

Summary: Martial Law and Election Fraud Allegations

- **Date: February 8, 2025**

- **Overview:**

- This document provides a concise overview of recent developments, emphasizing that President Yoon’s declaration of martial law was primarily aimed at investigating allegations of election fraud in South Korea.
- The report examines key aspects of the event, including the deployment of martial law forces at the National Election Commission (NEC), the president’s public statements, operations at the NEC training center, reactions from political and media circles, public opinion, and the Constitutional Court’s impeachment trial.
- It highlights that President Yoon’s decision was a necessary step toward addressing entrenched election fraud issues and restoring true liberal democracy, while also criticizing efforts by political factions, the mainstream media, and the judiciary to suppress or downplay these allegations.
- Public reactions have been divided, but there has been significant support for a thorough investigation, leading to a surge in President Yoon’s approval ratings as calls for electoral transparency intensified.
- The report concludes that President Yoon’s actions were indispensable for resolving the election fraud issue, emphasizing that attempts to obscure or dismiss these allegations must be held accountable.

Martial Law and Election Fraud Allegations: Analysis of the Yoon’s Measures and Their Impact

CPAC Korea, February 8, 2025

This report provides a detailed account of the background and series of measures taken following President Yoon Suk Yeol’s declaration of martial law on December 3, 2024. It evaluates his decision not as a mere crisis management tool but as a courageous step necessary to address widespread allegations of election fraud in South Korea. The premise of this report is that without resolving these allegations, the restoration of genuine liberal democracy is unattainable. Additionally, it critically examines the response of political entities, including the Democratic Party, the mainstream media, and the judiciary, who appear intent on concealing the truth behind the election fraud allegations. It also highlights the strong public support for a thorough investigation, transcending ideological lines, to uncover the full extent of the alleged election fraud.

This report focuses on the events surrounding President Yoon’s declaration of martial law, which was primarily aimed at securing evidence related to election fraud. It provides a

comprehensive analysis of the following aspects: the activities of martial law forces at the National Election Commission (NEC), the content of the president's statements, the operations conducted at the NEC training center, responses from political circles and the media, public reactions, and the election fraud issues raised during the Constitutional Court's impeachment trial. The report emphasizes that President Yoon's decision was a crucial step toward restoring true liberal democracy in South Korea by addressing deeply entrenched election fraud issues. It also strongly criticizes the efforts of political factions, media outlets, and judicial bodies that seek to suppress or downplay these allegations.

1. Martial Law Forces' Search of the National Election Commission

Immediately after the declaration of martial law, military forces swiftly entered the NEC headquarters to conduct searches aimed at securing evidence related to election fraud allegations. The search primarily targeted the NEC's internal servers and documents, with a particular focus on pre-election voting data. According to some media reports, martial law forces took control of key servers upon entry to the NEC to secure crucial evidence for verifying election fraud allegations.

Online sources claim that specific IP addresses repeatedly accessed the NEC servers, allegedly linked to China, suggesting possible external interference. While such claims have not been officially confirmed, they warrant careful consideration. Additionally, rumors circulating in online communities suggest that martial law forces captured dozens of Chinese spies at the NEC training center, who were allegedly involved in rigging elections in South Korea and other countries. While the accuracy of these claims remains unverified, they have further complicated the discourse surrounding election fraud allegations.

2. Analysis of President Yoon Suk Yeol's Public Statements

Following the declaration of martial law, President Yoon made multiple public statements emphasizing his commitment to uncovering the truth behind the election fraud allegations.

- In his first statement, he stressed the necessity of martial law to thoroughly investigate the fraud allegations raised in recent elections.
- In his second statement, he criticized the NEC's lack of cooperation and pointed out the limitations of conventional investigative methods, asserting that forced investigation under martial law had become inevitable.
- In his third statement, he provided a detailed report on the activities of martial law forces and assured the public that a rigorous investigation into election fraud allegations would be carried out.

While some analysts argue that President Yoon's statements served a broader political purpose beyond addressing election fraud, this report maintains that his declarations were an expression of his commitment to resolving the deep-rooted issue of election fraud in South Korea.

3. Martial Law Forces' Operations at the NEC Training Center

Martial law forces were deployed not only at the NEC headquarters but also at its training center to secure additional evidence related to election fraud allegations.

According to reports from Sky Daily, a joint South Korea-U.S. operation on December 3 resulted in the capture of a Chinese spy ring accused of election interference and online opinion manipulation, particularly through mass posting of comments. The captured spies were reportedly handed over to the U.S. military, transferred to a U.S. military base in Japan, and subsequently detained at a secret facility in Okinawa. During interrogations by U.S. intelligence agencies, they allegedly admitted to their involvement in election interference. Furthermore, reports indicate that black ops agents from the U.S. Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA) under the Trump administration were involved in the operation, suggesting that this case extends beyond mere arrests and is linked to a broader international election fraud and propaganda network.

It is important to note that these reports have not been independently verified, and they should be interpreted as reference material rather than confirmed facts.

4. Responses from Political Circles and the Media

The political and media responses to the declaration of martial law and election fraud allegations have been highly polarized.

- Both the Democratic Party and the ruling People Power Party (PPP) dismissed the fraud allegations as exaggerated and criticized the martial law declaration as excessive.
- Mainstream media outlets condemned the president's actions, arguing that the election fraud allegations lacked sufficient evidence. Some media even accused President Yoon of endorsing conspiracy theories.

However, some independent online media outlets have supported President Yoon's decision, asserting that signs of irregularities found in NEC servers justify the martial law measures. Meanwhile, opposition parties and legal experts have raised concerns that martial law may infringe on citizens' constitutional rights, with some critics arguing that Yoon's actions could violate South Korea's Constitution.

5. Public Reactions

Public opinion on the matter is sharply divided, though calls for a thorough investigation into election fraud allegations have been particularly strong.

- Supporters of President Yoon's decision argue that martial law is necessary to ensure electoral transparency and fairness.
- Opponents, however, view the declaration of martial law as an excessive measure that threatens democratic principles.

Online platforms have seen a fierce debate between those who support the president's actions and those who oppose them. On social media, discussions oscillate between concerns over potential infringements on civil liberties and the urgent need to investigate election fraud

allegations. Following the declaration of martial law, mass protests and demonstrations erupted nationwide, reflecting both deep political divisions and strong public demand for electoral transparency. Notably, the president's approval rating, which had been in the 20% range, surged above 50% as public support for election fraud investigations grew.

6. Election Fraud Issues in the Constitutional Court's Impeachment Trial

During President Yoon's impeachment trial at the Constitutional Court, his legal team prominently raised election fraud allegations as a key issue.

- They detailed multiple instances of electoral misconduct and irregularities, arguing that martial law was a necessary and legitimate measure to uncover the truth.
- Constitutional Court justices closely examined the validity of these claims, debating the legality and proportionality of the martial law declaration.

While some justices questioned the credibility of the evidence presented, others reportedly reacted indifferently to the allegations. Critics argue that some justices may have personal connections to the NEC, raising concerns about their impartiality in addressing the election fraud claims.

7. Conclusion

President Yoon's declaration of martial law was largely driven by his commitment to thoroughly investigating election fraud allegations. It reflects the reality that South Korea cannot achieve true liberal democracy without addressing its deeply rooted electoral issues. His administration's efforts to collect evidence under the framework of martial law should not be seen as mere crisis management but as an essential step toward restoring public trust and democratic integrity.

Conversely, elements within the political establishment—particularly the Democratic Party—along with the mainstream media and judicial system, have sought to suppress these allegations by downplaying the significance of martial law and limiting access to key evidence. However, public sentiment indicates overwhelming support for a transparent investigation into election fraud, regardless of ideological affiliation.

By analyzing the military's NEC operations, the president's public statements, political and media responses, and the Constitutional Court's impeachment proceedings, this report reaffirms that President Yoon's actions were an indispensable step toward addressing election fraud allegations. This effort is vital for the restoration of true democracy, and those attempting to conceal these allegations should be held accountable.

This report details the courageous decision made by President Yoon and the subsequent developments, reaffirming that the South Korean public strongly supports a rigorous investigation into election fraud allegations, transcending ideological divisions.

Summary_Crisis of South Korean Liberal Democracy

- **Date: February 8, 2025**

- **Overview:**

- This document provides an in-depth analysis of the ongoing impeachment trial and insurrection investigation following President Yoon Suk-yeol's declaration of martial law, prepared for CPAC panel discussion participants to review in advance.
- The panel discussion topic addresses the crisis facing South Korea's liberal democratic system due to the current political turmoil and considers the possibility that, should President Yoon be impeached and an early presidential election held, pro-China and pro-North Korea forces might seize power—and explores strategies to prevent such an outcome.
- This document analyzes the background of President Yoon Suk-yeol's declaration of martial law on December 3, 2024, and the subsequent impeachment trial and investigation of insurrection charges, highlighting the crisis facing South Korea's liberal democratic system.
- President Yoon declared martial law to thoroughly investigate allegations of electoral fraud, and the legitimacy and legal validity of this measure remain at the center of ongoing debates.
- The Constitutional Court is reviewing the necessity of the martial law declaration and whether the president abused his authority, while concerns grow that the impeachment trial is politically influenced due to the Democratic Party's recent changes in the composition of the Court.
- Prosecutors have indicted the president on insurrection charges, but this is widely viewed as political repression, with strong opposition arguing that the act of forcibly detaining the president himself constitutes a subversion of constitutional order.
- If President Yoon is impeached, pro-China and pro-North Korea forces are likely to seize power, posing not only an existential threat to South Korea's liberal democracy but also significant risks to the U.S.-ROK alliance and East Asian security, necessitating an international response.

Crisis of South Korean Liberal Democracy: The Impeachment Trial of President Yoon Suk-yeol, the Investigation of Insurrection Charges

CPAC Korea, February 8, 2025

1. Introduction

On December 3, 2024, President Yoon Suk-yeol declared martial law throughout the Republic of Korea primarily for the purpose of securing evidence to investigate allegations of electoral fraud. In the wake of that declaration, debates have persisted over the legitimacy and legal validity of the martial law, and both the impeachment trial against the president and the investigation of insurrection charges are currently underway. These circumstances constitute a serious challenge to the liberal democratic system of South Korea.

2. Background of President Yoon's Martial Law Declaration

President Yoon emphasized in his public addresses that the primary reason for declaring martial law was to thoroughly investigate the allegations of electoral fraud raised during the election process. In particular, he pointed to the lack of cooperation from the National Election Commission (NEC) and the limitations of conventional investigative methods, asserting that a forced investigation under martial law had become inevitable. However, these measures have also been interpreted as mere political crisis management, and their legitimacy continues to be contested.

- On December 3, 2024, President Yoon declared martial law throughout South Korea. In his address, he criticized the National Assembly for repeatedly initiating impeachment motions against government officials and for slashing the budget necessary for the nation's fundamental functions, thereby crippling governance. He further emphasized that martial law was essential to defend a free Korea from the threat posed by North Korean communist forces and to eliminate pro-North Korean, anti-state elements.
- Subsequently, during the Constitutional Court's impeachment trial proceedings, the presidential side argued that the chief basis for the martial law declaration was the need to investigate electoral fraud. They contended that mismanagement of the NEC's computerized system had undermined the credibility of the election results, thus necessitating a thorough investigation. In addition, they noted that the Democratic Party had repeatedly introduced impeachment motions against various ministers, the chairman of the Korea Communications Commission, the head of the Board of Audit and Inspection, and prosecutors, while simultaneously slashing the government budget in an apparent attempt to paralyze governance—factors cited as further justification for the martial law declaration.
- The presidential side further asserted that the situation constituted “a state of emergency equivalent to wartime or a national calamity,” thereby satisfying the legal prerequisites for declaring martial law. They maintained that, since the measure was not intended to disrupt the constitutional order, no insurrection

charge should be applicable. They also argued that no legal procedures were violated or basic rights infringed during the processes of declaring, maintaining, or lifting martial law; thus, neither the objective of subverting the constitutional order nor the criteria for insurrection under criminal law were met.

- These arguments are consistent with what President Yoon stated in his nationwide address on December 12, wherein he explained that the martial law declaration was necessary to counter the opposition's legislative and budgetary overreach and due to the inadequacies of the NEC's computerized system.
- Currently, the Constitutional Court is conducting the impeachment trial, and the presidential legal team insists that the martial law declaration was a justified measure and that procedural defects in the National Assembly's impeachment process necessitate the dismissal or rejection of the impeachment motion.

3. Progress of the Impeachment Trial

The National Assembly judged President Yoon's martial law declaration to be unconstitutional and passed an impeachment motion; the Constitutional Court is now conducting the impeachment trial. The Court is rigorously scrutinizing the necessity and proportionality of the martial law declaration, as well as whether the president abused his authority. Recently, the seventh round of hearings was held, during which the president's legal team continued to defend the legitimacy of the martial law declaration.

(1) Control of the Constitutional Court and the Impeachment of President Yoon: A Crisis for Democracy

South Korea's Constitutional Court is composed of nine justices—three appointed by the president, three elected by the National Assembly (with subsequent presidential appointment), and three nominated by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. In October 2024, the term of the three justices elected by the National Assembly expired; however, following President Yoon's impeachment, Acting President Han Duk-soo withheld their appointments due to a lack of bipartisan agreement. In response, the Democratic Party argued that Acting President Han was undermining the National Assembly's authority and pressed for impeachment, leading to the motion being passed. Consequently, when Acting President Han was impeached, Vice Prime Minister and Minister of Economy and Finance Choi Sang-mok assumed the role of acting president and promptly appointed two new Constitutional Court justices.

This increased the number of justices from six to eight, resulting in a majority perceived as pro-Democratic Party and pro-China/pro-North Korea. Critics contend that this deliberate reconfiguration of the Court was intended to heighten the likelihood of an adverse ruling in President Yoon's impeachment trial. Legal scholars have raised concerns regarding the presidential acting authority over the appointment of Constitutional Court justices, arguing that the Court's independence is being severely undermined, and that the Democratic Party is exploiting its parliamentary majority to extend its influence over the judiciary, thereby posing a grave threat to the rule of law and liberal democracy in South Korea.

(2) Political Bias Among Some Constitutional Court Justices

Controversy has arisen regarding the political leanings and past affiliations of certain Constitutional Court justices. In particular, Acting Chief Justice Moon Hyung-bae is known to have close ties with Lee Jae-myung, the representative of the Democratic Party of Korea, and is reputed to have been a member of the 18th class of the Judicial Research and Training Institute alongside Lee. Records of social media exchanges between them have been cited as evidence of their closeness. Moreover, Acting Chief Justice Moon has previously traveled to Hokkaido, Japan, with former National Election Commission officials, and later published a blog post explaining the handling of the related expenses. These circumstances have led to doubts being raised regarding his impartiality. Nonetheless, the Constitutional Court maintains that personal relationships do not influence judicial decisions.

The Court has rejected the presidential side's request to conduct a forensic examination of the NEC servers during the impeachment trial, deeming the request to lack both necessity and relevance. Similarly, the request to verify the voter registration list was dismissed, thereby limiting the evidence the presidential team could submit to substantiate the election fraud allegations.

4. The Unjust Application of Insurrection Charges Against President Yoon

Prosecutors have indicted President Yoon on charges of leading an insurrection, and a criminal trial is currently underway. The courts are thoroughly examining whether the insurrection charge is applicable and the extent of the president's responsibility, while President Yoon contends that his actions were the legitimate exercise of executive authority.

(1) Definition of Insurrection

According to Article 87 of the South Korean Criminal Code, insurrection is defined as the crime of engaging in violent uprising with the intent to desecrate the nation or subvert the constitutional order. Here, "subversion of the constitutional order" refers to actions aimed at fundamentally undermining the constitutional framework of the Republic of Korea, and a mere breach of law or a political crisis does not constitute insurrection. Moreover, insurrection is not established by mere aggressive political measures or power struggles but requires the concrete use of force—specifically, an "armed uprising" or "violent rebellion"—and must involve organized, collective action rather than isolated acts.

(2) Why President Yoon's Martial Law Measures Do Not Constitute Insurrection

President Yoon's decision to declare martial law was a legally sanctioned response under the Constitution and relevant laws to a national emergency. There is no evidence that his actions were intended to subvert the constitutional order or that any violent uprising was incited. The current insurrection charges against the president appear to be based on a narrative manipulated by the Democratic Party and pro-China/pro-North Korea factions, which have exploited their overwhelming parliamentary majority—secured through allegations of electoral fraud—to fabricate

a case against him. The following points further illustrate why the insurrection charge is inapplicable:

- The president's declaration of martial law was a lawful measure grounded in the Constitution and relevant laws. The martial law declared by President Yoon was a legal action pursuant to Article 77 of the Constitution, which states that "in times of war, national calamity, or a state of emergency comparable thereto, martial law may be declared when it is necessary to maintain public order." President Yoon based his decision on evidence of electoral fraud allegations regarding the National Election Commission, attempts by the National Assembly and the judiciary to undermine the constitutional order, and the possibility of foreign intervention; this action was a measure taken to safeguard the nation as guaranteed by the Constitution.
- There has never been an attempt to forcibly neutralize the National Assembly: The Democratic Party and pro-China/pro-North Korea factions claim that President Yoon sought to render the National Assembly powerless. However, the National Assembly continued to function normally even after the declaration of martial law, and discussions on lifting martial law were underway. In fact, President Yoon repeatedly affirmed that he would maintain the functions of both the executive and the legislature following the martial law declaration. Moreover, testimonies from some military commanders and officials from the National Intelligence Service, which were submitted as evidence to support claims of an attempt to neutralize the National Assembly, have been revealed to be false during the impeachment trial process. There is emerging evidence that some commanders gave false testimonies under pressure and intimidation from the Democratic Party, and it remains uncertain to what extent these testimonies will be accepted by the Constitutional Court.
- There was no attempt to arrest members of the National Assembly, and the claims are nothing more than false testimonies from some commanders: Certain military officials assert that President Yoon attempted to arrest National Assembly members; however, no concrete evidence exists to substantiate this claim. The martial law forces took measures solely to maintain public order and did not attempt to physically suppress or dissolve the legislature.
- The claim that the resolution to lift martial law was obstructed is a fabricated narrative: The failure of the National Assembly to pass a resolution to lift martial law was not due to any interference by President Yoon, but rather stemmed from internal divisions and political conflicts within the Assembly. The National Assembly, predominantly led by the Democratic Party, irrationally prioritized a political offensive aimed at applying insurrection charges over the discussion of lifting martial law, which resulted in the delay of the resolution.

(3) The imposition of insurrection charges against the president is precisely what the public considers to be "true insurrection."

The imposition of insurrection charges against President Yoon has provoked a strong popular outcry, with many asserting that the very act of detaining him on insurrection charges amounts to what is truly insurrection. Legal scholars and constitutional experts have advanced the following interpretations:

1. The act of deeming the president's legitimate exercise of authority as unlawful and detaining him may itself satisfy the criteria for insurrection: President Yoon exercised his powers in accordance with the Constitution and the law, but the Democratic Party and the judiciary have undermined his actions by framing them as a counterconstitutional coup.
2. Forcibly detaining the president on insurrection charges is, in fact, an act of subverting the constitutional order: Insurrection is defined as the act of destroying national order, and there is a compelling argument that the real subversion occurs when a president elected by the people is arrested and detained on fabricated charges.
3. Public opinion strongly opposes both the impeachment and the insurrection charges against President Yoon: Polls show that over 50% of the public is against impeaching him on these grounds, with growing concerns that if impeachment is upheld, pro-China and pro-North Korea forces may seize power in an early presidential election.
4. Fabricated testimonies are emerging throughout the impeachment trial process: False testimonies from some military commanders and the head of the National Intelligence Service have been exposed in court, and as the trial progresses, additional evidence is emerging that President Yoon has no connection to insurrection.

(4) Conclusion: The insurrection charge framework is nothing more than a manipulated political offensive.

The application of insurrection charges against President Yoon is an unfounded political repression, and strong criticism is mounting that those pushing for such charges are, in reality, destabilizing the constitutional order of the Republic of Korea.

- President Yoon's declaration of martial law was a lawful measure taken in accordance with the Constitution and the law.
- There is no evidence that he attempted to forcibly dissolve or neutralize the National Assembly, and claims that he sought to arrest its members are fabricated.
- False testimonies from certain military commanders and intelligence officials have emerged during the impeachment trial process.
- Some legal scholars argue that forcibly detaining the president on insurrection charges, when he has acted within his constitutional authority, actually undermines the constitutional order—constituting what may be termed the true act of insurrection.

Currently, the impeachment trial and criminal proceedings regarding the insurrection charges are ongoing, and it remains uncertain how the Constitutional Court will evaluate these false testimonies and manipulated allegations. Nonetheless, the public remains firmly opposed to impeaching President Yoon on insurrection charges and to holding an early presidential election that could enable pro-China and pro-North Korea forces to seize power. A decisive response is therefore required.

5. The Crisis of South Korean Liberal Democracy and the Rise of Pro-China/Pro-North Korea Forces

The present situation poses a grave threat to South Korea's liberal democratic system. The impeachment trial and insurrection investigation initiated following President Yoon's martial law declaration have been criticized as abuses of state power and violations of democratic principles. Moreover, the responses of political factions, the media, and the judiciary have led to a clash between democratic governance and the rule of law, exacerbating social conflicts.

Should the Constitutional Court endorse the impeachment and an early presidential election be held, there is a significant risk that pro-China and pro-North Korea political forces will assume power. Such an outcome could drastically alter South Korea's foreign policy direction and national security strategy, with serious repercussions for the nation's identity and sovereignty.

(1) Pro-China Orientation of Lee Jae-myung: Diplomatic Inclinations Evident in His Statements and Actions

- Lee Jae-myung, the representative of the Democratic Party of Korea, has been noted for making several pro-China statements and exhibiting pro-China behavior. On March 22, 2024, during an election campaign in the traditional market of Dangjin, South Chungcheong Province, he remarked, "Why not gather around China? Just say 'xièxiè (thanks),' and even for Taiwan, just say 'xièxiè'" — a comment that was criticized for oversimplifying South Korea's diplomatic stance amid the conflict between China and Taiwan.
- Furthermore, on June 8, 2023, during a meeting with Xing Haiming, the Chinese Ambassador to the Republic of Korea, when Xing stated that "betting on China's defeat is wrong and will undoubtedly lead to regret later," Lee was noted to have listened without objection, an act that was interpreted as indicative of his pro-China stance.
- Although Lee has been criticized for his pro-China inclinations, he has recently emphasized strengthening the alliance with the United States; however, questions about the sincerity of this adjustment persist.

(2) Pro-China Controversies Surrounding Kwon Young-se, the Representative of the People Power Party

- Kwon Young-se has been evaluated as having a pro-China orientation due to his previous roles as South Korea's Ambassador to China and Minister of Unification. During his tenure as Minister of Unification, he even advocated that North Korean television should be available for viewing in South Korea.
- Additionally, on December 22, 2024, he was criticized for his lack of response during a tractor protest that took place in front of the presidential residence in Hannam-dong, Yongsan, despite being a member of the National Assembly representing that district.

(3) Controversy Over Kwon Seong-dong's Proposal for Constitutional Reform Toward a Parliamentary System

- Kwon Seong-dong, the floor leader of the People Power Party, has recently pointed out the limitations of the presidential system, which he characterizes as an “all-or-nothing winner-takes-all” structure that fails to reflect the diverse opinions of the populace. He argues that a restructuring of power is necessary to establish a system based on mutual coexistence and cooperation.
- In this context, Kwon Seong-dong has proposed constitutional reform, including the introduction of a parliamentary system. Critics warn that pursuing such a reform without first ensuring electoral fairness may result in pro-China and pro-North Korea forces monopolizing power over the long term.

(4) Risk to the Survival of South Korea's Liberal Democracy

- If President Yoon's impeachment becomes a reality, it would be more than a mere change of government—it could serve as a catalyst for a fundamental transformation of South Korea's political system. In the event that impeachment is upheld and an early presidential election is held while electoral fraud allegations remain unresolved, there is a very high likelihood that a government with pro-China and pro-North Korea tendencies will once again come to power.
- Coupled with discussions of constitutional reform toward a parliamentary system, if left-wing forces were to secure an absolute majority in the National Assembly and push for the adoption of such a system, South Korea would be at significant risk of effectively transitioning to a one-party autocratic regime. Under a parliamentary system, the National Assembly elects the Prime Minister; if a faction that has gained control of the Assembly through electoral fraud were to force through constitutional reforms, the opportunity for the public to directly judge the government would disappear, thereby creating a structure that enables a particular political force to maintain permanent rule. This scenario would amount to the fundamental collapse of South Korea's liberal democratic system.

(5) Issues Directly Affecting the Fate of the Nation

- The survival of the Republic of Korea has been sustained on the basis of liberal democracy and the R.O.K.–U.S. alliance. However, if pro-China and pro-North Korea forces seize power and establish a long-term authoritarian regime following the impeachment of President Yoon, the very identity of the Republic of Korea is likely to undergo a fundamental transformation.
- In particular, if a pro-China regime comes to power, South Korea would fall under the influence of the Chinese Communist Party and become highly susceptible to Chinese demands in the realms of economic, military, and security policies. There is a strong risk that the R.O.K.–U.S. alliance would be weakened and that discussions about the withdrawal of U.S. forces from South Korea could gain significant momentum. Furthermore, if pro-North Korean policies are intensified under the guise of improving inter-Korean relations, South Korea's national security would face severe threats.

- The policies pursued by President Yoon—such as strengthening the R.O.K.–U.S. alliance, implementing an anti-China foreign policy, and actively participating in the Indo-Pacific strategy—are likely to collapse abruptly under a pro-China regime, thereby posing a direct threat to the very survival of the nation.

(6) Strategic Threats Faced by the United States

If President Yoon is impeached and South Korea transitions to a pro-China regime, significant strategic risks would emerge for the United States.

- **Weakening of the ROK–U.S. Alliance:** A pro-China administration in South Korea might weaken the military alliance between the two countries, potentially leading to discussions of withdrawing U.S. forces from South Korea.
- **Enhanced Chinese Hegemony in East Asia:** South Korea's realignment under pro-China influence would likely undermine the trilateral security cooperation among the United States, South Korea, and Japan, thereby facilitating China's bid for regional dominance and exacerbating tensions in the Taiwan Strait and the South China Sea.
- **Increased North Korean Military Threats:** A government sympathetic to North Korea could lead to a relaxation of sanctions and an acceleration of North Korea's nuclear and missile programs, further destabilizing regional security.
- **Deterioration of U.S.–Japan Relations:** A shift toward pro-China policies in South Korea might provoke anti-Japan sentiment and undermine the cooperative security framework among the United States, South Korea, and Japan.

(7) Points the United States Must Consider

- Considering the high likelihood that South Korea may transition to a pro-China regime following the impeachment of President Yoon Suk-yeol, the United States must not dismiss this as a mere internal political matter of Korea.
- The United States should adopt proactive policy responses to safeguard liberal democracy in South Korea and conduct a meticulous analysis of how political changes in Korea affect the strategic balance throughout East Asia.
- In particular, if impeachment proceeds while electoral fairness remains unestablished and an early presidential election subsequently takes place, it is highly likely to be a politically manipulative seizure of power masquerading as a democratic process. The United States must consider establishing an international monitoring framework to ensure that allegations of electoral fraud in Korea are thoroughly investigated and that a fair electoral environment is established prior to any change of regime, in order to uphold the values of liberal democracy.

(8) Conclusion: The impeachment of President Yoon Suk-yeol is not merely an internal Korean matter.

- If President Yoon Suk-yeol is impeached, there is a high likelihood that South Korea, with unresolved allegations of electoral fraud, will see pro-China and pro-North Korea forces come to power, which would fundamentally threaten its

liberal democracy. Moreover, any alteration in South Korea's national identity would inevitably have serious repercussions on the United States' East Asian strategy and global security.

- Therefore, the United States must consider taking proactive measures to safeguard South Korea's liberal democracy by addressing issues such as the weakening of the R.O.K.–U.S. alliance, the strengthening of Chinese hegemony in East Asia, an increased military threat from North Korea, and a deterioration of cooperation with Japan that may result from President Yoon Suk-yeol's impeachment.
- The impeachment of President Yoon Suk-yeol will be a critical turning point for both South Korea and the United States, and it must be recognized that this is not merely an internal Korean political matter but a core issue affecting international order and East Asian security.

6. Practical Response Measures to Safeguard South Korea's Liberal Democratic System

South Korea is currently facing a severe political crisis, and the impeachment of President Yoon Suk-yeol along with the attempt to indict him on insurrection charges are grave matters that threaten the very foundations of its liberal democratic system. To overcome this crisis and to defend liberal democracy, it is essential to adopt a systematic strategy and international cooperation that goes beyond mere political responses. To this end, the following concrete and practical measures are proposed.

(1) Restoration of Electoral Fairness: Investigation of Electoral Fraud and International Cooperation

The core of South Korea's political crisis lies in unresolved electoral fraud allegations and the attempt by pro-China and pro-North Korea factions to conceal them and seize political power. Given that the martial law declaration was the proximate cause of the impeachment trial, it is imperative to highlight and politicize the original rationale—namely, the investigation of electoral fraud.

- The original purpose of martial law must be communicated clearly to the public, and a mass movement should be stimulated to demand justice.
- It is essential to mobilize public opinion through rallies, media campaigns, and international petitions to expose the severity of the electoral fraud issue.
- Progressive civic organizations and the press should collaborate to reveal concrete evidence of electoral fraud and educate the citizenry.
- Since the electoral fraud issue is not merely a domestic problem but part of a global challenge involving international electoral cartels and potential interference by the Chinese Communist Party, South Korea must work in cooperation with the United States—whose former President Donald Trump and the Republican Party have prioritized combating electoral fraud—to launch an international campaign for electoral reform.

- International organizations such as the United Nations (UN), the International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (International IDEA), as well as the U.S. Congress and the Department of State should be engaged to establish an international election monitoring framework for South Korea and demand objective verification.

(2) Consolidation of Public Opinion and Boosting Support for President Yoon to Prevent Impeachment

It is critical to mobilize national public opinion to prevent the Constitutional Court from endorsing President Yoon's impeachment.

- Emphasize that martial law is a constitutionally sanctioned authority granted to the president to ensure national security, especially in light of electoral fraud allegations that pose a direct threat to the state.
- Launch a sustained campaign to expose that the forces pushing for impeachment are driven by a political agenda to conceal electoral fraud.
- Increase the political pressure on Constitutional Court justices by highlighting that endorsing impeachment would effectively lead South Korea toward a long-term dictatorship, and consistently raise the issue of the justices' political biases in their appointments.
- Leverage both domestic and international public opinion—through interviews, articles, and petitions—to stress that impeaching President Yoon would be detrimental to the national interests of both South Korea and the United States.

(3) Elimination of Pro-China/Anti-State Forces and National Purification

Once President Yoon has overcome the impeachment crisis and returned to office, comprehensive reforms must be promptly initiated to safeguard South Korea's liberal democracy.

- Establish an emergency task force to conduct a full-scale reform, including the rapid investigation and punishment of those involved in electoral fraud and other related crimes.
- Expedite judicial proceedings against pro-China politicians such as Lee Jae-myung and swiftly bring any individuals found guilty of subversive activities before the courts.
- Promptly call for re-elections of members of the National Assembly to secure a fair and representative legislature, thus laying the foundation for a political reorganization.
- Reform the judiciary—particularly the Constitutional Court and the Supreme Court—to eliminate political bias and establish an independent judicial system. This includes reforming the method of appointing Constitutional Court justices so that no single political faction can dominate the process, and undertaking reforms in key state institutions such as the National Intelligence Service, the Prosecutor's Office, and the police to eliminate threats to national security.

- Rigorously monitor and investigate any political interference by the Chinese Communist Party or pro-China organizations within South Korea, while simultaneously reducing economic dependency on China and strengthening cooperation with the United States and Japan to preserve South Korea's diplomatic independence.

(4) Additional Strategy: Strengthening International Solidarity and Cooperation with the Trump Administration

Following President Yoon's restoration, it is essential to maintain close cooperation with the Trump administration in the United States to further solidify the U.S.–ROK alliance.

- Collaborate with the Trump administration to conduct a thorough investigation into the electoral fraud allegations in South Korea and work together to dismantle any international electoral fraud cartels.
- Reinforce trilateral security cooperation among the United States, South Korea, and Japan, and implement policies to protect South Korea from the economic and military threats posed by China.

(5) Conclusion: Uniting Domestic Strength and International Support to Defend South Korea's Liberal Democracy

- The current crisis facing South Korea is not merely one of political chaos but a matter of survival for liberal democracy and the rule of law.
- To resolve this crisis, it is crucial to thoroughly investigate electoral fraud, prevent President Yoon's impeachment, and eliminate pro-China, anti-state forces.
- In this process, robust public support and international solidarity are indispensable; particularly, the United States must intensify its cooperation to safeguard South Korea's security and sovereignty.
- Once impeachment is overturned and President Yoon is restored, a comprehensive series of reforms must be implemented to reestablish South Korea's liberal democratic system and strengthen national security.
- Now, it is imperative that both the domestic public and the international community unite to secure the future of South Korea.