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Foreword

South Africa’s Apartheid and North Korea’s Songbun: Parallels in Crimes against Humanity by Robert Collins underlines similarities between two systematically, deliberately, and thoroughly discriminatory repressive systems. This project began with expert testimony Collins submitted as part of a joint investigation and documentation project scrutinizing human rights violations committed at North Korea’s short-term detention facilities, conducted by the Committee for Human Rights in North Korea (HRNK) and the International Bar Association (IBA). Collins’ unparalleled understanding of the North Korean regime and the depth of his analysis of North Korea’s policy of human rights denial persuaded the joint investigation team that his testimony must be developed into a stand-alone publication.

The latest Collins report adds to his many contributions to understanding North Korea’s levers of power, the dominant role of the Korean Workers’ Party and the key elites, the chain of command and control responsible for crimes against humanity, and other egregious human rights violations as well as the extent of the oppression brought onto all levels of North Korean society. Together with Collins’ North Korea’s Organization and Guidance Department: The Control Tower of Human Rights Denial (2019), Denied from the Start: Human Rights at the Local Level in North Korea (2018), From Cradle to Grave: The Path of North Korean Innocents (2017), Pyongyang Republic: North Korea’s Capital of Human Rights Denial (2016), and Marked for Life: Songbun, North Korea’s Social Classification System (2012), South Africa’s Apartheid and North Korea’s Songbun provides invaluable insight for decision makers, diplomats, scholars, and human rights defenders.

The point of Collins’ most recent report is not that songbun is apartheid. What the author demonstrates through his meticulous documentation and thorough analysis is that both songbun and apartheid are systematically discriminatory. Just like apartheid before, songbun continues to crush the people of North Korea, through the drafting, application and implementation of laws and a legal system absolutely controlled by one party. In the case of South Africa, the fundamental distinctive feature of apartheid was race. In the case of North Korea, that distinctive feature is perceived loyalty to the regime.

Together with HRNK colleagues, I have spent countless hours with human rights defenders from all around the world, in conference rooms and virtual conferences. While we all address different racial, cultural, historical, social, political, economic, religious, and ideological environments, we are firmly united by a common bond: deep concern for safeguarding the individual human rights inscribed in international and municipal laws and treaties. The North
Korean regime has been committing crimes so egregious that comparisons have been made with the Nazi Holocaust and the Soviet Gulag. North Korea's songbun system of social classification is so appallingly oppressive that parallels can be made with South Africa's apartheid. The point of our international engagement is not to force comparisons, but rather to listen and learn from colleagues sharing the common goal of human rights and justice, to build on parallels and precedents in order to help enact positive change on the Korean peninsula.

Rather than pressing comparisons between apartheid and songbun, Collins' report reminds us that it was coordinated, unwavering international action that put an end to South Africa's abysmal racial discrimination system. It is only organized, methodical, patient, unrelenting international pressure and action that can bring freedom, justice, and human rights to the people of North Korea.

Greg Scarlatoiu
Executive Director
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report argues that a parallel of apartheid exists today in North Korea, which is songbun, North Korea’s discriminatory social class system. While not arguing for an equivocation to South African apartheid, the report raises the issue of whether there can be a contemporary acknowledgment or application of apartheid as defined in the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (“Rome Statute”) and in the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid (“Apartheid Convention”). Robert Collins makes the case, using a parallel analysis, that North Korea’s discriminatory songbun system, rooted in discrimination based on social class but with racial elements, may serve as a contemporary form of apartheid as also highlighted by prominent experts, including Navi Pillay, former UN High Commissioner for Human Rights and President of the Rwanda Tribunal, and Michael Kirby, former Chair of the Commission of Inquiry on Human Rights in the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea and Justice of the High Court of Australia.

Since 2012, Robert Collins’ report on North Korea’s songbun has provided the structure for those interested in learning about the Kim family regime’s policies and practices related to classifying and treating North Korean people. As Mr. Collins has made clear, songbun is deeply held in discrimination based on perceived political loyalty to the Kim regime and impacts all major areas of life. North Korean escapees have spoken out about its impacts on everything from their career opportunities to marriage in North Korea. Songbun continues to be a suppressive policy of the Kim regime, which the UN Commission of Inquiry on human rights in the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea (COI) discussed in its 2014 findings of crimes against humanity, stating, “discrimination on the basis of gender and songbun is used to maintain a rigid social structure that is less likely to produce challenges to the political system.”

Mr. Collins’ report discusses the following: (1) South African and North Korean legislation and political documents, which serve as the foundation for implementing these discriminatory systems; (2) an overview of the South African system of apartheid, highlighting the classification of people based on race under the Population Registration Act; (3) North Korea’s songbun system, explaining the intricacies of classifying people into a three category and fifty-one sub-category caste system, imposed by the Korean Workers’ Party at the behest of the Supreme Leader; (4) the issue of both South African and North Korean policies that forcibly relocated entire populations and families, of which devastating effects are still felt today (with such policies still continuing in North Korea); and (5) potential legal considerations for arguing North Korea’s songbun is a modern-day
apartheid based on a broader application of the Apartheid Convention and Article 7 of the Rome Statute. In addition, page 53 of the report describes the discriminatory racial aspects of the songbun system that should be considered in an apartheid argument.

Ultimately, Mr. Collins highlights a possible novel perspective on the examination of the crime of apartheid: Is contemporary apartheid being committed by the North Korean regime? Mr. Collins’ scholarship and foresight continue to inspire our analysis of North Korea and its relationship with international law and human rights norms.

Amanda Mortwedt Oh
Human Rights Attorney
INTRODUCTION
The question presented in this report is whether North Korea’s *songbun* system may constitute the crime of *apartheid* based on a contemporary and broader application of *apartheid* under international law and *jus cogens* (peremptory norms). Using a parallel analysis with South African *apartheid*, North Korea’s discriminatory *songbun* system is rooted in discrimination based on social class, but with racial elements, which may serve as a contemporary form of *apartheid*. The following is an argument for viewing *songbun* as a modern form of *apartheid*, sometimes referred to as “political *apartheid*,” and whether this should constitute a crime against humanity under Article 7 of the Rome Statute.

The International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of *Apartheid*, held under the United Nations General Assembly, included *apartheid* as a crime against humanity in 1973. Article 7 of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court lists *apartheid* as a crime against humanity, defined as “inhumane acts of a character similar to those referred to in paragraph 1, committed in the context of an institutionalized regime of systematic oppression and domination by one racial group over any other racial group or groups and committed with the intention of maintaining that regime.”

Similarly, the practices and policies of *songbun* (North Korea’s social classification system) were found by the United Nations Human Rights Council’s Commission of Inquiry on Human Rights in the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea (COI) to constitute crimes against humanity. The COI came to the conclusion that “These crimes against humanity entail extermination, murder, enslavement, torture, imprisonment, rape, forced abortions and other sexual violence, persecution on political, religious, racial and gender grounds, the forcible transfer of populations, the enforced disappearance of persons and the inhumane act of knowingly causing prolonged starvation.” The COI further found that “crimes against humanity are ongoing in the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea because the policies, institutions and patterns of impunity that lie at their heart remain in place.” While *apartheid* focused primarily on racial discrimination with some political factors, *songbun* focuses primarily on political factors, such as family background and individual political actions, with some racial aspects as well. However, the parallels between the two sets of crimes against humanity are striking.


Figure 1: The chart below offers a concise comparison of apartheid and songbun

South Africa’s Apartheid

• the state passed laws which paved the way for “grand apartheid”, which was centered on separating races on a large scale
• compelled people to live in separate places defined by race
• formalized racial classification and introduced an identity card, specifying their racial group, for all persons over the age of eighteen
• the state determined where one lived according to race and each race was allotted their own area, which was used in later years as a basis for forced removal
• the state passed laws suppressing resistance, banning disorderly gatherings as well as certain organizations that were deemed to be threatening to the government
• the education system for African students was designed to prepare black people for life as a laboring class
• separate facilities were established based on race
• intermarriage was prohibited
• there was an exploitation of labor, including forced labor, in certain instances

North Korea’s Songbun

• the state instituted class distinction based on background and birth origin
• compelled people to live in separate places defined by background and birth origin
• formalized background classification and introduced an identity card for all persons over the age of seventeen, specifying their background and birth origin group
• state determined where one lived according to background and birth origin, which began as a basis of forced relocation
• state passed laws suppressing resistance; disorderly gatherings were banned, as were certain organizations that were deemed threatening to the party and government
• system of education was designed to prepare lower classes for lives as a laboring class
• separate facilities on the basis of background and birth origin, particularly housing, health facilities, workplace, higher education
• exploitation of labor in certain instances, both domestically and internationally
LEGISLATION AND DOCUMENTS
Both South Africa and North Korea produced legislation and political documents that justified their crimes against humanity under the apartheid and songbun social classification systems respectively. It is critical to understand that South Africa’s all-white National Party compelled the South African government to enact all such legislation just as North Korea’s Korean Workers’ Party (KWP) compelled the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea (DPRK) government and its institutions to do the same.

Whereas the South African government utilized a Western approach to legislation passed by a national legislature, albeit being directed by the National Party, undemocratic, and built on a racial hierarchy, North Korea employed a totalitarian approach to lawmaking. The personal directives of the Kim regime’s Supreme Leader were above the KWP charter and the state constitution. Supporting the supreme leader’s preeminence was the ubiquitous monitoring conducted by the KWP Organization and Guidance Department (OGD) of every North Korean’s compliance with the Ten Great Principles of Monolithic Ideology, which compelled every North Korean to adhere to the leader’s directives. The ten principles, which have a total of 65 sub-principles, are:

3 Official name of North Korea.
1. Struggle with all your life to paint the entire society with the one color of the Great Leader Kim Il-sung’s revolutionary thought.
2. Respect and revere highly and with loyalty the Great Leader Kim Il-sung.
3. Make absolute the authority of the Great Leader Kim Il-sung.
4. Accept the Great Leader Kim Il-sung’s revolutionary thought as your belief and take the Great Leader’s instructions as your creed.
5. Observe absolutely the principle of unconditional execution in carrying out the instructions of the Great Leader Kim Il-sung.
6. Rally the unity of ideological intellect and revolutionary solidarity around the Great Leader Kim Il-sung.
7. Learn from the Great Leader Kim Il-sung and master communist dignity, the methods of revolutionary projects, and the people’s work styles.
8. Preserve dearly the political life the Great Leader Kim Il-sung has bestowed upon you and repay loyally for the Great Leader’s boundless political trust and considerations with high political awareness and skill.
9. Establish a strong organizational discipline so that the entire Party, the entire people, and the entire military will operate uniformly under the sole leadership of the Great Leader Kim Il-sung.
10. The great revolutionary accomplishments pioneered by the Great Leader Kim Il-sung must be succeeded and perfected by hereditary successions until the end.4

Compliance with these principles is mandated by the KWP OGD for every North Korean starting in late elementary school, either weekly or bi-weekly, until the end of one’s life. This process provides the ideological basis for the Supreme Leader’s directives to be above the law, and to be, in fact, the law itself. To that point, according to Kim Jong-il, father of current Supreme Leader Kim Jong-un, the North Korean legal system and national laws are instruments of the working class and working masses. “Consequently, laws should be interpreted by the North Korean legal system from the perspective of the KWP and the working class.”5

SOUTH AFRICA’S APARTHEID
Enacted in 1950 and abolished in 1991, the Population Registration Act served as the basis for all other apartheid-focused legislation. This legislation categorized every person in South Africa as “white, black, or coloured.” The legislation was later modified to include Asians (primarily those from India). The legislation served as the basis for determining social and political rights, educational opportunities, and economic status. The South African government set up the Office for Race Classification to oversee the classification process. This office employed the following criteria for classifying the ethnicity of each person living in South Africa, which directly impacted the civil rights opportunities for each assessed individual:

- Characteristics of the person’s head hair
- Characteristics of the person’s other hair
- Skin color
- Facial features
- Home language and especially the knowledge of Afrikaans
- Area where the person lives, the person’s friends and acquaintances
- Employment
- Socioeconomic status
- Eating and drinking habits

Figure 2 shows an example of a South African government classification document for an individual during apartheid.

6 This task by the Office for Race Classification parallels one of the duties of the KWP OGD.

Figure 2. Race classification document based on South Africa’s 1950 Population Registration Act

---

For use in overall official instruction, the graphic below shows an example of a South African government classification document providing guidance on classifying individuals.

**Figure 3. Race classification document based on South Africa’s 1950 Population Registration Act**

Other documents were used for restrictive purposes. For example, the document in Figure 4 was referred to as a “dompass,” which was an authorization document to move from Bantu settlements to employment sites outside the Bantu settlements.

---

The following supporting legislation complemented South Africa’s Population Registration Act and consolidated apartheid’s intent:

- Prohibition of Mixed Marriages, which banned all interracial marriages
- Immorality Amendment Act #21 of 1950, which banned sexual relations between whites and blacks
- The Population Registration Act #30 of 1950, which classified people according to their racial characteristics
- Group Areas Act and Segregation Act #41 of 1950, which banned all races from living in the same area
- Suppression of Communism Act #40 of 1950, which banned the Communist Party in South Africa

Figure 4. Example of a “dompass”

- Bantu Building Workers Act# 27 of 1951
- Separate Representation of Voters Act #46 of 1951
- Prevention of illegal squatting Act #52 of 1951, which banned the illegal formation of squatter camps
- Bantu Authorities Act #68 of 1951, which established areas where blacks were allowed to live
- Natives Law Amendment Act of 1952
- Native Pass Laws Act #67 of 1952, which provided for settlement of labor disputes
- Bantu Education Act #47 of 1953
- Reservations of Separate Amenities Act #69 of 1953

The impact of apartheid on South African society is articulated simply in the graph on the next page. The red arrows represent aspects of how South African laws impacted non-whites. The yellow arrows represent aspects of apartheid’s benefits to South African whites and the purple arrows represent aspects of resistance to apartheid.


11 Ibid.

12 Ibid.
Figure 5. The Impacts of Apartheid

148 APARTHEID LAWS

- public facilities were separated
- interracial marriages were banned
- non-whites had no political rights
- non-white citizens could not vote
- education divided

- people were classified
  - four racial categories
    - black
    - Indian
    - white
    - colored (mixed race)
  - separated into different residential areas

blacks were divided into ten homelands
white and non-white use

racial segregation governed South Africa for fifty years in 1948 by the National Party ended in 1994 with Nelson Mandela means separateness economically motivated.

13 Ibid.
APARTHEID

THE DOMINATION OF THE WHITE SOUTH AFRICANS OVER THE NON-WHITE S IN EVERY ASPECT OF LIFE

APARTHEID LAWS

rational segregation

governed South Africa for fifty years

in 1948 by the National Party

ended in 1994 with Nelson Mandela

means separateness

economically motivated

black students

leaders help to eventually end apartheid

Walter Sisulu

Oliver Tambo

Nelson Mandela
NORTH KOREA’S SONGBUN
The Kim regime’s songbun classification system parallels each step of South Africa’s classification process, albeit based far more on party policy by the KWP rather than on DPRK government legislation—the opposite of South Africa’s apartheid. Both have various components, but the songbun classification system’s components—some different, some the same—incorporate much more detail. As soon as the Soviet Union’s 25th Army moved into the northern half of Korea above the 38th parallel after the end of World War II, ethnic Korean communist revolutionaries who accompanied them began revolutionizing the criteria for North Korea’s version of patriotism and deserved citizenship. These Korean communist revolutionaries established the North Korean Provisional People’s Committee (NKPPC), which instituted policies and practices that focused power on peasants, workers, and communist intellectuals at the expense of the pro-Japanese Koreans and landlords.  

On March 7, 1946, the NKPPC instituted a declaration of the “Classification of pro-Japan and Anti-Korean Elements.”

The NKPPC branded all Koreans who were landowners, businessmen, religious personnel, and those that collaborated with the Japanese during their 1910–1945 occupation of Korea as “counter-revolutionaries,” executing or imprisoning them, or sending them to live in isolated mountainous areas of northern North Korea. In 1957, the KWP Politburo began to formalize this process and issued a proclamation titled “On the Transformation of the Struggle with Counterrevolutionary Elements into an All-People All-Party Movement.” This officially initiated the songbun social classification system. The KWP then issued a directive known as the “May 30 Resolution” that initiated songbun as an official party-state platform. This was followed by the DPRK government’s only legislation on songbun issues—“Cabinet Decree No.149” that instituted the large-scale relocation of “unreliables.” Under the justification of “internal security reasons,” those in the “hostile class” were removed from within 20 kilometers from the east and west coastlines and


The NKPPC branded all Koreans who were landowners, businessmen, religious personnel, and those that collaborated with the Japanese during their 1910–1945 occupation of Korea as “counter-revolutionaries,” executing or imprisoning them, or sending them to live in isolated mountainous areas of northern North Korea.

18 Lee, 북한의 사회불평등구조 (North Korea’s Societal Inequality Structure), 310.
Figure 6: Songbun Background Investigation Projects\(^{19}\) (The charts in Figures 6 and 7 were used in a previous publication for the Committee for Human Rights in North Korea titled *Marked for Life: Songbun, North Korea’s Social Classification System*.\(^{20}\))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KWP Intensive Guidance Project</td>
<td>December 1958–December 1960</td>
<td>Exposing, punishing, and forcing relocation of impure elements to remote mountain villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident Registration Project (RRP)</td>
<td>April 1966–March 1967</td>
<td>Classification based on family background to arm a million-man army (investigate 3 direct generations and all relatives of the wife and mother who are separated up to the 6th degree of relationship)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification Project for Division of Populace into 3 Classes and 51 Sub-categories</td>
<td>April 1967–June 1970</td>
<td>Based on the re-registration project, the entire population is divided into the Core (Loyal) Class, Wavering Class and Hostile Class, and then further divided into 51 sub-categories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident Investigation Project (RIP)</td>
<td>February 1972–1974</td>
<td>Investigate and determine the inclinations of the people based on discussions concerning North-South relations and then classify people based on those who can be believed, those whose beliefs are somewhat dubious, and those believed to be anti-state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Identification Card Inspection Project</td>
<td>January 1980–December 1980</td>
<td>To expose impure elements, increase control, and inspect and renew citizen identification cards according to Kim Jong-il’s orders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project concerning repatriated Koreans and defectors from South Korea</td>
<td>April 1980–October 1980</td>
<td>Classify repatriated Koreans who entered North Korea, including those who defected to North Korea into an additional 13 sub-categories and update related surveillance projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project concerning Koreans repatriated from Japan to North Korea</td>
<td>January 1981–April 1981</td>
<td>Collect details of the data on former Korean residents in Japan who repatriated to North Korea and modernize surveillance data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Identification Card Renewal Project</td>
<td>November 1983–March 1984</td>
<td>Renewal of citizen identification cards and update songbun dossier for all residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident Reinvestigation Project</td>
<td>October 1989–December 1990 (*in some sources this date is March 1984–October 1989)</td>
<td>Review and re-index resident registration; develop background data on separated families (those families separated between North and South Korea during the Korean War)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoption of the Citizen Registration Law</td>
<td>November 1997</td>
<td>Birth certificate, citizenship certificate, Pyong-yang citizen card issuance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship Card Exchange</td>
<td>April 2004</td>
<td>Change of citizenship card from vinyl-coating style to a notebook-style</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The classification process of the songbun system begins at birth for every North Korean citizen. Children under the age of 17 are classified the same way as their parents. At the age of 17, the national police located in every community initiates a background investigation of every person, usually when they are seniors in high school. Upon completion of the investigation, a local police investigator presents the results to his police chief, who then recommends a songbun social classification to the local KWP committee chair and the songbun classification of that individual is determined. The investigation form, example seen on the next pages, parallels the document in Figure 2.
Figure 7: North Korean Resident Registration File

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>North Korean Resident Registration File</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Page 1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual #:</th>
<th>Onchon 2194</th>
<th>Resident File #:</th>
<th>Taedong 28641</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Ri Chung-song</td>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>Birth date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1941.9.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M/F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1941.9.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of Birth</td>
<td>South Pyongan Province, Taedong County, Wau-ri</td>
<td>Party Entrance Date</td>
<td>1963.4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chulsin Songbun</td>
<td>Peasant</td>
<td>Social Songbun</td>
<td>Soldier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handicaps and Physical Characteristics: (blank)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relation</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Birth date</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Ri Tae-won</td>
<td>1924.2.9</td>
<td>Onchon 21922</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Ri Mae-nyo</td>
<td>1926.11.28</td>
<td>Onchon 2193</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife</td>
<td>Pak Chun-ae</td>
<td>1943.2.11</td>
<td>Onchon 2195</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Son</td>
<td>Ri Chung-il</td>
<td>1960.9.18</td>
<td>Onchon 2196</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd son</td>
<td>Ri Chung-hyok</td>
<td>1967.8.9</td>
<td>Taedong 12811</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger brother</td>
<td>Ri Un-hyok</td>
<td>1943.2.9</td>
<td>Onchon 2197</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger brother</td>
<td>Ri Un-shil</td>
<td>1947.12.9</td>
<td>Onchon 2198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father’s Cousin</td>
<td>Ri Tae-hyok</td>
<td>1928.3.9</td>
<td>Pyongsong 12</td>
<td>China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father’s Cousin</td>
<td>Ri Tae-yop</td>
<td>1926.12.9</td>
<td>Sunchon 291</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Academic and Work Record

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Residence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1949.9.1</td>
<td>1954.8.30</td>
<td>Taedong County Taedong Elementary School</td>
<td>Pyongan South Province, Taedong County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954.9.1</td>
<td>1957.4.30</td>
<td>Taedong County Taedong Middle School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957.5.1</td>
<td>1963.7.6</td>
<td>KPA Unit 724 Squad Leader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963.7.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Taedong Cooperative Farmer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party Election Data</td>
<td>Awards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From</td>
<td>To</td>
<td>Elected Service</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982.10.2</td>
<td>1986.8.7</td>
<td>Candidate Member of Taedong County Party Committee</td>
<td>1961.4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1972.4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1982.2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diploma and Honors</th>
<th>Criminal Sanctions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Diploma / Honors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Blank)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Blank)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citizen Card Issue</th>
<th>Picture</th>
<th>Marital Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Reason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Class Foundation and Socio-political Life Record

Ri Chung-song was born the oldest son of Ri Tae-won who was a tenant farmer of 2,000 pyong of dry fields (1 pyong = 3.3 square meters), 1,000 pyong of rice fields. After liberation, his father was allocated 2,000 pyong of rice fields and 1,000 pyong of dry fields to farm. There were no problems during the Korean War. In August 1955, father became part of a cooperative farm. He attended elementary and middle school.

Interviewees include: South Pyongan Province, Taedong County Wau-ri Cooperative Farm
- Kim Hyong-su, 52, male, KWP member
- O Kil-hun, 59, male, KWP member
- Pyon Il-jae, 56, male, KWP member
- Cho Chae-il, 58, male, KWP member
- Ri Kil-song, 59, male, KWP member

1991.4.25

Entered KPA 1957.5.1 and served as squad leader in Unit 724. Discharged 1963.7.6 and worked at Taedong County cooperative farm since then.

Interviewees include:
- KPA Unit 724 Political Section chief Ri Kil-su, male, 51, KWP member
- South Pyongan Province, Taedong County Township Cooperative Farm party secretary Ri Mun-hak, male, 52, KWP member

1991.6.27
These forms are dictated by the Resident Registration Project Reference Manual (see next page). The investigator also uses and adheres to two documents issued by the KWP: the Task Guide Manual on Each Class and Social Stratum of the Masses and the Songbun Classification Guide. South Africa’s Population Registration Act contains parallels to the content in these documents.

Figure 8. Cover Page of the Resident Registration Project Reference Manual\textsuperscript{22}

\textsuperscript{22} Ibid.
Resident Registration Project Reference Manual Table of Contents
(Korean and English)

차 례

I. 주민등록사업
1. 주민료해사업
   1) 주민료해사업에서 지켜야 할 원칙
   2) 주민료해대상과 그에 대한 장악
   3) 주민료해사업분담
   4) 주민료해내용
   5) 주민료해방법
2. 주민대장을 만들고 배렬하는 사업
   6) 주민대장을 만드는데서 지켜야 할 원칙
   7) 주민대장을 만들어야 할 대상
   8) 주민등록카드와 주민대장 No 6을 쓰는 방법
   9) 찾기표를 쓰는 방법
  10) 주민대장근거자료집을 만드는 방법
   11) 주민대장을 매는 방법
  12) 주민대장번호 제정과 등록방법
  13) 본인번호 제정과 등록방법
  14) 주민대장배렬

II. 주민등록사업을 정상화하고 주민료해를 심화시키기 위한 사업
1. 새로 제기되는 대상들에 대한료해사업
   1) 새로 제기되는료해대상과 그에 대한 장악사업
   2) 새로 제기되는 대상들에 대한료해사업
2. 주민들의사회정지생활변동료해를 정상화하고 심화시키기 위한 사업
   1) 본인 및한집안가족들의사회정지생활변동료해를효화하기위한사업
   2) 따로사는 가족,친척들의사회정지생활변동료해를효화하기위한사업
   3) 남반부 또는다른나라에살고있는가족,친척들에대한료해사업
   4) 사회정지생활변동료해를정상화하도록장악과검열을강화하기위한사업
3. 주민료해를 더욱 심화시키기 위한 사업
   1)료해를심화시키아할대상
   2)료해를심화시키아할대상장악방법
   3)료해를심화시키아할대상들에대한료해방법
   4)완전히료해하지하지못하였거나잘못료해된대상들을료해한자료처리
   5)주민료해를심화시키고정상화하기위한보증인료해
4. 주민대장을 완성하기 위한 자료 등록 및 통보 사업
   1) 자료 정리 및 통보 사업에서 지켜야 할 원칙
   2) 주민대장정리방법
   3) 자료통보방법
5. 주민료해를 위한 자료교환
6. 주민대장을 넘겨주고 받기 위한 사업
   1) 주민대장이관사업에서 지켜야 할 원칙
   2) 주민대장을 넘겨주고 받는 절차와 방법

III. 주민대장 보관 및 리용
1. 주민대장보관관리
   1) 주민대장보관질서
   2) 첨기표보관관리
   3) 주민대장근거자료집 보관질서
2. 주민대장의 리용
   1) 주민대장의 리용
   2) 주민대장 리용에서 엄격한 규율을 세우기 위한 사업
   3) 주민대장열람대상
3. 주민대장실사
   1) 주요대장실사를 정상적으로 진행하기 위한 방법
   2) 주민대장실사방법

IV. 주민들의 성분 및 계층 규정사업
1. 성분 및 계층 규정 절차와 방법
   1) 성분 및 계층 규정에서 지켜야 할 원칙
   2) 성분 및 계층 규정대상과 대상장악방법
   3) 성분 및 계층 규정 절차와 방법
2. 성분 및 계층 규정기준
   1) 성분규정기준
   2) 계층규정기준

V. 주민등록사업 조직과 지도, 주민등록일군들의 임무
1. 주민등록사업 조직과 지도
   2) 호위사업지역과 중요지대 주민료해사업을 심화시키기 위한 사업
   3) 격변하는 정세의 요구에 맞게 주민료해사업을 심화시키고 정상화하기 위한 사업
   4) 새로운 자료들로 주민대상을 보충완성하고 주민대장보관관리리용사업에서
      엄격한 규율과 질서를 세우기 위한 사업
   5) 주민대장열람에서 엄격한 제도와 질서를 세우기 위한 사업
   6) 일군들속에서 주민등록사업을 중시하는 기풍을 세우기 위한 사업
   7) 주민등록사업에 대한 총화사업
2. 주민등록일군들의 임무
   1) 도안전국 부국장 (주민등록담당)의 임무
   2) 도안전국 처장 (주민등록담당)의 임무
   3) 도안전국 주민등록처 지도원들의 임무
   4) 시, 군 안전부 주민등록일군들의 임무
   5) 중앙기관 (국가안전보위부, 호의사령부, 91훈련소 포함) 주민료해일군들의 임무

VI. 부록
   1. 주민등록일군들이 가지고 있어야 할 문건
   2. 주민등록사업에서 쓰이는 말풀이
   3. 주민등록사업직관도
   4. 가족, 친척료해범위에 속한 촌수알아보기표
Table of Contents

I. Resident Registration Tasks
   1. Resident Registration Tasks
      1) Principles for Resident Investigation Tasks
      2) Controlling Targets of Resident Investigation
      3) Assigning Resident Investigation Tasks
      4) Topics/Contents of Resident Investigations
      5) How to Conduct Resident Investigations
   2. Task of Creating and Distributing Resident Documents
      1) Principles for Creating Resident Documents
      2) Purpose of Creating Resident Documents
      3) How to use Resident Registration Cards and Resident Document No. 6
      4) How to Use Search List Table
      5) How to Use a Resident Document as a Basis for Reference
      6) How to Group Resident Documents
      7) How to Number Resident Documents
      8) How to Establish and Register an Individual Number
      9) Arranging Resident Documents

II. Tasks to Standardize Resident Registration and to Intensify Resident Registration Investigations
   1. Investigation Tasks for Newly Raised/Filed/Identified Targets
      1) Newly Identified Targets of Investigation and Tasks for Control
      2) Investigation Tasks for Newly Identified Targets
   2. Tasks to Standardize and Deepen Investigations Concerning Change in the Social and Political Lives of Residents
      1) Tasks to Investigate Changes in the Social and Political Lives of Target and Target's Family Household
      2) Tasks to Investigate Changes in the Social and Political Lives of Family and Relatives Living Apart
      3) Tasks to Investigate Family and Relatives Living in the South or in Other Countries
      4) Tasks to Reinforce Standardization of Investigations of Change in Social and Political Life
   3. Tasks to Further Intensifying Resident Investigations
      1) Targets for Intensified Investigations
      2) How to Control Targets for Intensified Investigations
      3) How to Conduct Investigations of Targets for Intensified Investigations
4) Process for Investigating Targets That Have Not Been Thoroughly or Incorrectly Investigated
5) Guarantees for Intensifying and Standardizing Resident Investigation Materials

4. Tasks to Register and Promote Materials for Perfecting Resident Documents
   1) Principles to Follow When Handling and Promoting Materials
   2) How to Handle Resident Documents
   3) How to Promote Materials

5. Exchanging Materials for Resident Investigations

6. Tasks for Exchanging Resident Documents
   1) Principles for Resident Documents at Public Sites
   2) Steps and Procedures for how to Exchange Resident Documents

III. Resident Documents Storage and Usage
1. Resident Document Storage Management
   1) Resident Document Storage Principles
   2) Search Documents Storage Management
   3) Storage Principles for Resident Document’s Evidence
2. Resident Document Usage
   1) Resident Document Usage
   2) Tasks to Establish Strict Regulations for Resident Document Usage
   3) Access to Resident Documents
3. Resident Document Inspection
   1) How to Conduct Normal Resident Document Inspection
   2) How to Inspect Resident Documents

IV. Resident Songbun Social Classification and Maintenance Tasks
1. Steps and Procedures for Songbun Social Classification and Maintenance
   1) Principles to Follow for Songbun Social Classification and Maintenance
   2) Targets for Songbun Social Classification and Maintenance and How to Control Targets
   3) Steps and Procedures for Songbun Social Classification and Maintenance
4. Standards for Songbun Social Classification and Maintenance
   1) Standards for Songbun Maintenance
   2) Standards for Classification Regulations
V. Organization and Guidance for Resident Registration Tasks, Mission of Resident Registration Officials
1. Organization and Guidance for Resident Registration Tasks
   1) Tasks for Intensifying Resident Investigations in Guarded and Important Regions/Areas
   2) Tasks to Intensify and Standardize Resident Investigations to Meet the Demands of Rapidly Changing Circumstances
   3) Tasks to Supplement and Complete Resident Documents with New Materials and Tasks to Establish Strict Principles and Regulations for Resident Document Storage and Usage
   4) Tasks to Establish Strict Principles and Institutions for Reading Resident Documents
   5) Tasks to Establish Importance of Resident Registration Tasks Among Officials
   6) Self-critique Tasks Regarding Resident Registration
2. Mission of Resident Registration Officials
   1) Mission of the Deputy Director of the Provincial Police (Responsible for Resident Registration)
   2) Mission of the Chief of the Provincial Police (Responsible for Resident Registration)
   3) Mission of Resident Registration Guidance Officers of the Provincial Police
   4) Mission of Resident Registration Officials by City and County Police
   5) The Mission of Resident Investigation Officials of the Central Agencies (including Ministry of State Security, Guard Command, and the 91st Training Center)\(^{23}\)

VI. Addendum
1. Items that Resident Registration Officials Must Have
2. Interpretations of Resident Registration Tasks
3. Resident Registration Tasks Related to Direct Plan
4. Looking Into the Degree of Kinship During Investigation of Family and Kin

\(^{23}\) The title of “91st Training Center” is a former term for the Pyongyang Defense Command.
**Figure 14: Tables Showing Songbun Categories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Songbun Category</th>
<th>Songbun Category Description</th>
<th>Party Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Laborer (Basic background)</td>
<td>Peasants, hired agricultural workers, and laborers whose positions were unchanged before and after liberation and whose social songbun was laborer</td>
<td>Core class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hired agricultural workers</td>
<td>Those who came from historically peasant families</td>
<td>Core class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Poor farmers</td>
<td>Those who made their livelihood by farming their own land with at least 50% mixed crops</td>
<td>Core class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>White collar workers</td>
<td>Those who worked in the Party, government, administration, economic, cultural, or education field after liberation</td>
<td>Core class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Those who were intellectuals after liberation</td>
<td>Those who received a high school education in North Korea or other communist countries after liberation (Those educated overseas were placed under surveillance but remained part of core class)</td>
<td>Core class</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Revolutionaries’ Families</td>
<td>Families of those who were sacrificed in the anti-Japanese struggle</td>
<td>Treated as core class, appointed to party, government, military positions, those unable to further serve given maximum social security benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Families of Patriots</td>
<td>Families of non-combatant patriots killed in the Korean War</td>
<td>Treated as core class, appointed to party, government, military positions, those unable to further serve given maximum social security benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Families of Korean War dead</td>
<td>Those who died in the Korean War</td>
<td>Core class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Families of soldiers killed in Korean War</td>
<td>Families of soldiers killed in the Korean War</td>
<td>Core class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Rear area families</td>
<td>Families of active duty soldiers</td>
<td>Core class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Honored soldiers</td>
<td>Those who served in the Korean War</td>
<td>Core class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Post-liberation laborers</td>
<td>During the socialist revolution process after liberation, those who became laborers but were formerly middle/small merchants, industrialists, intellectuals, or rich farmers</td>
<td>Past songbun background and current activities require surveillance and supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Rich farmers</td>
<td>Farmers who hire one or more agricultural workers Farmers who hire workers for the planting/harvesting season</td>
<td>Must consider as resistance elements due to strong indications and subject to surveillance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Surveillance Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>National capitalists</td>
<td>Merchants who were national capitalists</td>
<td>Classified as resistance elements and subject to general surveillance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Landlords</td>
<td>At the time of land reform in 1946, those who had 5 chongbo of land or more confiscated(^{25}) Those who cultivated up to 3 chongbo of land</td>
<td>Subject to special surveillance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Pro-Japan and pro-U.S. individuals</td>
<td>Those who carried out pro-Japan or pro-U.S. activities</td>
<td>Subject to strict surveillance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Reactionary elements</td>
<td>Those who served the Japanese during the Japanese colonial period</td>
<td>Subject to strict surveillance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Those from the South (first category)</td>
<td>Families of rich farmers, landlords, national capitalists, pro-Japanese, pro-U.S., or reactionaries who came north during the Korean War</td>
<td>Subject to strict surveillance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Those from the South (second category)</td>
<td>Laborers and farmers who committed crimes and then came north during the Korean War</td>
<td>Subject to general surveillance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Those expelled from the party</td>
<td>Failed to carry out party mission and therefore expelled from the Party</td>
<td>Special surveillance based on reason for removal from the Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Those fired from their jobs</td>
<td>Cadre who were fired from positions after appointment</td>
<td>Problem data recorded in their files</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{25}\) One chongbo equals 3,000 pyong. One pyong is 35.58 square feet. Therefore, one chongbo is 106,740 square feet.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>22</th>
<th>Those who worked for the enemy</th>
<th>Those who surrendered who worked for the ROK-side police, security units or government during ROK occupation of the north during Korean War</th>
<th>Treated in same manner as those Removed from the Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Families of those arrested or jailed</td>
<td>Families of those sentenced to jail time</td>
<td>Treated in same manner as those removed from the Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Spies</td>
<td>Those arrested as infiltrators or spies or associated with either</td>
<td>Treated in same manner as those removed from the Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Anti-party, anti-revolution factionalists</td>
<td>Those from the South Korean Labor Party in 1957 Others purged for anti-Kim Il-sung actions</td>
<td>Treated in same manner as those removed from the Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Families of those executed</td>
<td>Families of those who were executed for anti-party activity after the Korean War</td>
<td>Treated in same manner as those removed from the Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Those released from prison for political crimes</td>
<td>Those released from prison after serving sentence or for political crimes</td>
<td>Treated in same manner as those removed from the Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Those who are lazy</td>
<td>Those who are lazy all of their life and causing trouble</td>
<td>General surveillance based on defining them as capable of being anti-revolutionaries during crisis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Hostesses</td>
<td>Shamans, fortune tellers, prostitutes, hostesses</td>
<td>General surveillance based on defining them as capable of being anti-revolutionaries during crisis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Subgroup/Description</td>
<td>Surveillance Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Those guilty of economic crimes</td>
<td>Those who serve jail time for theft, armed robbery, embezzlement</td>
<td>General surveillance based on defining them as capable of being anti-revolutionaries during crisis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Members of the Democratic Party</td>
<td>Families of those who were active in the Korea Socialist Democratic Party</td>
<td>Special surveillance based on position in Democratic Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Chondo religion, Chongu Party members</td>
<td>Former believers of Chondo religion or the Chongu Party</td>
<td>Special surveillance based on position in Democratic Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Koreans repatriated from China</td>
<td>Those returning from Northeast Asia after 1957</td>
<td>Other than Party members, returnees should be subject to surveillance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Koreans repatriated from Japan</td>
<td>Repatriated Koreans who formerly lived in Japan</td>
<td>Chosen Soren cadre join the Party and the rest placed under surveillance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Those who enter North Korea</td>
<td>Those who enter North Korea after liberation</td>
<td>Strict surveillance of those who enter North Korea after liberation, but not those who enter after liberation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Intelligentsia educated before liberation</td>
<td>Those who graduated from high school during Japanese colonial period</td>
<td>Part of this group subject to surveillance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Protestant Christians</td>
<td>Protestant believer at the end of the Korean War</td>
<td>Special surveillance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Buddhists</td>
<td>Buddhist believer at the end of the Korean War</td>
<td>Special surveillance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Catholic Christians</td>
<td>Catholic believer at the end of the Korean War</td>
<td>Special surveillance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Out-of-area student or well-known person</td>
<td>Those who studied overseas or out-of-area or were famous locally</td>
<td>General surveillance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Independent farmer</td>
<td>Farmer who makes his livelihood on his own land</td>
<td>Treated as wavering class and ideologically indoctrinated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Small businessman</td>
<td>Does not have own facilities but moves from location to location</td>
<td>Ideologically indoctrinated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Mid-level businessman</td>
<td>Merchant who owned his own residence and shop</td>
<td>Treated as wavering class and convinced to change ideologically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Artisans</td>
<td>Those who made their own products</td>
<td>Ideologically indoctrinated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Small factory owners</td>
<td>Those who owned their own small factory</td>
<td>General surveillance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Medium service traders</td>
<td>Owned their own facilities and buildings and hired employees</td>
<td>Convinced to change ideologically and treated as wavering class as much as possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Small service traders</td>
<td>Made their living as small service traders</td>
<td>Ideologically indoctrinated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Those from the South (third category)</td>
<td>Families of laborers and peasants from South Korea who were not guilty of political crime</td>
<td>Ideologically indoctrinated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>No assigned category</td>
<td>Those who did not enter a political party</td>
<td>Ideologically indoctrinated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Party member</td>
<td>Party member</td>
<td>Core class, treated as cadre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Capitalist</td>
<td>Those who lost all of their commercial assets to nationalization after 1946</td>
<td>Strict surveillance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Over time, these categories were modified, deleted, or supplemented with new categories as socio-political situations changed.

While DPRK legislation or supporting KWP policies does not specifically address interclass marriage, every North Korean knows that marriage between classes is highly discouraged by the citizens themselves. Of the loyal, wavering, and hostile classes, intermarriage between classes directly impacts education, housing, food security, economic opportunity, and healthcare, but most of all—opportunity. For a member of the loyal class to marry a hostile class member is risking not only his or her livelihood, but also that of their family members. The Kim regime has always employed the concept of yeon-jwa-je “guilt by association” to ensure entire families are punished for the crime of just one member of the family. Consequently, if a man from the loyal class marries a woman from the hostile class, that man’s parents and children will suffer irreparable harm to their way of life. Similar to how South Africans lived under apartheid, the majority of North Koreans are aware of their social status under songbun and why they are treated accordingly.

Labor restrictions most likely had and have the greatest impact on the daily lives of those disenfranchised by apartheid and songbun. Apartheid impacted the quality of life of every non-white South African. Songbun continues to impact the quality of life of every North Korean who is not part of the elite classes. Non-white African workers were excluded from industrial relations through South Africa’s Native Labor Act of 1953. Economic opportunity, quality of healthcare, education opportunities, and housing were all impacted by this legislation. In North Korea, a similar impact resulted from songbun classifications. The figure on the next page demonstrates how this works.

Similar to how South Africans lived under apartheid, the majority of North Koreans are aware of their social status under songbun and why they are treated accordingly.
Figure 15. North Korea’s Occupational Stratum

NORTH KOREA’S OCCUPATIONAL STRATUM OF CONSTRAINED MOBILITY
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Lee, 북한의 사회불평등구조 (North Korea’s Societal Inequality Structure), 44.
LOCATING POLICIES
Both South Africa and North Korea devised and implemented plans to relocate portions of their populations that they intended to disenfranchise, isolate, and/or imprison. Both apartheid and songbun were used as justifications to establish localities that would prevent the oppressed South African blacks and North Korea’s hostile class from living freely within their respective countries.

South Africa’s white National Party established “Bantustan” territories for black Africans only. Ten territories were established by the 1970 Bantu Homelands Citizenship Act and residents of these territories were denied South African citizenship, thus being deprived of political and civil rights in South Africa. At the time, that was 3.5 million people. See Dhiru V. Soni and Brij Maharaj, “Emerging Urban Forms In Rural South Africa,” Antipode 23, no.1 (1991): 54, https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8330.1991.tb00402.x.

Both apartheid and songbun were used as justifications to establish localities that would compel the oppressed South African blacks and North Korea’s hostile class from living freely within their respective countries.

The following figure depicts where these areas of forced separation are in South Africa.


Figure 16. South Africa’s Bantustan territories

31 McKenna, “Bantustan.”
In parallel actions and policy and based on the Intensive Guidance Project of the KWP and the KWP’s May 30th Resolution, approximately 3,200,000 people, or one-third of all North Koreans, were classified into the hostile class. Cabinet Decree No.149 resulted in 70,000 of these individuals being forced to relocate to mountainous and isolated areas of northern North Korea and 6,000 being sent to prison. North Korea’s KWP banned songbun’s hostile class from residence in the capital city of Pyongyang and its vicinity as well as anywhere near the demilitarized zone separating North Korea from South Korea (Republic of Korea). The justification was that members of the hostile class could not be trusted within or near areas of importance to regime security and national security.

Parallel to South Africa’s use of the “dompass” document to restrict the movement of non-whites into white-controlled territory, North Korea’s Kim regime issues two different national identification cards, as shown in Figures 17 and 18. For those not living in Pyongyang, North Korean residents receive a general “Resident Card” as seen in Figure 17. Beginning in 1997, the privileged elite and trusted loyal class living in Pyongyang or special areas under Pyongyang’s jurisdiction get a specific “Pyongyang Honored Identification Card” when they live in Pyongyang, as shown in Figure 18.

Figure 17. North Korea’s standard identification card for those living outside Pyongyang

---

32 Lee 북한의 사회불평등 구조 [North Korea’s Societal Inequality Structure], 72-73.
33 Kim, “Pukhanui Chumin Songbun” [North Korean Residents’ Songbun], 70-75.
Figure 18. North Korea’s “Pyongyang Honorary Citizen Card” for those living in Pyongyang.

According to the Pyongyang City Management Law, the party-state delineates who can live in Pyongyang. Furthermore, the more elite one’s status, the closer to downtown Pyongyang one can live. Based on one’s political performance, one can have one’s Pyongyang Honorary Citizen Card confiscated, leading to banishment from the city.36

Eventually, many of the remote mountainous areas became political prison camps for those found guilty of “betraying the supreme leader.” The total population of internees at the political prison camps numbers approximately 120,000, while the number in the long-term prison camps is estimated at above 70,000.37 A very recent estimate by DailyNK places the current number of political prisoners at 160,000.38 The figure on the next page depicts where these prisons are.

36 Ibid.
Figure 19. Map of North Korea's Kyo-hwa-so (labor re-education camps) and Kwan-li-so (political prison camps)39

39 Hawk and Oh, The Parallel Gulag.
Though there is no known North Korean law addressing the establishment and maintenance of North Korea’s political prison camps, there are the directives from the Kim regime’s Supreme Leader, which are regarded as the highest law in North Korea. On November 19, 2005, Kim Jong-il issued the following directive titled “Commanding General Comrade Kim Jong-il’s Words to Senior Cadre of the State Security Department” (now the Ministry of State Security). The directive states:

“My dear comrades, you are being called to uphold the revolutionary spirit, resist the yellow wind of capitalism and ensure that not a single citizen defects from North Korea. We have steadily reformed the ideology of the people since we won liberation from Japan. We have done enough of it. Now, we must give traitors a taste of the proletarian dictatorship. The roots of poisonous grasses must be pulled up. Any compromise means death in the class struggle.

My dear comrades, you should not compromise under any circumstance or show the slightest mercy on those who drop from the ranks of our revolution. We will stick to our methods at all costs.

We must show the people that the last of traitors are eliminated even at the cost of gun-shots in public. We must expand camps for political prisoners in strategic locations and maintain strict control over them. Now, we are fighting an invisible war with class foes. The confused elements at home are more dangerous than the enemy outside. My dear comrades, you are fighters at the forefront of the revolution. I sleep comfortably because all of you are out there. Let’s work hard through the upcoming generations to accomplish the great work of the Juche Revolution that the Supreme Generalissimo initiated from the peak of Mount Paektu.”

40 Many find this statement to be an exaggeration but every one of the 33,000 North Korean escapees living in South Korea will attest to this fact.
This directive is a clear order to the Ministry of State Security to establish and maintain political prison camps.41

The Bantustan territories had a catastrophic impact on the families that were forcibly relocated there, the North Korean political prison camps are designed for life imprisonment for most internees. Furthermore, many of the members of the hostile class who are not in prisons are forced to live in isolated mountainous areas where they are employed in strictly low-skilled labor jobs, such as mining.

LEGAL PARALELLES BETWEEN SOUTH AFRICAN AND NORTH KOREAN CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY
Article 7 of the Rome Statute defines crimes against humanity as follows:

(a) Murder;
(b) Extermination;
(c) Enslavement;
(d) Deportation or forcible transfer of population;
(e) Imprisonment or other severe deprivation of physical liberty in violation of fundamental rules of international law;
(f) Torture;
(g) Rape, sexual slavery, enforced prostitution, forced pregnancy, enforced sterilization, or any other form of sexual violence of comparable gravity;
(h) Persecution against any identifiable group or collectivity on political, racial, national, ethnic, cultural, religious, gender as defined in paragraph 3, or other grounds that are universally recognized as impermissible under international law;

Rome Statute, Article (2)(h) defines the crime of apartheid as:

inhumane acts of a character similar to those referred to in paragraph 1, committed in the context of an institutionalized regime of systematic oppression and domination by one racial group over any other racial group or groups and committed with the intention of maintaining that regime.

It is important to note that North Korea employs its own form of racism in its crimes against humanity. Under the Kim regime, North Korean ideology has always

42 Article 7 of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court.

43 The temporal jurisdiction under the Rome Statute began in 2002, when it entered into force. Thus, South Africa under apartheid does not fall, strictly legally speaking, under the jurisdiction of the Rome Statute.
stressed that the Korean race is superior over all other races and nations. If there is Chinese ethnicity in one’s family, then one is never socially classified under the upper loyal class. One could make it as far as the middle wavering class, provided one worked diligently and supported all KWP policies within the respective area of work (institutional or geographic).

THE ARGUMENT FOR NORTH KOREAN SONGBUN TO CONSTITUTE CONTEMPORARY APARTHEID
Notably, after the landmark 2014 COI report found evidence of crimes against humanity occurring in North Korea, Chair of the COI Justice Michael Kirby stated that North Korea must “abolish immediately and completely the discriminatory Songbun system,” describing it as “an apartheid of social class” (emphasis added). The COI report highlighted the critical structural role of North Korea’s use of “discrimination on the basis of gender and songbun” to “maintain a rigid social structure” and therefore commit crimes against humanity.

Subsequently, Navi Pillay, the former UN High Commissioner for Human Rights and President of the Rwanda Tribunal, addressed an audience in Seoul in 2015 calling North Korea’s caste system of songbun a new example of apartheid.

More recently, in 2017, the War Crimes Committee of the International Bar Association (IBA) held an Inquiry on North Korea’s alleged crimes against humanity, finding all crimes, except for the crime against apartheid, have been committed in North Korea. The IBA noted that the decision was made with the facts presented at the time and evidence may later be submitted that could make the designation of apartheid applicable (despite the fact that North Korea has not ratified or acceded to the Apartheid Convention or the Rome Statute).

As the previous information in this report details, North Korea’s songbun system is relatively robust and complicated, breaking individual North Koreans down into three main categories and 51 sub-categories. One could also view songbun as “political apartheid,” as the Kim family regime has a caste system that ensures the elites—those most loyal to the Kim family—dominate those groups deemed and categorized as less loyal. The oppression is rooted in family history, social classification, and sometimes race, and North Koreans are with few exceptions unable to break free of this systematic oppression. Their songbun classification dominates their lives from cradle to grave, impacting where they

---


47 Elizabeth Shim, “Ex-UN official: North Korean caste system is the new apartheid,” UPI, October 22, 2015, https://www.upi.com/Top_News/World-News/2015/10/22/Ex-UN-

live, their education, their partners, their occupations, their party membership, and their overall status in North Korea.

While the songbun system today in North Korea should be viewed as modern-day apartheid based on this social and political discriminatory system, there are racial elements involved in these categories too. In specific instances, while the overarching classification system centers on social classification based on political loyalty to the Kim family regime, it is important to also note that North Korea employs its own form of racism in its crimes against humanity. Under the Kim regime, North Korean ideology has always stressed that the Korean race is superior to all other races and nations. There are two main instances of this based on race or ethnicity.

(1) CHINESE

As discussed, if there is Chinese ethnicity in one’s family, then one is never socially classified under the upper loyal class (upper third). One could make it as far as the middle wavering class, provided one worked diligently and supported all KWP policies within the respective area of work (institutional or geographic).

(2) JAPANESE

However, the worst case of racial discrimination is having Japanese background. In 1960, there was a great migration of Koreans back from Japan who had been brought to Japan decades before to work in factories during World War II. They remained in Japan until North Korea offered them repatriation to the motherland. Known in Japan as Zainichi Koreans, 97% of them were from southern Korea. The number of Koreans who accepted repatriation in 1960 and 1961 to North Korea was approximately 93,000 (North Korea needed laborers). Many brought back Japanese spouses and their children. Upon arrival, their songbun social classification and subsequent treatment were based on their background with the Japanese and their origins from southern Korea.

Of course, there were exceptions to every rule in North Korea based on talents and capabilities that the Kim regime wanted to exploit. Even in the ruling Kim line, there is one woman who was half-Japanese. Kim Jong-un’s father, Kim Jong-il, found her so pretty that he made her his concubine. This was none other than Ko Yong-hui, Kim Jong-un’s mother.

(3) Jus Cogens (Peremptory Norms)

While it seems generally accepted that the Apartheid Convention was referring specifically to South Africa and is not

broadly applicable, some scholars argue that the application of the crime of apartheid should not only address apartheid in South Africa but post-South African apartheid cases as well. Some argue that the treaty has now become customary international law and arguably jus cogens, and thus a peremptory norm of international law that is not subject to derogation or avoidance. One of the main points of this argument comes from the inclusion of the crime of apartheid in the Rome Statute, which did not enter into force until 2002. As John Dugard has written, “It may be concluded that the Apartheid Convention is dead as far as the original cause for its creation—apartheid in South Africa—is concerned, but that it lives on as a species of the crime against humanity, under both customary international law and the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court.” Arguing for the acknowledgement of apartheid beyond South Africa, he continues:

That the Apartheid Convention is intended to apply to situations other than South Africa is confirmed by its endorsement in a wider context in instruments adopted before and after the fall of apartheid. In 1977, Additional Protocol I of the Geneva Conventions of 1949 recognized apartheid as a “grave breach” of the Protocol (art. 85, paragraph 4 (c)) without any geographical limitation. Apartheid features as a crime in the Draft Code of Crimes against the Peace and Security of Mankind adopted by the International Law Commission on first reading in 1991 without any reference to South Africa and in 1996 the Draft Code adopted on second reading recognized institutionalized racial discrimination as species of crime against humanity in article 18 (f) and explained in its commentary that this “is in fact the crime of apartheid under a more general denomination” (Report of the International Law Commission on the work of its forty-eighth session (A/51/10), p. 49). In 1998, the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court included the “crime of apartheid” as a form of crime against humanity (art. 7).
CONCLUSION
To that effect, the concepts of South Africa’s apartheid and North Korea’s songbun have parallel components whose consequences make them both inherently crimes against humanity.

As discussed, there are resounding similarities with North Korean songbun and South African apartheid in terms of oppression by one group over another and systematic discrimination impacting access to food and medicine, for example. While the Apartheid Convention seems to discuss the traditional notion of apartheid based on the crime of apartheid in South Africa, the 2002 Rome Statute’s inclusion of the crime as a crime against humanity, for one, allows for a broader application, allowing us to consider whether evidence suggests that North Korea’s Kim Jong-un should be held accountable for the crime of apartheid as a crime against humanity.

The crimes against humanity associated with apartheid and the songbun social-classification system served the political objectives, policies and practices of South Africa’s National Party and North Korea’s Korean Workers’ Party. To that effect, the concepts of South Africa’s apartheid and North Korea’s songbun have parallel components whose consequences make them both inherently crimes against humanity. Policies and practices grounded in both concepts suppress and deny opportunity, rights and privileges to systematically targeted segments of the population.
ANNEX 1: APPLICABLE LAWS TO APARTHEID IN NORTH KOREA

Three treaties apply to the crime of apartheid: (1) the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (ICERD);\textsuperscript{55} (2) the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid (Apartheid Convention);\textsuperscript{56} and (3) the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (Rome Statute).\textsuperscript{57}

(1) The ICERD

The ICERD went into force on March 7, 1966. It defined “racial discrimination” in Article 1 as “any distinction, exclusion, restriction or preference based on race, colour, descent, or national or ethnic origin which has the purpose or effect of nullifying or impairing the recognition, enjoyment or exercise, on an equal footing, of human rights and fundamental freedoms in the political, economic, social, cultural or any other field of public life” (emphasis added). Article 3 states, “States Parties particularly condemn racial segregation and apartheid and undertake to prevent, prohibit and eradicate all practices of this nature in territories under their jurisdiction.” On December 16, 1966,


the UN General Assembly passed a resolution (2202 A (XXI)) condemning apartheid in South Africa as a crime against humanity.\(^{58}\)

South Africa signed the ICERD in 1994. However, North Korea is not a signatory to the ICERD.\(^{59}\)

(2) The Apartheid Convention

Four UN Member States originally opposed the Apartheid Convention: Portugal; South Africa; the United Kingdom; and the United States. However, the Apartheid Convention came into force on July 18, 1976. These four countries never ratified or acceded to the Convention, and neither did North Korea or South Korea.\(^{60}\)

The Apartheid Convention provides the more expansive definition of apartheid compared to the Rome Statute (see (3) below). Article 1(1) declares apartheid a crime against humanity and—

> that inhuman acts resulting from the policies and practices of apartheid and similar policies and practices of racial segregation and discrimination, as defined in article II of the Convention, are crimes violating the principles of international law, in particular the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, and constituting a serious threat to international peace and security.

Article 2 states—

> “the crime of apartheid”, which shall include similar policies and practices of racial segregation and discrimination as practised in southern Africa, shall apply to the following inhuman acts committed for the purpose of establishing and maintaining domination by one racial group of persons over any other racial group of persons and systematically oppressing them:

(a) Denial to a member or members of a racial group or groups of the right to life and liberty of person:


\(^{60}\) Ibid.
(i) By murder of members of a racial group or groups;

(ii) By the infliction upon the members of a racial group or groups of serious bodily or mental harm, by the infringement of their freedom or dignity, or by subjecting them to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment;

(iii) By arbitrary arrest and illegal imprisonment of the members of a racial group or groups;

(b) Deliberate imposition on a racial group or groups of living conditions calculated to cause its or their physical destruction in whole or in part;

(c) Any legislative measures and other measures calculated to prevent a racial group or groups from participation in the political, social, economic and cultural life of the country and the deliberate creation of conditions preventing the full development of such a group or groups, in particular by denying to members of a racial group or groups basic human rights and freedoms, including the right to work, the right to form recognized trade unions, the right to education, the right to leave and to return to their country, the right to a nationality, the right to freedom of movement and residence, the right to freedom of opinion and expression, and the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association;

d) Any measures including legislative measures, designed to divide the population along racial lines by the creation of separate reserves and ghettos for the members of a racial group or groups, the prohibition of mixed marriages among members of various racial groups, the expropriation of landed property belonging to a racial group or groups or to members thereof;

(e) Exploitation of the labour of the members of a racial group or groups, in particular by submitting them to forced labour;

(f) Persecution of organizations and persons, by depriving them of fundamental rights and freedoms, because they oppose apartheid. (emphasis added)

The key language in Art. 2 above is that inhuman acts, listed in (a) through (f) above, are “committed for the purpose of establishing and maintaining domination by one racial group of persons over any other racial group of persons and systematically oppressing them” (emphasis added).
(3) The Rome Statute

Article 7(1)(j) of the Rome Statute lists “the crime of apartheid” as a crime against humanity “when committed as part of a widespread or systematic attack directed against any civilian population, with knowledge of the attack.” Article (2)(h) then defines the crime of apartheid as “inhumane acts of a character similar to those referred to in paragraph 1, committed in the context of an institutionalized regime of systematic oppression and domination by one racial group over any other racial group or groups and committed with the intention of maintaining that regime.”

“Racial group” is an important term in this article. Identical to the Apartheid Convention in this way, the Rome Statute defines apartheid, but not racial group. As such, it appears that the most difficult aspect of proving the crime of apartheid is the usage of the term “racial group.”
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