

The Amateur Computerist

<http://www.ais.org/~jrh/acn/>

Fall 2017

DPRK, UN Security Council and the UN Charter

Volume 30 No. 1

Table of Contents

Introduction	Page 1
Behind SK Bringing the <i>Cheonan</i> to UNSC.	Page 6
UNSC Response to NK Nuclear Test	Page 9
Path for UNSC to Resolve the Conflict	Page 11
SC Violates Article 32 of UN Charter	Page 17
Channel to Send Communication to UNSC	Page 20
Art. 32: Right to Due Process Violated by SC	Page 24
Appeal for Diplomatic Solution in N.E. Asia	Page 30
Letter: Wm to UNSG Guterres on Korea Crisis	Page 42

Introduction

During the Summer and Fall of 2017 there has been a very tense environment on the Korean Peninsula. A number of those who have been observing the situation for many years, along with people who call some part of Korea home are nervous about the level of tension in these past few months.

The relatively new president of the U.S., Donald Trump and the Prime Minister of Japan, Shinzō Abe made public statements about the situation which demonstrate either that they have little knowledge of the past history or the current situation or if they are familiar with what has come before, they now choose to misrepresent it.

One example, both Trump¹ and Abe² in separate situations claimed all negotiations with the DPRK have failed. A substantial article by Robert Carlin and John W. Lewis demonstrates how false such a claim is. The article documents the process of negotiations between the DPRK and the U.S. that led to the Agreed Framework.³ That agreement lasted almost eight years, during which time the DPRK suspended its nuclear program and the U.S. decreased its hostility toward the DPRK.

Another important example of successful negotiation was the Six-Party Talks which produced the *Joint Statement of the Fourth Round of the Six-Party Talks* in Beijing on September 19, 2005.⁴ The six parties agreed to take coordinated steps to implement the Joint Statement. It was the product of negotiations between the DPRK and the other five parties to the Six-Party Talks which had gone on from 2003 to 2005. The six parties which signed the agreement included the U.S. and the DPRK.

Instead of the new U.S. President and the Japanese Prime Minister reviewing these examples of successful negotiations and learning from them, they brazenly try to wipe such past experience from memory and substitute a false version of history to justify their own missteps.

The mainstream media in general commonly spread misrepresentations and the United Nations itself allows such misrepresentations. For example, take the name the “UN Command.” It is for an institutional form made up of the U.S. and the ROK militaries. The UN plays no role of oversight or supervision of the actions of this so-called UN Command, yet U.S. and the ROK are allowed to use the UN’s name to camouflage the U.S. government’s control over its actions.

Such misrepresentations help the U.S. and Japanese government officials in their efforts to rewrite the history of negotiations with the DPRK in order to justify their refusal to engage in negotiations as is their obligation.

Two recent issues of the *Amateur Computerist* took up to review the UN’s actions toward resolving the tensions on the Korean Peninsula while Ban Ki-moon was Secretary General. The two issues were: Vol. 28 No. 1 (Fall 2016) “Ten Years: Ban Ki-moon, UN Tension in Korea”⁵ and Vol. 28 No. 2 (Winter 2017) “Forces Working for Peaceful Conflict Resolution.”⁶

The articles in Vol. 28 No. 1 demonstrate the failure during the 10 year term of UN Secretary General Ban Ki-moon to solve the problem of the increasing tension on the Korean Peninsula.

The articles in Vol. 28 No. 2 document how there have been forces working to solve the problem. One example is how the Security Council functioned in June of 2010 under the Mexican Presidency. In this situation the DPRK was invited to make its position known on an issue before the Security Council. This is a requirement of the UN Charter,⁷ but in recent times it is rarely upheld. Other processes in the UN Security Council required procedures that are helpful are similarly documented, particularly the S/NC procedure, a procedure included in the Appendix to the Security Council's Provisional Rules of Procedure. Under this procedure, communications can be sent to the Security Council from private individuals and non-governmental bodies relating to matters of which the Security Council is seized. The Secretariat is to provide a publicly available list of such communication so the Security Council members can ask for copies of communication they find of interest.

The importance of Vol. 28 No. 2 is that it documents not only the required actions for Security Council members with respect to hearing all sides of a dispute, but also that the public has a means of communicating with the Security Council on issues before the Council members. The situation is described when such means were utilized in the dispute over whether North Korea should be blamed for the sinking of the *Cheonan*, a South Korean Corvette. A more all sided process prevailed which supported a peaceful settlement of the dispute.

The current issue of the *Amateur Computerist*, Vol. 30, No. 1 (Fall 2017) includes several articles supplementing the issues raised by Vol. 28 No. 1 and Vol. 28 No. 2.

This issue documents how important Article 32 of the Charter is to the processes of the UN Security Council. Article 32 provides due process to all nations that are parties to a dispute instead of one side constantly being accused of wrong doing by the Security Council. The issue also documents the importance of private individuals and non-governmental bodies having a means to communicate with the members of the Security Council.

In a journal article documenting many of the Security Council processes in the dispute brought to it in 2010 over the sinking of the *Cheonan*, Mi-yeon Hur writes:⁸

North Korea sent a letter to the Security Council, referring to the widespread international suspicions over the JIG investigation [South Korean investigation]. North Korea urged the members not to become victims of the Lee government's deceptive accusation against North Korea and asked for a more independent and balanced approach on the *Cheonan* incident (Hauben, 2013). The North Korean delegation, in response to an invitation from UN Ambassador Claude Heller, the President of the Security Council, discussed the *Cheonan* issue at an informal session with the Security Council members, and Sin Son-ho, the North Korean Ambassador to the UN, specially scheduled an unprecedented press conference to present his government's refutation of the allegations made by the Lee government.

This journal article compliments the articles in Vol. 28 No. 2 that show it is possible for the Security Council processes to be supportive of the needed due process procedures, but that such processes requires support from various parties toward such an outcome.

The three issues of the *Amateur Computerist* review the 10 years of Ban Ki-moon's terms at the UN, the continuing developments over the processes accorded to North Korea by the Security Council and the violations of Article 32. They help to demonstrate the need to review how well the processes and procedures of the Charter are being applied in order to have the UN serve the desire for peace that led to its birth.

Notes:

1. "Presidents and their administrations have been talking to North Korea for 25 years, agreements made and massive amounts of money paid ... hasn't worked, agreements violated before the ink was dry, makings fools of U.S. negotiators. Sorry, but only one thing will work!" <https://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/916750042014404608> and <https://twitter.com/realdonaldtrump/status/916751271960436737>
2. "We cannot afford being deceived by them again." <http://www.foxnews.com/world/2017/10/08/abe-says-japan-fully-behind-us-on-pressuring-north-korea.html>

<https://gadebate.un.org/en/72/japan>

https://gadebate.un.org/sites/default/files/gastatements/72/jp_en.pdf.

3. “Negotiating with North Korea: 1992–2007,” in *Korea Yearbook, 2007: Politics, Economy and Society* edited by Rüdiger Frank, James E. Hoare, Patrick Köllner, and Susan Pares, pages 235-251. A copy of the article is available online at:

[https://cisac.fsi.stanford.edu/sites/default/files/Negotiating with North Korea 1992-2007.pdf](https://cisac.fsi.stanford.edu/sites/default/files/Negotiating_with_North_Korea_1992-2007.pdf)

4. Online at <https://www.state.gov/p/eap/regional/c15455.htm>

5. <http://www.ais.org/~jrh/acn/ACn28-1.pdf>

6. <http://www.ais.org/~jrh/acn/ACn28-2.pdf>

7. UN Charter Chapter V, Article 32: “Any Member of the United Nations which is not a member of the Security Council or any state which is not a Member of the United Nations, if it is a party to a dispute under consideration by the Security Council, shall be invited to participate, without vote, in the discussion relating to the dispute. The Security Council shall lay down such conditions as it deems just for the participation of a state which is not a Member of the United Nations.”

<http://legal.un.org/repertory/art32.shtml>

8. “Revisiting the *Cheonan* sinking in the Yellow Sea,” *The Pacific Review*, Vol. 30 Issue 3, 2017, pp. 348-364.

[Editor's Note: This article appeared on the netizenblog on June 7, 2010 and can be seen at: http://blogs.taz.de/netizenblog/2010/06/07/whats_behind_south_korea_bringing_the_cheonan_issue_to_the_un_security_council/]

What's Behind South Korea Bringing the *Cheonan* Issue to the UN Security Council?

by Ronda Hauben
netcolumnist@gmail.com

An article on the *Cheonan* warship sinking, "The whole story of the South Korean government as a false account?" was published in *Telepolis* on June 1, 2010. It documents several of the misleading claims being made by the South Korean government to put the blame on North Korea.

The June 2 election in South Korea for local and regional government showed that many South Korean citizens and netizens rejected the Lee Myung-bak government claims and rendered his Grand National Party candidates a surprising and serious defeat.

This, however, has not deterred the Lee government from its goal. The election results were announced demonstrating the criticism of the government's hostile policy toward North Korea represented by the so called "investigation" blaming North Korea for the sinking of the *Cheonan*. Yet, the South Korean government initiated action to take its spurious claims to the United Nations Security Council. A helpful perspective is offered by Peter Lee in his Asia Times Online article, "The *Cheonan* sinking ... and Korea rising."

"What is indisputable," Peter Lee writes, "is the determination of the Lee Myung-bak administration to exploit the geopolitical opportunity presented by the sinking." He explains how the South Korean president not only tried to use the incident, "as a 9/11 opportunity" to get support for his government in the local and regional elections, which

clearly failed, but also to “strengthen the South Korean alliance with the U.S.” to offer a counterweight to China.

Even more serious, however, is the observation made by some in South Korea, that the Lee administration is endangering their lives by its hostile acts toward North Korea. Similarly the strategy of trying to use the UN Security Council to give a seal of approval for the so called “investigation” which drew significant criticisms from politicians and the public at home is but a sign of the significant role the U.S. government is playing in this dangerous South Korean gambit.

The South Korean NGO People’s Solidarity for Participatory Democracy (PSPD) recently published an English translation of a critique of the South Korean government’s “international” investigation of the *Cheonan* sinking. The PSPD report provides helpful documentation of a number of the inconsistencies and fallacies of the whole process of the claimed “investigation.”

According to the PSPD critique, it was only after significant criticism of the fact that the South Korean military was conducting the “investigation” of the *Cheonan* sinking, that it was announced that four other nations had been invited to be part of the “investigation.” Little is known, however, about what role these other nations played in the investigation. PSPD reports that the head of the U.S. group appeared at the press conference announcing the results of the investigation, to express U.S. government support. He said that there had been close cooperation between South Korea and the U.S. in the investigation. This did not, however, answer the question about the role the foreign nations in the investigation and whether they had any ability to contribute an independent perspective.

North Korea asked to be allowed to send a team of investigators to examine the supposed evidence. South Korea refused the request.

One of the civilian members of the investigation said that he was not provided with any briefing materials or basic information. Also he said that the investigation only considered the theory of the government about the torpedo as the cause of the sinking, and that the investigation was conducted to support that theory.

The government has brought lawsuits or charges against several citizens and netizens and a national assembly representative who expressed disagreement with the claims of the government.

The PSPD report raises a number of other important issues about the nature of the South Korean government investigation.

By bringing the *Cheonan* issue to the UN Security Council, the South Korean government is presenting the UN with a serious challenge. The PSPD report has urged the South Korean government to refrain from international actions until the National Assembly has been assisted in conducting a fact-finding process. The effort of the South Korean government to ignore the questions of its citizens and politicians and take the matter to the UN Security Council is the effort to use the UN Security Council to deny democratic processes to its own citizens. PSPD has documented how what the South Korean government is doing by bringing the issue to the Security Council is increasing the threat to peace and security on the Korean peninsula. This is the opposite of what the Security Council is to be involved with under the UN Charter.

How the Security Council handles this issue will be an important demonstration of its ability to fulfill its obligations under the UN charter to the other member nations of the UN and to the people of those nations.

For PSPD Report See: http://www.peoplepower21.org/?module=file&act=procFileDownload&file_srl=40158&sid=7ab45eab894bb107361ef5447c30048b&module_srl=37681&usg=AFQjCNFTU9vP98NdyzvCupVWG0HqgMhLlw

[Editor's Note: This article appeared on the netizenblog on Feb. 1, 2016 and can be seen at: <http://blogs.taz.de/netizenblog/2016/02/01/the-un-security-council-response-to-north-koreas-4th-nuclear-test-needs-serious-discussion-and-consideration/>]

The UN Security Council Response to North Korea's 4th Nuclear Test Needs Serious Discussion and Consideration

by Ronda Hauben
netcolumnist@gmail.com

The United Nations Security Council is currently in the process of negotiating a resolution in response to the 4th nuclear test by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (the DPRK more commonly known as North Korea) conducted in early January 2016.

There has been little open discussion at the Security Council about the resolution, but some media have reported about the content of an early version by the U.S. which is the pen holder to draft the resolution. They have described some of the measures, particularly some which require stiff action by China against North Korea.¹

Though there has not been much sign of negotiations at the UN headquarters, there has been diplomatic activity by government officials of some of the nations who are on the Security Council. Recently, the U.S. Secretary of State John Kerry went to China to meet with China's President Xi Jinping and Wang Yi, China's Foreign Minister, about the nature of the sanctions that the U.S. is proposing.

There have been discussions about the Chinese perspective of the issue on CCTV.² One recent program featured two Chinese Foreign Policy experts, Ruan Zongze and Yang Xiyu discussing the situation. They commented that there have been a series of sanctions against North Korea, but these sanctions only result in subsequent new nuclear tests. A different process is needed, they proposed, and felt the need to make a change in the hostile environment created between North Korea

and the UN Security Council, which stiffening sanctions only reinforces.

Examining the dynamics between the UN Security Council and North Korea helps to clarify that there is a need to consider how this conflict developed and what is a means to help to resolve it.

Looking back at the situation that has led to this dilemma, it is important to recognize that the Korean War has never been officially ended by a peace treaty. Instead there is only an armistice and the obligation set forth in the armistice to settle the political disputes via a peace treaty has never been fulfilled.

Similarly, the six party talks began in 2003 and resulted in an agreement referred to as the September 19, 2005 joint statement of the six-party talks. This agreement was quickly broken by the U.S. action to put sanctions on the Banco Delta Asia (BDA) under the claim that this was justified by Section 311 of the U.S. Patriot Act. This resulted in the freezing of \$25 million of North Korean funds in the bank. Another serious result was that North Korea lost access to the international banking system. Initially, despite the six party agreement, the other four members of the six party talks took no action to challenge the U.S. action and thus the agreement was shown to be too weak to protect its implementation. Subsequently, North Korea left the six party talks and found that only after it had carried out a nuclear test did the U.S. agree to talk with North Korea over the problem.

There have been subsequent examples of the problem that North Korea is faced with given the political and military power of the U.S.

Thus the problem for the Security Council with respect to North Korea's 4th nuclear test, is not only a problem with North Korea. It is similarly a problem that the Security Council has failed to go to the root of the problem and to examine both the role played by the U.S. in increasing the tension, and the role played by North Korea in believing it has to threaten a nuclear defense if it is attacked.

In a series of earlier articles, I explore the problem and raise some of the background that needs to be understood to consider how to resolve the conflict. Eventually a recognition of the need for a peace treaty to end the Korean War is critical rather than merely asking North Korea to cease to build up what it relies on for its defense.³

Notes:

1. An article on inews163 on Jan 23, 2016, refers to the tough sanctions as “an economic blockade” against the DPRK. “Japanese Media the United States and-South Korea Asked China to Draft Sanctions to Include a Ban on Oil” (link n/a).
 2. <http://english.cntv.cn/2016/01/30/VIDEmYZxgdgJh81Ax1WcE76v160130.shtml>
 3. See for example: <http://blogs.taz.de/netizenblog/2013/12/17/why-netizen-journalism-matters>
<http://blogs.taz.de/netizenblog/2015/06/10/mudubong-detained-by-unsc/>
<http://blogs.taz.de/netizenblog/2013/08/31/united-nations-command-as-camouflage/>
-

[Editor’s Note: This article appeared on the netizenblog on March 17, 2016 and can be seen at: <http://blogs.taz.de/netizenblog/2016/03/17/what-path-to-resolve-conflict/>]

What Path for the UN Security Council to Resolve the Conflict on the Korean Peninsula?

by Ronda Hauben
netcolumnist@gmail.com

Recently a Chinese commentator, observing the relationship between the need for a peace treaty to end the Korean War and North Korea’s four nuclear tests wrote:

North Korea, in a statement after its nuclear test, has made it clear that if it could sign a peace treaty with the United States, and if the United States could stop holding joint military exercises with South Korea, it would not conduct further nuclear tests. This proved that the North Korean nuclear issue is, in essence, an issue between the United States and North Korea¹

The Armistice Agreement that ended the fighting of the Korean War was signed on July 27, 1953. While the Armistice Agreement provided for a cease fire, it did not end the Korean War.

The Armistice Agreement that the U.S. and North Korea signed states that a political agreement is needed by the parties to end the war. A political conference was to be held to set the terms for an agreement among the parties to provide for a peace regime on the Korean Peninsula. Such a political conference was to provide the means to “settle through negotiation the questions of the withdrawal of all foreign forces from Korea, the peaceful settlement of the Korean question,” etc. (See Article IV of the Armistice Agreement.)

Though a political conference was eventually held, the parties did not succeed in drafting a treaty to end the war.

It is now more than 60 years later. There still is no political agreement to end the Korean War. Nor is there a political agreement to withdraw foreign troops from the Korean Peninsula. Korea continues to be divided into the Republic of Korea, more commonly known as South Korea, and the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, more commonly known as North Korea.

There are 28,000 U.S. troops permanently stationed in South Korea. U.S. troops take part in exercises along with South Korean troops to simulate war activities against North Korea. In the event of a war, the U.S. and South Korea have agreed that the U.S. will have wartime operational command over the South Korean troops.

Moreover, there is a formal agreement between the U.S. and South Korea that includes the U.S. commitment to provide nuclear weapon protection for South Korea. This is referred to as a nuclear umbrella.

Recently, China proposed that the UN Security Council find a way to engage North Korea in political negotiations toward a peace regime for the Korean Peninsula. China supported the need for a peace treaty which at long last would end the Korean War. But then the U.S. and South Korea agreed to negotiate for the positioning of the U.S. THAAD (Terminal High Altitude Area Defense) system in South Korea under the command of the U.S. troops stationed there. The THAAD is a system that China explained would represent a stepped up use of foreign military equipment on the peninsula, a process forbidden under the terms of the 1953 Armistice Agreement. (See Article 13A2d)

In response to the proposed deployment of THAAD on the Korean Peninsula, China expressed its opposition to the increased militarization that THAAD would represent to the region. Once the U.S. and South Korea added the possibility of their agreement to deploy THAAD in South Korea, the discussion between the U.S. and China appeared to focus on THAAD and China appeared to subordinate its focus on the need for dialogue with North Korea to resolve the conflict situation to its opposition to THAAD.

There is also opposition to the placement of THAAD in South Korea among South Koreans who have offered their critiques of how it will be used. For example, according to a public statement by one South Korean NGO “a multitude of experts” contend it is easy to use THAAD to put “most of Chinese territory under detectable range, regardless of THAAD’s location in South Korea.”²

The sanctions in the Security Council resolution drawn up by the U.S. require nations to search any cargo from or to North Korea in their territory. The sanctions include the restriction on the sale by North Korea of its gold, its coal and other minerals. Also the resolution restricts countries from providing fuel for planes to North Korea.

The 1953 Armistice Agreement forbids any naval blockade of Korea. In her comments about the sanctions, the U.S. UN Ambassador bragged that the resolution restricts North Korean cargo “whether by land, sea or air.” Hence, the Security Council resolution replaces what little remains of the 1953 Armistice regime with a previously forbidden form of blockade of North Korea, intensifying the war-provoking situation on the Korean Peninsula.

With China agreeing to a minimal reference to negotiations in the Security Council Resolution against North Korea, the U.S. and China bilaterally agreed to a U.S. draft resolution. Then the U.S. brought the resolution to the other members of the Security Council, pressuring them to quickly adopt it.

The UN Charter calls for the UN Security Council to consider issues it deems violations of international peace and security, and to investigate the conflict situation toward finding a peaceful resolution.

Also, Chapter V, Article 32 of the UN Charter mandates that any state which is not a member of the Security Council, “if it is a party to a

dispute under consideration by the Security Council, shall be invited to participate, without vote, in the discussion relating to the dispute.”

There is no indication that the Security Council made any effort to invite North Korea to the minimal discussion of the U.S. draft that was held by Security Council members. During the explanations made by member nations after the vote in favor of the resolution, some nations commented about the lack of a proper period of time for the Security Council to consider and discuss the resolution and its implications. The U.S., by rushing the adoption of the resolution by the Security Council denied not only North Korea, but even the Security Council members themselves, the time needed for responsible discussion about the resolution and whether it could contribute to a peaceful settlement of the conflict.

In their statements after passing by unanimous consent Security Council Resolution S/RES/2270 (2016) imposing these new sanctions on North Korea, both Russia and China explained their opposition to the installation of THAAD on the Korean Peninsula. Japan, however, welcomed such an increased militarization.

In a statement after the resolution was approved by the Security Council, the South Korean Ambassador to the UN, directed his comments to North Korea, though it was not at the meeting. He said³:

I would like to say a few words in appeal to those who are ruling North Korea. I would say in Korean, ‘please stop it now.’ I would ask them: Why do you need these weapons? In South Korea we do not have a nuclear bomb. As we border each other, you do not need an intercontinental missile if you are targeting us. Why do you need these weapons? You say the United States is a threat to you. Why would the United States threaten you? Why would the strongest military Power in the world threaten a small country far across the Pacific? There is no threat. It is a figment of your imagination. If you continue in this way, the only people who will suffer from what you are doing are your own people, and our people as well. So please, wake up, open your eyes, look out at what is happening in the world. Give up the nukes.

Join the rest of us in the world and we can live together in safety and peace.

The problem with such a statement is that the U.S. and South Korea have a formal agreement for the U.S. to protect South Korea under the U.S. nuclear umbrella. It is dishonest to hide that nuclear weapon protection is indeed part of the military assurance provided to South Korea by the U.S. Similarly, North Korea notes that U.S. troops remain in South Korea and in the case of a war not only will these troops be used, but the U.S. military will exercise operational command over the South Korean military. The U.S. and South Korea and at times other nations join in military maneuvers several times a year that directly threaten the security of North Korea. For example, as of March 7 this year, the U.S. and South Korea are carrying out military maneuvers involving 17,000 U.S. troops and 300,000 South Korean troops. These maneuvers are practicing for a war with North Korea.⁴

The fact that there is no peace treaty after more than 60 years despite the provisions in the Armistice Agreement calling for the political negotiations to officially end the war demonstrates that the Korean War is not over. Similarly, the statement by South Korea that there is no security threat facing North Korea, is but a demonstration of the belittling attitude of the South Korean government toward North Korea.

While in other situations, Russia and China have recognized that North Korea has serious and legitimate security concerns, at this Security Council meeting, neither of them nor any other member of the Security Council objected to the inaccuracy of the South Korean Ambassador's statement.⁵

That the South Korean Ambassador could make such a statement at a Security Council meeting, with not one Security Council member objecting that it is an inaccurate statement, demonstrates the failure of the UN Security Council to provide a process to understand and resolve a serious and dangerous conflict threatening international peace and security.

Notes:

1. Wu Zhenglong, “Create Conditions to Restart North Korean Nuclear Talks” <https://www.chinausfocus.com/peace-security/create-conditions-to-restart-north-korean-nuclear-talks>
2. See for example, the PSPD Statement “We Oppose THAAD System Deployment in South Korea-PSPD in English.” PSPD is a South Korean NGO. See: http://www.peoplepower21.org/Index.php?mid=English&document_srl=1393339&listStyle=list
3. UN Security Council Meeting, Wednesday, March 2, 2016, S/PV.7638, p.14. http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/PV.7638
4. The U.S. is a party to the conflict that involves North Korea’s claim that it needs nuclear weapons for self defense because the U.S. continues to be at war with North Korea. Yet in the actions of the Security Council on this dispute not only is the U.S. the pen holder drafting the resolution, but it also pressured other members for a quick vote on its proposed resolution.

A party to a conflict is permitted to dominate the process by which the Security Council acts on the conflict. Such actions are contrary to the spirit and provisions of the UN Charter.

5. In other circumstances, at least Russia and China have recognized the serious security threat facing North Korea. For example on March 7, 2016, the Russian Foreign Ministry wrote: “Naturally, as a state, which is directly named as an object of this kind of military activities, the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea (DPRK) cannot but feel reasonably concerned for its security. Russia has many times stated its openly negative attitude to such manifestations of military and political pressure on Pyongyang,” the Russian Foreign Ministry said. <http://tass.ru/en/politics/860974>
-

[Editor's Note: This article appeared on the netizenblog on Oct 24, 2016 and can be seen at: <http://blogs.taz.de/netizenblog/2016/10/24/unsc-violates-article-32-charter/>]

UN Security Council Violates Article 32 of UN Charter in its Sanctions Against DPRK

by Ronda Hauben
netcolumnist@gmail.com

On September 9, 2016 the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) carried out its 5th nuclear test.

In the past the UN Security Council has imposed a series of sanctions as the response to each nuclear test carried out by the DPRK.

This situation has continued for over 10 years.

During a press stakeout, the Japanese Ambassador to the UN, who is currently a member of the Security Council, was asked by a journalist if he could say what the DPRK demands are. The Japanese Ambassador responded that the DPRK wants "to develop nuclear weapons in order to be a full nuclear weapons state."¹

Such a response, especially considering the long standing role Japan has played in the conflict with the DPRK, demonstrates a serious lack of accountability by the Security Council in its treatment of the DPRK.

Japan not only was on the Security Council but also was the President of the UN Security Council on October 14, 2006 when the DPRK made a statement at the Security Council explaining why it had carried out its first nuclear test on October 9, 2006. In the Security Council meeting of October 14, 2006, which is documented in the UN transcript of that meeting the DPRK Ambassador to the UN, Pak Gil Yon explained²:

It is gangster-like for the UN Security Council to have adopted today a coercive resolution, while neglecting the nuclear threat, moves for sanctions and pressure of the Unit-

ed States against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. This clearly testifies that the Security Council has completely lost its impartiality and persists in applying double standards in its work.

The Ambassador continued:

The delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea expresses its disappointment over the fact that the Security Council finds itself incapable of saying even a word of concern to the United States, which threatens the Democratic People's Republic of Korea with nuclear pre-emptive attack and conducting large-scale joint military exercises near the Korean peninsula.

The DPRK Ambassador explained that the October 9, 2006 nuclear test "was entirely attributable to the United States nuclear threat, sanctions and pressure."

The DPRK noted that it had "exerted every possible effort to settle the nuclear issue through dialogue and negotiations, prompted by its sincere desire to realize the denuclearization of the Korean peninsula." The DPRK Ambassador then described how the Bush Administration, "responded to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea's patient and sincere effort and magnanimity with a policy of sanctions and blockade. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea was compelled to substantially prove its possession of nukes to protect its sovereignty and the right to existence from the daily increasing danger of war from the United States."

The statement ended by asserting that "The Democratic People's Republic of Korea is ready for both dialogue and confrontation. If the United States persistently increases pressure upon the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, my country will continue to take physical countermeasures, considering such pressure to be a declaration of war."

According to the language and spirit of the UN Charter, the process of deciding how to handle a dispute needs to be a process where the Security Council invites a party to a dispute such as the one involving the DPRK to participate in the Security Council discussion of the dispute.

This provision of the UN charter makes it possible for the members of the Security Council to listen to the different sides in a dispute before a decision is reached about how to resolve the dispute.

In the UN Security Council consideration of the dispute leading to the first nuclear explosion, the DPRK was only allowed to speak after the Security Council had already decided to support the U.S. and punish the DPRK. The meeting transcript does not provide any record of any questions asked by Security Council members of the DPRK Ambassador so as to better understand his side of the dispute.

The lack of any response from Security Council members to the DPRK side of the dispute might seem understandable if one did not know about Chapter V Article 32 of the UN Charter.

This Article says that when the Security Council takes a dispute under consideration, member nations who are a party to the conflict but not a member of the Security Council, “shall be invited to participate without vote, in the discussion relating to the dispute”³

Yet this requirement of the UN Charter has in general been systematically violated by the UN Security Council with the DPRK. This makes it possible for most Security Council member nations to appear to have no idea of the basis of the dispute between the U.S. and the DPRK which the DPRK says is the reason it needs a nuclear weapon to guarantee its security.

The implication of this situation is that as long as the Security Council ignores its obligation under the UN charter to properly invite the DPRK to the Security Council to be a participant in its discussion of the dispute between the U.S. and the DPRK, the dispute only becomes more intractable and more dangerous to peace and security, not only on the Korean Peninsula but to the world.

Notes:

1. UN webcast, Friday, Sept 9, 2016 available at:

<http://webtv.un.org/media/media-stakeouts/watch/koro-bessho-japan-on-non-proliferation-and-the-democratic-peoples-republic-of-korea-dprk-security-council-media-stakeout-9-september-2016/5118990324001> (start: 4:00 to 5:08)

2. See pp. 7-8 S/PV.5551, Saturday 14 October, 2006, available at: http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/PV.5551, See also S/PV.5490 15 July, 2006 pp.

8-9, available at: <http://www.securitycouncilreport.org/atf/cf/%7B65BF9B-6D27-4E9C-8CD3-CF6E4FF96FF9%7D/Chap%20VII%20SPV%205490.pdf>

3. UN Charter, Chapter V, Article 32, p. 23.

[Editor's Note: This article appeared on the netizenblog on Jan. 29, 2017 and can be seen at: <http://blogs.taz.de/netizenblog/2017/01/29/channel-for-communication-to-unsc/>]

Channel for Individuals or NGO's to Send Communication to the UN Security Council

by Ronda Hauben
netcolumnist@gmail.com

Since the early days of the UN Security Council, there has been a procedure for private individuals and non-governmental organizations to be able to send communications to the Security Council on matters of which it is seized.¹ The procedure has been referred to by its library classification symbol which is S/NC.

I first came across this procedure when an NGO in South Korea had been accused of being unpatriotic to the South Korean government because that NGO (and others as well) sent a critique to the Security Council about something the South Korean government was presenting to the Security Council.²

It seemed particularly inappropriate for the South Korean government to accuse an NGO of disloyalty because of a letter sent to members of the Security Council as there is a long tradition from 1946 to the present for private individuals or NGO's to write to the Security Council. Security Council documents show that there are lists of probably thousands of such communications.

In doing some research at the UN into the background of this procedure of the UN I came to realize that in the early days of the Security Council, lists of such communications were issued by the Secretariat on

a frequent basis. The procedure is described in the Appendix of the Provisional Rules of Procedure of the Security Council. It states:

Provisional Procedure for Dealing with Communications from Private Individuals and Non-Governmental Bodies

A. A list of all communications from private individuals and non-governmental bodies relating to matters of which the Security Council is seized shall be circulated to all representatives on the Security Council.

B. A copy of any communication on the list shall be given by the Secretariat to any representative on the Security Council at his request.

The lists published by the UN Secretariat of the communications received by the Security Council from individuals or non-governmental entities included the name and organization of the sender, the date of the communication, the city or town and country of the sender, and originally whether the communication was a telegram, letter, petition etc. The communications were grouped by the Security Council agenda item that the communication referred to.

If a Security Council member saw some communication on a list that was of interest, the Security Council member could request a copy of the communication from the Secretariat.

From 1946 and for several years afterwards, lists were issued on a frequent basis. By the mid 1990's the lists would be issued on a quarterly basis by the UN Secretariat. Then for some reason not yet understood, starting from the 2000 list, lists by the Secretariat would only be issued once a year, around April.

Along with the less frequent issuing of the lists of communications sent to the Security Council, there appears to be no publicly available information indicating how or where an individual or non-governmental entity can send a communication to the Security Council.

Recently when asking some Security Council members if they were aware of this procedure, only one indicated he remembered seeing some correspondence from individuals or NGO's sent to the Security Council. Others appeared to have no knowledge of this process. While this brief survey was only based on a small sample, it demonstrated a breakdown in one of the few publicly available channels of communi-

cation between members of the public and members of the Security Council.

In 2010 some NGO's and some academics who were scientists attempted to send communication to the Security Council about a matter being considered by the Security Council. They sent e-mail to all the member states then on the Security Council. None of these communications, however, appeared on the annual S/NC list published by the UN Secretariat for 2010.

More recently, during the press conference marking the beginning of the Russian Federation's Presidency of the Security Council for the month of October 2016, Ambassador Vitaly Churkin responded to a question raised by a journalist. He said that he would support, "the greater involvement of women" in line with Security Council Resolution 1325 to help address the high level of tension on the Korean Peninsula.

In response to his statement, Christine Ahn, the International Coordinator for the NGO "Women Cross DMZ" wrote to the Security Council asking that several recommendations the group proposed be raised at the Security Council Debate on Resolution 1325 planned for October 25, 2016.

When she tried to find where to send her letter to have it considered as a communication to the Security Council, however, there was no clear information publicly available about where an individual or NGO should send their communication. A press inquiry demonstrated that such information was not easy to locate.

Similarly, a press inquiry to some Security Council members yielded little help with how to find such information. It was only a month later, at the press conference held by the Spanish Ambassador on the occasion of assuming the Presidency of the Security Council for the month of December 2016, that there was an offer of help to find the answer to the mystery.

Ambassador Román Oyarzun Marchesi, the Spanish Ambassador to the UN, welcomed the question on how to send communication to the Security Council saying that his delegation "really believed in the participation of civil society." He promised that if information was sent

to him documenting the problem, “I’ll do my best ... I’ll see what I can do.”³

An inquiry by his press secretary led to a response from the Secretariat. The e-mail from the Office of the President of the Security Council in the UN Department of Political Affairs in the Secretariat stated that if an e-mail or surface mail on a topic being considered by the Security Council is sent to the e-mail address given in the UN Journal for communications for UN member nations to send their communication to the Security Council, or to the postal address provided, it will usually be informally circulated by the Security Council President via their “political coordinators’ network.” If the document “falls under one of the agenda items seized by the Security Council, it gets listed and published as a Security Council document under S/NC[year]/1.” Then it will appear on the list that is published for that year by the Secretariat.⁴

Looking at the earliest S/NC lists, one is impressed by the fact that there are communications from individuals and groups around the world. For example some of the earliest lists present communication received “Concerning Franco Regime in Spain.”

Looking at the names of those who are listed as sending communication to the UN Security Council from 1946 to the present, one gets a sense of the UN existing in bigger world in a way that is different from what is conveyed when one just watches the workings of, for example, the Security Council. It would appear that more serious attention should be paid to making the address for sending communication to the Security Council publicly available. Also more frequent publication of the lists would make it possible for Security Council members to make timely requests for copies of the communications that interested them. That could help broaden the perspectives of Security Council members to enable them to be better able to find peaceful ways to resolve difficult conflicts.

Notes:

1. The term “seized” as used at the UN indicates, “that, while the Security Council is seized of a matter, no other organ of the United Nations may legally take it up, as under Article 12 of the UN Charter.” See: https://en.wiktionary.org/wiki/be_seized_of

2. Ronda Hauben, “S. Korean Gov’t Urged to End Criminal Investigation of NGO for Questions on *Cheonan* Sent to UN,” taz.de/netizenblog, June 26, 2010, http://blogs.taz.de/netizenblog/2010/06/26/s_korean_govt_urged_to_end_criminal_investigation_of_ngo/

3. Román Oyarzun Marchesi (Spain), President of the Security Council for the month of December 2016 – Press Conference. See “1 Dec 2016 – Press Conference by H.E. Mr. Román Oyarzun Marchesi, Permanent Representative of Spain to the United Nations and President of the Security Council for the month of December 2016, on the Security Council Programme of work for the month” at: <http://webtv.un.org/watch/rom%C3%A1n-oyarzun-marchesi-spain-president-of-the-security-council-for-the-month-of-december-2016-press-conference/5232207921001>

4. Communication from private individuals, NGO’s or other entities which relate to the work of the Security Council can be sent to the e-mail address listed in the UN Journal,

dpa-scsb3@un.org or mailed to:
United Nations Security Council
405 East 42nd Street
New York, NY 10017

[Editor’s Note: A version of the following article appeared on *La Voce di New York* under the title “Crisis with North Korea: the UN Charter Has Been Violated by the Security Council” on Oct 13, 2017, online at: <http://www.lavocedinewyork.com/en/un/2017/10/13/crisis-with-north-korea-the-un-charter-has-been-violated-by-security-council/>.]

Article 32: Right to Due Process Enshrined in the UN Charter, Violated by Security Council

By Ronda Hauben
netcolumnist@gmail.com

There is a provision in the UN Charter which requires the Security Council, when it discusses a dispute, to invite those countries that are parties to the dispute to participate in that discussion. This requirement of the UN Charter is explained in Article 32 of the Charter.¹

The language of Article 32 says:

Any member of the United Nations which is not a member of the Security Council ... if it is a party to a dispute under consideration by the Security Council **shall** be invited to participate, without vote, in the discussion relating to the dispute. (Emphasis added)

The Security Council, however, does not comply with this requirement of the UN Charter. The many resolutions that have been passed by the Security Council condemning actions of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) were passed without the members of the Security Council including the DPRK in the discussion as is required by the UN Charter.

For example, shortly after the first nuclear test was carried out by the DPRK on October 9, 2006, the DPRK indicated that there were reasons why it took this action. In violation of the Charter, however, the members of the Security Council did not invite the DPRK to participate in the discussion in the Council about the dispute. Instead sanctions were imposed by the Security Council on the DPRK without hearing its side of the dispute. Only after the sanctions were voted on was the Representative of the DPRK allowed to speak.

How can the members of the Security Council understand the nature of a dispute without hearing from the parties to the dispute? How can Security Council members decide how to act to resolve a dispute unless they hear from those involved in the dispute.

It is now more than 10 years after the UN Security Council passed Resolution 1718 punishing the DPRK for its first nuclear test.

The DPRK has conducted several additional nuclear or missile tests. The UN Security Council has passed several additional resolutions against the DPRK, without making any attempt to hear from the DPRK. The DPRK has written to the Security Council several letters asking to have the Security Council consider why the DPRK says it needs to develop a nuclear weapon. The DPRK has also offered to freeze further nuclear development if the U.S. and the Republic of Korea (ROK) cease large scale military drills against the DPRK that they hold several times a year. The U.S. refuses to consider this offer and the

Security Council members continue to support the U.S.-created resolutions increasing the Security Council's sanctions against the DPRK.²

While the Security Council ignores the letters from the DPRK and the Charter requirement that it hear DPRK's views about the dispute, several Security Council members publicly proclaim inaccurately that it is the DPRK that refuses to negotiate about its nuclear program.³

The failure of the Security Council to adhere to the obligation of the UN Charter, has led to an ever more tense situation over the dispute between the DPRK and the U.S.

An event, however, which helps to shed light on this situation took place at UN headquarters on September 22, 2017 during the week of the General Debate that began the 72nd Session of the General Assembly. A press conference was held by the Foreign Minister of the Russian Federation, Sergey Lavrov. In response to a question raised by a journalist at the press conference, FM Lavrov provided not only an understanding of the nature of the obligation that Article 32 bestows on the Security Council, but also an understanding of the importance of this obligation.⁴ The journalist asked Foreign Minister Lavrov:

Journalist Q: "My question is about the significance of the Security Council and the world not hearing, in the process of the sanctions, from the DPRK. Under Article 32, it says that the DPRK should be invited to the Security Council. They've [the DPRK] also asked to come about the joint exercises. They've sent numerous letters to the Security Council and yet we are told they don't want to negotiate. But if the Security Council constantly doesn't even follow the Charter inviting them, how can they [the DPRK] have a sense there's any process going on within the Security Council? Can you say Russia's position about having an invitation the way Article 32 provides for of a country who is being discussed and hearing their side of the story?"

Foreign Minister Lavrov responded:

Lavrov: "I believe that when the UN Security Council reviews the issues which regard any country, any member country, this country has to be invited and has to have an opportunity to present their position to the UN Security

Council. For me, this is a given and it is enshrined in [the] Charter as you quite rightfully say. But when it goes for the practical actions not everything depends on us. There are many opportunities for other Security Council members, member states. Well, in any case, despite this article [in the Charter], the routine practice is the following that we need consensus. Not everything depends on us.”

Lavrov’s response clarified that while the obligation is “enshrined in the Charter” to provide an opportunity for any country, involved in a dispute considered by the Security Council to be invited and to be able to present its view of the dispute to the Security Council, he also acknowledges that this obligation of the Charter is not practiced at present by Security Council members. Instead Security Council members determine by consensus what their practice will be. In addition, Lavrov explains that on its own the Russian Federation is not able to change this Security Council violation of the Charter.

Lavrov is not alone in recognizing the violation by the Security Council of the right to due process under the Charter for those being condemned by the Security Council. This violation of the Charter by the practice of the Security Council also has been the subject of criticism by member states demonstrating the need for Security Council Reform.

For example at the 62nd General Assembly meeting on the need for Security Council Reform, Ambassador Hilario Davide of the Philippines told the Council⁵:

(D)ue process and the rule of law demand that Member States that are not members of the Security Council but are the subjects of the Council’s scrutiny should have the right to appear before the Council at all stages of the proceedings concerning them to state or defend their positions on the issues that are the subjects of or are related to that scrutiny This is a denial of due process, which is a violation of the basic principle of the rule of law. Due process and the rule of law require that a party must be heard before it is condemned.

Also this violation of the Charter had been criticized by civil society groups, as for example, in a recent letter sent to the Secretary General and signed by over 300 women and women's groups from 45 countries. In the letter, the women wrote:⁶

In accordance with UN Charter rules, we urge you to respond to North Korea's security concerns regarding these war drills, the world's largest, which rehearse surgical strikes on North Korea, 'decapitation,' and regime change. According to Article 32 of the UN Charter, 'Any Member of the United Nations which is not a member of the Security Council ... if it is a party to a dispute under consideration by the Security Council, shall be invited to participate, without vote, in the discussion relating to the dispute.' Yet the DPRK has never been invited to participate in UNSC sessions on sanctions resolutions, and the Permanent Mission of the DPRK to the UN has not received a response to its August 25, 2017 letter where they strongly request[ed] the Security Council of the United Nations to place the issue of the joint military exercise as its emergent agenda and discuss in the meeting with no further delay.

Criticism of the Security Council's failure to provide due process to those they condemn has even been raised in court proceedings as with SC resolution 1267, with the Court requiring the Security Council to change its procedures.⁷

Also, there is an example of the Security Council acting differently. In 2010 the Security Council took up a dispute regarding the Republic of Korea and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, and invited both parties to present their view of the dispute. Then the Security Council issued a Presidential Statement documenting the nature of the dispute and urging the two parties to settle it in a peaceful manner.⁸

It is significant that Lavrov recognizes the obligation of the Security Council to hear the views of nations involved in a dispute being considered by the Security Council. His acknowledgment that such problems need others to take them up in order to be resolved, implies a current challenge for the UN. The ongoing failure of the Security Coun-

cil to operate according to the Charter undermines the legitimacy of the Security Council and even of the UN.

Notes:

1. Charter of the United Nations, Chapter 5, Article 32

<http://legal.un.org/repertory/art32.shtml>

2. The U.S. is the penholder writing the SC Resolutions against the DPRK and then using various forms of pressure to get the SC to pass the resolution. This is the case even though the U.S. is a party to the dispute with the DPRK.

3. See for example <http://webtv.un.org/watch/japan-prime-minister-addresses-general-debate-72nd-session/5581786476001/>

“Japan – Prime Minister Addresses General Debate, 72nd Session 20 Sep 2017 – Shinzo Abe, Prime Minister of Japan, addresses the general debate of the 72nd Session of the General Assembly of the UN (New York, 19 - 25 September 2017).”

4. See <http://webtv.un.org/media/watch/sergey-lavrov-russian-federation-press-conference-22-september-2017/5583136573001/?term=> (Start 30:23; End 32:03).

“Sergey Lavrov (Russian Federation) – Press Conference (22 September 2017) 22 Sep 2017 – Sergey V. Lavrov, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, addresses the press on disarmament and other topics.”

5. See [http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/PV.5968\(Resumption1\)](http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/PV.5968(Resumption1)) Transcript Security Council meeting, August 27, 2008, S/PV.5968, Resumption 1. p. 8

6. See for example https://www.womencrossdmz.org/web/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/Final_Letter-to-UNSG-ver6.pdf

7. See for example <https://www.heise.de/tp/features/At-Legal-Crossroads-3419131.html>

Ronda Hauben, “At Legal Crossroads: Security Council sanctions imposed without Due Process,” *Telepolis*, 29 June, 2008.

8. See for example http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/PRST/2010/13 UN Security Council Presidential Statement S/PRST/2010/13.

[Editor's Note: The following statement appeared on September 26, 2017 on the People's Solidarity for Participatory Democracy (PSPD) website at: http://www.peoplepower21.org/index.php?mid=English&document_srl=1528596&listStyle=list and other websites. *Abolition 2000* is a network of over 2000 organizations in more than 90 countries worldwide working for a global treaty to eliminate nuclear weapons.]

Appeal for a Diplomatic Solution in North East Asia

The Abolition 2000 members and affiliated networks listed below, representing peace and disarmament organisations from around the world, call on the United States and North Korea to step back from the brink of war in North East Asia, and instead adopt a diplomatic approach to prevent war.

We call for the immediate commencement of negotiations to prevent a military conflict from erupting, and to resolve the underlying conflicts. Such negotiations should take place both bilaterally and through a renewed Six-Party framework involving China, Japan, North Korea, Russia, South Korea and the United States.

The escalating tensions and threat of military conflict over North Korea's nuclear and missile capabilities makes a diplomatic solution of vital importance and the highest priority. The increasing risk of war – and possibly even the use of nuclear weapons by miscalculation, accident, or intent – is frightening.

More than three million citizens of Korea, China, USA and other countries lost their lives in the Korean War from 1950-1953. Should a war erupt again, the loss of lives could be considerably worse, especially if nuclear weapons are used. Indeed, a nuclear conflict erupting in Korea could engulf the entire world in a nuclear catastrophe that would end civilization as we know it. In supporting diplomacy rather than war, we:

1. Oppose any pre-emptive use of force by any of the parties, which would be counter-productive and likely lead to nuclear war;

2. Call on all parties to refrain from militaristic rhetoric and provocative military exercises;
 3. Encourage China, Japan, North Korea, Russia, South Korea and the United States to consider the phased and comprehensive approach for a North-East Asian Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone with a 3+3 arrangement,* which already has cross-party support in Japan and South Korea and interest from the North Korean government;
 4. Encourage China, Japan, North Korea, Russia, South Korea and the United States to also consider options and modalities for turning the 1953 Armistice Agreement into a formal end to the 1950-1953 Korean War;
 5. Welcome the call of the UN Secretary-General for a resumption of Six-Party Talks and his offer to assist in negotiations;
 6. Welcome also the offer of the European Union to assist in diplomatic negotiations, as they did successfully in the negotiations on Iran's nuclear program;
 7. Call on the United Nations Security Council to prioritise a diplomatic solution to the conflict.
-

* The 3+3 arrangement would include Japan, South Korea and North Korea agreeing not to possess or host nuclear weapons, and would require China, Russia and the USA agreeing not to deploy nuclear weapons in Japan, South Korea or North Korea, nor to attack or threaten to attack them with nuclear weapons.

Endorsers of the Appeal for a diplomatic solution in North East Asia:

Organizations:

Abolition 2000 U.K. (U.K.)
Albert Schweitzer Institute (USA)
All Souls Nuclear Disarmament Task Force (USA)
Anglican Pacifist Fellowship of New Zealand (N.Z.)
Aotearoa Lawyers for Peace (New Zealand)
Artistes pour la Paix (Canada)
Artsen voor Vrede - Flemish IPPNW (Belgium)

Association Des Medecins Francais Pour La Prevention de la Guerre Nucleaire –
IPPNW France (France)
Association of World Citizens (Germany)
The ATOM Project (Kazakhstan)
Australian Anti-Bases Campaign Coalition (Australia)
Baptist Peace Fellowship of North America (USA)
Basel Peace Office (Switzerland, International)
Beyond Nuclear (USA, International)
Blue Banner (Mongolia)
Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament – CND (U.K.)
Canadian Pugwash Group (Canada)
CND New Zealand (New Zealand)
CND Scotland (Scotland)
Christian Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (U.K.)
Coalition for Peace Action, New Jersey (USA)
Coalition for Peace Action, Pennsylvania (USA)
Colorado Coalition for the Prevention of Nuclear War
Committee of 100 (Finland)
Connecticut Peace and Solidarity Coalition (USA)
Cymru Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (Wales)
Denman Island Peace Group (Canada)
DPRK Friendship and Cultural Society (Australia)
Earth Action (USA, International)
Earthcare not Warfare (USA)
Economists for Peace and Security (USA)
Edinburgh Peace & Justice Centre (Scotland)
Edinburgh CND (Scotland)
Environmentalists Against War (USA)
European Environment Foundation (Switzerland)
Frauen für den Frieden – Women for Peace (Switzerland)
Gandhi Development Trust (South Africa)
Gensuikyo - Japan Council against A and H Bombs (Japan)
Grandmothers for Peace (USA, International)
Green Party of Washington State (USA)
Ground Zero Center for Nonviolent Action (USA)
Harrison fellowship of Reconciliation (USA)
Hokotehi Moriori Trust (Rekohu, Chatham Islands)
Human Survival Project (Australia, International)
IALANA (International Association of Lawyers Against
Nuclear Arms) Italy Section (Italy)
IALANA Germany – Vereinigung für Friedensrecht
International Fellowship of Reconciliation - Austria
IPPNW Germany

Iona Community (Scotland)
Irish Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (Ireland)
Japan Association of Lawyers Against Nuclear Arms
Ke Aupuni O Hawaii (The Hawaiian Kingdom) (Hawaii)
Lawyers' Committee on Nuclear Policy (USA)
Leo Club of Sunflower Saidpur City (Bangladesh)
Mankato Area Peace vigil (USA)
Medact (IPPNW U.K.) Nuclear Weapons Group (U.K.)
Le Mouvement de la Paix (France)
Network of Spiritual Progressives (USA)
Nobel Peace Prize Watch (Norway)
Norges Fredslag - Norwegian Peace Society (Norway)
Norwegian Peace Council (Norway)
Nuclear Age Peace Foundation (USA)
Nuclear Free Local Authorities (U.K.)
N.Z. DPRK Society (New Zealand)
One People One Planet (New Zealand)
Oxford Network for Global Justice and Peace (U.K.)
Pacific Institute of Resource Management (N.Z.)
Pax Christi International (Belgium, International)
Pax Christi Metro New York (USA)
Peace Action Manhattan (USA)
Peace Action NY State (USA)
Peace Depot (Japan)
Peace Foundation – Te Taupapa Rongomau o Aotearoa (N.Z.)
Peace People (Northern Ireland)
Peace Union of Finland (Finland)
Peaceworkers (USA)
People for Nuclear Disarmament (Australia)
Peoples Solidarity for Participatory Democracy (Republic of Korea)
Phoenix Settlement Trust (South Africa)
Physicians for Social Responsibility/IPPNW (Switzerland)
Portland Fellowship of Reconciliation (USA)
Pugwash Conferences on Science and World Affairs (Italy, International)
Quaker Peace and Service Aotearoa New Zealand (N.Z.)
Religions for Peace (USA, International)
Religions for Peace Canada (Canada)
Rideau Institute (Canada)
Scientists for Global Responsibility (Australia)
Shining Bangladesh Foundation (Bangladesh)
Soka Gakkai International New Zealand (N.Z.)
STOP the War Coalition (Philippines)
Swedish Fellowship of Reconciliation (Sweden)

Swedish IALANA (Sweden)
Swiss Lawyers for Nuclear Disarmament (Switzerland)
Trident Ploughshares (U.K.)
Tri-Valley CAREs (USA)
United Religions Initiative (USA)
Uniting for Peace (U.K.)
Forum voor Vredesactie - Peace Action (Belgium)
Washington Physicians for Social Responsibility (USA)
Western States Legal Foundation (USA)
Western Washington Fellowship of Reconciliation (USA)
Women for Peace Germany (Germany)
WILPF (Women's International League for Peace and Freedom) German Section (Germany)
WILPF Scottish Section (Scotland)
Seattle Fellowship of Reconciliation (USA)
World Beyond War (USA, International)
World Future Council (Germany, International)
Yorkshire Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (U.K.)
Youth for Nuclear Nonproliferation and Disarmament (Bangladesh, India, Nepal, Sri Lanka).
Zone Libre (Mexico)

Individuals:

(Titles and organization names included for identification purposes only)

Junko Abe (Japan)
Mostafiz Ahmed (Bangladesh). President, Leo Club of Sunflower Saidpur City
Nur E Alam (Bangladesh). Youth NND Group
Giorgio Alba (Italy). Abolition 2000 Global Council
Paul Alexander, Ph.D. (U.K.). Visiting Scholar, College of Arts and Law. University of Birmingham
John Amidon (USA). President, Veterans for Peace, Chapter 10
Jean Anderson (Aotearoa/New Zealand)
Irshad Ansari (Nepal). Youth NND Group
Carol Archer (U.K.). Peace activist
M.K. Bashar Bahar (Bangladesh). Chairman, BSB Cambrian Education Group.
Nivy Balachandran (Australia). Religions for Peace Regional Coordinator, Australia, New Zealand and the Pacific Islands
Patti Bass (USA)
David Barrows (USA)
Rev. Kathleen Bellefeuille-Rice (USA)
Dr. Terry Bergeson (USA). Former WA State Superintendent of Public Instruction
Phon van den Biesen (Netherlands). Vice-President, International Association of Lawyers Against Nuclear Arms

Ranjit Bhagat (Nepal). Youth NND Group
Cr David Blackburn (U.K.), Nuclear Free Local Authorities English Forum Chair, Leeds City Council
Dr Frank Boulton (U.K.). Trustee of MEDACT, the U.K. affiliate of the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War (IPPNW)
Francis Anthony Boyle (USA). Professor of international law, University of Illinois College of Law
Dr Derman Boztok MD (Turkey). President of IPPNW Turkey
Dr Adam Broinowski (Australia). Research Fellow, College of Asia and the Pacific. Australian National University
Allen Brubaker (USA). Former development worker in Somalia and member of the Mennonite Board of Missions
Mark & Margaret Bubenik (USA). Members of Ground Zero Center for Nonviolent Action
Shawkat Chowdhury MP (Bangladesh)
Rob Clarke (Aotearoa/New Zealand). Special Officer for Education, United Nations Association of New Zealand
Prof. Ana María Cetto (Mexico). Director, Museum of Light, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.
Peter von Christierson (USA)
Brenda Clowes (USA). Couples Counsellor
Harriett Cody (USA)
Betsy Collins (USA)
Dr Tony Colman (U.K.) World Future Councillor
Phyllis Creighton (Canada), Science for Peace
Tarja Cronberg (Finland), Chair of the Middle Powers Initiative. Abolition 2000 Global Council Member
Cr Feargal Dalton (U.K.), Nuclear Free Local Authorities Scotland Forum Convener, Glasgow City Council
Rev. John Dear (USA). Author and activist
Cr Mark Dearey (U.K.), Nuclear Free Local Authorities All Ireland Forum Co-Chair, Louth County Council
Dr. Dieter Deiseroth (Germany). Academic Council, International Association of Lawyers Against Nuclear Arms
William H. Dent, Jr. (USA)
Dr Kate Dewes (Aotearoa/New Zealand). Co-Director, Disarmament and Security Centre
Akib Dipu (Bangladesh). Youth NND Group
Sergio Duarte (Brazil). President of Pugwash Conferences on Science and World Affairs. Former UN Under-Secretary General for Disarmament Affairs.
Leonard Eiger (USA). Coordinator, NO to NEW TRIDENT Campaign
Cheryl Eiger (USA). Member, Ground Zero Center for Nonviolent Action

Dr Scilla Elworthy (U.K.). Founder, Oxford Research Group and of Peace Direct. Councillor, World Future Council

Andreas Emerson-Moering (U.K.). Head of Religious Studies, Norwich High School, U.K.

Edwin G. Ehmke (USA)

Anwar Fazal (Malaysia). Director of the Right Livelihood College. Right Livelihood Laureate, 1982

Rosemary Field (U.K.). Medact - IPPNW U.K. section.

Anda Filip (Romania/Switzerland). Member of the World Future Council

Cr Grace Fletcher-Hackwood (U.K.), Nuclear Free Local Authorities English Forum Vice Chair, Manchester City Council

Dr. Royston Flude (Switzerland). President, World Circle of the Consensus: Self-sustaining People, Organizations and Communities

Dr. Frank A. Fromherz (USA). Professor of sociology of religion, war, peace, and social justice, Portland State University, Oregon

Ela Gandhi (South Africa). Vice-President, Religions for Peace

Prof Emilie Gaillard (France). Law professor at University of Caen Normandy.

IALANA Board member Roger Gordon (USA). Retired psychotherapist

Commander (ret.) Robert Green (Aotearoa/New Zealand).

Co-Director, Disarmament and Security Centre Robin Greenberg (Aotearoa/New Zealand). Filmmaker & conflict resolution practitioner

Daniel Gingras (Canada). Former president of Artistes pour la Paix. Member of la Société Saint-Jean-Baptiste de Montréal

Chris Gwyntopher (U.K.). Refugee and Migrants Advice Worker. Member of FOR, Religious Society of Friends, Trident Ploughshares and CND.

Gwyn Gwyntopher (U.K.). Retired Social Workers and Lecturer. Member of FOR, Religious Society of Friends, Trident Ploughshares and CND.

Regina Hagen (Germany). Atomwaffenfrei Jetzt (Nuclear Weapons-Free Now) Campaign Council member. Abolition 2000 Global Council Member

David C Hall MD (USA). Past president, Physicians for Social Responsibility

Rev. Anne S. Hall (USA). Retired Lutheran pastor (ELCA), member of Ground Zero Center for Nonviolent Action and Washington Physicians for Social Responsibility.

John Hallam (Australia), People for Nuclear Disarmament. Human Survival Project. Abolition 2000 Global Council Member

Michael Hamel-Green (Australia). Emeritus Professor, Victoria University Melbourne

Mary Hanson (USA), Co-chair, Ground Zero Center for Nonviolent Action Stewardship Council

Stephen A. Harrison (USA). Lawyer. Member of Peace Action

Thea Harvey-Barratt (USA). Executive Director, Economists for Peace and Security

M.A. Hasan (Bangladesh). Chairman, Aristopharma Ltd.

Aminul Haque (Bangladesh). Youth NND Group

Elaine Hickman (USA). Member of Ground Zero Center for Non-Violent Action
Ronja Ievers (New Zealand), National Administrator United Nations Association of
New Zealand
S.M. Imtiaz Alam (Bangladesh). Youth NND Group
Yaeka Inoue (Japan). JALANA
Chand Babu Iraki (Nepal) Youth NND Group
Mehboob Babu Iraki (Nepal). Youth NND Group
Moinul Islam (Bangladesh). Youth NND Group
Mokhlasur Islam (Bangladesh). Principal, Sunflower School & College, Saidpur.
David T. Ives (USA). Executive Director of the Albert
chweitzer Institute. Adjunct Professor of Political Science, Philosophy, and Latin
American Culture
Frank Jackson (U.K.). Abolition 2000 U.K. Committee
Enkhsaikhan Jargalsaikhan (Mongolia), Blue Banner
Bishakha Jha (Nepal). Youth NND Group\
Birgitta Jonsdottir MP (Iceland). Parliamentarian. Poet. Member, Pirate Party. PNN
Council Member. Chair of the International Modern Media institute.
Senator Sehar Kamran (Pakistan). Member Senate of Pakistan Standing Committees
on Defence, Human Rights & Federal Education. President Centre for Pakistan & Gulf
Studies
Akira KASAI (Japan). Member of the House of Representatives
Richard Keller (Aotearoa/New Zealand)
Rabbi Jonathan Keren-Black (Australia)
Naimul Haque Khan (Bangladesh). Director, Lubnan Trade Consortium Ltd.
Bill Kidd MSP (Scotland). Co-President of Parliamentarians for Nuclear
Nonproliferation and Disarmament. Abolition 2000 Global Council Member
Maruf Zaman Koyel (Bangladesh). President, Nilphamari Chamber of Commerce &
Industries.
Kristi (Canada). Peace campaigner from Edmonton
Raffaella Kristmann (Switzerland). Frauen für den Frieden, Basel
Stephen Vincent Kobasa (USA), Trident Resistance Network
Prof. Rolf Kreibich (Germany). Secretariat for Future Research, Freie University
Berlin. Member of the World Future Council\
David Krieger (USA). President of the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation
Dennis Kucinich (USA). Former Congressman and Mayor of Cleveland Ohio
Prof. Elizabeth Kucinich (USA). Regenerative Agriculture & Agroforestry Advocate
Barry Ladendorf (USA). President, Veterans For Peace
Dominique Lalanne (France). Nuclear physicist. Coordinator of Armes nucléaires
STOP. Abolition 2000 Global Council Member
Jean-Yvon Landrac (France). Abolition 2000 Global Council member
Sarah Lasenby (U.K.). Oxford Quaker
Nydia Leaf (USA). Member of Granny Peace Brigade

Cr Sue Lent (U.K.), Nuclear Free Local Authorities Welsh Forum, Cardiff City Council

Rabbi Michael Lerner (USA). Editor, Tikkun Magazine

Joyce Leeson (U.K.) Public Health Physician

Andrew Lichterman (USA). Western States Legal Foundation. Abolition 2000 Global Council Member

Dr David Lowry (U.K.). Former director, European Proliferation Information Centre (EPIC)

Tim Lynch (New Zealand). Our Planet

Lachlan Mackay (New Zealand), Parliament of the World's Religions Youth Ambassador. Abolition 2000 Global Council Member

Dirk Van der Maelen MP (Belgium). Chairman Commission for Foreign Affairs, Belgian Parliament

Mairead Corrigan Maguire (Ireland). Nobel Peace Laureate 1976

Muna Makhamreh (Jordan). Lawyer. Board director of "MASAR" for Human Development. PNND Coordinator for Arab Countries.

Jean-Marie Matagne (France). Action des Citoyens pour le Désarmement Nucléaire. Abolition 2000 Global Council Member

Prof. Manfred Max-Neef (Chile). Universidad Austral de Chile. Member of the World Future Council

Fabio Marcelli (Italy). Association of Democratic Lawyers. Board Member of IALANA

Joanie McClellan (USA). Fellowship of Reconciliation

Cr Norman McDonald (U.K.), Nuclear Free Local Authorities Steering Committee Vice Chair, Western Isles Council

Nancy McGill (USA). Journalist

R. Michael Medley, Ph.D. (USA). Professor Emeritus of English, Eastern Mennonite University

Dr Philip Michael (Ireland). Past VP (Europe) International Society of Doctors for the Environment

Patricia A. Milliren (USA)

Mokhsedul Momenin (Bangladesh). Union Chairman

LeRoy Moore PhD, (USA). Rocky Mountain Peace and Justice Center

John Morgan (New Zealand). Special Officer for Human Rights, UNA New Zealand

Sean Morris (U.K.). Secretary (Principal Policy Officer), Nuclear Free Local Authorities.

Prof. Keiko Nakamura (Japan). Research Center for Nuclear Abolition at Nagasaki University (RECNA)

Kara Nelson (N.Z.). 97-year old peace marcher

Alan Newberg (USA)

Ian Newman (Australia). Biophysicist

Roland Nivet (France). Spokesman, Le Mouvement de la Paix

Jan Oberg (Sweden) Co-founder & director of the Transnational Foundation for Peace & Future Research

Kenichi Okubo (Japan). JALANA

Sister Kay O'Neil (USA). Presentation Sisters Social Justice Team, Minnesota

Dr Kirsten Osen (Norway). Member Norske leger motatomvåpen – IPPNW Norway

John Otranto (Germany)

Rev. LeDayne McLeese Polaski (USA). Executive Director, Baptist Peace Fellowship of North America

Rosemarie Pace (USA). Director of Pax Christi Metro NY

Mary Jane Parrine (USA). Stanford University. Pacific Life Community.

Lorin Peters (USA). Physics teacher. Daughter of a Manhattan Project scientist.

Dr Tomasz Pierscionek (U.K.). Psychiatrist. Journalist. Member of Medact, U.K. section of IPPNW

Prof Pasquale Policastro (Poland), Law Professor. Board Member of IALANA

Mary Popeo (USA). Peace Culture Village

Judi Poulson (USA)

Montserrat Prieto (Spain). Mundo sin Guerres – World without War or Violence. Abolition 2000 Global Council

Michael and Patricia Pulham (U.K.). Christian CND

Mukund Purohit (India)

Eva Quistorp (Germany), Women for Peace

Rezaul Islam Raju (Bangladesh). Principal, Lions School & College, Saidpur

M. V. Ramana (Canada), Liu Institute for Global Issues. Abolition 2000 Global Council Member

Tanja Ranke (Germany)

Hemamali Yasintha Rathnayake (Sri Lanka). Youth NND Group

Prof Nasila Selasini Rembe (South Africa). UNESCO 'Oliver Tambo' Chair of Human Rights, University of Fort Hare

Reetika (India). Youth NND Group

Nasim Reza (Bangladesh). Youth NND Group

Laurie Ross (Aotearoa-New Zealand). New Zealand/Aotearoa Nuclear Free Peacemaking

Philippa Rowland (Australia). President, Multi-faith Association of South Australia

Audrey van Ryn (Aotearoa-New Zealand)

Harvey Sadis (USA)

Steve Saelzler (USA). Veterans for Peace Chapter 74

Sadman Sakib (Bangladesh). Youth NND Group

Richard Salvador (Belau/Palau). Abolition 2000 Global Council Member

Rahanuma Saraha (Bangladesh) Youth NND Group

Amzad Hossain Sarkar (Bangladesh). Mayor of Saidpur

Takeya Sasaki (Japan). JALANA

A.H.M. Sazzad (Bangladesh). Youth NND Group

Jürgen Scheffran (Germany). Abolition 2000 Global Council

Wolfgang Schlupp-Hauck (Germany). Chairman, Friedenswerkstatt Mutlangen.
 Sister Gladys Schmitz (USA). Mankato Peace vigil.
 Suzanne Schwarz (Switzerland), Journalist. Member Frauen für den Frieden Schweiz
 Sukla Sen (India), Abolition 2000 Global Council Member
 John and Mary Sevanick (USA)
 Elizabeth J. Shafer J.D (USA). Board member of Lawyers' Committee on Nuclear Policy
 Janet Siano (USA)
 Benjamin H Sibelman (USA)
 Helen Simpson (U.K.). Entrepreneur. Wholestep Ltd.
 Ivo Šlaus (Croatia). Physicist. Honorary President of the World Academy of Art and Science.
 Gar Smith (USA). Co-founder of EAW, author of Nuclear Roulette and editor of The War and Environment Reader
 Maui Solomon (Rekohu, Chatham Islands, N.Z.). Barrister.
 Chairman, Hokotehi Moriori Trust
 Gray Southon (New Zealand)
 Rae Street (U.K.). Greater Manchester & District CND
 Noel Stott (South Africa, U.K.). VERTIC
 Shigemasa Sugiyama (Japan). JALANA
 Lornita R. Swain (USA). Fellowship of Reconciliation
 Alamgir Swapan (Bangladesh). Reporter, Somoy News.
 Bishop Bill Swing (USA). United Religions Initiative
 Kyoko Tanaka (Japan). JALANA
 Prof. Armin Tenner (Netherlands). Former Chair, International Network of Engineers and Scientists for Social Responsibility
 Aaron Tovish (Mexico). Executive Director, Zone Libre
 Cr John Trainor (U.K.), Nuclear Free Local Authorities All Ireland Forum Co-Chair, Newry, Mourne and Down Council.
 Brian Trautman (USA). Treasurer, National Board of Directors, Veterans For Peace
 Cr Stephen Tollestrup (New Zealand). Member of the Auckland City Council, Waitakere Ranges Local Board.
 Diane Turner (USA). Director, Meaningful Movies Project
 Hiromichi Umabayashi (Japan). Special Advisor, Peace Depot.
 Yasuo Umeda (Japan). JALANA
 Prof Kenji Urata (Japan). Waseda University School of Law.
 Board Member of the International Association of Lawyers Against Nuclear Arms
 Corazon Valdez Fabros (Philippines) Abolition 2000 Global Council Member
 Jo Valentine (Australia). Former senator for Western Australia. Abolition 2000 Global Council Member
 Mrinal Verma (India). Abolition 2000 Youth Working Group
 Thore Vestby (Norway). Vice-President, Mayors for Peace.
 Gordana Vukomanovic (Serbia). Yugo sport & Art Association

Paul F. Walker, Ph.D. (USA). International Program Director, Green Cross International

Jimi Wallace (New Zealand). Soka Gakkai International N.Z.

Alyn Ware (New Zealand/Czech Republic). Abolition 2000 Global Council Member.

Barbara H Warren, MD, MPH (USA). Physicians for Social Responsibility, Arizona

Brian E. Watson (USA). Artist

Dave Webb (U.K.). Chair, Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament. Member, Abolition 2000 Global Council

Anders Wijkman (Sweden), Co-President of the Club of Rome, Member of the World Future Council

Lucas Wirl (Germany). International Association of Lawyers Against Nuclear Arms. Abolition 2000 Global Council.

Lawrence S. Wittner, Ph.D. (USA). Professor of History

Yoji Yahagi (Japan). JALANA

Daisuke Yamaguchi (Japan). PNND Japan Coordinator. Member of the Abolition 2000 Global Council

Dr Ichiro Yuasa (Japan). Vice-President of Peace Depot

Mounir Zahran (Egypt). Egypt Council for Foreign Affairs. Abolition 2000 Global Council Member

Luis Roberto Zamora Bolaños (Costa Rica). Lawyer. Board Member of International Association of Lawyers Against Nuclear Arms

Angie Zelter (U.K.). Trident Ploughshares. Right Livelihood Laureate 2001

[Editor's Note: On September 22, 2017, nearly 300 women leaders and several major women's organizations from 45 countries, sent the following letter to the UN Secretary-General Antonio Guterres urging him to immediately appoint a Special Envoy to de-escalate the threat of war facing the Korean Peninsula. The letter was initiated by Women Cross DMZ*. This letter is online at: https://www.women_crossdmz.org/web/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/Final_Letter-to-UNSG-ver6.pdf.]

Letter from Women Calling for UN Efforts for Peace on the Korean Peninsula

UN Secretary-General Antonio Guterres
United Nations, New York

Dear Mr. Secretary-General,

We are peace-loving women from over 45 countries, including the United States, Republic of Korea (ROK), Japan, and Guam, and many from nations that fought in the Korean War. We are united by our belief that diplomacy is the only way to resolve the nuclear crisis and threat of war now facing the Korean Peninsula, China, Russia, Japan, and other U.S. allies and territories in the region.

In his first General Assembly address, President Trump threatened, "to totally destroy North Korea," if the United States or its allies were attacked. As the world's greatest military power, the United States is the only nation ever to use atomic bombs against a civilian population that annihilated a quarter million people in Nagasaki and Hiroshima. We call on you, as Secretary-General of the United Nations, to counsel in the strongest of terms, the President of the United States and its Ambassador to the UN, that threats to destroy another country are unacceptable and will not be tolerated by the community of nations.

We must work to abolish nuclear weapons worldwide, including in India, Israel, North Korea, Pakistan, and among all Permanent Members of the Security Council. We oppose North Korea's increased

militarization, including testing missiles and nuclear weapons, and threats to retaliate against the United States, its allies, and its territories where significant U.S. military bases are located. However, we understand North Korea's fears of a U.S. pre-emptive strike. There is still no Peace Treaty ending the Korean War, during which the United States carpet-bombed 85 percent of North Korea. From 1950-53, four million people were killed, including a quarter of the North Korean population.

As the leader of the United Nations, which was established "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war," we appeal to you to act swiftly to prevent the Korean Peninsula from becoming ground zero for a global nuclear war. We urge you to:

1. Immediately appoint a Special Envoy to deescalate the Korean conflict to "*encourage dialogue, compromise and the peaceful resolution of tensions.*" Past Secretaries-General, Kofi Annan and Boutros Boutros-Ghali, initiated peace processes for the Korean Peninsula. Given the well documented fact of women peacemakers' significant impact toward reaching peace settlements, a high-level intervention of women mediators is needed now to avert war.

2. Hold the United States accountable for threatening to wage war against another sovereign country at the United Nations. U.S. and North Korean leaders regularly exchange such threats, but we do not believe such threats to annihilate an entire population of 25 million people should go unchecked, and certainly not in *the* international forum for peace, cooperation and diplomacy. In his September 19, 2017 UN General Assembly speech, Mr. Trump violated Article 2, Paragraph 4 of the UN Charter: "*All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state.*"

3. Support a freeze of North Korea's nuclear and missile programs in exchange for halting U.S.-R.O.K. war drills. In accordance with UN Charter rules, we urge you to respond to North Korea's security concerns regarding these war drills, the world's largest, which rehearse surgical strikes on North Korea, "decapitation," and regime change. According to Article 32 of the UN Charter, "*Any Member of the United Nations which is not a member of the Security Council ... if it is a party to a dispute under consideration by the Security Council, shall be in-*

vited to participate, without vote, in the discussion relating to the dispute.” Yet the DPRK has never been invited to participate in UNSC sessions on sanctions resolutions, and the Permanent Mission of the DPRK to the UN has not received a response to its August 25, 2017 letter where they “strongly request[ed] the Security Council of the United Nations to place the issue of the joint military exercise as its emergent agenda and discuss in the meeting with no further delay.” U.S. Ambassador to the UN Nikki Haley recently warned, “If North Korea keeps on with this reckless behavior ... North Korea will be destroyed.” North Korea refers to its own history of surviving indiscriminate U.S. bombing during the Korean War and the enduring hostile U.S. policy in justifying its nuclear weapons. North Korea also points to Iraq and Libya as examples of countries that suffered heavily under U.S. military intervention because they did not have a nuclear deterrent or agreed to give it up. With the United States now threatening to abrogate the Iran deal, North Korea has fewer incentives to denuclearize.

The world community cannot simply wait for the Trump administration to engage in dialogue with North Korea. For the Trump administration, current acts of diplomacy are narrowly defined as instituting more sanctions against North Korea and cajoling other countries to cut off diplomatic ties with Pyongyang. Not only have sanctions failed to halt North Korea’s nuclear and missile program, by now targeting sectors not directly linked to them, new sanctions under UNSCR 2375 and 2371, which ban exports such as textiles and seafood, will inflict more economic misery on the North Korean people and make the DPRK ever more isolated and desperate to strengthen its nuclear and missile deterrence.

In this dangerous hour, with no Korean peace process and when threats of annihilation are made in the halls of diplomacy, we urge you to act on these three recommendations to de-fuse the crisis and work towards the peaceful conclusion of the Korean War with a peace agreement as promised under the 1953 Armistice Agreement, Article 4, Paragraph 60.

Averting war and a global nuclear disaster rests with your ability to act now.

Respectfully yours,**

1. Abigail Disney, USA, Filmmaker and Philanthropist
2. Ai-jen Poo, USA, Executive Director, National Domestic Workers Alliance
3. Aiko Yamashiro, USA, Women's Voices Women Speak
4. Aimee Alison, USA, President Democracy in Color
5. Aiyong Choi, USA, Steering Committee Member, Women Cross DMZ
6. Akiko Minami, USA, University of California, Santa Cruz
7. Alana Price, USA, Editor of Truthout
8. Alexandra Suh, USA, Executive Director, Koreatown Immigrant Workers Alliance
9. Alice Slater, USA, Coordinating Committee Member, World Beyond War
10. Alice Walker, USA, Author and Activist
11. Alicia Garza, USA, National Domestic Workers Alliance and Black Lives Matter
12. Amina Mama, Nigeria/USA, Professor, University of California, Davis
13. Amira Ali, Ethiopia, Author and Activist
14. Ana Oliveira, USA, Philanthropist
15. Anasuya Sengupta, India/USA, Feminist author and activist, co-founder Whose Voices?
16. Angela Chung, USA, Attorney and Human Rights Activist
17. Angela Davis, USA, Professor, University of California, Santa Cruz
18. Angeline Dorzil, France, Student at the University of Paris
19. Ani DiFranco, USA, Singer, Songwriter, Poet, Multi-instrumentalist & Business-woman
20. Anjali Roy, USA, Women's Voices Women Speak
21. Annabel Park, USA, Filmmaker
22. Ann Frisch, USA, Professor Emerita University of Wisconsin Rotary Club of White Bear Lake, 5960
23. Anne Delaney, USA, Artist and Philanthropist
24. Anne Wheelock, USA, National Education Policy Center
25. Anuradha Mittal, USA, Executive Director, Oakland Institute
26. Ann Patterson, Northern Ireland, Peace People
27. Ann Wright, USA, Retired U.S. Army Colonel & Diplomat
28. Anne Beldo, Norway, Lawyer and Partner of Hegg & Co. Law Firm
29. Annette Groth, Germany, Member of Bundestag
30. Annie Isabel Fukushima, USA, Professor, University of Utah
31. Audrey McLaughlin, Canada, Former President, Socialist International Women
32. Barbara Milliken, USA, Board Member Venice Community Housing
33. Becky Rafter, USA, Executive Director, Georgia Women's Action for New Directions (WAND)
34. Betty Burkes, USA, Cambridge Insight Meditation Center
35. Betty Reardon, USA, Founding Director of the International Institute on Peace Education
36. Breana Butler, USA, National Board Member, Women's March

37. Bridget Burns, Co-Director, Women's Environment and Development Organization (WEDO)
38. Brinton Lykes, USA, Professor, Boston College
39. Caitlin Kee, USA, Attorney, Thomson-Reuters
40. Caitlin Stanton, USA, Urgent Action Fund for Women
41. Carrie Menkel-Meadow, USA, Chancellor's Professor of Law, University of California Irvine Law
42. Catherine Christie, Canada, United Church Canada
43. Catherine Hoffman, USA, Coordinator, Cambridge Restorative Justice Working Group
44. Catherine Killough, USA, Ploughshares Fund
45. Carter McKenzie, USA, Springfield-Eugene Chapter of Showing Up for Racial Justice
46. Charlotte Bunch, USA, Founder, Center for Global Women's Leadership, Rutgers University
47. Charlotte Wiktorsson, Sweden, Swedish Physicians Against War
48. Christine Ahn, USA, International Coordinator, Women Cross DMZ
49. Christine Chai, USA, Asian Women United
50. Christine Cordero, USA, Center for Story-based Strategy
51. Chung-Wha Hong, USA, Executive Director, Grassroots International
52. Cindy Wiesner, USA, Grassroots Global Justice Alliance National Coordinator
53. Clare Bayard, USA, Catalyst Project
54. Coleen Baik, USA, Twitter @Design Alumna
55. Cora Weiss, USA, UN Representative, International Peace Bureau
56. Corazon Valdez Fabros, Philippines, Co-Vice President, International Peace Bureau
57. Cynda Collins Arsenault, USA, Philanthropist
58. Cynthia Enloe, USA, Professor, Clark University
59. Darakshan Raja, USA, Executive Director, Washington Peace Center
60. Deann Borshay Liem, USA, Filmmaker
61. Devra Weber, USA, Professor, University of California
62. Don Mee Choi, USA, Poet & Translator, International Women's Network Against Militarism
63. Dorchen A. Leidholdt, USA, Attorney, Professor, Feminist
64. Dorothy Ogle, USA, National Council of Churches
65. Dorothy J. Solinger, USA, Professor Emerita, University of California, Irvine
66. Ekaterina Zagladina, Russia, Permanent Secretariat, Nobel Peace Summit
67. Elaine H. Kim, USA, Professor, University of California, Berkeley
68. Eleana J. Kim, Professor, Department of Anthropology, University of California, Irvine
69. Eleanor Blomstrom, Co-Director, Women's Environment and Development Organization (WEDO)

70. Ellen Carol DuBois, Professor, History and Gender Studies, University of California, Los Angeles
71. Ellen-Rae Cachola, USA, Women's Voices Women Speak
72. Ellen Friedman, USA, Executive Director, Compton Foundation
73. Elizabeth Colton, USA, Founding President, International Museum of Women
74. Elisabeth Porter, Australia, Professor, University of South Australia
75. Emilia Castro, Canada, Co-Representative of Intl. Com., Americas Region, World March of Women
76. Eunice How, USA, Asian Pacific American Labor Alliance, AFL-CIO, Seattle chapter
77. Eve Ensler, USA, Playwright
78. Eveline Shen, USA, Executive Director, Forward Together
79. Ewa Eriksson Fortier, Sweden, Humanitarian Aid Worker
80. Faye Leone, USA, Writer and Editor, International Institute for Sustainable Development
81. Fenna ten Berge, Netherlands, Director of Muslims for Progressive Values
82. Fiona Dove, Netherlands, Executive Director, Transnational Institute
83. Fragkiska Megaloudi, Greece, Journalist
84. Frances Kissling, USA, University of Pennsylvania; former President, Catholics for Choice
85. Francisca de Haan, Netherlands, Professor, Central European University
86. Gabriela Zapata Alvarez, Mexico, Consultative Group to Assist the Poor
87. Gay Dillingham, USA, Filmmaker, Former Advisor to Governor Bill Richardson
88. Gayle Wells, USA, Business owner
89. Glenda Paige, USA, Secretary, Governing Council, Center for Global Nonkilling
90. Gloria Steinem, USA, Writer and Activist, Presidential Medal of Freedom Awardee
91. Grace Cho, USA, Professor, College of Staten Island, City University of New York
92. Grace Kyungwon Hong, USA, Professor, University of California, Los Angeles
93. Gwen Kim, USA, Ohana Koa, Nuclear Free and Independent Hawaii
94. Gwyn Kirk, USA, Women for Genuine Security
95. Haeyoung Kim, USA, Graduate Student, University of Chicago
96. Haeyoung Yoon, USA, human rights lawyer
97. Heather Booth, USA, Organizer, Democracy Partners
98. Helen Caldicott, Australia, Founding President of Physicians for Social Responsibility
99. Helen Kim, USA Building Movement Project
100. Helena Wong, USA, U.S. National Organizer, World March of Women
101. Hope A. Cristobal, Guam, Former Senator
102. Hye-Jung Park, USA, Filmmaker, Community Media Activist
103. Hyaewool Choi, Australia, Professor, Australian National University
104. Hye Ran Kim-Cragg, Canada, Professor, St. Andrews College, Saskatoon

105. Hyun Lee, USA, Zoom In Korea
106. Hyunju Bae, Republic of Korea, Central and Executive Committee, World Council of Churches
107. Ingeborg Breines, Norway, Co-President, International Peace Bureau; former Director UNESCO
108. Isabella Sargsyan, Armenia, Helsinki Citizens' Assembly
109. Isabelle Geukens, Netherlands, Executive Director, Women Peacemakers Program
110. Jaana Rehnstrom, Finland, President, KOTA Alliance
111. Jackie Cabasso, USA, U.S. Mayors for Peace
112. Jacquelyn Wells, USA, Women Cross DMZs
113. Jacqui True, Australia, Professor, Monash University
114. Jane Chung-Do, Professor, University of Hawaii Manoa
115. Jane Jin Kaisen, Denmark, Artist and Filmmaker
116. Janis Alton, Canada, Co-Chair, Canadian Voice of Women for Peace
117. Jasmine Galace, Philippines, The Center for Peace Education, Miriam College
118. Jean Chung, Republic of Korea/USA, Founder, Action for One Korea
119. Jennifer Kwon-Dobbs, USA, Professor, St. Olaf College
120. Ji-yeon Yuh, USA, Associate Professor of History, Northwestern University
121. Joanne Yoon Fukumoto, USA, Trinity United Methodist Church
122. Joan Russow, Canada, Global Compliance Project
123. Jodie Evans, USA, Co-founder, Code Pink
124. Josephine Kahambu Mutangi, Democratic Republic of Congo, President, Women Department in The Conservationists On Call for Environmental Services
125. Joy Dunsheath, New Zealand, President, United Nations Association New Zealand
126. JT Takagi, USA, Filmmaker, Third World Newsreel
127. Judith LeBlanc, USA, Director, Native Organizers Alliance
128. Judy Hatcher, USA, Activist
129. Judy Rebick, Canada, Former President, National Action Committee on the Status of Women
130. Julie Burton, USA, President, Women's Media Center
131. Julie Johnson Staples, USA, Board Member, Peace Action Fund of New York
132. Julie Young, USA, Board Chair, Korean American Story
133. Justine Kwachu Kumche, Cameroon, Executive Director, Women in Alternative Action—WAA
134. Justine Masika, Democratic Republic of Congo, Synergie des Femmes pour les Victimes des Violences Sexuelles
135. Kate Dewes, New Zealand, Former Member of United Nations Secretary General's Advisory Board on Disarmament Matters; Co-Director of the Disarmament and Security Centre
136. Kate Hudson, United Kingdom, General Secretary, Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament

137. Kate Kroeger, USA, Executive Director, Urgent Action Fund for Women
138. Katherine King, USA, Professor, University of California, Los Angeles
139. Kathy Crandall Robinson, USA, Women in International Security
140. Kathy Kelly, USA, Voices for Creative Nonviolence
141. Kathy Yamashita, Canada, President of Alberta & Northwest Conference, United Church of Canada
142. Kavita Ramdas, USA, MADRE
143. Khin Ohmar, Burma/Myanmar, Coordinator, Burma Partnership
144. Kim Ku'ulei Birnie, Hawaii/USA, Women's Voices, Women Speak
145. Kim Phuc, Canada/Vietnam, UNESCO Goodwill Ambassador
146. Koohan Paik, USA, Journalist and Activist
147. Kosima Weber Liu, China, Executive Director, Environmental Education Media Project
148. Kozue Akibayashi, Japan, Intl. President, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom
149. Krassimira Daskalova, Bulgaria, Professor, University of Sofia
150. Krishanti Dharmaraj, USA, Executive Director, Center for Women's Global Leadership
151. Kristin Stoneking, USA, Executive Director, Fellowship of Reconciliation
152. Kyeong-Hee Choi, USA, Professor, University of Chicago
153. Kyung-Hee Ha, Japan, Assistant Professor, Meiji University
154. Laura Dawn, USA, filmmaker & Founder, ART NOT WAR
155. Laura Hein, USA, Professor, Northwestern University
156. Laura Pollecutt, South Africa, Peace Activist
157. Laura Shapiro, USA, Designer
158. Laurie Ross, New Zealand, The Peace Foundation of New Zealand Aotearoa, International Affairs and Disarmament Committee
159. Laurie Sackler, USA, Mother, Food & Water Activist
160. Lebbie Hopkins, Australia, Professor, Edith Cowan University
161. Leymah Gbowee, Liberia, 2011 Nobel Peace Laureate
162. Linda Burnham, USA, National Domestic Workers Alliance
163. Lindsey Asher, USA, Global Women's March
164. Lindsey German, United Kingdom, National Convener, Stop the War Coalition
165. Lisa Natividad, Guam, President, Guahan Coalition for Peace and Justice
166. Liz Bernstein, Canada, Executive Director, Nobel Women's Initiative
167. Liza Maza, Philippines, former Parliamentarian; Gabriella Network
168. Lois Wilson, Canada, Former Canadian Senator and Moderator, United Church of Canada
169. Lourdes Leon Guerrero, Guam, Fuetsan Famalao'an
170. Luisa Morgantini, Italy, Member, European Parliament
171. Lydia Alpizar, Mexico, Executive Director, AWID (Association of Women's Rights in Development)

172. Madeline Rees, United Kingdom, Secretary General, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom
173. Madelyn Hoffman, USA, Executive Director, New Jersey Peace Action
174. Maggie Martin, USA, Iraq Veterans Against the War
175. Mairead Maguire, Northern Ireland, 1976 Nobel Peace Laureate
176. Maja Vitas Majstorovic, Serbia, Gender Coordinator, Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict
177. Marevic Parcon, Philippines, Asia Regional Coordinator, Women's Global Network for Reproductive Rights
178. Margaret Gerhardt, USA, Graduate Student, University of Pennsylvania
179. Margaret Melkonian, USA, Long Island Alliance for Peaceful Alternatives
180. Margaret McMichael, USA
181. Margo Okazawa-Rey, USA, Professor Emerita, San Francisco State University
182. Marie Kennedy, USA, Professor Emerita, University of Massachusetts Boston
183. Marylia Kelley, USA, Executive Director, Tri-Valley CAREs (Communities Against a Radioactive Environment)
184. Marilyn Waring, New Zealand, Professor of Public Policy, Auckland University of Technology
185. Marta Benavides, El Salvador, Siglo XXIII
186. Mary C. Murphree, USA, Sociologist
187. Mary Scott, Canada, Institute for International Women's Rights – Manitoba
188. Mavic Cabrera-Balleza, Philippines, International Coordinator, Global Network of Women Peacebuilders
189. May Boeve, USA, 350.org
190. Maya Schenwar, USA, Truthout Editor
191. Medea Benjamin, USA, Co-founder, Code Pink
192. Meenakshi Gopinath, India, Women in Security, Conflict Management and Peace (WISCOMP)
193. Megan Amundson, USA, Executive Director, Women's Action for New Direction (WAND)
194. Megan Burke, USA, Former, Director, International Campaign to Ban Landmines Coalition
195. Melissa Giovale, USA, Founder and Board Member, Bell Garden Buddhist Center
196. Meredith Woo, USA, Open Society Foundations
197. Meri Joyce, Australia, Regional Coordinator, Global Partnership for Prevention of Armed Conflict
198. Mimi Han, Republic of Korea/USA, International Vice President, YWCA
199. Mimi Ho, USA, Co-Director, Movement Strategy Center
200. Mimi Kim, USA, Professor, Cal State University, Long Beach
201. Mina Watanabe, Japan, Secretary General, Women's Active Museum on War and Peace

202. Miranda Cahn, New Zealand, Head of Programme Development and Quality, Save the Children New Zealand
203. Musimbi Kanyoro, Kenya/USA, Executive Director of Global Fund for Women
204. Myung Ji Cho, USA, Methodist Minister Korean American National Coordinating Council Ohio
205. Nada Drobnjak, Montenegro, Member of Parliament
206. Nada Khader, USA, Executive Director, WESPAC Foundation
207. Nadia Hallgren, USA, Filmmaker
208. Namhee Lee, USA, Professor, University of California, Los Angeles
209. Nan Kim, USA, Professor, University of Wisconsin
210. Nancy Holmstrom, USA, Professor of Philosophy Emerita, Rutgers University
211. Nancy Ruth, Canada, Senator
212. Naomi Klein, Canada, Journalist and Activist
213. Nathalie Margie, USA, Urgent Action Fund
214. Navina Khanna, USA, Director, Heal Food Alliance Oakland
215. Na-young Ha, USA, Minister, Organizing Director, Hana Center Chicago
216. Netsai Mushonga, Zimbabwe, Commissioner, Zimbabwe Electoral Commission; African Women Active Nonviolence Initiative for Social Change
217. Nighat Said Khan, Pakistan, Executive Chair, DidiBahini
218. Nina Tsikhistavi-Khutsishvili, Georgia, Board Chair, International Center on Conflict and Negotiation
219. Noura Erakat, USA, Human Rights Attorney
220. Nunu Kidane, USA, Board Member, Priority Africa Network
221. Orysia Sushko, Ukraine, President, World Federation of Ukrainian Women's Organizations
222. Ouypourn Khuankaew, Thailand, Founder, International Women's Partnership for Peace and Justice
223. Pam McMichael, USA, Director of Highlander Research and Education Center
224. Pamela Brubaker, USA, Professor Emerita, California Lutheran University
225. Patricia Guerrero, Colombia, Human Rights Lawyer, League of Displaced Women
226. Patricia Thane, United Kingdom, Professor, Kings College
227. Paula Garb, USA, Co-Director, Center for Citizen Peacebuilding, University of California, Irvine
228. Penny Rosenwasser, USA, Founding Board Member, Jewish Voice for Peace
229. Phyllis Bennis, USA, Director, New Internationalism Project, Institute for Policy Studies
230. Radhika Balakrishnan, USA, Professor, Rutgers University
231. Rebecca Subar, USA, Adjunct Professor, Peace and Conflict Studies, West Chester University
232. Regina Munoz, Sweden, Peace Activist
233. Robina Marie Winbush, USA, Minister, Member of World Council of Churches Exec and Central Committee

234. Rose Othieno, Uganda, Executive Director, Center for Conflict Resolution
235. Sally Jones, USA, Chair, Peace Action Fund New York State
236. Saloni Singh, Nepal, Executive Chair, DidiBahini
237. Samantha Gunwardana, Australia, Monash University
238. Sandra Moran, Guatemala, Co-Representative of Intl. Committee, Americas Region, World March of Women
239. Sarah Lazare, USA, Editor, In These Times
240. Satoko Norimatsu, Canada, Director of Peace Philosophy Centre
241. Setsuko Thurlow, Canada, International Educator, Hibakusha/A-Bomb Survivor
242. Sharon Bhagwan Rolls, Fiji, Executive Producer, FemLINKpacific; Board Chair, Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict
243. Shirley Douglas, Canada, Actor and Activist
244. Simone Chun, USA, Journalist and Activist
245. Sophia Close, Australia, Australia National University, Canberra
246. Sophie Toupin, Canada, Women Peace and Security Network Canada
247. Sophie Kim, USA, University of Hawaii, Manoa
248. Soya Jung, USA, Writer and Activist
249. Sue Wareham OAM, Australia, Vice-President, Medical Association for Prevention of War
250. Sung-ok Lee, USA, Assistant General Secretary, United Methodist Women
251. Susan Cundiff, USA, Oregon Women's Action for New Directions (WAND)
252. Susan Smith, USA, Muslim Peace Fellowship
253. Su Yon Pak, USA, Professor, Union Theological Seminary
254. Suzuyo Takazato, Japan, Okinawa Women Act Against Military Violence
255. Suzy Kim, USA, Professor, Rutgers University
256. Taina Bien-Aime, USA, Executive Director, International Coalition Against Trafficking in Women
257. Tani Barlow, USA, Professor, Rice University
258. Tanya Selvaratnam, USA, Senior Producer, Art Not War
259. Terrilee Kekoolani, Ko Pae'Aina Hawai'i, Kanaka Maoli
260. Terry Greenblatt, Israel/USA, The Ploughshares Fund
261. Thu-huong Nguyen-vo, USA, University of California, Los Angeles
262. Tracy Lai, USA, National Secretary, Asian Pacific American Labor Alliance
263. Una Kim, USA, Researcher
264. Unzu Lee, USA, Presbyterian Minister, Women for Genuine Security
265. Valerie Plame, USA, Former Covert CIA Operations Officer
266. Vana Kim, USA, Spiritual Teacher
267. Visaka Dharmadasa, Sri Lanka, Founder, Association of War Affected Women
268. Wei Zhang, USA, Folk Art Researcher
269. Wendi Deetz, USA, Global Fund for Women
270. Winnie Wang, USA, Center for Global Nonkilling
271. Wonhee Anne Joh, USA, Professor of Theology, Garrett-Evangelical Theological Seminary

272. Yayoi Tsuchida, Japan, General Secretary, Japan Council Against Atomic and Hydrogen Bombs
 273. Yifat Susskind, USA, Executive Director, MADRE
 274. Yoonkyung Lee, Canada, Professor, University of Toronto
 275. Youngju Ryu, USA, Professor, University of Michigan
*** (Note: Organizations/Affiliations Listed Only for Identification Purposes)*

International Women's Organizations

Center for Women's Global Leadership, Rutgers University
 Church Women United CODE PINK Global Fund for Women
 Global Women's March International Women's Network
 Against Militarism MADRE Urgent Action Fund Women's
 Media Center Women's International League for Peace and Freedom

South Korean Women's and Peace Organizations

1. Women Making Peace
2. Korea Women's Association United
3. Korean Association of Women Theologians
4. The Council of Churches in Korea, Women's Committee
5. The Association of Major Superiors of Women Religious in Korea
6. The Righteous People for Korean Unification
7. The Gongju Women Human Rights Center
8. The World Council of Churches
9. The Christian Network for Peace and Unification
10. beyondit
11. Okedongmu Children in Korea
12. Women History Forum
13. Peace Mother
14. Kyunggi Women's Association United
15. Kyunggi Goyang-Paju Women Link
16. Kyunggi Women's Network
17. The Korean Council for the Women Drafted for Military Sexual Slavery by Japan
18. Korea Women's Political Solidarity
19. Korean Sharing Movement
20. People's Solidarity for Participatory Democracy
21. Iftopia
22. Ewha Women's Alumni Meeting for Democracy
23. Kyunggi Jinbo Women United
24. Kyunggi Council of Women
25. Chungchung-namdo Education Center for Equality
26. 21st Century Seoul Women's Union
27. Common Nourishing and Education
28. Ecumenical Youth Network

29. Women Ministers Association of Presbyterian Churches Korea
 30. Women Ministers' Association of Presbyterian Church in the Republic of Korea)
 31. Korea Association Methodist Women in Ministry
 32. Korea Methodist Women's Leadership Institute
 33. Korea Church Women United
 34. Duraebang
 35. Sunlit Sisters' Center
 36. United for Women's Rights Against U.S. Military Bases' Crime
 37. United Voice for the Eradication of Prostitution: Hansori
-

*Women Cross DMZ <https://www.womencrossdmz.org/>

The opinions expressed in articles are those of their authors and not necessarily the opinions of the *Amateur Computerist* newsletter. We welcome submissions from a spectrum of viewpoints.

ELECTRONIC EDITION

ACN Webpage: <http://www.ais.org/~jrh/acn/>

All issues of the *Amateur Computerist* are on-line.

All issues can be accessed from the Index at:

<http://www.ais.org/~jrh/acn/NewIndex.pdf>

EDITORIAL STAFF

Ronda Hauben

William Rohler

Norman O. Thompson

Michael Hauben (1973-2001)

Jay Hauben

The *Amateur Computerist* invites submissions.

Articles can be submitted via e-mail: jrh29@columbia.edu

Permission is given to reprint articles from this issue in a non profit publication provided credit is given, with name of author and source of article cited.