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Abstract

The question of possible reunification on Korean Peninsula is the matter of debates and studies for many scholars, as it is one of the most complex issues of the International relations field. In this research geopolitical, socioeconomic and in some point psychological prospect of possible reunification will be covered, however the specification of the paper is the effect on international labor market of South Korea.

To understand the outcomes of the Korean reunification it was decided to conduct a case-study basing on the example of German reunification. Historical background of Germany, external workforce inflow and current situation of international workers in Germany is described in the paper to understand possible effects of consolidation on Korean peninsula on international workers specifically in South Korea.

Moreover, geopolitical analysis of two Koreas will be managed to make a clearer assumption and to check the hypothesis.

Possible pathway of reunification will be revealed and on the basis of it conclusion on the hypothesis will be checked.
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INTRODUCTION

The topic of the thesis work is one of the most debatable issues and targets of analysis of International Relations field – the possible reunification on Korean peninsula. It has always intrigued scholars - how absolutely polar states with the same nationhood - would overcome a gap of separation and exist as one country. Analyzing all prospect of possible reunification would not fit into the frame of the research, therefore the specification of the subject was narrowed down to the analysis of the effects on the labor market in South Korea, however socioeconomic, geopolitical aspects will be touched as well.

Nowadays, South Korea and North Korea are known to be influential players on the international political scene and it is generally observed that they are taken separately, however before they existed as one state and shared the same nationhood. After the split in 1945 two states had been following polar pathways of development, being supported and influenced by different superpowers with opposite ideologies.

Modern North Korea is known to be one of the most closed countries in the world, having homogeneous society. Whereas, South Korea oppositely welcomes international expatriates and lets the external workflow in.

1. Aims

Conducted internet research on geopolitical and economic situation of two states has contributed to the plot of the work and utilized in creation of the hypothesis: international workers of South Korea would be replaced by the workforce from the North Korea.

This thesis work can be utilized in the further research on the effects of reunification on Korean Peninsula, basing on example of German reunification and its influence on socioeconomic and political aspects, as these criteria would directly affect international migrants. The goal of the next level of the research is to suggest solutions for avoiding gaps in the system and to conduct a study on the impact on potential labor market and the migration policy of the reunited Korea.

Other implementation of my work would be deeper understanding of migration patterns in the modern globalization period, representing South Korea (in a unified model) - whether as migrant-recipient or migrant-donor country.

2. Methodology

First of all, conducted internet research utilized in gathering sufficient amount of information on the topic and choosing further methods of research. Data for this research were
collected using secondary sources. Because of the global range of this topic the amount of available data was excessive. However, some information might be presented including biased opinion. In order to prevent this issue, it was decided to use recent and respected resources. Overall, the collected information was a useful basis for the research.

Surfing throughout the internet represented the historical background and current situation in both Koreas, however it was not enough to make an assumption, therefore, the second methodological tool was chosen – the case-study.

The scale of the research is based on the theoretical approach, thus it is required to apply on a reliable example of reunification of different countries, which have the same or closest conditions. Furthermore, German reunification could serve as a comparative model to predict the outcomes of the Korean reunification on international workers because it is the most recent example.

A comprehensive analysis of the relationship between the GDR and the Federal Republic of Germany was carried out throughout the existence of socialist Germany in various fields, taking into account national circumstances, as well as the international situation and domestic political development, primarily in the FRG. The interrelation of the processes of rapprochement between the GDR and the FRG with the formation of the necessary conditions and prerequisites on the basis of which it became possible to create a united Germany is shown. Alike research tool represents possible scenarios after Korean reunification.

When writing the work, a large number of both East German and West German works were used to analyze the problems of relations between the GDR and the FRG, official publications of the governments of both countries, and program documents of the GDR leadership on the unification of the two countries were utilized as well.

The theoretical and methodological basis of the thesis are scientific statements developed on the method of dialectical materialism and comparative historical approach, revealing the relationship between politics and ideology, politics and economics and their correlation to the labor market, as international workers or expatriates will be replaced by North Korean cheap workforce.
Historical Overview

1. German reunification

Germany is considered to be a progressive and highly developed country, which contributed to the up-growth of the whole world and in particular - Europe. The activities of Europe almost entirely correspond to the national interests of Germany. German policy is a key to the overall development of the situation in the EU (Jarausch, *Uniting Germany documents and debates, 1944-1993*, 1997).

Analysis of the of the stages of the German reunification is attached below:

1. The problem of German unification had two closely interrelated aspects: intra-German: relations between the FRG and the GDR, and international: related to the circumstances and interests of the four great powers, former members of the anti-Hitler coalition (Berdahl, *Where the world ended*: Identity, differentiation, and unification in the German borderland, 1995).

2. Two German states for more than four decades have developed in two different ways, to a certain extent, opposite in socio-economic and political terms: The Federal Republic of Germany - capitalist, the German Democratic Republic - followed the path of state socialism, which at that time was considered the optimal type of socialism. These two factors created serious obstacles to the re-establishment of a single German state.

3. The intra-German aspect of the possible unification depended on large extent of the guidelines of the leadership of two German states. The government of FRG, headed by K. Adenauer, proceeded the non-recognition of the GDR, its possible takeover by the Federal Republic of Germany and pursued a corresponding policy, which turned out to be completely untenable. Subsequent governments of the Federal Republic of Germany, mainly from the period of Chancellorship of W. Brandt until the end of the 80s, pursued a line of all-round cooperation: financial, economic, political and cultural - with the GDR (Berdahl, *Where the world ended*: Identity, differentiation, and unification in the German borderland, 1995). At the same time, it was obviously meant that this would create prerequisites for further achievement under favorable conditions of state unity. The leadership of the GDR, which at first supported the idea of achieving unity within the framework of a peace treaty, then began to defend the idea of the “two German nations, two German states”. Later, in the 70s-80s, refusing to raise this question, it actually pursued a line on preserving the independence of the GDR within the Warsaw
Pact with active use of the opportunities opened up as a result of the intensive
development of comprehensive German-German relations. In this way, the leaders of the
GDR expected to overcome the great difficulties and problems that emerged in the
development of the country.

4. In the 80s the character of the internal development of the two German states, its results
and real achievements that influenced the minds of citizens began to acquire more
significance. Under certain difficulties and shortcomings, the FRG successfully
developed, becoming one of the three most powerful world economic powers. A high
standard of living was achieved for citizens, and political stability in society was ensured
(Shingleton, Gibbon, & Mack, *Dimensions of German unification: Economic, social and
legal analyses*, 1995).

In the GDR, the difficulties in socio-economic development (with all that there were
considerable achievements in social terms) exacerbated, revealed a significant lag in the
living standards of its citizens from the citizens of Western Germany. The functioning of
the authoritarian bureaucratic political system in the country, the restriction of certain
freedoms of citizens led to the crisis of the entire socio-political system, mass discontent
of a significant part of the population. The outward manifestation of this discontent was
the emigration of the citizens of the GDR to the Federal Republic of
Germany(Shingleton, Gibbon, & Mack, *Dimensions of German unification: Economic,
social and legal analyses*, 1995).

The propaganda and information authorities of the Federal Republic of Germany
stimulated and developed this discontent, influencing the minds of the citizens of the
GDR by propaganda of the real and imaginary achievements of the Federal Republic of
Germany in various spheres of social life, the advantages of capitalism as a system. At
the same time, of course, the real social achievements in the GDR were ignored.

5. The crisis situation in the GDR in 1989 was actively used by the ruling circles of the
Federal Republic of Germany headed by Chancellor G. Kohl (Lange, *The political
economy of German unification*, 1998). They launched intensive activities in the
international arena, primarily influencing the great powers, in order to implement their
plans for the unification of Germany. It was gradually becoming obvious that the
“union” was turning into a “takeover” of the German Democratic Republic.

6. The international aspect of the problem was important throughout all post-war years.
Much depended on the position of the four great powers. In the conditions of the Cold
War, two German states were part of two opposing military-political blocs: NATO and
Warsaw Pact. Before the accession of the FRG and GDR in 1955 to blocs, the possible
unity of Germany was conceived by the great powers, who were responsible in accordance with the international agreements of 1943-1945 for the fate of the German people and the German state, in connection with the conclusion of a peace treaty. Their position was of exceptional importance at the end of the 1980s. The US government not only vigorously supported the course of the ruling circles of the Federal Republic of Germany, but also had a corresponding impact on the leaders of the three other great powers, especially the USSR. The leaders of Great Britain and France, who at first reservedly met the onslaught of Kohl-Genschler and did not approve of the unification, along the way under pressure from Bonn and Washington agreed with the plans and actions of the FRG leadership (Shingleton, Gibbon, & Mack, n.d.).

7. The position of the Soviet Union and its leaders was of great importance for the GDR throughout the entire postwar period. In the late 80s the leaders of the USSR, first of all Gorbachev, Yakovlev and Shevardnadze left their ally of the GDR without any support by eliminating the sociopolitical system that existed in the USSR, transitioning to capitalism and initiating the collapse of the USSR. Step by step, they were inferior to the requirements of Bonn and Washington, thereby contributing not only to unification, but to the absorption of one state by another (Jarausch, n.d.).

Overall, the reunification of Germany, which took place in October 3 1990, was presented as one of the most impressive results of the “end of the cold war”, the unification of Germany increased its weight in world politics, gave an additional incentive to strengthen its economic hegemony in Europe. However, for Germany itself, the unification (and in fact the takeover of the GDR, since the new German state was not created as a result of the unification, but simply the GDR became part of the Federal Republic of Germany) gave rise to a host of political, economic, social and cultural problems, many of which persist until so far and even lead to new consequences.

2. Turkish workflow into Germany

Nowadays, Germany is considered to be highly progressive country with exceptional living standards (Jarausch, Uniting Germany documents and debates, 1944-1993, 1997), influence within European Union and tolerant attitude towards expatriates, however prerequisites for the soft international labor policy began with the massive Turkish workflow, and since that time Turks make up the biggest diaspora of the German state.

The large-scale immigration of Turkish workers since the early 1960s was caused, on the one hand, by high population growth and mass unemployment in Turkey, and on the other, by the need for workers in northwestern Europe (Deutsche Welle, "Turkish guest workers
transformed German society | DW | 30.10.2011," n.d.). West Germany, like the rest of Western Europe, has begun to experience labor shortages since the early 1950s. Hiring workers from Mediterranean countries was an easy way to solve this problem. In 1961, the construction of the Berlin Wall exacerbates the shortage by limiting the influx of immigrants from the GDR. Turkey at the same time is facing a high level of unemployment. The Turkish government has offered Germany to hire Turkish guest workers. Theodore Blank, the Minister of Labor and Public Affairs opposed such agreements. He believed that the cultural gap between Germany and Turkey is too large and besides, Germany did not need new workers, because there were enough unemployed people in poor areas of Germany who could take those jobs. However, the United States had a certain political pressure on Germany and the German Foreign Ministry then began negotiations and in 1961 the agreements were signed. It was necessary to stabilize the situation in Turkey. The pressure from German employers in 1962 and 1963 played a key role in the abolition of the two-year limit on the stay of Turkish workers in West Germany (Bartsch, Brandt, & Steinvorth, "Turkish Immigration to Germany: A Sorry History of Self-Deception and Wasted Opportunities - SPIEGEL ONLINE - International," n.d.).

In 1961, only 7,116 Turkish workers immigrated to Germany. Employment contracts in 1961 made Germany the main host country for Turkish migrant workers and by 1973 about 80% of Turks in Western Europe lived in Germany and although this figure had decreased to 70% by 1990, Germany remains the main country of settlement of Turkish immigrants. Most Turks were convinced that they were in Germany temporarily and that such a day would come when they would return to Turkey to start a new life, using the money they had earned. During the recession of 1966-1967, the number of Turks leaving Germany significantly increased, because of the first oil crisis in 1973 (Bartsch, Brandt, & Steinvorth, "Turkish Immigration to Germany: A Sorry History of Self-Deception and Wasted Opportunities - SPIEGEL ONLINE - International," n.d.). The last increase in the number of people leaving in 1981-1984 was caused by mass unemployment in Germany and the policy of material incentives for the re-emigration of Turks. However, in the end, the number of immigrants who returned to Turkey remained relatively small, and their departure did not prevent the rapid growth of the Turkish population in Germany. In the 1970s, approximately 400,000 Turkish workers returned to Turkey, while the rest took advantage of the right for family reunification, so that their families moved to Germany. As a result, between 1974 and 1988 the number of Turks in Germany almost doubled, the sex ratio returned to normal and the age structure became significantly younger than that of the German population, due to the higher number of children per family. By 1987 21% of ethnic Germans were under the age of 21, compared with 42% among Turks in Germany. The recession of 1967 temporarily suspended the process of hiring new workers and when it resumed, their
composition changed dramatically, since BfA (Bundesversicherungsanstalt für Angestellte) - the German migration service, provided working visas mostly to women. This was partly due to the continuing labor shortage in low-paid, low-profile areas of the service industry and partly with the family reunification process (Miller, n.d.). Many wives moved to their husbands, however some women also came with the hope of taking their husbands and children to Germany. In addition, Turkish workers had the opportunity to earn enough money to return home, marry and move their wives to Germany, especially after the family reunification law of 1974 greatly facilitated this process. By 1976, 27% of the Turks in Germany were women (Miller, n.d.).

3. **General effects of German reunification with specification on international workers**

   Indeed, a significant part of the population of the GDR perceived the coming union with the Federal Republic of Germany with great optimism. It seemed that life would become better, economic well-being would increase and most importantly, the German people would reunite almost half a century after the war. However, almost immediately after the reunion that had begun, it became clear that it would not lead to such joyous consequences as its ardent supporters had imagined (DENNIS, n.d.).

   First of all, it should be borne in mind that it was not the reunion that took place, but the absorption of the GDR “through economic integration”. Officials from the Federal Republic of Germany arrived to East Germany, to head all the local authorities and administrations. Former citizens of the GDR, who: worked in government bodies, were former party activists or law enforcement officers were left out of public life, deprived of the opportunity to pursue a career in a united Germany. The authorities of the united Germany considered them potentially unreliable citizens and the West Germans were not going to allow new competitors to the areas of governance, security, the armed forces, law and order (Port, n.d.).

   Furthermore, the tremendous money exchange fraudulency was held. At first, the authorities of the Federal Republic of Germany promised that they would change the marks of the GDR at a rate of 1:1, which was very encouraging to the people of East Germany. However, as it turned out, only savings of 4 thousand marks were changed at this rate. Larger funds have already been changed at the rate of 2 GDR marks for 1 mark of the Federal Republic of Germany, thus the savings of former GDR citizens have been halved. The government simply robbed them (Port, n.d.).

   Naturally, this inevitably affected both the living standards of the East Germans and their ability to settle in a capitalist economy, for example - to start their own business. There was a
rapid impoverishment and marginalization of the population of East Germany. Even today the standard of living of most East Germans is different from the standard of living of their Western tribesmen, which is also reflected in the political preferences of East Germans (Jarausch, n.d.). After the unification of Germany, the catastrophic decline in production at enterprises in the eastern part of the country begun. Products that were produced by the enterprises of the former GDR were recognized as not meeting the standards of Western Germany. Many enterprises were unable to restructure their operating principles in accordance with the changing requirements and ceased to exist. Others went bankrupt, unable to compete with more dynamic West German enterprises. Employees of East German enterprises and institutions joined the list of the unemployed. By July 1991, unemployment reached more than 12% of the able-bodied citizens of the former German Democratic Republic, at the same time a significant part of workers was transferred to part-time work in order to reduce wages. According to 1991 data, out of 8.5 million able-bodied people in Germany were actually unemployed, despite the fact that official unemployment figures were approximately 2.5 million people, which is of course - much lower. For the citizens of the former GDR, unemployment itself was a great shock, since before the unification of Germany this problem simply did not exist in the country (Jarausch, n.d.). Probably, the citizens of the GDR lived modestly but there was no such colossal social stratification as in the Federal Republic of Germany, there were no oligarchs and beggars, unemployed or homeless people.

In the east of Germany, West German prices were set almost immediately, while the incomes of East Germans in 1991 accounted for only 37% of the income of West Germans. The standard of living of the population in East Germany has plummeted, many families could not afford even the most necessary goods. This led to the fact that the most active, qualified and young East Germans went to West Germany for work purpose. In East Germany an older, less qualified and less active population remained, which also did not contribute to the economic development of the eastern lands. Until now, in East Germany people receive lower salaries than in the west of the country. According to studies, the youngest working East Germans complain about this – they are those who were born after the unification of Germany in the early 1990s.

*East Germany was also confronted with such an unknown phenomenon in the GDR as labor migration* (Jarausch, n.d.). By the time of the unification of Germany, the German Federal Republic already had an impressive diaspora of immigrants from Asian and African countries, who in the 1990s - 2000s only gained more and more people. East Germans were completely unprepared to the neighborhood with people with such a different culture and mentality - after all, the GDR for all forty years of its existence remained virtually a mono-ethnic state. In addition, given the high level of unemployment, East Germans were worried that immigrants
would compete with them in the labor market. This, like the other factors mentioned above, explain where there is much greater sympathy for nationalist forces in the federal states located in the east of Germany. East Germany became the stronghold of the nationalist forces, which criticized the migration policy.

Alike pessimism in East Germany, chaotic movement of people to the west and general socioeconomic problems have led to public debate about problems of national identity and citizenship, including the place of the Turkish minority in the future united Germany (Miller, n.d.). These debates were accompanied by xenophobia and violence on a national basis in relation to the Turkish population – the biggest diaspora of the Germany. Anti-immigrant sentiment was particularly strong in the territories of the former East Germany, which have undergone significant social and economic transformations in the process of unification. The Turkish diaspora feared for their security in Germany, as there were about 1,500 cases of violence on national grounds. Political rhetoric calling for the creation of immigrant-free zones (Ausländer-freie Zonen) and the rise of the neo-Nazi movement generated widespread support among liberal Germans of the opposite idea of Germany as a ‘multicultural’ society.

However, later on laws on citizenship by place of birth, not of origin, were adopted in 2000 and restrictions on dual citizenship are still in force. However, the number of second-generation Turks who have opted for German citizenship is increasing and they are becoming more involved in political life (Miller, n.d.).

The degree of assimilation of Turkish immigrants in Germany differs depending on such factors as age, level of education, religiosity, place of birth, etc. Since the majority of Turkish immigrants for many years were not urban residents, but came from the villages of Anatolia, assimilation was particularly difficult and time consuming. Low-educated, very religious and not inclined to social contacts with the Germans, the older generation mostly lived within their rather isolated communities and came into contact with the Germans mostly only during work. Their children and especially their grandchildren, are much more assimilated and often feel like full-fledged citizens of Germany. A typical representative of the young generation of immigrants, for example, is 23-year-old Mete Kaan Yaaman (Mete Kaan Yaman), who won the beauty contest Mr. Germany in 2009/2010, he speaks German without the slightest accent and has an identical to young Germans mentality, Mete Kaan Yaman is an example of successful assimilation ("Biografie," n.d.). An example of successful assimilation of a Turkish middle-aged immigrant is the German statesman and political figure, the co-chairman of the Green Party - Cem Ozdemir ("Biografie," n.d.). Overall, the Turkish community of Germany, so far, has made only the first steps towards full integration.
Separation of the Korea and the Korean War

As it was mentioned before, nowadays Koreas are taken separately. After the split, two Koreas had been following different pathways of development and reached different results: for instance, North Korea’s economy is classified as not only centralized, but also one of the most closed in the world and very nationalized. Largely agrarian North Korea has a GDP less than 1% of the South Korea’s and its politics is known for its dynastical pattern of dictatorial regime.

While South Korea itself is a part of World’s G-20 economies, with 11th nominal and 13th purchasing power parity GDP worldwide. Its internationally recognized brands like Samsung, LG make other countries eager to invest through massive export flows. South Korea’s enormous investments into education turned its people from illiterate into most educated in the world, which is proven by the highest statistics of people with tertiary education. South Korea has most of its aspects set up, while North Korea has not. In the modern world of globalization people become more open towards living abroad and South Korea having one of the most developed economies has attracted thousands of expatriates who live there (Bowers, n.d.).

All started in August 1945, when the defeat of the Red Army led to the liberation of North Korea from Japan, which used to be its governor-general. According to an agreement between the allies of the anti-Hitler coalition in Korea, two temporary zones were defined for accepting the surrender of the Japanese army: The Soviet - to the north of the 38th parallel and the American - to the south of it. In September 1945, US troops landed in the south of the country (Hulbert & Weems, n.d.).

In 1947, the issue of creating a single state in Korea at the initiative of the United States was referred to the UN, which decided to hold elections under the supervision of a UN commission. In May 1948, parliamentary elections were held in South Korea and the Republic of Korea was proclaimed in August 15, 1948 (Casey, n.d.).

In response, elections were held in the North for the Supreme National Assembly of Korea and in September 9, 1948 the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea (DPRK) was proclaimed.

The military-political contradictions between states with different socio-political systems led to war in the early 1950s. The conflict began in June 25, 1950. Contingents of the US armed forces and 15 other countries operating under the flag of the multinational force of the United Nations took part in hostilities on the side of the Republic of Korea, contingents of the armed forces of China and the USSR supported the DPRK (Hulbert & Weems, n.d.).

In July 1951, the front stabilized at approximately the 38th parallel, where the hostilities began. The war has acquired a positional character. By the spring of 1953, it became obvious that the price of victory for both sides would be too high. In July 27, 1953 a cease-fire agreement was
concluded at Panmunjom. Under the Armistice Agreement, North Korea and South Korea were divided by a military-demarcation line, on both sides of which there is a demilitarized zone with a total width of four kilometers (Casey, n.d.).

The Korean Peninsula is formally still in a state of war, since the Korean War ended with the signing of an armistice, not a peace treaty. It was signed by the commanders of the DPRK and China - on the one hand and the United States under the UN flag - on the other.

The United States refused to sign a peace agreement with North Korea, retaining about 28,000 of its troops in the south of the Korean Peninsula (Demick, n.d.).

In July 1972, the Joint Statement of the North and the South was signed, which set the basic principles of unification - independently, without reliance on external forces; in peaceful way; based on the "great national consolidation." The unification of the country in Pyongyang is seen by creating a confederation (Confederative Democratic Republic of Korea) according to the formula "one nation, one state - two systems, two governments". In 1991, the DPRK and the ROK concluded an Agreement on reconciliation, non-aggression, cooperation and exchanges; in 1992, they adopted a Joint Declaration on the Denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula (Bowers, n.d.).

In the entire history of relations, two inter-Korean summits took place. Both were held in Pyongyang: from 13 to 15 June 2000 between the former head of the DPRK, Kim Jong Il and the then President of the Republic of Korea, Kim Dae-Jung, and the second is from 2 to 4 October 2007, between Kim Jong Il and the former President of the Republic of Korea, Roh Moo-Hyun.

In 2008, the coming of Lee Myung-Bak to power for the presidential administration of ROK, which was accompanied by a tightening of the South Korean approaches towards Pyongyang, led to the suspension of the implementation of earlier agreements and the collapse of most inter-Korean projects (Demick, n.d.).

The aggravation of the situation on the peninsula took place in October 2006 and in May 2009, when the DPRK conducted underground nuclear tests. They caused protests from the international community. In response to the actions of Pyongyang, the UN Security Council adopted resolutions 1718 and 1874, requiring the DPRK to cease nuclear activities and return to negotiations on the denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula.

Armed clashes occurred repeatedly between North and South Korea, leading to human casualties and putting the entire process of inter-Korean rapprochement to the brink of collapse.

The degree of extreme aggravation of inter-Korean relations reached after the death of the South Korean corvette Cheonan in the Yellow Sea in March 26, 2010, which sank in the area controlled by Seoul Pennendo Island near the border with North Korea as a result of a strong explosion, the cause of which has not been established. On board were 104 people, 46 sailors were killed. In Seoul, Pyongyang was accused of destroying the ship, the DPRK considers the results
of the investigation as falsification (Bowers, n.d.).

In November 23, 2010 on the Korean Peninsula in the area of Yonphendo Island in the Yellow Sea, where the controversial dividing line between the DPRK and South Korea runs, the largest armed incident in the last half century has occurred. According to reports from Seoul, the island was subjected to shelling from the North and Southerners returned fire. As a result, two South Korean soldiers were killed, 14 were injured by shrapnel.

Relations between South Korea and the DPRK deteriorated sharply in the spring of 2013, when the United States and South Korea held the annual large-scale joint military exercises "Key Resolve" and "Foal Eagle" (Key Resolve and Foal Eagle). Then Pyongyang announced its withdrawal from the armistice agreement with South Korea and the possible start of hostilities with the use of nuclear weapons.

A new round of tensions on the Korean Peninsula, which resulted in an artillery fire exchange in the Yellow Sea at the beginning of April 2014, was also provoked by the US-South Korean military exercises "Key Resolve" and "Foal Eagle" that started in late February 2014.

The joint exercises of the United States and the Republic of Korea are traditionally viewed by Pyongyang as a “rehearsal of war” on the Korean Peninsula and are accompanied by threats from the DPRK to strike back in the event of an attack on its territory.

In March and April 2015, North Korea launched two short-range missiles toward the Sea of Japan and four missiles toward the Yellow Sea as a protest against military exercises "Key-Resolve" and "Foal Eagle" and also launched seven land-based missiles - towards the East China Sea (Bowers, n.d.).

Overall, own national motivation in favor of unification manifested in Korea is still weak and has not become a really urgent task for the whole nation. Naturally, if the Koreans themselves are not yet able to determine their attitude towards unification or rapprochement, then it is hardly reasonable to demand from others to take more specific positions on this issue.

**Current international labor market in South Korea**

Korea belongs to the few states on whose territory there are no national minorities. Those quite few foreigners who have been in Korea for a long time have neither Korean citizenship, nor, as a rule, hopes to get it.

The absence of "aboriginal" national minorities does not mean, however, that Korea is inhabited exclusively by Koreans. On the territory of Korea, there are always a number of citizens of other states, both neighboring and those with whom Korea maintains traditional ties (Denney, "South Korea's Migrant Workers in the Public Eye," n.d.).
Until very recently, South Korea was an exemplary mono-ethnic country. Twenty years ago, there were only 50,000 foreigners in Korea, a decade ago there were half a million foreigners and now, according to statistics and competent authorities represented by the immigration office, 1.25 million foreigners legally and illegally are in South Korea, which is 2.5% of the total population of the country. There are 168,000 illegal migrants, that is, about 14% of the total number (Denney, "South Korea's Migrant Workers in the Public Eye," n.d.)

Foreign workers are dominated by immigrants from China, most of whom are ethnic Koreans. There are 680 thousand Chinese citizens in Korea. Behind the Chinese, by a large margin, are the Americans and the Vietnamese, of which, respectively, 132 and 116 thousand.

For the South Korean economy, the presence of foreign workers is necessary, since Koreans are not eager to do low-skilled labor (there is no unemployment in the country). Many productions would simply stop without Chinese, Uzbeks and Vietnamese.

The guest workers themselves are attracted, of course, by high Korean salaries. Although visitors are payed less than Koreans who do alike work, the monthly income of most migrant workers is 1500-2000 US dollars a month, this illustrates tremendous difference with, for example, Vietnam, where the average salary last year was $150 dollars (Lee, "The labor market in South Korea, 2000–2016," n.d.).

Unlike many other countries, in Korea, the presence of foreign workers as a whole is not perceived by society as a problem. There are two reasons for this hospitality. First, the South Korean intellectual and political elite understands that in a rapidly aging population, only the entry of foreign workers can, if not prevent an impending crisis, then at least delay it. This is one of those rare questions on which the Korean right fully agrees with the Korean left.

Secondly, Korean hospitality towards international workers is caused by the fact that Korean society is designed so that foreign workers remain invisible in Korea and rarely find themselves in situations where local people may perceive them as competitors or as an annoying factor.

In their overwhelming majority, they do not speak Korean at all (the only, although statistically notable exception is Chinese Koreans), and Koreans for the most part do not speak foreign languages. However, it’s not just the language barrier, although it plays a huge role. Foreign workers simply rarely find themselves in such social situations in which they could make any contact with Koreans. They live in their national world, which does not intersect with the great world of Korea and they don’t have the opportunity to leave their migrant world to the big Korean (Sung-Teak, "Prospects for Increasing Labor Market Flexibility in Korea," n.d.).

Foreigners almost do not engage in trade, including street ones, as it is difficult to obtain permission for such activities without a Korean partner and it is impossible to trade illegally in
Korea. There is no assimilation of foreign workers as well. Obtaining Korean citizenship is not easy and most foreign workers have no chance to get one. Having had no citizenship, foreign workers have very limited access to social benefits — and, accordingly, they do not compete with locals for these benefits. For instance, in most cases the loss of a permanent job, means for them either a transition to the very unpleasant status of an illegal immigrant or leaving the country (Sung-Teak, "Prospects for Increasing Labor Market Flexibility in Korea," n.d.).

To enter the ranks of the middle class of the respectable majority of Korean society, in general, is possible only through the filters of a tough competitive education system in which the children of foreign workers have no chance of success. However, migrant workers usually come to Korea without families and if suddenly children are with them, they try to send children to their national schools, if they find such in Korea at all.

Most guest workers view their stay in Korea as temporary, do not particularly want to take root in the country and accordingly, do not perceive their isolation as a problem. For their part, Koreans also perceive migrant workers as temporary aliens - in general, not without reason: Korean society is designed so that immigrants are much less likely to assimilate in South Korea than, for example, in Europe. They are “guest workers”, they are visiting in Korea and this situation is quite satisfying for the owners, who at the same time treat the guests quite correctly Denney, "South Korea's Migrant Workers in the Public Eye," n.d.).

Analysis of the geopolitical situation of two Koreas

In order to conduct analytic research in the given field, the comparison of two states, at the current period of time is required. As Koreas are not yet reunified like Germany and the hypothesis of the research must be checked, the analysis of the current geopolitical situation in both countries is needed.

By analyzing geopolitics of the South Korea, following conclusions can be made:
1) From the geographical point of view, South Korea is an island with an extended sea borders, therefore being located in the center of the marine logistics gives it a nice profit and higher expert evaluation (Armacost, "Korea: A Geopolitical Overview," n.d.).
2) Political model of South Korea makes it an interesting research target, because of the unique role of the president. Constitutionally South Korea is a presidential state, however it represents high level of authoritarianism in an active democratic system. Combination of Asian – Chinese, Confucian values and models of governing of West-European social systems form a unique political structure of South Korea. This is primarily manifested in
the high mobilization potential of the system of social management, which helps maintaining a high level of civil liberties. Considering that most of South Korea’s neighbors share identic, traditional Asian values such model of political structuring maintains high level of intergovernmental relations (Armacost, "Korea: A Geopolitical Overview," n.d.).

3) “Stability and resilience” – is a motto under which South Korea has been undergoing the economic development path for almost 40 years. According to the analysis of the economic development and the modern state of industrial potential of neighboring states of trans border region – NEA (North East Asia), following conclusion is as follows: South Korea is among leader states, only being after Peoples Republic of China, but substantially overtaking Japan in terms of economic growth. In terms of demographical potential, South Korea takes the 3rd place being ahead of China, however the quality of population potential must be considered as well, and in South Korea this point is on high level, which is explained by high level of life, literacy and sufficient qualification of labor force. The weak point of the geopolitics of South Korea is in its dependency on the import of raw materials. Own natural resource potential of South Korea is insufficient to cover the needs of its nowadays economics (Rojansky, "Geopolitical Implications of a New Era on the Korean Peninsula," n.d.).

4) Characteristics of international relations of South Korea with its neighbor states can be explained by the semicentennary conflict between two Korean states, the root of which lies deep in the ideological models of development. Nowadays, the conflict is in latent mode, however sometimes the temperature of the “cold” peace goes up, situation gets closer to its end-point where the war is behind the corner relations (Rojansky, "Geopolitical Implications of a New Era on the Korean Peninsula," n.d.). In a contrast to its Northern neighbor, which in an international arena is highlighted as negative, South Korea is spotted in a positive light. Nevertheless, the process of the regional cooperation has no ideological and political barriers. It’s been a while since South Korea normalized its political relations with China and Russian Federation. South Korea remains an ally of USA and its economic integration with Japan gets stronger (Armacost, "Korea: A Geopolitical Overview," n.d.).

In practice, alike situation allows South Korea to reinforce its socioeconomic development. In contrast to regional standoff between China and Japan, South Korea has it all to establish higher status of its geopolitics in the North East Asian region, which eventually would form reunified Korea, on South Korea’s conditions, just alike FRG.
North Korean geopolitics evaluation is as follows:

1) Configuration of the territorial advantage (being surrounded by two seas) is as South Korea’s. State lies on many marine trades which intersect with lots of states, which is highly beneficial for economics, however this geographical convenience is not being used, as international relations between North Korea and other states is unsatisfied. It is hard to evaluate North Korea’s geopolitics as its potential is not being used because of the political confrontation with USA, Japan and South Korea ("Phillip Orchard," n.d.).

2) Nature-resource potential of the country is very diverse. A plenty of minerals are being industrially mined. Having had a huge variety of fossil fuels has become a fountainhead for the development of ferrous and nonferrous metallurgy. Resource security of North Korea is higher than that of South Korea and Japan (Lee, "Geopolitical Implications of a New Era on the Korean Peninsula," n.d.).

3) The demographic potential of the North Korea is gradually lower than in South Korea, not only the quantity of people, but the literacy rate of them. Because of its political isolation, North Korea suffers from lack of modernization of the industries and this results in the lower quality of life. Despite that disadvantages, social plan of the government is operating sustainably: free education and medicine, low rate of unemployment and pension benefits ("Phillip Orchard," n.d.). However, sustainable is not superior, so North Korea’s social benefits are way behind of modern standards.

4) Overall, nowadays North Korea’s geopolitical situation is problematic. North Korea is essentially a kind of cold war relic. Despite the collapse of the world socialist system, the DPRK preserved the ideological basis of its development, thereby consciously introducing itself into economic and political isolation. The only country with which North Korea has maintained economic and military-political cooperation is Communist China. Other countries-neighbors in the region like Russia, take a neutral position in relation to the Korean problems, or, like Japan, South Korea, the United States, are in a state of military-political confrontation. Having had nuclear weapons, has served North Korea a bad name and weakened its geopolitical status among other states, and this is what political confront countries like Japan and USA use against (Lee, "Geopolitical Implications of a New Era on the Korean Peninsula," n.d.).

1. Possible pathways of Korean reunification

To conclude, after analyzing the level of geopolitical potential of both countries, it is possible to calculate options for the development of integration processes on the Korean
Peninsula. The option of forcible affiliation on the basis of socialist ideology in the conditions of modern Korea is impossible, although it is the one which finds the greatest support from North Korean politicians (Lee, "Geopolitical Implications of a New Era on the Korean Peninsula," n.d.). At the present stage, the balance of power between the DPRK and the ROK and the mood of the leading world powers leave no room for its implementation, since it is obvious that the communist model of building the economy has not justified itself.

The scenario of a military-political takeover of the North by the South is also impossible. Despite the fact that the geopolitical potential of Seoul exceeds Pyongyang, in a violent union there are huge risks for the Republic of Korea. Even with military and technical support from the United States and Japan, the DPRK army is a serious force (Armacost, "Korea: A Geopolitical Overview," n.d.). Today it is the largest army in the region after the Chinese, where 1,760 thousand people are under arms. Moreover, the North has nuclear weapons and delivery vehicles in the form of medium-range missiles from 1,300 to 2,000 km. They are able to hit the main US military bases in the Far East, almost the entire territory of Japan, not to mention the military and civilian facilities south of the 38th parallel (Armacost, "Korea: A Geopolitical Overview," n.d.).

In order for the scenario of the integration to become a reality, it is necessary to at least twice exceed the geopolitical potential of one party to the conflict over the other. However, a peaceful rapprochement between North and South Korea with the existence of the totalitarian regime of the DPRK is impossible. Seoul's desire to make more open relations with Pyongyang is the best way to stimulate gradual evolutionary changes there. Currently, North Korea is experiencing a deep socio-economic crisis. It has no reliable allies and partners that contribute to the preservation of the statues in the DPRK. In the country, not only is there no organized opposition, but there is not a single independent public opinion. In addition, Pyongyang is both politically and economically independent. North Koreans live in an isolated world. Throughout all the post-war years, the South has never been able to become an attractive standard of society for northerners (due to the military dictatorship in the Republic of Korea), and now because of close relations with the USA.

The situation on the peninsula became even more complicated at the end of 2011 due to the forced change of leadership of the DPRK. The sudden death of Kim Jong-II and the transfer of power to his son Kim Jong-Un caused confusion among the majority of experts on the "Korean issue". Under certain conditions, the likelihood of a change in the course of self-isolation and opposition significantly increased, which could be the beginning of a new stage in the development of inter-Korean relations ("Phillip Orchard," n.d.). However, contrary to the expectations of many Western and South Korean analysts, the transfer of higher power to Kim Jong Un took place without apparent difficulties and a sharp change in foreign policy. The
country continues the process of legitimizing the new government, aimed at stabilizing the political and most importantly, the economic situation. A certain adjustment of the socio-economic policy in the DPRK is evidenced by the increased managerial focus on the development of light industry, agriculture and the improvement of the welfare of the population.

The North still does not have the political, economic, personnel and organizational potential for reforming the administrative-command management system. The preservation of the communist ideology is an attempt by the country's political elite to use all the forces and means to preserve the existing status quo. There are no resources for modernization in the country and there are no resources to promote their own merger project. Any changes are fraught with a sharp deterioration in the social situation ("Phillip Orchard," n.d.).

The peaceful unification formula, suggested by the political elite of Seoul differs from the simple “unification through takeover” scheme (Rojansky, "Geopolitical Implications of a New Era on the Korean Peninsula," n.d.). It has much in common with the political and economic processes that led to the creation of the European Union: the formation of a system of common economic interests and goals within a unified economic community, while foreign and domestic policies remain independent. In this context, this experience can be applied to the creation of the “Economic Community of the Korean Peninsula”, the model of which is close to the processes taking place in Europe. Such a scenario can be realized only if both Koreas agree to this with the support of the states surrounding the Korean Peninsula. The unification of Korea should begin with economic integration, since it will allow restoring the North Korean economy and bringing the economic indicators of the DPRK closer to the South Korean level, which will facilitate further unification (Armacost, "Korea: A Geopolitical Overview," n.d.).
Discussion

Throughout the history, there were a variety of reunifications among states with identical nationhood, however the chosen German case is the most relevant and represents Korean case more than other examples, because from the point of external political support, Germanys had different influential superpowers as their allies, just like Koreas (US and USSR). So the implementation of the historical background in the research was reasonable.

The second paragraph of the body, which tells about massive workflow from Turkey into FRG serves as the plot for the comparison with South Korea, which in its turn welcomes international workers from China, Vietnam and etc. Hereby, the similarity of FRG and South Korea being migrant-recipient countries is proven and it validates the choice for the case-study model once again.

The third part of the body that tells about effects of German reunification has served as the key factor of proving or rejecting the hypothesis, as it figures out the attitude of Germans towards international workers – the “gastarbeiteis” from Turkey and Turkish response towards it.

The next part is deducted to the historical background of two Koreas. In order to make a clearer assumptions and predictions it was necessary to rely on a history of separation to predict the most probable pathway of reunification, either takeover or the peaceful economic integration, like in Europe.

The next passage informs about current state of the international labor market in South Korea, which is the key specialization of the paper.

In the last chapter, analysis of the geopolitical statuses of nowadays Koreas’ was conducted. Comparing geopolitical states contributed in choosing the theoretical reunification pathway, which in its turn was useful in the check of the hypothesis of the work.
Conclusion

To conclude, the subject of the research is very unique and delicate, as the peace over Korean peninsula is not yet signed and two states with dramatically different political and socioeconomic views are too influential in the international political ground.

To define the effects of the possible reunification on international labor market of South Korea and answer the hypothesis, it was required to identify the theoretical pathway of possible consolidation. Having historical background and current international labor force situation as a basis of proving or rejecting the hypothesis (whether: international workers of South Korea would be replaced by the workforce of North Koreans) is not enough, therefore the geopolitical analysis was made to predict the possible way of reunification, and it was investigated that most probable theoretical pathway of reunification would be similar to German – through economic integration (it validates the choice of the case-study model once again).

It is, however, less common for two Koreas to unify, because of the factors that were already discovered in the paper.

During the research, it was investigated that international workforce situation in FRG and South Korea slightly differs, if German guest workers prefer to stay and build a diaspora, most Korean guest workers after improving their financial condition, go back to their countries. However, psychological and ideological circumstances need to be taken into account, the gap of separation between two Koreas is too broad, while guest workers are already used to the modern lifestyle of the Southern part of peninsula.

It has also been observed that Germany had a massive external workflow, specifically from Turkey. After German reunification the situation of international guest workers did not change, despite there were xenophobia, social deprivations towards them and in some cases deportations, however people from GDR could not replace Turkish “gastarbeiters”, furthermore most of Turks in Germany integrated their offspring into German society. The flow of international workforce into South Korea is continuous and shows an annual increase, it is explained by the significant difference between South Korean economics and migrant-donor states’ economic situation. Moreover, Germany stayed and stays as a migrant-recipient country, attracting people with its high living standards and leading role in the European Union, so as South Korea with its good geopolitical situation and wellbeing. So, South Korea will also keep accepting guest workers as one of the most developed states of the region.

Thus, the hypothesis is wrong and is rejected, North Korean workers will not replace international workers in South Korea.
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## Appendix A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of migrant</th>
<th>Is a foreign migrant worker?</th>
<th>Is an international migrant?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Citizen of the country of residence who is working and was born in another country</td>
<td>No, as did not move in search of work</td>
<td>Yes, as the country of birth is different from the country of residence (see definition in international migrant stocks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person born in, and working in the country in question, but who does not have citizenship</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen returning to work in the country in question after working abroad</td>
<td>No, as holding the citizenship of the country of origin</td>
<td>Yes, due to change in country of residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Border workers (who reside in one country but work in another)*</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consular official*</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military personnel*</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Differences between foreign migrant workers and international migrants.
Appendix B

Germany showing the highest migration inflow rate.

Appendix C

Origins of Marriage Migrants Into Korea