indeed be a reality for them. So it's very important that we, trying to understand their perspective, are conscious of how they are approaching the matter.

KOREAN VOICES: THE IBA/KBA REPORT ON DPRK

Secondly, this was made still clearer to me when I read the copy of the report which has been prepared by the International Bar Association (IBA). The IBA is one of the sponsors of this symposium, indeed the lead sponsor of this event here today at Johns Hopkins.

This IBA report on human rights in North Korea is not a document prepared by occidentals, or even by an international organisation of people of different cultural backgrounds. It is actually a document prepared on the Korean Peninsula by the Korean Bar Association, which is established in the Republic of South Korea. So it is prepared by a group of Korean lawyers who have gathered together their perspectives, a Korean perspective on human rights in North Korea.

If we're seeking to put our minds into the space of those whom we are seeking to address and to influence, it is self-evidently important that we should try to get our minds around a Korean perspective, in this case not a North Korean perspective, but a perspective of lawyers of the Korean Bar Association in South Korea. So when one looks at this report and just concentrating for the moment on the conclusion, what do we find?

The conclusion, written by a lawyer, Lee Sock Bum, who was delegated by the Korean Bar Association in South Korea, says that the four principles for improving human rights in North Korea include, first, compliance with international human rights principles. Secondly, balancing human rights with peace. Well, human rights have their own

dignity and peace, and human rights are two of the three great objectives of the United Nations. So I suppose you could say there is a balance of some kind to be achieved. The third principle relates to securing substantive improvement in human rights. Perhaps naturally this Korean document is not addressed to high issues of sanctions and international human rights principles and so on. It concerns how can we actually improve human rights for our cousins and our uncles and grandmothers and all the people out there who are distant from us, but are really part of ourselves?'

The fourth principle is the cooperative improvement of human rights and the focus of this document is on cooperation. So, in their methodology, the authors say the North Korean government must play the principal role in improving human rights. That's the first methodological principle. Their second is that we, who are suggesting improvements, must suggest effective measures to be taken. We should be concentrating on the practical. Thirdly, we should avoid confrontation and we should look for cooperation. Fourthly, reformers must cooperate, in so far as they can to secure improvement in the human rights situation in North Korea. And, fifthly, human rights should be improved in concert with other universal values: the harmonious pursuit of universal values shared by the entire international community.

The KBA report traces these values back through the UN Charter, the Declaration of the World Conference on Human Rights in Vienna and so on. But the last paragraph is worth reading to you because this, I remind you, is a Korean perspective - of lawyers in South Korea:

‘The current situation in which South Korea and North Korea have different political and economic systems, and are opposed ideologically and militarily, imposes a double hardship. South Korea should take an active role in improving human rights in North Korea without raising human rights issues solely as a means of putting political pressure on North Korea. We would like to point out that pressurising and isolating North Korea, or using human rights issues as a means to do so, will not bring about a positive outcome.’

So this is the conclusion of the Korean Bar Association, addressing the issues which are occupying us in this conference. If we are seeking to hear both sides and hear different perspectives then we have to attend to what the [North Korean] ambassador said. And make allowances for the old-fashioned communist ideological language. And consider that there may be some elements that are speaking to us that we should try to understand. Certainly we should try to look at the KBA opinions.

You can get it online. On every chair there’s a reference to it. The IBA paid for this to be translated from the Korean so that it would be available to us. It is important that we attend to it.

HAS THE GLOBAL RESPONSE TO DPRK BEEN A FAILURE?

Now, back in Australia, in the early part of the 21st century, I had the great privilege to meet Kim Dae-jung, the then Leader of the Opposition

in the Republic of Korea. He was a man who was something of a hero in civil libertarian circles in Australia. He had twice walked towards his death. But he had not been executed. He went on to become the President of the Republic of Korea.

As you know, he instituted the 'Sunshine Policy'. He gave a lot of ROK money to North Korea. He hoped that a new attitude, a new strategy, a strategy of outreach and of friendship and of a willingness to go the extra mile would make a difference.

Yet what happened? He made the outreach. He went the extra mile. He went to Pyongyang. But during the time that he was discussing the matter with the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, they were engaging themselves in the building of a nuclear arsenal. The plain fact of the matter is, the sad, cruel bottom line of the fact of the dealings with North Korea is, that kindness and outreach, so far, has not been very successful in securing change in DPRK.

In the previous session of this symposium, Frank Januzzi said 'our approach has failed.' That seemed a very harsh judgment. But was it a fair judgment? There have, after all, been some improvements. The United Nations Universal Periodic Review has been embraced by DPRK at long last. The first response by DPRK to Universal Periodic Review was that there was absolutely no need for improvements. But then they, ultimately, started to agree that there were improvements they could make. So that was our improvement of sorts.

The Special Rapporteur on DPRK was invited, during the 'Charm Offensive' (the first Charm Offensive), to visit North Korea. But then that request for him to come to North Korea was withdrawn. Likewise the European Union Special Representative on Human Rights, and the Human Rights Commissioner of the United Nations. Invitations withdrawn.

SOME SMALL TOKENS OF SUCCESS

Lately, there have been hints of "Charm 2". The former invitations may be renewed. But it hasn't come to pass yet.

Some family reunions have taken place. I was asked during this visit, 'Did the Republic of Korea pay money to DPRK to secure the recent family reunions?' I said I hadn't heard that. I don't think that was so, I don't believe it would be so. How would they get an appropriation approved by the legislature to pay for that?

But from what I hear today, it may be that some money has been paid. Who can say that would be anything but a proper gesture to help people who are now very old?

At a special session, a panel, which I chaired in September 2015 in Geneva, we learned about the abductees and the people who have been held behind: two hundred thousand of them, half of them prisoners

of war. We learned about the special burden in the Republic of Korea concerning the families in the North. And we learned, as Ambassador Lee pointed out this morning, that if we go on at the present rate of the family reunions it will take three hundred years for us to get through the requests in the South for family reunion.

Of course, the people who are seeking reunion, by definition, are generally very old people, in their eighties, or in their nineties. Therefore, it's not going to happen in proper numbers and in time unless something really changes: unless something really breaks.

I said at that session in Geneva that this conduct by DPRK is truly barbarous. It is barbarous conduct. On a human level, it is cruel and unkind. It should be changed. In the age of Skype, in the age of the telephone, in the age of modern technology it should be changed quickly. But there is little hint that change is in the air.

The recent reunion is perhaps itself a small hint that something is happening. Other things that have happened – we heard in the last session of China cooperating with the earlier UN sanctions. We heard of the fact that the Foreign Minister of DPRK has turned up at two of the recent sessions of the United Nations. This is something new.

We learned through the wonderful work done by Greg Scarlatti and his organisation (HRNK) of the closure (or apparent closure) of at least one

of the detention camps. But query whether it's simply shifting people around so they go into other camps for economic or other purposes. Or a step towards dismantlement of the system.

We saw one notable sports game. That was a very moving experience. I found it very moving. It occurred when, in the Asian Games, in the final of the football competition, North Korea and South Korea played each other. The crowd at Incheon shouted out repeatedly 'We are one', I think that is a very moving thing. The crowd spoke from their hearts.

We must try to get our heads into the pain of the division of Korea. This was not a division chosen by the people of Korea. It was a division imposed on the people of Korea by the Allied leaders in Cairo, in the lead up to the end of the Second World War. They did not choose to be divided. They are victims, all of them. Every Korean is a victim.

When I was received by President Park Guen-hye at the Blue House in 2014, she said, 'We must have reunification. We believe that, if we could have reunification, somehow we would solve these problems.'

But how can we reunify a country which is one of the leading economic lights, and one of the most inventive places, in the world, with a country which is dark, and which is cruel and unkind. That is a really big question. The market economy continues to grow in North Korea. There is no doubt about that. That growth gives people a sense of freedom,

economic freedom, as China is discovering. Economic freedom is an aspect of human freedom. So that's a good thing that's happening. But the growth is very small.

Ambassador Ahn Ho-Young (ROK) told me yesterday, over lunch, that the speech made by Kim Jong-Un to the recent 70th year celebrations in Pyongyang was unusual. It was a speech repeatedly talking about the people. It wasn't only talking about the Korean Workers' Party, or the Korean People's Army. It was talking about the people of DPRK. So at least the rhetoric was somewhat different from the past. If we want to have a people-centred change, this may be an early sign – or is it another false dawn?

There are three million mobile phones in DPRK, if you believe *The Economist*. *The Economist* graph of the growth of mobile phones is astonishing. Of course, these cell phones don't have access to the internet. They only have access to a DPRK intranet. But they thereby leap over the control, which is recounted in the report of the COI, the control of the local official who can prevent a person leaving his or her village. Everyone now with a cell phone can pass on information, once information gets in. It can go throughout the three million and all the persons who have contact with the three million. And information about the world is power.

There was a very calibrated response on both sides in Korea to the very sad recent event involving the land mines that did such terrible damage,

maiming two ROK soldiers. That showed a certain degree of reality in what could have been a dangerous moment when the two Koreas were facing each other. There was a kind of apology by DPRK. One looks for more such signals.

I've also got on my list the ski resorts built by the DPRK regime. I don't really think they're much of a step forward. But at least it shows somebody's going up there and enjoying the freedom of skiing through air and snow.

And there's also the action of the Government of Botswana in breaking diplomatic relations – it would be a good thing if a lot of countries broke diplomatic relations with DPRK, to mark their disapproval of the crimes against humanity revealed by the COI. When I was at the General Assembly, when they had just received the COI report, one asked: what can we do? What can we ambassadors do? I said, when you meet the Ambassador for the DPRK in the corridors of this place, as you will, you should tell him personally that you do not approve of what is revealed about the conduct of DPRK in the report. It is said that DPRK is beyond shame. But that proposition should be tested and pressed.

We were told in the last session of this symposium that shaming doesn't work at all on DPRK. But something has happened in the response of DPRK to the world. DPRK today is not the same as DPRK before the COI report. That suggests once more, the value of the United Nations. Still, it can speak for humanity. For all its faults and weaknesses, the

fact that people are together, human beings are together, and the fact that they can communicate together, is extremely important for peace and security, human rights and justice, the three great objectives of the United Nations.

Yet whereas Botswana broke off relations and many condemned DPRK for its crimes, I sat there, in the Human Rights Council and the General Assembly, whilst other countries time after time said 'We do not approve of singling out countries for human rights assessments': Venezuela, Cuba, Vietnam, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Iran, Syria, Belarus, the Russian Federation, China. The same countries every time.

They never criticised the report of the COI, or say we disregard this or disagree with that. They simply said we don't agree with the methodology. They don't agree with having a special country assessment. Yet, once you get a special country assessment, even if you didn't agree with the original decision to undertake it, how can you turn your back away from what is reported? You have to have some rational sense of concern with what comes forward.

RECENT ACHIEVEMENTS: THE RECKONING

And so here we stand. The achievements that we've made in the United Nations system since the COI report was produced are several. First, the COI recorded its findings as we were required to do. This is now part of the history of the Korean people. When the cloud ultimately lifts, it

will be there as a history of great wrongs that have been done to the Korean people. It cannot be erased.

Secondly, the field office which the COI recommended – the United Nations to its credit acted with great speed on this. ROK, also to its credit agreed that there should be the setting up of the field office in Seoul. It is there. It is maintaining the work of the COI by continuing to gather the testimony of refugees and people who complain about DPRK, based on their own experiences and knowledge.

The High Commissioner for Human Rights, Prince Zeid of Jordan, made a good suggestion. This was that the statements taken from victims should be recorded in the manner of a brief for the prosecutor of the evidence of potential witnesses. It should be there, ready for the time when, in due course of history, there will be accountability. It should be done in a manner appropriate for prosecution of those who should be rendered accountable.

Thirdly, a contact group – this was the idea of getting some of those countries (Venezuela, Cuba, etcetera) together with other countries that are independent, to be a means whereby to bridge the gulf between DPRK and the rest of the United Nations system. The UN Special Rapporteur, Marzuki Darusman, is negotiating a possible contact group at this moment. I hope that there will be action on that before the end of this year.

Fourthly, person-to-person contacts. Well, we know about the recent contact in the family reunion. But no contact so far of other direct kinds that the COI recommended. Very few person-to-person contacts. No postal, phone or professional dialogue. For most, DPRK is a land of darkness and silence.

Fifthly, the Security Council referral. That was done. Human rights in DPRK is on the agenda of the Security Council.

I have heard suggestions that the United States, even as we are meeting here in Washington, is considering what should be on the agenda for the meeting of the Security Council when the United States is the President of the Council in December. It's a pity, in a way, that Ambassador Samantha Power couldn't have been here today in that last session to hear the suggestions of what should be done.

If the attention of the United States is going to be on the here and now and on the immediate issues in Islamic State and in Syria and the like, that will forfeit the great leadership role which the United States of America inescapably has in the United Nations. I do hope that North Korea will not pass from the agenda in December 2015. I have a chance, thanks to Ambassador King, to go to the United States State Department tomorrow. I will be urging that the United States, as it has from the beginning, should continue to support the COI report and make sure that the Security Council, at least, has this issue on its agenda. It will be a sad indictment of the world if, a year after putting it on the agenda, nothing is done. I think that the COI report should be followed up.

What about sanctions? Well, we had a wonderful session in this symposium: a really brilliant session. Some people say to me that in the big picture this is not going to make a lot of difference. Still the value of the legislation that is under consideration in the United States Congress at the moment seems to me to be this: it empowers. In the end you may not take this or that power forward. But unless you have the legislation which empowers the doing of things as part of the law of this land, then it's harder. You then have to try to squeeze it into President Obama's 2015 executive order.

It would be a good thing if the people of the United States, even in a divided time and in a very political time, could come together to empower the taking of action which would be effective and well targeted sanctions. At least they should be to the level of Myanmar/ Burma. That would not be such a bad thing, I think. It deserves the chance to try.

Broadcasts and media, and SIM cards – anyone who can get a tiny SIM card with access to the internet can put it into their intranet cell phone. This is something that is opening up the mind of the people of North Korea. And their rulers know it as they struggle to keep DPRK remote and isolated.

The Republic of Korea, probably since the time of Kim Dae-jung, appears to be very cautious about broadcasts into North Korea. In a way, you can understand it. They are only 50 miles from North Korea. It is a very dangerous country. A country that murdered one of its leaders, Jiang Song-Thaek, in four days, the third most important man in the country. It's a dangerous place. One can therefore understand concern. Still, it would not be a bad thing if the Republic of Korea could bring the

messages of freedom from the people of the Republic of Korea, on what they enjoy, to the notice of cousins and uncles, grandmothers and others in North Korea. There's a need for a change here. I urged on the BBC that they should revive their shortwave service. I'm glad to say that the BBC has announced in recent days that they are restoring shortwave broadcasts in the Korean language to North Korea – a good thing. Maintaining, improving and increasing media outreach to DPRK should be a top priority of free peoples.

Family reunions – well, we certainly need to do it faster than 300 years.

Of the issues that we didn't really go into in enough detail in the COI report because we didn't have time: one of them was religion. We left many issues about the affront to the freedom of religion in DPRK to be dealt with later, when more evidence was to hand. There's a need for closer inspection of the oppression of people because of their religious beliefs.

The same is true about the overseas use of the DPRK labour force. We didn't really deal with all those people whom you commonly see when you pass through Bangkok Airport. They're there in very large numbers. They appear to be noticeably shorter in stature than most of the people in the airport. All male. All middle aged. They are on their way to Dubai or to some place in the Middle East sometimes allegedly for slave-labour type conditions. That is an issue that needs to be followed up. I hope that the new field office in Seoul will do so.

I come back to China. Speaking frankly and honestly, China has been a disappointment. But there have been other disappointments. India has

been a disappointment. Indonesia has been a disappointment. Certainly, South Africa has been a disappointment. I've reminded South African friends how, during apartheid I breached my rule and I got out and demonstrated. I exercised my citizen's right to demonstrate against apartheid. A lot of Australians did, in sporting grounds and elsewhere. We helped change opinions about apartheid and raise pressure for change in the United Nations and in the international community.

And yet when South Africa is put to the test today on human rights, when democracy for others and crimes against humanity are called into question, South Africa abstains. It's as if the nonaligned movement has been resuscitated from the Cold War-era and dusted up and applied to Indonesia, India and South Africa. India and Indonesia are specially surprising, given the changes of government there. Yet this is the truth of the matter and someone must say so.

Nuclear arms is itself a human rights issue. So it isn't alien to the investigation of human rights. Nuclear weapons threaten the right to life and all other human rights for which the United Nations stands. North Korea's unilateral action in withdrawing from the *Now Proliferation Treaty* constitutes the same attitude of disrespecting, in a totalitarian manner, the rights of the citizens, of DPRK and of their neighbours. Therefore, it is proper that we should be deeply concerned about the nuclear issues that are presented to the world by DPRK's nuclear weapons. And its boasts about the possibility that it might deploy all or any of its weapons of war against the people whom they denounce as their enemies.

If I had to give a scorecard for the United Nations conduct on DPRK's human rights record, I would be a little higher than Frank Januzzi's. Our approach has failed to a large extent, that is true. Yet we have put a few runs on the board. Still, there's a lot more to be achieved. It won't be achieved if we turn away and look only at other lands and other problems.

THE WORLD'S DUTY TO SPEAK AND ACT FOR THE VOICELESS

The people of DPRK rely on us – people in free countries – to speak and act for them. In doing so, we are speaking and acting for the voiceless. It is our duty to raise our voices. I would like to thank the IBA for the book translated for our use. It does give an insight. It is important that we should hear that insight. And also to try to understand the attitudes of North Korea expressed in its own words. And I also thank Johns Hopkins once again for having me here in this excellent space, amidst all these think tanks exhibiting intelligence, originality and fresh thinking.

When I looked at the participants in this symposium and saw all these brilliant people, I thought, there are two wonderful things about Washington. One is *Kramer's Bookstore*, with its wonderful books. Those books are so cheap by world standards! This is a cheap-book country. I've purchased some terrific books while I've been here.

The second is all the think tanks, housed all so close to each other. It must be very 'indigestionous' to have your lunch every day in this area of Washington, gobbling it down in order to hear more and more people say more and more original, thoughtful, provocative, upsetting, interesting and important things to each other and to the world.

So thank you all very much for having me once again here. If there is health in me, I will keep coming back. You can take the man out of the work of the United Nations on North Korea. But you cannot take North Korea out of the man. Once you have been exposed to the issues of Korea, of the Korean people divided against their will, you are never quite the same again. All of us must think outside the square. All of us must think of how we could make a real difference and not be content with a beautiful report. The COI report was good, but not enough. We have a saying in our countries: "*actions speak louder than words*".