

# 오스트리아의 중립화 통일 경험과 한국에의 함의 Neutrality for Korea?

Heinz GAERTNER

University of Vienna  
Austrian Institute for International Affairs

Heinz Gaertner is Professor at the University of Vienna and the Academic Director of the Austrian Institute for International Affairs (oiip). He is editor (together with Akbulut and Honig) of the book Peace, Democracy, and Security (Lexington: New York), 2015.

\* 이 글에 포함된 의견은 저자 개인의 견해로 제주평화연구원의 공식입장과는 무관합니다.

[편집자 註] 어느 때부터 우리 사회에서는 독일의 통일경험 속에서 남북통일을 위한 교훈을 찾는 것이 일반화되었다. 하지만 Heinz Gaertner 교수는 한반도에서는 아직 냉전이 끝나지 않았기 때문에 냉전이 종식되면서 통일이 된 독일의 경험보다는 2차 대전후 중립화를 통해서 통일이 된 오스트리아의 경험이 더 유용할 수 있다고 주장한다. 최근 타결된 이란핵협상이 오스트리아의 비엔나에서 열렸던 사실에서도 볼 수 있듯이 중립화 통일 이후 오스트리아는 국제무대에서 중요한 중재자, 조정자로 등장하였다. Gaertner 교수는 중립화된 통일 한국도 아시아에서 중요한 중재자와 조정자로서 역할을 할 수 있을 것이라고 보고 있다. 하지만 주변 강대국의 이해관계가 복잡하고 북한이 핵무장까지 한 상황에서 과연 중립화가 우리에게 가능한 선택일까? 혹시 이 상주의를 앞세우다 우리의 평화와 안보를 위태롭게 하는 것은 아닐까? 이러한 의문과 우려에 대한 답을 찾고자 JPI PeaceNet은 Gaertner 교수의 기고문에 이어서 중립화에 대한 건국대 윤태룡 교수의 서면 인터뷰를 게재할 계획이다. 독자들의 많은 관심을 부탁드립니다. 편집자:한인택 연구위원( ihan@jpi.or.kr )

No analogy works perfect. No models of other countries fit for the Korean peninsula entirely. Nevertheless, analogies help to understand experiences of other countries. Lessons can be learned from success and failure of other countries in similar situations. Usually, the German unification of 1989/1990 serves as a model for a potential unification of the Korean peninsula. Obviously, there are parallels: decades of separation, two diverse economic and political systems with different ideologies. However, the geopolitical situations between Germany and Korea are very different. The unification of Germany became possible only because the Soviet that controlled East-Germany disappeared. The geopolitical context in North East Asia by and large stayed the same since the end of the Korean War. Here the Austrian experience could help.

The principles of the EU's North Korean policy, non-proliferation, regional stability and peace, and human rights are essential. Nevertheless, a solution without China and Russia will not be possible. Such priorities will do little to soothe especially China. To address this geopolitical difficulties the Austrian model can give some answers. A guarantee based on international law that a united Korea will not join a military alliance with the US might be acceptable for China and Russia. In addition, in Austrian State Treaty certain capabilities of Austria's military were limited. The State Treaty also guaranteed that Austria would not join a new with Germany (Anschlussverbot), as it had happened in 1938. In the case of Korea, such a State Treaty could expressly prohibit territorial claims of any external power, whereby the unity of Korea should be guaranteed. In this way, a united peninsula could serve as buffer zone among neighboring countries. No foreign troops would be necessary on Korean soil. For a transition period US-troops could remain deployed in the South of Korea. A phased out withdrawal has to be negotiated among the new Korean government, the US, China and Russia. US presence will stay in Japan and on sea just like NATO-troops in Europe after the Second World War. After all, one of their roles was to keep Germany under control.

Here is the difference! Austria was only divided for ten years mainly in military terms. It goes without saying that there was no such a deep separation of two very different systems as in Korea. In a reunified Korea the two different systems might coexist for some time to come, politically but in particular economically and psychologically. If this appears to be necessary, a united Korea with two different systems is all the more only feasible on the basis of neutrality, on the one hand. Otherwise the conflict lines in the region will be transferred into the new Korean state. A neutral state as a buffer state will reduce the confrontational structure in North East Asia, on the other hand.

European and American economic aid packages, similar to the post-World War II Marshall-Plan, would be essential for a reunified Korea. The combination of neutrality and the Marshall-Plan was a definite success for Austria. Moreover, one could argue that Austria's neutrality law was the beginning of the detente policy between East and West.

Last but not least, thanks to this policy of neutrality, Vienna was chosen as the third UN-capital and seat of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), UN specialized agencies (e.g. UNIDO) and the secretariats of OPEC and OSCE (formerly CSCE). During the Cold War neutral states offered mediation and good offices and advocated that the policy of detente not faltered. Furthermore, the PrepCom (an administration committee for the surveillance of the comprehensive test ban agreement) of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), the secretariat of the Wassenaar Arrangement (about the transfer of conventional weapons), the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (ODC), the Vienna Center for Disarmament and Non-Proliferation (VCDNP) and the World Institute for Nuclear Security (WINS) were also settled in Vienna. Vienna became the central place for the negotiations of

the talks on Iran' s nuclear program 2014-2015. In 2015 an Austrian diplomat was appointed as special representative of the OSCE in the Ukraine.

These would all be options for united Korea in Asia. Participation and mediation are considerable potential areas of influence for neutral states in the realm of multilateral cooperation. The directions outlined above advocate that the Austrian model delivers a long-term diplomatic solution that should be taken into consideration.

Aug 6, 2015

저작권자 © 제주평화연구원, 무단 전재 및 재배포 금지

