



I ssue B riefing

The Year 2015 or After: Transition of Wartime Operational Control, Self-esteem of the Republic of Korea, and Trust-building Process

September 30, 2013

Kyung-young Chung

The transition of wartime operation control (OPCON) from Combined Forces Command (CFC) to the Republic of Korea (ROK) Joint Chiefs of Staff (JCS) will be an epochal turning point for the evolution of the ROK-U.S. alliance. In early June 2013, the ROK government requested a review of the transition of wartime OPCON by December 1, 2015. The reasons for the ROK government proposal were the increased threat level caused by North Korea's third nuclear test, which was reinforced by long-range missile fire, the possibility of miscalculation, and the unpreparedness of the Republic of Korea military.

North Korea's third nuclear test and further development of long-range missiles have had a tremendous impact on the Park Geun-hye Administration's policy-making process regarding another delay in the OPCON transition due to changing threat perceptions. Assuming that the transition of wartime OPCON will be implemented on December 1, 2015, North Korea could miscalculate in waging a war if South Korea will not be fully prepared at that time. Therefore, the Park administration is sensitive to any potential terrible tragedy during her tenure as president in the event of another Korean war.

The role of national defense is to protect the sovereignty and territory of the state and defend the lives and property of its citizens. To retain the national self-esteem of the ROK is both noble and valuable, and if South Korea continues to delegate the leading role of defense of the ROK to the U.S., then the ROK's dependence is undesirable.

That the Park Geun-hye administration again requested the U.S. to take a leadership position in the defense of the ROK is not consistent with South Korea's status as the 15th-largest economic power in the world, its international prestige, and its enhanced sense of national security¹ as a result of the ROK-U.S. alliance and the South Korean people's strenuous efforts. The ROK should defend the country and be able to stand on its own for its national security. Another delay in the transition of wartime OPCON should not meet one of the commitments in the ROK-U.S. mutual agreement. How will the international community, as well as North Korea, perceive South Korea's lack of confidence in defending its country?

This paper will first provide a historical review of OPCON. It will then discuss the background of the Park Administration's request, and the factors for U.S. consideration. Next, it will address the reasons why the year 2015 was chosen for the transition of wartime OPCON. Finally, this paper will make policy recommendations.

East Asia Institute acknowledges the grant support from the MacArthur Foundation that made this research possible.

East Asia Institute
909 Sampoong B/D, Eulji-ro 158, Jung-gu,
Seoul 100-786, South Korea
Phone 82 2 2277 1683 Fax 82 2 2277 1697
Email eai@eai.or.kr Website www.eai.or.kr

All statements of fact and expressions of opinion contained in its publications are the sole responsibility of the author or authors. East Asia Institute takes no institutional position on policy issues and has no affiliation with the Korean government.



A Historical Review of Operational Control

North Korea launched a large-scale invasion along the 38th parallel on June 25, 1950. It took three days for the North Korean People's Army (KPA) to occupy Seoul. The U.S. Truman Administration took prompt and decisive action to participate in the Korean War. In early July 1950, Task Force Smith deployed to the Korean theater. On July 14, President Syngman Rhee sent an official letter to General Douglas MacArthur, commander of UN forces, which delegated the command authority of the Korean armed forces to the UNC for as long as the then-present state of North Korean hostility remained. The UNC could prevent communist expansionism through unity of command. However, after the armistice agreement, the operational control was supposed to revert back to the ROK government.

The South Korean government had to insure that the U.S. government could protect South Korea by signing the ROK-U.S. mutual defense treaty on Oct 1, 1953. Considering painful lessons learned during the Korean War, the South Korean government attempted to retract OPCON authority from the UNC. The U.S. reached an agreement with the ROK on the Agreed Minutes relating to continued cooperation in economic and military matters on November 17, 1954 which stated that as long the UNC continues to defend South Korea, the UNC will exercise operational control over ROK forces. Since the establishment of the CFC on November 7, 1978, operational control has shifted from the UNC to CFC. In particular, after the former Soviet Union dissolved in 1990, the U.S. developed the East Asia Security Initiative (EASI), which included changing the role of USFK and the Koreanization of South Korean defense. South Korean President Roh Tae-woo promised to transition operational control after considering the political requirements of the South Korean people after democratization.

Peacetime operational control shifted from the CFC to the ROK JCS on December 1, 1994. But after the first North Korean nuclear crisis, both governments could not implement a wartime operational control transition.

Changes in the international security environment in the 21st century accelerated the wartime oper-

ational control transition. After 9/11, in order to handle China's potential threat as well as international terrorism, the U.S. examined its oversea bases by conducting its Global Posture Review. The U.S. developed a policy and system in which the South Korean military leads and U.S. Forces provide support, which included the relocation of U.S. forces in Korea and USFK strategic flexibility. In addition, President Roh Moo-hyun requested a more mature and equal relationship with U.S. by seeking wartime operational control. In 2006, the two allies reached an agreement on the transition of wartime operational control by April 17, 2012. Due to North Korea's second nuclear test on May 25, 2009 and the sinking of the Cheonan on March 26, 2010, the ROK and U.S. governments reached an agreement on the postponement of the transition of wartime OPCON to December 1, 2015.

Background of the Park Administration Request and U.S Consideration Factors

It is estimated that the Park administration requested to review the wartime OPCON based on the following reasons. First, it wanted to reevaluate the security environments between the time when the allies agreed to the OPCON transition and the time after the North launched a long-range missile on December 12, 2012 and conducted a third nuclear test on February 12, 2013. Secondly, the administration was concerned about Korea's capability to respond to North Korea's nuclear and missile threats. Lastly, it wanted to review Korea's military capabilities to exercise wartime operational control.²

Proponents of another delay in the transition of wartime OPCON insist that it should be postponed until North Korean threats and the nuclear crisis disappear and peace settles upon the Korean peninsula. The insistence of this group implies that South Korea will never exercise the transition of wartime OPCON over to its own forces. North Korea will never abandon its nuclear arsenal since they continuously attempt to use nuclear devices for regime survival and ransom to drag down South Korea. Additionally, North Korea



attempts to employ nuclear devices as negotiation leverage with the U.S. North Korea also wants to prevent China's intervention and attempt to communize the Korean peninsula through nuclear war or the threat of nuclear war. This means that South Korea will never implement operational control over its own forces.

In the meantime, the U.S. has responded negatively by releasing remarks by key military personnel about the ROK government's review of the transition of wartime OPCON. In written testimony submitted by Gen. Martin Dempsey, chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, during his reconfirmation hearing at the U.S. Senate Armed Services Committee on July 18, 2013, Dempsey said, "I support transitioning wartime OPCON to Korea according to plan. From a military point of view, the timing of the transition is appropriate." In addition, General Curtis Scaparrotti, who has been nominated as the next commander of U.S. forces in Korea, met with Yonhap News reporters on July 30. Scaparrotti said, "I approve of plans to transition OPCON in 2015, I think it's a good plan. And I think we should move forward accordingly."³ Korean Defense Minister Kim Kwan-jin responded during a meeting with reporters after talks with U.S. Secretary of Defense Chuck Hagel on August 28, 2013, "It is not just a military issue, but something that requires in-depth discussions that should involve political, diplomatic and comprehensive considerations."⁴

It is expected that the U.S. may seriously consider South Korea's public opinion regarding the transition of wartime OPCON and its impact on national self-esteem, the level of trust in the alliance, USFK strategic flexibility, the rebalancing strategy to East Asia, and U.S. financial pressure as its defense budget faces a reduction of \$487 billion in the upcoming ten years. The U.S. military is already planning to go from about 570,000 soldiers to 490,000 by 2017. The current plan to reduce the size of the Marine Corps to 182,000 from 205,000 could also be changed.⁵ The substantial reduction of U.S. troops will have a serious impact on U.S. deployment to the Korean theater in the event of war on the peninsula. The re-postponement will have a bad impact on the U.S. strategically and financially.

In the meantime, the U.S., which assesses the ROK-U.S. alliance as the linchpin of peace and stability in the Asia-Pacific region, will still take the lead in defending the ROK regardless of its success with economic growth and political development. Does it make sense? If the U.S. again accepts the ROK's proposal, is it eventually helpful for the ROK to be considered as a reliable ally?

Reasons for the Year 2015 for the Transition of Wartime OPCON

1. The Rationale for the Transition of Wartime OPCON

Why should the Republic of Korea exercise wartime operational control over its forces? First, the transition of wartime operational control is a requirement in pushing for a unification strategy in wartime, as well as peacetime, on a national, strategic level. North Korea should also consider South Korea an equal counterpart with whom to negotiate military confidence-building measures and a peace regime on the peninsula, because South Korea retains its wartime operational control. In the event of war, if South Korea's forces take the lead in conducting military operations, South Korea will be able to play a leading role in accomplishing unification by making China less likely to intervene in the war on the peninsula – rather than if the U.S. takes the lead in conducting counter-offensive operations towards China along the international border.

Second, wartime operational control signifies that, by exercising autonomy in the employment of military power, South Korea is building a system that is able to manage North Korean threats and to take measures to retaliate against North Korean military provocations. North Korea would not dare to further provoke the South since it realizes that South Korea now has full authority over its forces in responding to any provocations. The ROK military's mission in preventing any further North Korea military provocations could make contributions that lead North Korea to establish a normal relationship with the South.



Third, wartime operational control implies military sovereignty should be exercised by South Korea. For example, when a driver drives a car, he is in charge and responsible for the safety and security of himself, as well as the passenger. The passenger, however, does not have any sense of responsibility in case of an emergency. This concept is applicable to the defense of South Korea. Hence, South Korea has the authority to defend and protect its own country.

Fourth, each sovereign state should exercise operational control over its own forces during both wartime and peacetime. During the Korean War, the delegation of operational control authority to the UNC was acceptable because of the national crisis; however, it has still remained under the leading role of the U.S., which is an unusual case. Wartime operational control should revert back to the ROK government, because it is a normal state with economic power, as well as international prestige regarding its forces.

Finally, the transition of wartime operational control to South Korea will not only support inter-Korean policies, but also be an opportunity to expand South Korea's diplomatic prospects by exercising extensive autonomy in activities with the international community.

2. The Constraints in Coping with North Korea's Military Provocations

The second reason for the transition of wartime control is to enable the ROK military to proactively cope with North Korea's military provocations. The U.S. has been sensitive to a potential escalation of war if South Korea retaliates massively and decisively against North Korea's military provocations. The U.S. believed it should contain South Korea's ability to retaliate by exercising operational control over its forces as a control tool. The combined command structure could then deter war on the peninsula. In this sense, South Korea could achieve successful economic development. However, consequently South Korean forces have become cowardly. North Korea has violated the armistice agreement with 2,953 incidents since it was signed.

Because of the armistice UNC rules of engagement and the duality of command structure between

peace and war time, the South Korean government and its forces could not respond in a timely manner against North Korean provocations and terrorism with more powerful weapon systems. The war environment on the Korean Peninsula is a unique situation that can progress at an alarming rate from peacetime to crisis and crisis to wartime. The armistice and its UNC rules of engagement dictate that South Korean forces should respond proportionally against North Korea provocations and in accordance with lethality of the weapon system employed by the KPA. In addition the chairman of the ROK JCS exercises operational control over ROK forces during peace time. However, if the crisis becomes worse, operational control over Korean forces should be shifted to the commander, CFC.

The complexity of the UNC rules of engagement dictated by the armistice and the combined command structure constrain ROK forces to be able to timely respond to North Korean provocation. This has led North Korea to perceive South Korean forces as a paper tiger. North Korea has continuously exploited the vulnerability of the command structure and rules of engagement. South Korea could not massively and promptly retaliate against North Korean hostilities, including the sinking of the Cheonan. Even though North Korea has trampled South Korean territory, including the Shelling of Yeonpyeong Island, the South Korean government and its forces have not been able to exercise self-defense rights against North Korean brutality. It is ironic and unacceptable that South Korean cannot defend its national sovereignty and territory, as well as protect its people. This is abnormal and unusual. South Korea should be able to exercise its right to self-defense.

These painful lessons from past incidents led the ROK-U.S. alliance to collectively cope with North Korea's local provocations. The ROK military has made strenuous efforts to effectively institutionalize military-readiness posture to prevent North Korea provocations by taking the initiative in employing the combined assets. On March 22, 2013, the signing of the ROK-US Combined Counter-Provocation Plan by General Chung Sung-jo, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and General James D. Thurman, commander



of USFK, had significant implications concerning the transition of wartime OPCON. The Combined Counter-Provocation Plan allows South Korean forces to exercise its self-defense right against any further North Korean provocations by prompt and decisive retaliation. It also allows USFK to jointly fight by deploying U.S. assets in Korea, and even U.S. assets from Japan and the continental United States in order to prevent further escalation. The concept of the Combined Counter-Provocation Plan could be applicable to a wartime setting where the ROK takes the lead and the U.S. supports it.

During a meeting with Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu on March 21, President Obama stated that all countries have independent rights when it comes to making decisions to carry out a military action - a significant message for South Korea. "I also appreciate the fact that the president has reaffirmed more than any other president Israel's right and duty to defend itself, by itself, for itself. That sums up our common view," Netanyahu said.⁶

Also, in early 2011, military operations were launched in Libya to eliminate a Kaddafi regime that had lost the responsibility to protect its own people. As a result, the UN Security Council passed a resolution to place military sanctions on the regime. The operations were led by NATO forces, along with the U.S. The U.S. delegated operational control authority to NATO member states, such as Italy, France and the U.K., because they better understood and were familiarized with the region, even though the U.S. provided much of the weapon systems and equipment. This exemplifies a cooperative strategy by the Obama Administration which respects the other party as an equal partner.

3. The U.S. Solid Commitment to Defend South Korea even after the Transition of Wartime OPCON

The argument that the transition of wartime operational control would cause the U.S.-ROK alliance to weaken, eventually leading to the withdrawal of USFK, is not appropriate. The ROK and U.S. governments agreed to the following four points in the event of the

transition of wartime OPCON. First, the ROK-U.S. Mutual Defense Treaty is still effective, even after the transition. Second, the strategic mechanisms between the two allies, including the Security Consultative Meeting and Military Committee Meeting, are also effective. Third, the U.S. will continue to provide bridging capabilities for vulnerable areas within ROK forces, even after the transition. Finally, the U.S. will deploy augmented forces to the Korean theater in the event of war.

The U.S. commitment to defend South Korea is solid and clear. The U.S. would not withdraw its troops from Korea, especially considering that the relocation of U.S. forces to Camp Humphrey, which is currently under construction, will be four times larger than the previous camp. In particular, the U.S. will continue to evaluate the Korean peninsula as a critical strategic point to contain Chinese influence in the region. The U.S. considers South Korea a power hub for coping with contingency situations in the Asia-Pacific region. U.S. forces in Korea have been partially re-deployed in the past to Thailand to conduct the Cobra Gold exercise, and also to the Philippines for the Balikatan exercise. That is why the U.S. government adopted an accompany-dependant policy recently from a non-command responsible assignment policy in Korea, which led U.S. soldiers' assignment to Korea to become psychologically more stable.

The primary reason for reviewing the time period for the transition of wartime OPCON requested by the South Korean government and its military forces is the nuclear and missile threats. North Korean strategic weapon systems, such as its nuclear arsenal and missiles, threaten the U.S., as well as South Korean national security, and are a challenge to its national survival. South Korean and U.S. forces should prepare against any nuclear war. This past spring, the U.S. demonstrated its ability to use extended deterrence through power projection by flying strategic bombers, including the B-52, B-2, F-22 and planes from the aircraft carrier *U.S.S. Nimitz*, over the peninsula in a move against future North Korea provocations and threats. The weapon systems flew from varied places such as U.S. bases in Japan, Guam, and even from the continental



U.S. The U.S. has exemplified its determination to cope with any contingency caused by nuclear and missile threats. In this sense, the U.S. retains a solid and powerful resolution.

South Korean forces also have made tremendous efforts to develop kill-chain systems and to develop a Korean missile defense system to deal with the North Korean missile threat. The South Korean military has already allocated in its defense budget to purchase weapon systems such as surveillance and reconnaissance and deep-strike assets.

4. To Implement a Trust-building Process and Seoul Process Requires the Transition of Wartime OPCON

As long as the Park administration does not have confidence in national security and will not exercise operational control over its forces, it might not be able to implement a trust-building process on the Korean peninsula and Northeast Asian peace and cooperation initiatives. The end goal of a trust-building process is to normalize the relationship between the two Koreas. The instable armistice structure could be shifted to a permanent peace structure. If South Korea will not exercise operational control over its forces, it will not be in a position to achieve arms control, as well as security and military confidence-building measures.

North Korea will attempt to directly negotiate with the U.S. without considering South Korea as the key party at the negotiation table. The Park Administration should take a closer look at North Korean behavior, which has always been to stick to bilateral negotiations with the U.S. - in particular over military and nuclear issues. Hence, the transition of wartime OPCON will be the most critical variable for the South Korean government to deal with the North.

In the meantime, to implement the Northeast Asia Peace and Cooperation Initiative, it is necessary for South Korea to take the lead in institutionalizing multi-lateral security cooperation for events such as natural disasters and atomic plant safety problems. The basic prerequisite for the Seoul process is for South Korea to exercise operational control over its own forces. This indicates that South Korea should

have also autonomy over its forces in order to be considered as a key and equal player in the region. Therefore, President Park should take the lead in regional security cooperation. Particularly, the Beijing-Seoul-Tokyo trilateral cooperation secretariat, which was established in 2011, will be a backbone of the Northeast Asia Peace Cooperation Initiative.

Policy Recommendations

1. The ROK-U.S. alliance should be a role model for world alliances in terms of successful industrialization, democratization, and eventual security autonomy.

The alliance's eventual objective is to help the weaker party to become self-reliant toward its own defense. The ROK-U.S. alliance is a great example of this concept, whereby the ROK has been able to advance greatly during its alliance with the U.S. Economic growth, political development, and security autonomy have risen dramatically due to the alliance. However, if the transition of wartime OPCON is not implemented, the two allies can no longer be considered a benchmark for third-world countries, because security autonomy has not yet been fully established.

2. Be Careful Not to Overestimate North Korean Forces and Do Not Underestimate South Korean Forces.

It is important to correctly assess North Korean forces. However, we don't need to overestimate North Korean forces. If we underestimate South Korean forces, it will have a severe impact on South Korean troop morale and a negative impact on South Korean war-fighting capabilities.

More than 40 years have passed since President Park Chung-hee launched a self-reliance defense policy in the early 1970s, which helped South Korea to pass North Korea in terms of economic power. The *2009 Military Balance* published by IISS indicates that South Korea's defense budget is \$22.5 billion, which is



five times larger than that of North Korea's \$4.38 billion. In particular, the KPA has severe shortages in oil, food and the essential components of weapon systems. The North's seaports, airports, and other infrastructure are in bad condition. Those factors have negatively impacted the war sustainability of the North. In the meantime, South Korean forces have continued to strengthen their war-fighting capability by purchasing sophisticated weapon systems. In particular, South Korea's overwhelming industrial capacity is superior to that of the North. In that context, South Korea can take the lead in defeating the KPA in the event of a war supported by the U.S.

South Korean forces have demonstrated their war and operational fighting capabilities in the past. During the Vietnam War, the commander of South Korean forces in Vietnam exercised operational control over his own forces and showed excellence in military operations. Also, South Korea deployed its Zaytun Division to the Iraq War. The stabilization operation conducted by the Zaytun Division was benchmarked by all the other coalition forces, including the U.S. In addition, South Korea's Naval Special Forces conducted a marvelous counter-piracy operation using highly-sophisticated weapon systems during *Operation Twilight Aden Bay* in January 2011. The South Korean JCS commanded and controlled the counter-piracy operation by employing GPS and satellites from Seoul. All these exemplify the war-fighting capability of South Korea done in close operation with the U.S. Also, since the sinking of the *Cheonan* and the shelling of Yeonpyeong Island, volunteer rates for the Marine Corps and Special Forces Command have doubled, which demand both physical and mental toughness. These imply the fact that South Korean forces should and will be able to take the lead in waging war by exercising their own operational control.

3. Strategies for Neutralizing North Korea's Nuclear Arsenal and the Redeployment of Tactical Nuclear Warheads to South Korea Should Be Developed and Implemented for Convincing the South Korean Government to Seriously Reconsider the Request to Postpone the Transition Again.

The primary reason for reviewing the timeline of the transition of wartime OPCON requested by the South Korean government and military forces is the nuclear and missile threat. North Korean strategic weapon systems, such as its nuclear arsenal and missiles, threaten the U.S. and South Korea's national security and challenge South Korea's national survival. South Korean and U.S. forces should prepare against nuclear war.

It is necessary for the U.S. to proactively re-deploy tactical warheads to the Korean peninsula. The U.S. Department of Defense is now reviewing the re-deployment of tactical nuclear warheads to the Asian-Pacific region. This option seems to be inconsistent with the Obama administration policy of a nuclear-free world.⁷ However, the re-entry of tactical nuclear devices into the Korean theater would serve to neutralize North Korean nuclear employment and to prevent a domino effect of nuclear proliferation in the region.

In particular, if the Obama administration makes a decision regarding the re-entry of tactical nuclear warheads to the Korean theater, it is intended to persuade the South Korean government to implement the transition of wartime OPCON as planned. The return of tactical warheads by the U.S., which seems to show the U.S. perceived South Korea's request as a preliminary action, would lead China to play a more active role in resolving the North Korean nuclear issue and also to help the South Korean people eliminate feelings of psychological instability.

If North Korea abandons its nuclear arsenal, then the U.S. government would withdraw tactical warheads from Korea to the U.S. These strategies and the re-entry of tactical warheads would enable South Korea to cope with the nuclear crisis of the North. In the meantime, South Korean forces can take the lead in protecting sovereignty, territory, and defending the lives and property of the Korean people by exercising wartime operational control.



The South Korean people are supposed to defend their nation. Even though Korea has been invaded more than a hundred times, their ancestors have protected the country through bloody battles. The South Korean people should protect their country against any external invasions. In addition, considering the size of South Korean forces, 3.8 million soldiers consisting of 600,000 active troops and 3.2 million mobilized personnel, and approximately 200,000 U.S. forces which could be deployed to the Korean peninsula theater in the event of war with 28,500 soldiers present in Korea, it does not make sense for South Korean forces to follow U.S. troops in the event of war. In particular, if South Korean forces take the lead in waging a war against the North, it seems less likely that China will intervene in another Korean war. Moreover, it should be noted that the objectives of war between two allies are not consistent. This was observed during the Korean War when the U.S. attempted to terminate the war through armistice negotiation, whereas the South Korean government attempted to continuously conduct military operations by withdrawing the operational control authority from the UNC.

4. The Defense Budget Should Be Increased to Reinforce the Essential Combat Assets for South Korea's War-fighting Capability.

It is inevitable for South Korea to purchase C4I surveillance and reconnaissance assets, such as the Global Hawk system. South Korea should develop 800-km range ballistic missiles, which cover the entire area of North Korea, in order to improve the striking capability of South Korean forces. The South Korean government should allocate a greater share of funds to the defense budget in order to reinforce military operational capability. Unlike the Roh Moo-hyun Administration, which retained a 7.8% average annual defense budget increase, the Lee Myung-bak Administration only allocated a 6.4% average annual defense budget increase. President Park Geun-hye's promise to increase the annual defense budget, which supersedes the increase of the annual financial budget, should be implemented.

5. Mid- and Long-term Strategies for National Security and Sustainable Economic Growth Should Be Developed.

The South Korean government should consider the defense industry, as well as defense-burden sharing, to form linkages between security and the economy. The South Korean government negotiates with the U.S. about the extent of its defense-burden sharing, which is currently about 42 percent of the U.S. troops present cost. The U.S. side has requested an increase to more than 1 trillion won from the current 869.5 billion won defense-burden sharing. Considering USFK strategic flexibility, does it make sense to pay the U.S.-requested additional cost?

In addition, if the U.S. continues to exercise war-time operational control over ROK forces, then dependency will grow deeper through the purchase of more U.S.-made weapon systems. Also, South Korea's defense industry will not be able to develop. Besides, military-industry joint investment will be limited. As a result, a linkage strategy between security and the economy should be developed. This also means that South Korea should consider developing a national strategy from a mid and long-term perspective, and not necessarily continue to rely heavily on the U.S. To achieve self-sufficient defense and develop a defense industry, South Korea will enhance national interests by stimulating sustainable economic growth. These strategies should be pursued by the Park Administration.

6. Preparation for the Transition of Wartime OPCON Should be Initiated by the President.

The President, as commander-in-chief of ROK forces, should be in charge of the preparation of the transition of wartime OPCON issue. This issue is not a purely military issue, but a national security issue. Thus, the president should take full responsibility. As President Park Chung-hee strongly pursued a self-reliant defense during his leadership, President Park Geun-hye should initiate a quarterly 'Transition of Wartime Operation Control Status Conference' until December 1, 2015.



President Park should take appropriate actions with related ministries to implement the transition of wartime OPCON and coordinate with the National Assembly and South Korean citizens to mentally prepare for the transition. The year 2015 will be a historical year for South Korean national security and national self-esteem. It will proactively enable South Korea to successfully implement the Northeast Asia Peace and Cooperation Initiatives, as well as the trust-building process on the Korean peninsula. Furthermore, the ROK-U.S. alliance would then serve as a global role model for other alliances to imitate due to the strength of its security autonomy, as well as the successful industrialization and democratization that accompanied it. The ROK-U.S. alliance will play a crucial role in demonstrating a global partnership to achieve international security missions for peace, human rights, and development and making great contributions to civilization. ■

Acknowledgement

The author appreciates Chaesung Chun and Young-ho Kim for helpful comments.

——— *Kyung-young Chung* is the director of the Institute of International Strategy on East Asia, and taught national security courses at the Korea National Defense University and the Catholic University of Korea.

Notes

¹ In particular, the South Korean people reinforced their self-reliant defense posture after the sinking of the Cheonan and the shelling of Yeonpyong-Island. The significant, substantial change of the Korean people related to their perception of national security was exemplified in a Gallup public opinion poll. The poll reported that 47.7 % of the public listed a self-reliant posture support-

ed by the ROK military war-fighting capability as the most critical requirement for everlasting peace on the Korean peninsula, more than any other factor. Chosun Ilbo, Jan 9, 2013.

² “Allies to hold further talks on wartime control transition delay: Minister Kim says Korea, U.S. need more technical consultations,” *The Korea Herald*, August 28, 2013.

³ “Allies face tough talks over wartime control transition: U.S. top brass support December 2015 plan; Seoul hopes for delay,” *The Korea Herald*, July 31, 2013.

⁴ “Allies to hold further talks on wartime control transition delay: Minister Kim says Korea, U.S. need more technical consultations,” *The Korea Herald*, August 28, 2013.

⁵ “Military paints dire picture from budget cuts,” August 1, 2013. <<http://news.yahoo.com/military-paints-dire-picture-budget-cuts-150735607.html>>

⁶ “Obama and Netanyahu Make Peace during President’s First Israel Visit,” *The Daily Beast*, March 20, 2013, <<http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2013/03/20/obama-and-netanyahu-make-peace-during-president-s-first-israel-visit.html>>

⁷ Amy F. Woolf, “Nonstrategic Nuclear Weapons,” December 19, 2012, Congressional Research Service.

