

## **An Analysis of Strategic Effects of the ROK-U.S. Alliance and Relocation of the USFK: Implementation and Prospects**

Yun Yeong-mi & Park Ki-cheol\*

*Pyeongtaek University, Pyeongtaek, Republic of Korea*

This study is to evaluate the main role of the USFK, the process and the progress of negotiations between South Korea and the United States regarding the USFK's relocation and the major challenges encountered. Also, in this study the possibilities and roles of central and local cooperative development are reviewed, focusing on the major roles of the USFK and the negotiations on its relocation to Pyeongtaek. National security and the USFK relocation policies are no longer exclusive propositions for the central government. To readjust the strategic ROK-U.S. alliance and ensure smooth the USFK relocation to Pyeongtaek, the opinions of the local residents have to be taken into consideration. Apparently, the USFK relocation directly involves changes and readjustment of the ROK-U.S. alliance and the U.S. military power at the national level, and it is considered as an issue closely connected with the development of the local community in Pyeongtaek. It is expected that ultimately this study should contribute to the review of the Cooperative Governance between the central and local governments or civilian and military cooperation according to changes in the roles of the USFK relocation.

**Keywords:** strategic ROK-U.S. alliance, USFK relocation, national security, civilian and military cooperation, cooperative governance

### **Introduction**

The Republic of Korea-United States (ROK-U.S.) alliance during the post-Cold War era has been aiming to build a strategic alliance, rather than an ideological one, in order to serve the interests of both countries. This aim to achieve a strategic cooperation also brings into consideration several factors, including the prevention of war on the Korean peninsula, deterrence of North Korean provocations as well as the changes occurring in the security environment, the political and economic development in the Northeast Asian region and the democratization of South Korea. A strategic alliance between South Korea and the United States also indicates cooperation by both countries to address global and regional conflicts, maintain harmonious relations and maximize the interests of the allies. By helping in the resolution of North Korea's

---

\*E-mail: [yyun@ptu.ac.kr](mailto:yyun@ptu.ac.kr) & [basis63@hotmail.com](mailto:basis63@hotmail.com)

nuclear issue for world peace while equally protecting the interests of South Korea and the United States the strategic alliance also helped support the objective to unify South Korea and North Korea and to maintain the peace on the Korean peninsula. The Global Defense Posture Review (GPR), which was conducted by the United States after the terrorist attacks in 2001, also held the ROK-U.S. alliance in a favorable light in evaluating and defining its defense strategies and military postures. The GPR resulted from an idea that overseas deployment of the U.S. Armed Forces within the framework of the Cold War dynamics makes it difficult to address new types of security threats, such as terrorism and regional conflicts, in an efficient manner.<sup>1</sup>

At present the ROK-U.S. alliance is being transformed into a strategic alliance, while at the same time, a new security agenda is being expanded on a global level. The security agenda includes Peacekeeping Operations (PKO) in international conflict zones, promoting cooperation for counter-terrorism, with regional security policies with focus on current national and military issues, as well as highlighting the importance of 'comprehensive security' to promote national interests.<sup>2</sup> This also emphasizes an issue regarding non-traditional security issues or low politics, aside from other military issues being encountered. South Korea and the United States also strive to maintain and develop the alliance through the relocation plans for the United States Forces in Korea (USFK), by transitioning wartime operational control and by addressing the USFK reduction issues. Adjustments to the command structures under the alliance, such as transferring wartime operational control, remain under discussion as part of a plan to improve equality in the ROK-U.S. alliance.<sup>3</sup>

In this context, this study is to evaluate the main role of the USFK, the process and the progress of negotiations between South Korea and the United States regarding the USFK's relocation and the major challenges encountered. Policies covering security, the military, and the relocation of the USFK can no longer be considered as the exclusive responsibility of the central government. The relocation of the USFK involves the readjustment of military power by the United States, which is an issue that is directly associated with the changes and readjustments seen in the ROK-U.S. alliance as well as in the development of the community where the U.S. military troops are stationed.

A number of relevant studies have already been conducted on the USFK relocation. However, it remains necessary to investigate the effect of the USFK relocation policy on the ROK-U.S. alliance and national security at the local level. The relocation of the USFK is part of a national security agenda that can be considered as a contributing factor to the development of the local government as this involves the return of land and facilities occupied by the USFK. This study is also to deduce future development plans by assessing the major issues and problems based on a survey of local residents on their awareness regarding the USFK relocation and the need to deploy the U.S. military forces in South Korea. Determining the sources of conflicts and the elements of the agenda will serve as an important factor for the successful implementation of the relocation policy as well as for the strategic development of the ROK-U.S. alliance in the short term. A discriminant analysis of the policy compliance of local residents will be undertaken based on the results of a questionnaire survey conducted on local residents of Pyeongtaek after the implementation of the Special Act for Support of Pyeongtaek. In addition to Pyeongtaek residents, the questionnaire survey also includes residents of Gyeonggi Province and other areas where U.S. military forces are stationed.

## **Enhancement of the ROK-U.S. Alliance and Process on the Relocation of the USFK**

Alliance, as defined by Stephen Walt, refers to “a formal or informal arrangement for security cooperation between two or more sovereign states.”<sup>4</sup> J. R. Friedman also defined alliance as a “mutual interest on the expansion or maintenance of the status quo toward the territory, population, strategic support, risk of war, consideration of military intervention and presence of one or more actual or potential hostile countries.”<sup>5</sup> Alliance can also be described as a treaty between two or more countries to provide military support against common enemies. It is also necessary to mutually protect and sustain respective national interests as well as cope with the changes in the security environment and strategic contexts to achieve a successful and effective alliance. Accordingly, it can be safely stated that forming alliances and maximization of military power is an important factor in a country’s survival and in the maximization of national interests.<sup>6</sup>

The origin of alliance results from efforts to develop abilities necessary to resist threats from common enemies, thereby contributing to increased security. Once an alliance is formed, constraints to one’s freedom to act and dependence on the alliance offset the shared security interests and joint ownership of material and human resources between or among participating countries. In general, two types of alliances can also be identified, including symmetric alliances and asymmetric alliances. The symmetric alliance refers to the alliance between countries with similar strengths while asymmetric alliance refers to a partnership where the difference in gains and losses for participating countries are uneven and the obligations and expectations are asymmetric.<sup>7</sup> Since alliances are political in nature and face constant changes, an alliance is inevitably readjusted depending on the changes in the political power of participating countries. Several factors determine the cohesiveness of an alliance, including the efficiency, political and social support of the allies’ citizens, institutionalization of security and military cooperation, mutual recognition of national interests as well as political values and shared threat perceptions.<sup>8</sup>

The ROK-U.S. alliance, which has been formed under the Mutual Defense Treaty signed by South Korea and the United States on October 1, 1953, can be characterized as a bilateral and asymmetric alliance as well as a military one. This form of alliance differs from the multilateral and asymmetric alliances formed in some countries. According to the historical background of the alliance, the ROK-U.S. alliance has been based on Article 2 of the ROK-U.S. Mutual Defense Treaty, which also provides a basis for political consultations. The combined defense forces of the two countries resulting from the ROK-U.S. alliance have contributed to deterrence and maintenance of peace on the Korean peninsula for half a century. The combined defense system has also supported South Korea to develop and promote liberal democracy and capitalism in a secure and stable environment.

Based on this perspective, the reduction of the USFK stationed in the country is determined to be one of the important issues related to the readjustment of the ROK-U.S. alliance in the post-Cold War era. After the Korean War, the number of troops in the USFK reached hundreds of thousands. However, it has been gradually decreased since the 1970s and maintained at around 35,000 to 37,000 deployed soldiers. Details of the relocation plan and the reduction of troops in the USFK have been drawn up based on the GPR conducted after the 9/11 terrorist attacks in 2001.

In line with the GPR, the USFK reduction efforts have been developed that include the relocation of the U.S. ground forces deployed near the border to bases on the civilian front, such as Pyeongtaek and Osan. On June 24, 2004, the United States also recommended that the deployed troops in the USFK be reduced to 12,500 by 2005.<sup>9</sup>

South Korea has conducted negotiations with the U.S. government on the schedule for the reduction and the scale of adjustment for the USFK in consideration of several important factors, including the nuclear threat from South Korea, the building up of South Korean military power, national security issues as well as the symbolism of the USFK deployment. A three-step reduction plan has been formulated resulting from these negotiations and focusing on the 2nd Infantry Division of the United States by the end of 2008. The plan to reduce the USFK to 12,500 has been scrapped as a result of the transfer of wartime operational control and due to the security situation on the Korean peninsula in April 2008. The two countries also agreed to maintain 28,500 soldiers in the USFK.<sup>10</sup>

The key effects of the deployment of the U.S. military forces in South Korean society and the military can be determined as follows: First of all, the USFK has significantly contributed to the development of a social safety net as well as to the nation's economic development by reassuring foreign investors and reducing costs related to security and defense. The Korean military relies heavily on the USFK in several areas. Cooperation with the USFK is considered to be important since South Korea incurs substantial costs to equip itself or enable itself to participate in a war or independently defend itself against external threats. South Korea's military intelligence division is identified to be the sector that has the highest dependence on the USFK in terms of national security and defense. The USFK provides the Korean military with significant strategic and tactical information, which is important in enhancing the latter's military intelligence capabilities. As an example, the Korean military relies on the USFK for North Korea's signal intelligence (SIGNIT) and on the use of imagery intelligence (IMINT). Secondly, the U.S. forces deployed in Korea also serve as a tripwire against a potential invasion by North Korea. Substantial defense costs will be incurred to develop military intelligence capabilities as well as initial response capabilities in the event of surprise attacks from North Korea. Economic implications are also seen in relation to the deployment of the U.S. troops in Korea, including the creation of new jobs and economic impact on the communities where the U.S. troops are stationed. The deployment of the U.S. troops also gives other countries and foreign investors the impression that South Korea is a stable country. Thirdly, it allows South Korea to counterbalance the military intervention from major powers, such as China, Japan, and Russia, during or after the unification process. This also contributes to securing national interests of the two countries, providing a deterrence to the arms race, and maintaining the balance of power in Northeast Asia. From this perspective, dramatic change in South Korea or withdrawal of the USFK might likely result in an intensive arms race in Northeast Asia, which could lead to regional instability.

Barry Buzan pointed out that "The state provides a certain degree of security to individuals, but its price appears in the form of raised threat." This statement implies that a threat factor to security is strong enough to affect the individual security and that conflicts between personal security and national security are inevitable.<sup>11</sup> The dilemma between personal security and national security is duly observed in the

relocation of the USFK. The results of the questionnaire survey conducted in 2001 on local residents in Dongducheon, Paju, Uijeongbu, and Pyeongtaek where the U.S. troops are stationed demonstrated the dilemma that local residents are facing with regard to the relocation of the USFK.<sup>12</sup>

The primary reason for relocating the USFK to Pyeongtaek has been the readjustment of the U.S. military bases stationed in South Korea, including those located in the areas of Dongducheon and Uijeongbu. The relocation plan mainly involves the transfer of the 2nd Infantry Division in the two areas mentioned based on the Land Partnership Plan (LPP) as well as the Yongsan Relocation Plan (YRP). The relocation of the USFK has gradually progressed after prolonged negotiations between the two countries. The adjustments being discussed in terms of the responsibility and authority of South Korea's United Nations Command (UNC) and the relocation of the USFK to Pyeongtaek are being undertaken in line with America's GPR. This also indicates adjusting the scale of the USFK and transitioning its military forces from being fixed troops into mobile troops in an effort to contribute to deterrence on the Korean peninsula and to allow it to quickly intervene in the war zone as needed.

### **Negotiations and Utilization of the Relocation of the USFK**

The negotiations on the relocation of the USFK between South Korea and the United States have been undertaken in the context of the following background.<sup>13</sup> First of all, there was a demand for the consolidation of all the U.S. military bases scattered across Korea. Large-scale military garrison and training facilities were located primarily in the Seoul Metropolitan Area and the border, raising public concerns. This, in turn, brought out the need for a decentralized movement of the U.S. military bases. Plans to relocate the U.S. military bases have also been evaluated to address civil complaints and to allow for the efficient management and operation of the U.S. forces with the return of land grants and consolidation of the U.S. military bases and training facilities scattered across the country.

Secondly, changes in the awareness of the U.S. military presence and the need for conflict resolution in the areas where the U.S. forces are deployed have also been noted. Growing anti-American sentiment triggered by the deaths of the schoolgirls in 2002 was one of the internal changes noted in South Korea. In view of the internal changes in terms of awareness of the U.S. presence and the changes in the U.S. global strategy, the U.S. government also accepted the requirements outlined by the South Korean government in order to maintain and strengthen the ROK-U.S. military alliance as well as to secure a stable environment for the deployed U.S. troops.

Thirdly, the efficient reorganization of the U.S. military bases has been called for due to democratization and economic development of South Korea. This is to help lower the public's resistance to the U.S. presence in the Seoul downtown area as a result of rapid urbanization and as a way to restore national pride. In addition, the U.S. soldiers have started to avoid being deployed in South Korea due to the lack and deterioration of facilities in the U.S. military bases in the country. To resolve these issues, South Korea and the U.S. government started discussions on the USFK relocation plans based on mutual understanding and cooperation to achieve efficient deployment of the U.S. military bases in the country (See Table 1).<sup>14</sup>

Table 1. Background to the USFK Relocation

Main Issues
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To ensure stable stationing environment of the USFK through the consolidation of U.S. military bases</li> <li>• To promote balanced development of the country through efficient utilization and development of the land returned from the U.S. armed forces stationed in Korea</li> <li>• To strengthen national security and build a future-oriented security alliance through readjustment and enhancement of the ROK-U.S. alliance</li> <li>• To inspire national pride through liquidation of foreign military bases in downtown Seoul</li> </ul>

The LPP has been developed in November 2001 by the Korean minister of National Defense and the the U.S. Secretaries of Defense, respectively, in an effort to consolidate the U.S. military bases located across the country. The LPP has obtained congressional approval in October 2002 and subsequently, the U.S. government announced in April 2003 that the U.S. troops deployed to the north of the Han River would be transferred to the south of the river. The announcement was made at the 1st Future of the ROK-U.S. Alliance (FOTA) meeting, which signaled the start of the official discussions on the realignment of the U.S. military bases in Korea. The discussions particularly include the relocation of the 2nd Infantry Division of the U.S. Army as well as the Yongsan U.S. military base. By May 2003, the two countries had agreed on an earlier relocation of the U.S. military base in Yongsan and to redeploy the 2nd Infantry Division after careful examination of the South Korean situation during the ROK-U.S. summit talks.

South Korea and the United States then entered into an Umbrella Agreement (UA) and an Implementation Agreement (IA) in July 2003 to replace the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) and the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) signed in 1990 as the legal basis for transferring the U.S. military bases during the 10th FOTA meeting (See Table 2). The UA particularly pertains to the transfer of the facilities and the U.S. troops deployed at the Yongsan military base to Pyeongtaek by the end of December 2008. Moreover, the two countries agreed to redeploy the 2nd Infantry

Table 2. Yongsan Garrison Relocation Agreement (UA/IA)

Conclusions from the UA on the principles, sites and costs related to relocation of Yongsan Garrison and congressional ratification (December 9, 2004)

- Transfer of nine U.S. military bases in downtown Seoul to Pyeongtaek
- Donation of facilities and land of more than 1.7 million m<sup>2</sup> (420 acres) for relocation to Pyeongtaek
- Provision of sites [more than 82,000 m<sup>2</sup> (20 acres)] for the residual forces of Yongsan Garrison and protective duties
- Implementation of joint investigation of environmental contamination and the remediation process
- Costs related to construction, design and planning of the facilities shall be borne by the requestor of relocation
- C4I equipment not available is replaced with substitute equipment within the budget of US\$9 million

Division in two phases. In the first phase, consolidation of the existing main bases in Dongducheon and Uijeongbu would be undertaken until 2006, focusing on the U.S. military bases in the north of the Han River. The second phase involved the relocation of the main force unit to the south of the Han River. Moreover, the two countries also agreed that construction of facilities and donation of the land for the redeployment of the USFK would be made available until 2008.

South Korea and the United States also signed an agreement in July 2004 for the relocation of the Yongsan Garrison during the 11th FOTA meeting. The purchase of the land to be used in Pyeongtaek and the process for the relocation of the U.S. military base had been undertaken at a later period. The special legislation of support for the areas where the U.S. forces were deployed had been drafted and submitted to the 17th National Assembly. In addition, new organizations had been established in Pyeongtaek, Gyeonggi Province, and the efforts of the central government pushed forward the detailed plans for the relocation. The two countries were able to reach a final agreement on the relocation of the Yongsan Garrison on October 2004 in the 10th and 11th FOTA meetings after over 10 years of delays and discussions. The development plan for the Pyeongtaek relocation site, which requires an investment of around 18 trillion won (US\$17 billion) been finalized with the enactment of a special law on support for Pyeongtaek in December 2004. The construction of the U.S. military base in Pyeongtaek had started in November 2007. However, the move to relocate the USFK to Pyeongtaek was changed in early February 2011. Under the revised plan, the relocation of the Yongsan military base will be conducted in 2015 while the redeployment of the 2nd Infantry Division is scheduled to be completed in the first half of 2016.

In principle, the one requiring the relocation should be responsible for the relocation costs for the USFK. During the negotiations for the relocation in March 2003, the two countries agreed that the cost for relocating the Yongsan Garrison should be borne by South Korea while deployment costs for the 2nd Infantry Division will be handled by the United States. This agreement was in accordance with the principle of “cost has been borne by cause providers” as stipulated in the LPP and the YRP, which were approved by the National Assembly in December 2004. For the relocation to the Pyeongtaek military base, a cost estimate was developed based on the basic design requirements presented by the United States according to the Master Plan (MP). South Korea announced the final cost for the relocation project amounting to 8.894 trillion won (US\$8.1 billion), which represented 60 percent as compared to the 5.341 trillion won (US\$5.1 billion) estimated for construction and land acquisition costs in December 2004. The reason for the increased budget is that the project support costs, such as interest expense and costs for residents’ compensation, had been included. These costs were excluded when the initial cost estimates were made.

Table 3. The Cost for the USFK Relocation to Pyeongtaek (2011)

	2011	2004
Construction cost	5.341 trillion won (US\$5.1 billion)	4.447 trillion won (US\$4.1 billion)
Business support cost	3.86 trillion won (US\$3.5 billion)	–
Total project cost	8.894 trillion won (US\$8.1 billion)	–

The additional costs included in the higher budget are as follows:

- a) Construction costs – The construction costs included are 13 percent higher, increasing from 4.447 trillion won (US\$4.1 billion) in 2004 to 5.341 trillion won (US\$5.1 billion). The increased construction cost included costs due to inflation amounting to 587.1 billion won (US\$536 million) and accounting for less than 3 percent. Reserve funds were also reflected in the increased construction costs.
- b) Business support costs – The costs for business support surged gradually as several costs related to the relocation of the U.S. military base and the compensation for local residents had been increased after the enactment of the special act of support for Pyeongtaek city in 2006.<sup>15</sup>

The business support costs for the relocation of the Yongsan Garrison to be shouldered by South Korea can be itemized as follows:

- a) Support costs for Pyeongtaek city – The costs amount to 1.1 trillion won (US\$1 billion).
- b) Cost of environmental remediation projects – This cost item amounts to 300 billion won (US\$273 million).
- c) Costs of facility demolition – This cost item amounts to 250 billion won (US\$228 million).
- d) Cost of relocation complex composition – This cost item amounts to 100 billion won (US\$91 million).
- e) Moving expenses – This cost item amounts to 100 billion won (US\$91 million).
- f) Financial/administrative costs – This cost item amounts to over 890 billion won (US\$813 million).

The total business support costs including the cost items above amounted to 3.86 trillion won (US\$3.5 billion) or 1.6531 trillion won (US\$1.5 billion) of which had already been allocated (See Table 3). The total business support costs also included an increase of 600 billion won (US\$548 million) due to an interest of 490 billion won (US\$447 million) from loans to finance business support activities.<sup>16</sup>

In accordance with the negotiations for the revision of the LPP and the relocation of the Yongsan Garrison completed in the 10th FOTA meeting on July 23, 2004, the area for the U.S. military bases amounting to 243 million m<sup>2</sup> (60,041 acres) had been reduced by one-third to 76 million m<sup>2</sup> (18,943 acres). The agreed reduction also led to reduction in land grants to the USFK by 66 percent and lowered the number of U.S. armed forces stationed in Korea to only 47,000. It was also determined that the operational structure for the USFK bases would be comprised of two hubs in Osan/Pyeongtaek and Daegu/Busan districts, respectively, and three bases at the Yongsan base. The residual core facilities and the training center will be situated to the north of the Han River and in the Osan air base. The union training center was established north of the Han River due to the U.S. troops stationed on the Han River, and some troops from the 2nd Infantry Division had also been deployed alternately in Pyeongtaek. In line with the GPR formulated by the United States, the bases located in the Osan/Pyeongtaek areas will serve as the Main Operating Bases (MOB)<sup>17</sup> for the U.S. troops deployed under the ROK-U.S. alliance. These may also serve as permanent bases while performing independent military missions and promoting security cooperation with other countries.

The relocation of the USFK to Pyeongtaek is significant since the results and the



process are based on the mutual trust between the two countries. In addition, a stable foundation to push forward the projects had been set up by MP. The military bases found in the Pyeongtaek area had been established by Japan during World War II. These have been used as U.S. military bases for more than half a century after the liberation. At present, there are two U.S. military bases operating in Pyeongtaek, including a K-55 airbase (Songtan) and a K-6 army base<sup>18</sup> in Camp Humphreys in Paengseong. The headquarters for the 7th Air Force is located at the K-55 military base. This site plays a pivotal role in the U.S. Air Force and serves as an “immigration office” for the U.S. forces and their families. In the near future, it is expected that the USFK headquarters, the United Nations Command (UNC) and the Combined Forces Command (CFC) will be stationed in Pyeongtaek. Tens of thousands of U.S. troops, along with their families, as well as army officials with U.S. citizenship are expected to reside in the area once the Yongsan Garrison is relocated and the 2nd Infantry Division is redeployed in Pyeongtaek.<sup>19</sup>

In January 2006, the ownership of the land in the relocation site had been transferred to the Ministry of National Defense, and works to prepare the site for facility construction, such as land surveys and geotechnical investigation, were conducted. In the same year, the South Korean government also drew up the MP and conducted a cultural heritage indicator survey and an environmental impact assessment on the relocation site. Work on the foundation had also been undertaken starting 2007.<sup>20</sup> According to the relocation plan finalized by end of 2004, a total of 3,490,000 m<sup>2</sup> (862 acres) will be added for the K-55 base, which allocated 640,000 m<sup>2</sup> (158 acres) for the Osan air base, and for the K-6 or Camp Humphreys, which as a total of 2,850,000 m<sup>2</sup> (704 acres) at its Pyeongtaek base. The scale of the U.S. military bases when the relocation is completed after 2015 is expected to reach a total of 4,430,000 m<sup>2</sup> (1,905 acres) which will be composed of the existing K-6 base with 1,510,000 m<sup>2</sup> (373 acres) and new site with 2,920,000 m<sup>2</sup> (722 acres). As for the USFK base in Pyeongtaek, 86 percent thereof is expected to be occupied by the 2nd Infantry Division and the Yongsan U.S. military base will use the remaining space. In June 2010, the USFK has also changed its name from the USFK Command to the U.S. Korea Command or the U.S. KORCOM. It also prepared several detailed plans for implementation in April 2012.

The construction site for the relocation project is divided into three zones, including the following:<sup>21</sup>

- a) Parcel # 1 – This is referred to as Zone 1, with a total area of 830,000 m<sup>2</sup> (205 acres). Construction of this zone is based on the order by the USFK in March 2007. Seohee Construction has started construction work.
- b) Parcel # 2 – This is referred to as Zone 2, with a total area of 8,120,000 m<sup>2</sup> (2006 acres). Construction of this zone is based on the order by the Ministry of National Defense in May 2008.
- c) Parcel # 3 – This is referred to as zone K, with a total area of 450,000 m<sup>2</sup> (111 acres). The construction of this zone is based on the order of the Ministry of National Defense. Construction work for the zone has been started by Hanjin Heavy Industries & Construction in November 2007.

During the site preparation that commenced in July 2009, a total of five districts had been divided, with three zones to be managed by South Korea and two zones to be controlled by the United States.<sup>22</sup> According to the survey conducted by the relocation

center in March 2011, 38 percent of the work to prepare the site has already been in progress. The survey also showed that 41 percent of the construction work for the infrastructures needed, such as the roads and railways, were also under way. All construction work is scheduled for completion in 2013.<sup>23</sup> An environmental remediation project is also currently being conducted, focusing on 17 locations in 47 bases. This represents a 76 percent completion rate, with the project scheduled for completion by the end of 2012. The construction of the major facilities had been issued by the end of 2010.<sup>24</sup>

By the end of March 2011, the site preparation is already nearing completion before the building construction work begins. Embankment work to raise the standard height by one to two meters was conducted at the site of the U.S. military base before the construction of the structures begins. The cost of embankment work is estimated to amount to 300 billion won (US\$274 million) to 400 billion won (US\$374 million). South Korea takes charge of the embankment work of zone K. As for the construction for gas facilities, 51 percent of the work is already completed. The sewage treatment plant is also expected to be completed in August 2012 while the railroad to be used for transporting military equipment is scheduled for completion in December 2013.<sup>25</sup>

At present, site preparation for Zone 1 (Parcel 1) and zone 2 (Parcel 2), which has the largest size, is in progress. The progress of the construction work for Parcel 2 is at 45 percent for the United States and 55 percent for South Korea. After site preparation for Zone K is completed, construction for residential and special facilities, including hospitals, schools and apartments, as well as military facilities, including runways and communication centers, is expected to start. South Korea and the United States plan to complete the construction of all facilities by the end of 2015. In addition, the Pyeongtaek base is expected to operate as a military base in 2016. Once the relocation is completed, the number of people stationed in the military base in 2016 is expected to reach 44,370. The facilities scheduled for construction include five hospital buildings, 82 buildings for family residences, 89 buildings for welfare facilities, 85 buildings for headquarters and administrative facilities, five school buildings and 33 buildings for maintenance facilities.

### **Effects of the USFK Relocation and the Local Residents' Awareness**

The South Korean government enacted a "Special Act on Support for the USFK Relocation" for the purpose of launching the USFK relocation projects, supporting migration measures and protecting local residents in Pyeongtaek and Osan areas. It also enacted a "Special Act on Support for Pyeongtaek" passed by the National Assembly at the end of February 2004, which is referred to hereinafter as "Special Act for Support of Pyeongtaek City," for implementation from April 1, 2005 to December 31, 2014.<sup>26</sup>

The "Special Act for Support of Pyeongtaek City" outlines the support and obligations for the USFK relocation project, support guidelines for the establishment of long-term comprehensive development for the city and the creation of special accounts for the USFK relocation. The Special Act also addresses the removal of regulatory barriers, deregulation and other measures to provide support to the surrounding areas of the USFK military bases. The Pyeongtaek regional development plan as incorporated in this Special Act is already in progress. In terms of the investment to be allocated,

around 1.1 trillion won will be invested to expand the U.S. military bases, which will be comprised of bases in Anjeongri and Camp Humphreys in Pyeongtaek. The South Korean government also plans to invest a total of 18.8 trillion won (US\$17 billion) in Pyeongtaek for the construction of high-technology areas along the Pyeongtaek harbor.<sup>27</sup> It is also expected to invest 18.8 trillion won (US\$17 billion) in 89 businesses covering nine sectors, including agriculture, manufacturing, urban development, traffic volume, and tourism by 2020. Large-scale employment and regional economic development are expected once the surrounding commercial areas are developed.<sup>28</sup>

The establishment and expansion of 61 high-tech industries received permission under the Special Act. The Pyeongtaek regional development plan has also been finalized through consultations with the Pyeongtaek, Gyeonggi Province and other relevant central departments on December 6, 2005. Under this master plan, substantial investments are planned including 16 businesses covering four sectors, including the creation of a high-technology industrial complex, development of tourism in Pyeongtaek, promotion of an advanced agricultural complex and the maintenance of the areas surrounding the U.S. military bases. Pyeongtaek city has been planned to be developed into a strategic hub and a city center of conservation and development as well as a city of global culture and education. It is expected to lead regional innovation and facilitate the development of a global trading center. Pyeongtaek city is also expected to attract domestic and international enterprises with the expansion of its local port. Under the development plan, Pyeongtaek would be promoted as an international hub and an international cultural exchange city. It aims to attract foreign institutions and universities in its effort to become a city of culture, arts, and global education (See Table 4). It is necessary to conduct a survey on the local residents' awareness, which affects relocation policies, to help establish medium-term and long-term measures for the relocation of the USFK. The purpose of the survey is to help develop and establish regional development plans after the characteristics and level of awareness on the subject matter among the local residents are established. It aims to determine the prioritization of countermeasures regarding the USFK relocation in policy formulation.

As shown in Table 4, more than half of the local residents gave a positive evaluation on the impact of the U.S. armed forces on regional security. However, they demonstrated a reserved or negative attitude toward the impact of the U.S. military presence on the local communities. The survey shows that local residents agreed that there is a need for the USFK to help in achieving national security but revealed a different perspective when it directly affects their interests.<sup>29</sup>

Based on the results of the survey on local residents' awareness in Gyeonggi Province in March 2006, it was found that a majority (or 51.7 percent) of the respondents believed that the ROK-U.S. alliance has been weakened over the years. Moreover, 52.1 percent of the respondents to the survey in Gyeonggi Province also believed that the direction of the changes undertaken under the ROK-U.S. alliance is not desirable. In addition, the results of the analysis of the opinions on national unification conducted by the Institute for National Unification in 2005 showed that the anti-American sentiment of residents in Gyeonggi Province was slightly higher, at 56 percent, as compared to the national average of 50.3 percent. However, this average remains low as compared with that of Gwangju, Jeollabuk Province, Gyeongsangnam Province, Daegu, Ulsan and Chungcheongnam Province.<sup>30</sup>

Also based on the survey results obtained in April 2006 when conflicts between the USFK and local residents on the location of the USFK to Pyeongtaek had been

Table 4. Overall Opinion about the Effects of Relocation of the USFK on Regional Communities

	Total		Dongducheon		Paju		Uijeongbu		Pyeongtaek	
	Number of responses	Ratio	Number of responses	Ratio	Number of responses	Ratio	Number of responses	Ratio	Number of responses	Ratio
Very good impact	28	2.3	10	3.2	5	1.7	2	0.7	11	3.7
Some positive influence	214	17.8	60	19.5	44	14.8	35	11.7	75	25.5
No significant impact	501	41.8	120	39.0	135	45.3	117	39.0	129	43.9
Some adverse impact	315	26.3	81	26.3	67	22.5	109	36.3	58	19.7
Very bad impact	134	11.2	34	11.0	42	14.1	37	12.3	21	7.1
No response	8	0.7	3	1.0	5	1.7	-	-	-	-
Total	1200	100.0	308	100.0	298	100.0	300	100.0	294	100.0

Source: Gyeonggi Research Institute, *A Study on the Integration of the USFK and Regional Community* (Seoul: Gyeonggi Research Institute, 2001), 116.

most severe, 30.2 percent of Pyeongtaek residents identified the inhibition of the educational environment due to the influx of vulgar culture of the United States and a military campsite town as the top indicator of a most negatively affected area due to the relocation of the USFK to Pyeongtaek .

The results also showed that complaints regarding “limitation of exercise of property and land use” had decreased but unfavorable views on the “social and cultural environment” had increased. The rate of occurrence of crimes committed by the U.S. soldiers was significantly low in the Pyeongtaek area as compared to those from the regions where the U.S. military forces are deployed, including Dongducheon, Uijeongbu, and Paju. Only 11.1 percent of the respondents answered “Yes” to the question “Have you, your family and neighbors ever suffered any damage from the USFK?” A total of 43.3 percent responded positively to the question on the presence of the USFK in Pyeongtaek, with 34.5 percent responding negatively. In addition, more residents or 42.9 percent in the Paengseong area, where conflicts related to the USFK relocation were most severe, responded negatively (42.9 percent) as compared to the other residents at 33.9 percent. However, there was no significance difference found when comparing their responses.<sup>31</sup>

A survey focusing on public opinion on the USFK relocation was conducted in early September 2006 among 300 residents of Pyeongtaek. It was conducted after the policies to relocate the USFK to Pyeongtaek had been finalized and the Special Act for Support of Pyeongtaek City had been enacted.<sup>32</sup> In this survey, samples have been selected using random allocation in terms of regions, gender, and ages proportional to the population. The survey instrument used has six demographic questions and 20 questions that include arguments for and against the USFK relocation. Sampling error was set at 95 percent while the level of reliability has been set at 5.7 per-

cent. In addition, 53 percent of Pyeongtaek residents expressed their approval for the USFK relocation based on the results of the questionnaire survey conducted on Pyeongtaek residents from October 16 to 23, 2003. Furthermore, 37.8 percent of survey respondents also showed negative comments toward issues relating to the USFK relocation, including the redeployment of the Yongsan U.S. military base and the 2nd Infantry Division. This can be compared to the results of the 2006 survey, which showed that 55.5 percent of the respondents answered positively and 37.6 percent expressed disapproval of the USFK relocation.<sup>33</sup>

In terms of compliance with government policy, it was concluded that the enactment of the Special Act for Support of Pyeongtaek City had a positive effect on the approval by the local residents for the USFK relocation. High approval rating for the relocation was also seen due to the expectations of economic development resulting from the regional development plan as indicated in the Special Act. However, there are still concerns about the increase in crime incidence, educational concerns and environmental problems. It is also recommended that the disapproval ratings obtained should not be ignored to prevent conflict and division among the regional community. This should be done although the number of residents in favor of the USFK relocation is relatively higher in the Pyeongtaek area as compared to the others. Accordingly, it is necessary for the local government to formulate policies and establish institutional devices to resolve conflicts as well as achieve regional unity.<sup>34</sup>

A survey on the awareness for the enactment of the special laws for the USFK relocation was also carried out as part of the government’s communication and publicity efforts. The results showed that 66 percent of the Pyeongtaek citizens were unaware of the enactment of the special laws. The low level of awareness regarding the special laws indicates that a problem exists in the process of policy communication by the government. Furthermore, low awareness of special laws that directly affect regional development as well as the residents’ lives may lead to repercussions resulting from the lack of awareness of important policies. It can also highlight the issues regarding the reliability of government policies and could serve as a barrier to achieve policy objectives. With this analysis, indifference by the local residents to the policies is also a challenge that needs to be addressed.

Table 5. A Survey on Causes of Underdevelopment of Pyeongtaek

Causes	Response (%)
Weak industrial base	23.0
Presence of military facilities, such as the U.S. military bases	23.4
Development regulatory restrictions, such as Seoul Metropolitan Area Readjustment Planning Act	16.5
Lack of medical and cultural facilities	4.3
Lack of secondary and higher education facilities, such as middle and high schools and universities	11.6
Poor living environment in mountain area (agricultural area)	14.1
Others (Have no idea)	7.1
Total	100.0

A comparative analysis on the degree of development in Pyeongtaek and other cities has been conducted to measure the effect of the U.S. military presence on the development of Pyeongtaek. A total of 31.2 percent of Pyeongtaek citizens had responded that Pyeongtaek has developed while a majority, or 62.1 percent, of the citizens stated that the area has not developed as compared to nearby cities, such as Yongin, Asan, and Osan.<sup>35</sup>

Based on the survey results, the lack of industrial infrastructure has been cited as the major reason for regional backwardness. In a survey conducted from June 28 to July 7, 2004, there were 31.6 percent of respondents who answered “Yes” to the question, “Has Pyeongtaek city developed more than the other cities in the Seoul metropolitan area?” while 68.4 percent answered “No.” Based on the survey results indicated above, military facilities can be considered as a major barrier to regional development.

As shown in Table 6, the ratio of those in favor of the relocation of the USFK because of its positive impact on regional economic development and quality of life is high. However, there are negative expectations in terms of the impact of the USFK relocation on the educational and cultural environment as well as on the local image. As a recommendation, it is necessary to formulate and implement policies that would lessen the negative impact on the educational and cultural environment by considering the opinions of local residents. It is also recommended that a good foundation to promote the area as an international city of peace should be developed in order to eliminate the negative image associated with the city where the U.S. armed forces are stationed.

The Special Act for Support of Pyeongtaek City has also clearly defined the policy compliance and compensation for local residents according to the USFK relocation

Table 6. Responses of Pyeongtaek Citizens to Policy Effectiveness of the Presence and Relocation of the U.S. Military Forces

Areas of Policy Effectiveness	Response	Ratio (%)
Impact on local economy (Activation of economy)	Affected	73.6
	Not affected	24.5
	Have no idea	1.9
	Total	100.0
Effect on educational and cultural environment (Educational culture)	Positive	42.0
	Negative	52.4
	Have no idea	5.6
	Total	100.0
Impact on local image (Local image)	Good effect	42.3
	Negative impact	55.0
	Have no idea	2.7
	Total	100.0
Effect on regional development and quality of life (Quality of life)	Good effect	53.0
	Negative impact	43.0
	Have no idea	4.0
	Total	100.0

policy. In order to effectively facilitate the relocation of the U.S. military bases, it is necessary to smoothly implement infrastructure projects, protect the rights and interests of local residents and focus on infrastructure-centric support. However, distrust still exists among local residents toward the regional development plans established based on the special law.<sup>36</sup>

On the other hand, results of different surveys conducted in the USFK relocation areas highlight several major issues about policy compliance and the measures for implementation. The surveys showed that it is not true that a significant number of residents only have a one-sided opinion about the USFK's presence in the country. Results indicated that Pyeongtaek residents are in favor of the USFK relocation and have a positive awareness regarding its impact on the regional development. The USFK relocation is also being seen in a positive light in terms of national security and development. However, negative awareness is reported for areas related to safety and development. A negative perception about the relocation policy is noted. Negative perceptions noted include anxiety about the financial support outlined in the special laws as well as mistrust of the development plan recommended by the government for implementation after the relocation is completed. In addition, central government-led improvement measures and development strategies that are dependent on external resources raised issues of inequality between regional areas due to soaring land prices and the exclusion of the local government and residents from policy implementation. Therefore, the major challenge is to determine the accurate perceptions regarding the USFK relocation and related issues, accommodate resulting conflicts appropriately and effectively enforce policies.

A SWOT analysis conducted on the regional development as a result of the USFK relocation highlighted the need to take advantage of positive opportunities to improve global image in terms of peace and security as well as attract foreign tourists and businessmen to the relocation areas. The relocation of the Yongsan U.S. military base and the 2nd Infantry Division is expected to bring about production-induced effects corresponding to a GRDP of 6 percent and employment opportunities for around 30,000 persons annually. Various support activities are also expected as a result of the relocation. An opportunity to discuss opinions and perceptions with the local government is also recommended to resolve conflicts related to environmental issues and noise from the U.S. military bases. On the other hand, the potential for regional development can be negatively affected as a result of the negative image associated to the area where the military base is located as well as to the loss of citizens' residential areas due to land grants awarded. Division and conflicts among the local residents over compensation benefits are also among the concerns. In addition, complaints from local residents have been received due to the constraints in developing nearby residential areas, including those military-protected areas. Local residents also complained about being identified as a military campsite town, which creates a negative image for their respective communities. Policies that address these issues and reduce the threat factors indicated need to be discussed and implemented.<sup>37</sup>

## **Conclusion**

The relocation of the USFK to Pyeongtaek is regarded as a measure that is part of the strategic alliance being formed between South Korea and the United States to

contribute to the peace and prosperity of the Asian region and the Korean peninsula. The economic impact due to the USFK relocation led to positive results in various areas, including the land for the relocation, the construction and operation of the U.S. military bases, housing, leasing agreements, supply requirements for the U.S. troops and employment. It is also expected that the effects of the stimulated regional economy due to the construction of the U.S. military bases should be visible in the near future. The ripple effects of the stimulated economy are also expected to spread to items, such as the bases' operating expenses, consumption by the U.S. soldiers, their families and employees, as well as to the housing and rental businesses.

To conclude, several challenges and courses of actions are duly recommended as follows: Firstly, it is recommended that a plan to stimulate the regional economy should be put in place to serve as the driving force of urban development. In turn, this would create employment and attract more people. In addition, financial support programs as specified in the special laws are urgently needed. The local economy can be improved by developing commercial areas, such as Pyeongtaek, and creating employment as a result of the USFK relocation. Policies to revitalize the economy, including policies on urban development and employment, need to be prioritized. In addition, in order to improve compliance by the local residents to the USFK relocation policies, there is a need to implement policies on income, education, housing, and culture, which can affect the lives of the local residents. This is a way to increase the satisfaction of the local population affected by the relocation.

Secondly, the substantial benefits expected from creating an educational and cultural environment as a result of the relocation and the presence of the U.S. armed forces should also be provided to the local residents. Gyeonggi Province and the Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology in Pyeongtaek have announced at the end of April 2008 that the USFK has agreed to establish 18 schools, including ones for elementary, middle, and high schools, at the Pyeongtaek military base by 2020. Initially, the USFK planned to establish only four schools but revised its plan since the number of their families is expected to increase to 14,000 due to the term extension from one year to two to three years.<sup>38</sup>

Thirdly, it is necessary to stimulate the regional economy and promote job creation through USFK-related businesses and organizational activities. This, in turn, can contribute to the creation and development of an industrial complex for marine tourism. In the near future, opportunities to increase income of the local residents and stimulate an influx of population can be obtained through the development of the tourism industry and the promotion of the west-coast belt and marine industry. Local attractions with a global appeal that can promote sports tourism can also be developed through being associated with the Pyeongtaek Lake and the tourist attractions on the west coast.<sup>39</sup> The establishment of international language schools, building a family-friendly leisure environment and the construction of a military museum for cultural exchange should be considered to help promote and improve a positive image for Pyeongtaek as a secured and culturally diverse city.

Fourthly, the legal and institutional system for cooperation between civilians and the military should be strengthened from the perspective of the central government.<sup>40</sup> The cooperation between the central and the local government has a significant effect on regional development since the issue of the USFK relocation leads to conflicts between national security and sources of livelihood of local residents. Local governments are expected to play an important role in conveying regional characteristics



and the opinions of local residents to the central government. At the same time, they also play a key role in conveying the commitment of the central government to the local residents. It should be taken into consideration that for military reserves, development might be restricted to areas with military protection. On the other hand, a military base can have a positive impact on the local communities by being a consumer of goods and services and a provider of equipment and human resources.<sup>41</sup>

Fifthly, the utilization of the U.S. military bases for families need to be considered in extending the period of military service and eliminating the factors why American soldiers avoid military duty in South Korea. To address this, the U.S. government provides welfare services to American soldiers and their families. This also helps ensure that combat-ready forces are deployed in South Korea. The government also initiates efforts to interact with the citizens of Korea through programs, such as the “Good Neighbor Program” and “Come with U.S.” The United States is also currently focusing on strengthening the ROK-U.S. alliance by pending additional reduction of troops in the USFK as well as proposing extension of military service in the USFK from one to three years.<sup>42</sup>

In conclusion, a change in the awareness of security threats and in the concept of national security is required. The USFK relocation policy has been promoted as part of efforts to develop the strategic alliance between the two countries based on mutual understanding and cooperation. The consolidation of the U.S. military bases scattered across the country is currently being conducted in consideration of the importance of the role and effectiveness of the USFK deployed in South Korea. At the same time, the USFK relocation policy is actively promoted and enforced under interweaving purposes for national security as well as for effective relocation of the U.S. military bases and regional development. The relocation policy is also being enforced to resolve conflicts within the local communities and address the inflexibility and operational inefficiency of the current USFK systems. It is also seen as a way to cope with the changes in military strategies on the Korean peninsula.

As indicated by the survey results shown, the central government’s unilateral decision-making may not be effective in resolving conflicts and facilitating regional development amidst the issues related to relocation of the USFK to Pyeongtaek. The central government focuses on addressing the problems at the national and macro level while the local governments tend to focus on regional and local issues. These differences in perspectives and approaches may lead to significant conflict when formulating and implementing long-term development policy parallel to the USFK relocation. To avoid this, their perspectives and approaches in terms of policy development should be congruent. It is also necessary to establish a cooperative civil and military relationship at both micro and macro levels based on community participation in order to facilitate long-term development and sustain the ROK-U.S. alliance.<sup>43</sup>

Moreover, the compensation and indemnities to be given should be adequate to reduce the damages and conflicts encountered in the areas as a result of the USFK relocation. The elements of the agenda that are directly related to national security and regional development need to be incorporated in the process of and after completion of the relocation of the USFK to Pyeongtaek. Cooperative governance at the level of the local governments and the central government is needed to address regional issues and conflicts to be faced after completing the relocation. This can further help in minimizing and managing the repercussions after the relocation. The role of central government as one of the major players and supporters of the USFK relocation as

well as the role of the local government as a trouble-shooter and a conflict manager at the community level are roles considered to be most important in the process. Finally, continued efforts to collect public opinions and the varying perspectives gathered from the media and NGO groups in a timely manner are also duly needed.

## Notes

1. Kim Il-yeong and Cho Seong-ryeol, *USFK: History, Issues, Prospects* (Seoul: Hanwool, 2003), 153–54.
2. For a more detailed discussion, see Yun Yeong-mi, “The ROK-U.S. alliance and new security: focusing on the USFK relocation status and its prospects,” *Phenomenon and Recognition, Korea Institute of Humanities and Social Sciences* 31, no. 1/2 (2007): 127–28; and Gwon Jaesang, *The Changing Face of National Security, Transformation of National Security: Conceptual Analysis* (Seoul: Gandhi Seowon, 2003), 39–45.
3. Choi Gang, “Arms Control on the Korean Peninsula and the Future of USFK: The Limits of Coexistence and Possibilities,” *Strategic Research* No. 27 (March 2003): 82–108.
4. Stephen M. Walt, *The Origins of Alliances* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1987), 12.
5. Julian R. Friedman, *Alliance in International Policies* (Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon Inc., 1970), 4–5.
6. Bruno Tertrais, “The Changing Nature of Military Alliances,” *The Washington Quarterly* 27, no. 2 (Spring 2004): 135–37.
7. Even in the case of asymmetrical alliance, there is a significant difference in accordance with the influence of superpowers and degree of control measures depending on whether it is bilateral or multilateral in terms of the alliance scale. For instance, since the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) is an asymmetrical alliance, but multilateral in terms of the scale of the alliance, the actual structure of the alliance takes on a dual structure of politics and military affairs, and political structure.
8. Yun, “The ROK-U.S. alliance and new security,” 127–28.
9. Kim Il-soo, “Case study of politicization of security issues after democratization: the ROK-U.S. relations,” paper presented at an academic seminar of the Korea International Political Science Association (September 13, 2007), 114.
10. For a more detailed discussion on the USFK reduction, see Yun Yeong-mi, *Diplomacy and Security in Northeast Asia* (Seoul: Doonam, 2010), 237–39; and Kim Yeong-ho et al., “Readjustment of the USFK and military security order of Northeast Asia in the 21st century,” *Policy Report of National Assembly Defense Committee*, September 2005.
11. Barry Buzan, *People, States and Fear: An Agenda for International Security Studies in the Post-Cold War Era* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1991), 50.
12. Choi Yong-hwan, “The USFK relocation issues from the standpoint of the community: Focusing on Pyeongtaek cases,” *Study of International Relations* 13, no. 1 (Spring 2008): 59.
13. Roh Tae-woo, who ran as a presidential candidate at the end of 1987, had been the first one to recommend the relocation of the USFK. Official discussions on the issue of relocation started with the signing of a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), and a Basic Agreement indicating the relocation of the Yongsan U.S. military base to Pyeongtaek began in June 1990 and completed by 1996. The agreement also required South Korea to shoulder all the costs related to the relocation. Moreover, issues had been raised regarding the role of the U.S. troops, which served as a tripwire, as well as the significant costs related to the relocation.
14. For a more detailed account, see Yun Yeong-mi, “The strategic ROK-U.S. alliance in the

- future and implications of the USFK relocation in Pyeongtaek,” *Korea Northeast Asia Publications* 13, no. 4 (2008).
15. See [www.mnd.mil.kr/USFKrelocation\\_new/main/index.jsp](http://www.mnd.mil.kr/USFKrelocation_new/main/index.jsp) (accessed May 12, 2011).
  16. See <http://news.hankooki.com/lpage/society/201103/h2011032918253421950.htm> (accessed May 13, 2011).
  17. For a more detailed discussion, see Yun, *Diplomacy and National Security*, 257.
  18. The stationing of the USFK at the K-55 base began in March 1952. Presently, the U.S. 7th Air Force headquarters are stationed there, and the base of the K-6 and U.S. Army troops is located in Anjeong-ri, Pyeongseong-eup, where a Japanese military garrison was set up during the Sino-Japanese War (1894–95), and U.S. troops have been stationed there since the Korean War.
  19. *Long-term comprehensive development plan for Pyeongtaek* (Pyeongtaek City, May 2005), 101.
  20. *Defense White Paper* (Seoul: Ministry of National Defense, 2006), 86–87.
  21. *Defense Daily*, September 11, 2007.
  22. Yonhap News, October 21, 2010.
  23. *Hankook Ilbo*, March 29, 2011.
  24. *Defense Daily*, December 24, 2010.
  25. The transport methods and quality of soil required for embankment work shall be determined by the contractor. The method of selecting the contractor for the base construction is opened to completion bidding in principle, and limited competitive bidding shall be applied according to the nature and scale of the construction. *Seoul Daily Newspaper*, March 30, 2011; and *Aju Economic Daily*, December 17, 2010.
  26. *Law No. 7271* (Proclamation date, December 31, 2004. Effective date, April 1, 2005); *Partial revision* (August 4, 2005, Law No. 7678).
  27. For a more detailed account, see Gang Hee-won and Yun Yeong-mi, “Policy compliance and the relocation of the USFK to Pyeongtaek: Investigation of compliance factors by discriminant analysis,” *Local Government Studies*, Korea Institute of Local Government 11, no. 2, 2007.
  28. See [www.mnd.mil.kr/USFKrelocation\\_new/main/index.jsp](http://www.mnd.mil.kr/USFKrelocation_new/main/index.jsp) (accessed May 12, 2011).
  29. Gyeonggi Research Institute, *A Study on the USFK and Community Integration* (Seoul: Gyeonggi Research Institute, 2001), 116.
  30. Gyeonggi Research Institute carried out “A survey on awareness of inhabitants in Gyeonggi-do in relation to North-South problems” in March 2006. This survey was conducted from March 16 to 17, 2006, targeting 2,000 men and women aged over 19 who live in Gyeonggi Province. Choi Yong-whan, “Report of the improvement plans and present status of military facilities,” Gyeonggi Research Institute (2008): 69–70.
  31. Gyeonggi Research Institute, *A Study on the Plans for Enhancement of Cooperation and Conflict Management of the USFK and Local Communities Due to Relocation of the USFK to Pyeongtaek* (Suwon, Gyeonggi Province: Gyeonggi Research Institute, 2006), 65.
  32. The telephone survey polled 300 men and women aged over 19 who live in Pyeongtaek through structured questionnaires organized by Hangil Research from September 6 to September 9, 2006, see Yun Yeong-mi and Gang Hee-won, “Comparison on the awareness of local residents in the area in which US troops are stationed and political implications: focusing on the local residents of Dongducheon and Pyeongtaek areas,” *Defense Policy Research Report* (Seoul: Ministry of National Defense, 2006).
  33. *Pyeongtaek Citizen Newspaper*, October 23, 2003.
  34. Yun, *Diplomacy and Security in Northeast Asia*, 299.
  35. For a more detailed account, see Jang Jeong-min et al., “Long-term development plans and survey on the awareness of Pyeongtaek residents regarding the USFK relocation,” (Seoul: Korea Research Institute for Human Settlements, November 2004).
  36. Gang Hee-won, “Alternatives and limitations of external-dependent development strategy

- for Pyeongtaek regarding the relocation of USFK,” *Korea Policy Research* 5, no. 2 (2005): 1–2.
37. *A study on the effect of military structure reorganization according to defense reform 2020 on Gyeonggi-do* (Suwon, Gyeonggi Province: Gyeonggi Research Institute, 2009), 85.
  38. Yonhap News, April 27, 2009.
  39. *A study on the effect*, 112–13.
  40. Further discussion on the civil and military relationship, Yun Yeong-mi, “Review on the cooperative civil and military relationship and reasonable readjustment of areas in which U.S. armed forces are stationed in the post-Cold War era,” *Journal of Korea and Northeast Society* 3, no. 56 (2010).
  41. Gang Han-gu et al., *The Presence of U.S. Armed Forces and the Local Economy* (Seoul: KIDA Press, 2005), 13.
  42. At the same time, “Single Soldier Post” would be changed into “Army Family Community.” The numbers of USFK military personnel and family members are expected to increase. The United States approved a three-year extension of military service of the USFK accompanied by family members in December 2008. In relation to the USFK relocation project, General Walter Sharp, former commander of the U.S. Forces in Korea said, “All the soldiers accompanied by family members shall have three years of military service in Korea, and for those who are not accompanied by family members or don’t have family dependents it will be two years of military service for stable stationing of the USFK in Korea.” It is expected that the number of the USFK and its family members will increase significantly by up to 100,000 from 28,000 at present. See <http://www.kyeongin.com/news/articleView.html?idxno=565529> (accessed May 1, 2011).
  43. Yun, *Diplomacy and Security in Northeast Asia*, 314.

## Notes on Contributor

**Yun Yeong-mi** received a Master’s degree in International Relations from the University of Aberdeen in 1993, and Ph.D. in Political Science from Glasgow University in 2001. She is an associate professor at Pyeongtaek University, where she has taught diplomacy & security in Northeast Asia since 2005. She also worked as a TV presenter at KTV. She has served as an Advisory Council Member in the Ministry of National Defense since 2006 and has also been a radio presenter at KFN since 2009. She is author and co-author of numerous scholarly articles, and author or co-translator of several books including; *Korea and International Cooperation in the Global Era* (2012); *Contemporary Russian Politics and International Relations* (2011); *Northeast Asia’s Diplomacy and Security* (2010); *Capitalism Revolution of Russia* (2010). Her recent publication includes “Russia’ Role and Position under the SCO.” Her research interests have been focused on issues of Russian politics, foreign policy, and security and diplomacy of Northeast Asia.

**Park Ki-cheol** received Ph.D. in National Chengchi University, Taiwan. He is a professor at Pyeongtaek University, where he has taught Chinese Political Economy at the Department of Chinese Studies since 1998. He has served as a Research Fellow at the Association of Korean-Chinese Academy since 2006. He is author and co-author of numerous scholarly articles and author or co-translator of several books including *The study of China’s internet-nationalism and foreign policy* (2011); *The study of China’s Neo-nationalism and China threat* (2010); *The Analysis of Overseas Chinese invest to China* (2010); and *Reform of Chinese Government* (1998). His research interests have been focused issues of Chinese diplomacy and China-Korea political relations.