

Gangjeong Village 'Jikimis' as Commoners: For a commons paradigm-based social movement theory*

YEA-YL YOON | JEJU NATIONAL UNIVERSITY

This paper attempts to investigate the significance of the practice of the “jikimis” of Gangjeong Village in particular among social movements in South Korea. There is an island named Jeju-do in the south part of South Korea, and Gangjeong Village is a coastal village on the southern part of Jeju-do. A naval base was built there in 2016 as a national project. Gangjeong Village was selected as a naval base site in 2007, and struggles to prevent the construction of the naval base continued thereafter for 10 years, but the naval base was eventually built. By the way, during the course of the opposition movement, activists called jikimis and ordinary citizens entered Gangjeong Village for solidarity with the opposition movement of the residents, and some of them have continued their activities while living in the village even after the naval base was built. This paper is intended to capture them as commoners and analyze the significance of their practice in terms of commoning. In addition, this paper will address what tasks for grouping are provided to the commons theory by their movement after the defeat of the movement.

Keywords: *commons theory, commoning, national project, social movent, jikimis, Gangjeong Village*

*This work was supported by the Ministry of Education of the Republic of Korea and the National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF-2017S1A3A2067220).

Introduction: The Rise of the Commons Paradigm and South Korean Society

Although industrialization in South Korea has advanced at a rapid pace, authoritative compressed growth and rapid marketization have destroyed natural environments and has been driving village communities in regions where people had been living by relying on natural resources to crisis. As growth and development were compressive, destruction and crises are progressing compressively, too. In responding to the crises of village communities brought about by the current social system organized with state power and market power as two axes, an awareness of the problems of the commons theory provides great implications. Since modernization, natural resources have been managed and used mainly with the decisions and interventions of the government (public) and the market (private). In opposition to this binomial composition as such, the commons theory indicated the possibility of resource management based on the autonomy of local residents as a “third way.” That is, the commons theory presented a new perspective that the operating principle of the commons, which is neither the domination of the market (private ownership) nor the domination of the state (state ownership), can enable sustainable lives.

In the academia of South Korea, the commons theory has also been attracting attention since the beginning of the 2010s (see Choi 2017). In international academia, the cornerstone of the commons theory was laid by Elinor Ostrom’s study on traditional types of commons, that is, natural resources commons (Ostrom 1990). The essence of the study is that the fact that collective management, which is neither private (not relying on capitalist enterprises) nor public (not relying on the state), of lands, water, forests, and fishing grounds is possible was proved through empirical investigation. Currently, the horizon of the commons theory is extended beyond the domain of the traditional natural common-pool resource (CPR) to the domain of relationships with various resources that constitute the lives of people. This is attributed to the fact that the concept of the commons provides consistent alternative models for aligning economic, social, and ethical concerns in a larger picture. It offers many promising, practical solutions to the problems of our time - economic growth, inequality, precarious work, migration, climate change, the failures of representative democracy, bureaucracy (Bollier 2016a).

In addition, not only are theoretical discussions developed in academia,

but commons movements are also activated. Bollier states that commons are not only some things that are shared (material and immaterial objects) but also the activities, practice, and lives of sharing, and the economic and social order, paradigm, logic, and principle of sharing (Bollier 2016b). If so, commons movements can be said to be alternatives to the state and market that have dominated modern systems and are movements to return the collective value created by people to the people, as well as all conscious efforts that aim to reconstruct self-sufficient and autonomous communities (Jang 2016). A wide range of activists and practitioners are invoking the vocabulary of the commons to defend the disappearing material commons as well as to expand non-material commons as practices for building communities, solidarity (Peuter and Dyer-Witthoford 2010). The commons paradigm has been applied to the diagnosis and prescription related to social problems, and its importance will grow further hereafter.

This paper attempts to investigate the significance of the practice of the “jikimis” of Gangjeong Village in particular among social movements in South Korea. There is an island named Jeju-do in the south part of South Korea, and Gangjeong Village is a coastal village on the southern part of Jeju-do. A naval base was built there in 2016 as a national project. Gangjeong Village was selected as a naval base site in 2007, and struggles to prevent the construction of the naval base continued thereafter for 10 years, but the naval base was eventually built. By the way, during the course of the opposition movement, activists called jikimis and ordinary citizens entered Gangjeong Village for solidarity with the opposition movement of the residents, and some of them have continued their activities while living in the village even after the naval base was built. This paper is intended to capture them as commoners and analyze the significance of their practice in terms of commoning. In addition, this paper will address what tasks for grouping are provided to the commons theory by their movement after the defeat of the movement.

South Korean National Projects and Jikimis

South Korean National Projects and Gangjeong Village

In South Korean society, national projects have been implemented with the decision of the central government, continuously causing problems in the provinces. The national projects that have been implemented since the 2000s

include the reclaimed land development in Saemangeum in Jeonbuk(1998~), the construction of a nuclear waste disposal site in Buan (2003~), the expansion of the U.S. Army base in Pyeongtaek, Gyeonggi-do (2003~), the installation of a transmission tower in Milyang, Gyeongnam (2008~), the four-river project in Dumulmeori in Gyeonggi-do (2012~), and the THAAD deployment in Seongju, Gyeongbuk (2016~). Many of these national projects implemented in the provinces are large-scale development projects or military base or power generation facility formation projects. Such national projects bring about big problems to the relevant regions and village communities because they are often pushed by an alliance of bureaucrats and capital without undergoing any democratic process of collecting the residents' intentions in the processes through which these national projects are determined and promoted.

Goh Byeong-gwon captured the problems in national projects and the phenomenon of deportation of the public occurring in South Korean society with the concept of "marginalization." He took note of the various implications of the word "margin." Margin has lexical meanings such as boundary, limit, and profit. He reads the word margin as follows: "boundary," which is the first meaning of margin, indicates the position of the people that has become secondary in the domain of power and wealth; "limit," which is the second meaning of margin, indicates the situation faced by the lives of the people; and "profit," which is the third meaning of margin, tells us what state power and capital aim at by marginalizing the people (Goh 2009).

His idea is useful in interpreting the present situation of Gangjeong Village. In addition, his idea is also useful in revealing the universal significance of interpreting the present situation of the village in South Korean society. Gangjeong Village is a village on the southern end of Jeju, which is at the boundary of South Korea, and it is a village where a military base was established because it is at the boundary of South Korea. In other words, it is a marginalized village. The margin named Gangjeong Village is a blind spot where the residents' rights as people are not protected and the violence of the state and the logic of capital are plainly exposed. There, insecurity and crises are basic conditions of life.

However, that is why the events occurring in the village and the activities arising in response to the events have important meanings in South Korean society. Gangjeong Village is a place where different logics and values collide with each other. Values termed developmentalism and ecology, centralism and regionalism, exploitation and preservation, competition and cooperation, and uniformity and diversity are pitted against each other there.

Therefore, taking a view of the struggles of Gangjeong Village is more meaningful than just examining a village.

The process of struggles of Gangjeong Village over 10 years can be summarized as follows. In April 2007, at an extraordinary general meeting in which only 87 people out of the population of 1,900 gathered, it was decided to apply for the construction of a naval base in secret. The Jeju government immediately accepted the application for the construction of the naval base. In response to the foregoing, in May 2007, the “Gangjeong Village Jeju naval base opposition countermeasure committee” was founded. In August 2007, in a vote in which 725 residents participated, 94% of the residents expressed their opposition to the attraction of the naval base. On this occasion, the former chairman of the village council, who led the attraction of the naval base, was dismissed and a new village council chairman was elected. Thereafter, in November 2007, the residents announced the “Gangjeong Life and Peace Village Declaration.” However, the Jeju government enforced the promotion of the naval base construction. In October 2008, Jeju civic groups began relay hunger strikes against the naval base construction. In August 2009, the “headquarters for a movement for citizen recall of Kim Tae-hwan, the governor of Jeju-do,” consisting of Gangjeong Village residents and 30 civic groups in the Jeju area, conducted a vote for citizen recall of the governor of Jeju-do, but the agenda was thrown out due to the voter turnout being lower than the required one. In those days, the Ministry of National Defense approved a plan for the implementation of national defense military facilities in January 2009, the Cultural Heritage Administration permitted cultural heritage alteration in September 2009. Thereafter, the Jeju government held a consultation on the environmental impact assessment and lifted the absolute conservation area in December 2009. Meanwhile, the “Gangjeong Village Jeju naval base opposition countermeasure committee” conducted various activities to raise issues through administrative and legal procedures. However, in November 2010, the Jeju government officially accepted the naval base. Then, in March 2011, as the Jeju naval base opposition movement was heightened, peace and religious organizations and activists throughout the country visited Gangjeong Village and the naval base emerged as a matter of nationwide interest. In September 2011, public power was put into the village. In March 2012, work to blast a rock named “Guroembi” in Gangjeong Village began, and with this as a momentum, many people from the whole country, including the general public, visited the village. In February 2013, a plan was established to construct not only the naval base, but also a cruise port, and the name of the Jeju naval base was

changed to “Civil-Military Combined Tourist Harbor.” In February 2016, the naval base was completed. Despite the initial promise that the naval base would not be used as a U.S. military facility, the U.S. Navy Aegis destroyer *Stethem* entered the port in March 2017, and the Virginia-class nuclear-powered attack submarine *Mississippi* (SSN-782) entered the port in November 2017 (See Gangjeong Village Council Jeju Naval Base and Life and Peace Movement Source Book Publication Promotion Committee 2018).

As the naval base has been completed and the cruise port is about to be completed, the landscape of Gangjeong Village has been drastically changed. The village is filled with construction sites even on the coast. The sea that could be seen from anywhere in the village is gradually disappearing from the visual field, and even the view of Mount Halla is being cut off. Shops in the service industry are increasing on the streets. Alleys have been changed into motorcar roads with extension works. Land in the village was gradually bought by outsiders and the navy and the purpose of use has been changed. Already half of the coast and a quarter of the land has been encroached upon by the naval base and the cruise port. In addition, the land will be expropriated little by little to make oil storage tanks, armories, and helicopter pads so that the land is occupied by base-related facilities. Furthermore, when the cruise port is completed, Gangjeong Village will be turned into a military camp town and tourist destination.

Long-term Struggle and Jikimis

As the Jeju naval base opposition movement became a nationwide issue in March 2011, many groups such as “Pioneers,” “People who Seek Peace and Unification,” and the “Life and Peace Association Pilgrimage Group” and many individuals came to Gangjeong Village. People with different social backgrounds and life histories who came to Gangjeong, have the common name “jikimis” in the village. *Jikimi* is a noun that means “guard” and is derived from the verb “to guard.”

The term “jikimi” has been used in the scenes of social movements in South Korean society since the 2000s. The sense of existence of *jikimis* was first magnified in the “struggle against the expansion of the Pyeongtaek U.S. military base,” which began in 2003. The appearance of *jikimis* became an important turning point in the process of development of the movement. When an opposition movement against a national project occurs in a province, the residents in the province gather together to develop the movement in the initial phase in general. The areas designated for national

projects are the sites of the lives and work of the residents and places where the memories of the residents have been accumulated. The residents have a sense of bonding based on the adjacency of residences and the commonality of lives, and the social networks formed by them naturally become powerful resources for mobilization (Jeong 2017). However, when a movement is prolonged, it becomes hard to continue the movement with only internal mobilization. In addition, cracks occur even between the residents. In such situations, activists and citizens come to protect the village together in some cases, and some of them live together in the village. They come into events that have already occurred but do not yet have any determined meaning and live as new members of the communities while producing and sharing the meanings of the events.

What is characteristic of the activities of jikimis as such is that they live in the villages. Unlike normal external solidarity movement organizations that intermittently combine with residents' struggle, jikimis come into the villages and live with the residents. In Pyeongtaek, as the struggle was prolonged, many residents quit the struggle and left the village and jikimis moved into the empty houses of the residents who left to settle in the village, farm together with the residents, and share daily lives. As jikimis lived in the village, the residents were able to escape from a psychological sense of isolation, and as jikimis conducted united activities with external activists, the participants in the movement could be expanded. The jikimis in Pyeongtaek were called "Hwangsaeu ljikimis." Hwangsaeul was the name of a field belonging to the area designated for the U.S. military base site to be expanded. The major slogan of the "Pyeongtaek U.S. military base expansion opposition movement" was "Let us farm this year too." The best goal of the struggle was to continue living there as usual.

In the background of the situation where jikimis came to live with the residents there is the prolongation of the struggle. In situations where national projects are pushed ahead and residents are resisting, struggles are prolonged if there is no mechanism to mediate or solve the problem. The problems in the communities caused by national projects listed above lasted for 1 or 2 years at least, and more than 10 years in some cases. Although "the continuation of struggles" means "an interruption of daily life" when struggles end in a short period of time, the boundary between "living" and "struggles" is not clear in the case of long-term struggles. That is, the people involved cannot but struggle in the way they live and live in the way they struggle. Therefore, the appearance of jikimis leads to a (temporary) reconstruction of the community in the village. In situations of long-term

struggles, the village community is transformed into a struggle community with flexible boundaries between life and struggles (Jeong 2017).

However, once the struggle is over, the struggle community returns to a daily residential community. Among the national project opposition movements in South Korea, those that have successfully blocked the relevant projects are extremely rare. Opposition movements fail or end up with a certain amount of compensation paid to the residents or landowners in most cases. In such cases, jikimis disappear from villages along with the extinction of movements because the purpose of jikimis is not to become the residents of the villages, but to conduct movements together with the residents.

However, the case of Gangjeong Village was different. In the village too, jikimis became “new parties” to make the stage of life into the stage of a movement while living there with the residents, and they were defeated in the movement together with the residents. However, some jikimis moved their domiciles to Gangjeong Village even after the defeat of the movement to become new residents and continue to live in the village. This is not only because they came to have an attachment to the village and their sense of fellowship with the residents was reinforced in the process of the movement, but also because they cannot stop their peace activities due to problems occurring unceasingly as the naval base is adjacent to the living space of the village. Let us listen to the words of one jikimi. “After the completion of the naval base, we were asked, “Why do you still fight and stay here despite the naval base having been completed?” However, let us think about it. The reason we opposed the naval base was because we were worried about not only the procedures in the base construction process, but also some problems that would occur after completion. Therefore, now, when the military base has been completed, can be said to be the time when the movement is more necessary. The naval base opposition movement of Gangjeong began as a movement to stop the construction of the military base and expanded into a peace movement to resist militarism and protects lives and human rights.”(Eom 2018, p. 41). They are actually steadily continuing base surveillance activities. However, jikimis do not only conduct the peace movement to live as new residents here. What kind of “movements after the movement” are they conducting? What is the junction between their activities and the commons movement, and what do their activities suggest to the commons theory?

Village Community and Commoners in Gangjeong

Community and Commons

In this section, it is necessary to explore the form of existence of those jikimis who came into the village to become a “party of the movement” during the period of struggles and became “residents of the village,” from the perspective of community changes and reconstruction according to the struggles. What kind of status as members of the village do those people have who became members of the struggle community during the period of struggle since the struggle community has turned back into a regular residence community?

In the case of Gangjeong Village, however, the existing village community that must embrace them was greatly damaged. Although the division of a community over development and preservation occurs frequently in the process of the progression of national projects in South Korean society, the degree of division was very severe in the case of the village. There was a large aftermath from the fact that the project per se began with the rough and hasty decision to attract the naval base made in an extraordinary general meeting held in secret by some residents. Only 87 people, centering on the chairman of the village council and the fishing village fraternity, participated in the meeting with a view to receiving compensation. Here, the question of who has the right to decide on the disposal of the coast jointly used by the village residents, which is not land owned by the residents, emerges as an issue. In a vote by the residents conducted immediately after the decision, in which 725 people participated, 94% of the residents expressed their opposition to the attraction of the naval base, but the administrative effect of the voting was not acknowledged. The subsequent opposition movement was intensified as it was accompanied by physical conflicts with public power, and the village community was divided into a supporting side and an opposition side. As a result, the community was severely broken up during the process of struggles for a decade.¹

After the completion of the naval base in 2016, a “presentation for residents about the community recovery project” was held on June 22, 2017, and the Jeju government presented a support plan titled “Community Recovery Projects.” This plan consisted of a total of 21 projects, and the

¹ According to the “Hankyoreh 21” (2016.06.26), 221 village communities existed as of May 2007, but only 150 were left 10 years later.

project costs amounted to over 300 billion won in the plan. In fact, quite a lot of the project cost was allocated to projects incidental to the port to make marine wind power generators or improve the area into the area into a tourist destination, along with road development and widening work (Gangjeong Village Society and Jeju Special Self-Governing Province 2017). In addition, as can be seen in detailed projects such as the “Ecological River Tour Road,” the “Formation of a Wetland Ecological Park,” the “Formation of a Recreational / Ecological Experience Center and an Ecological Exploration Center,” and the “Ecological Festival,” the idea of these projects is to form Gangjeong Village, which has become a military camp town, into a tourist attraction. Although some of the village residents requested to prepare fields that could be owned and managed jointly, those requests were rejected for the reason that the procedures for the expropriation of land for public use are complicated or that the prices of land in Gangjeong Village are high. Of a total of 21 projects, only some with low set project costs such as the “Construction of a Community Center,” the “Construction of a Branch Office of the Community Health Center,” the “Improvement of the Agricultural Water Supply Facility” and “Mandarin Rain Proof Facility Support” are expected to present direct benefits to the residents and farmers.

By the way, let us take note of the name of the project plan here. In this case, “community recovery” means that a large amount of funds will be mobilized and several facilities will be provided to address the dissatisfaction of village residents due to the construction of the naval base and the direction of the community recovery is to increase the economic value of the village. In fact, land prices in Gangjeong Village have increased greatly thanks to the expectation of the recovery projects and the construction of the cruise port.

However, although the “Community Recovery Projects” may increase the economic value of the village, can these projects indeed help the village community recover? Here, let us consider what village communities mean based on the commons theory. *Gemeinschaft*, which means “community” in German, was derived from the adjective *gemein*, which means “common.” That is, the community is “sharing relationships” (Rosa et al. 2010). Commons are the core of sharing (*geteiltes*). In particular, a community of farming villages or fishing villages in the provinces was an economic unit. A village community as an economic unit comes to have a bond originating in commons. Commons do not only refer to tangible natural resources. David Bollier set commons as a concept that encompasses unique rules, traditions, and values intended to continuously use and manage common resources, and communities that adopt such rules, traditions, and values as their order of life

(Bollier 2016a). The rules, traditions, and values form the cultural basis of the community. Then, from the perspective of the commons theory, it can be said that a community is a group that exists based on the commons ecosystem consisting of natural resources and the institutions surrounding the natural resources. Communities, especially those in rural or fishing villages, do not mean demographic sets residing in certain areas. The dismantling of the village community of Gangjeong means that people have been deprived of the natural resources that have been used for a long period of time on the one hand, and that the social relationships and rules unique to the village have been broken on the other hand. According to the community recovery project plan, a community center will be built at a cost of 5 billion won to activate exchanges among village residents. However, the commons lost by the residents are different from such a public space. The community cannot be recovered with simple economic support. Rather than public facilities, commoning is necessary for the community to recover.

Guroembi as Commons

To understand the relationship between commons and communities in Gangjeong Village, Guroembi, a huge lava rock 1.2 km long and 250 m wide that has become a symbol of the opposition movement, should be re-illuminated from the perspective of the commons theory. An important slogan of the naval base construction opposition movement was "Save Guroembi." The naval base site is 0.49 million m² in area made by using 0.2 million m² of the coast and reclaiming 0.29m² of the sea, and the site includes the area with the rock. The slogan "Save Guroembi" could mean "Let us stop the construction of the naval base." When Guroembi was blasted for the commencement of construction of the naval base in March 2012, the opposition movement was greatly heightened throughout the country with the name "Peace Activity to Preserve Guroembi." The rock was clearly a symbol of the opposition movement.²

The importance of Guroembi, however, is not just attributed to the fact that it was on the site designated for the naval base. The reason why it has become a symbol of the opposition movement is associated with the ecological value of the rock. Guroembi and the surrounding coast were originally designated as an absolute preservation area under the Special Act

² Guroembi appears in five of the titles of 10 books related to the Jeju naval base opposition movement.

on Jeju-do Development because the landscape value of the area was very high. In absolute preservation areas, not only changes in the present shape of the land but also the occupation, use, or reclamation of public waters are prohibited and military bases cannot be established. In addition, endangered wild fauna and flora designated by the Ministry of Environment were living and distributed in the area and the depressions in Guroembi on the coast were freshwater swamps where wetland animals including amphibians were breeding. This ecological environment observed in the coastal rock was unique on the coast of Jeju-do. In addition, some of the eastern part of the Gangjeong Sea where Guroembi is located belongs to multiple protection areas such as the UNESCO Biosphere Reserve, the Ministry of Maritime Affairs and Fisheries' Ecosystem Conservation Zone, the Ministry of Environment's Natural Reserve, and the Provincial Marine Park. The entire area of Gangjeong Sea is a soft coral habitat, and the surroundings are absolute preservation coastal areas. Gangjeong Sea was designated as a natural monument for the first time as a marine life habitat in South Korea. Guroembi was a proper name that encompassed such a stunning coastal ecosystem.³ In addition, Guroembi was not just ecologically symbolic to the village residents, it was unique commons as a rock, and the ecological symbolism of Guroembi also originates in the fact that it was commons. On March 11, 2012, shortly after the blasting of Guroembi on March 7, Hwang Pyeong-wu, the director of the Korea Cultural Heritage Policy Research Institute, held a press conference and argued, "The Cultural Heritage Administration and the Navy should thoroughly reinvestigate the value of Guroembi rock to see if it has a value as a cultural asset. "The next day, the Cultural Heritage Administration made its position clear with explanatory material with the title, "We explain the value of Jeju Guroembi rock for designation as a cultural asset," which said, "We did not proceed with the procedure for designation of a cultural asset because it was difficult to find any particular comparative advantage in Guroembi rock for designation as a national cultural asset." On October 5, 2010, the chairman of the Natural Monument Subcommittee and Cultural Heritage Committee members majoring in geological features conducted field surveys and released a review opinion that said, "the Guroembi coast has no worthwhile value to be designated as a national cultural asset because it is similar to other coasts in

³ The opposition movement also made the eco-village the main issue. In 2008, the Gangjeong Village Council organized the Gangjeong Natural Eco-village Steering Committee, and on the day of completion of the Jejunaval base in 2016, the village council declared Gangjeong Village a "Life and Peace Culture Village."

Jeju-do where basaltic lava flows are exposed.”⁴

That is, the Cultural Heritage Administration's opinion was that since Guroembi is a lava rock commonly found in the whole area of Jeju, its value as a cultural asset could not be acknowledged. However, cultural values cannot be determined by geological analysis, and when you listen to the testimony of the residents it can be seen that the cultural value in this case means the attributes as the commons of Guroembi. Guroembi rock was a space that formed culture for the residents for a long period of time, as a yard of the village, as a playground, as a rest area, and as a sanctum. There is a legend that said that there were nine hermitages on Guroembi, and the name originated from the legend. In addition, the Halmangmul (which means “the water of old women”), freshly drawn water that is used when rites are held in the village, came out of a crack in the rock of Guroembi. Children gathered here to play, and adults gathered here to chat. Above all, Guroembi was a blessed collection site where food could be obtained. A variety of seafood could be harvested in Guroembi and the surrounding coastal wetlands. Even children could easily harvest seafood. The residents also obtained salt from Guroembi. The cultural values, that is, the attributes as commons of Guroembi were embedded in the social and economic conditions of Gangjeong Village.

Gangjeong is a village that has been formed and sustained by Guroembi, the coastal wetlands, and natural resources in the coastal waters. Therefore, when the naval base was constructed, not only did the residents lose access to some of the spaces in the village, but also the village per se was spoiled because the social relations, livelihood activities, and leisure activities in the village were drastically changed. One thing that must be emphasized again here is that not only does commons refer to natural resources, but also activities are an important part of commons. As Peter Linebaugh said, “To speak of the commons as if it were a natural resource is misleading at best and dangerous at worst - the commons is an activity and if anything, it express relationship in society that are inseparable from relations to nature. It might be better to keep the word as a verb, an activity, rather than as noun, a substantive.” (Linebaugh 2009, p. 279). To speak of the commons as if it were a natural resource is misleading at best and dangerous at worst - the commons is an activity and if anything, it express relationship in society that are inseparable from relations to nature. It might be better to keep the word as a verb, an activity, rather than as noun, a substantive. That is, when the

⁴ “Things that have not been known about Guroembi rock,” *Asian Economy*, March 13, 2012.

Cultural Heritage Administration dismissed the argument about the cultural value of Guroembi for the reason that it was a rock that could be seen on other coasts too, the activities of Gangjeong Village residents that had continued historically were also denied.

When seen from the perspective of the commons theory, a community can be said to be a network of social activities that use and manage commons. In addition, commons should be based on the ownership of the entire community, that is, common ownership. Furthermore, the access to and use of the commons should be regulated by the democratic decisions of all members. The commons is built upon on a network of social relationships that arise from the implicit expectation that we will take care of each other and on a shared understanding that some things belong to all of us and must be used in a sustainable and equitable way - which is the essence of the commons itself. Even if it is not a specified rule, it exists as “common sense” and forms the basis of “commonfare.” However, in Gangjeong Village, the commons called Guroembi (and the Gangjeong Sea) was sold by some residents for their own interests in an undemocratic manner. As a result, the village lost its important common natural resources, and as the relationship between the residents and the nature of Guroembi (and the coastal waters) was severed, the relationships between humans was spoiled.

Jikimis as Commoners

As the crisis situation faced by the Gangjeong Village community was explained from the perspective of the commons theory, we will now prepare a perspective to illuminate the jikimis of the village as commoners (Bollier 2014, p. 15). Bollier defines commoning as “acts of mutual support, conflict, negotiation, communication and experimentation that are needed to create systems to manage shared resources” and commoners can be assumed to be the main agents that perform the commoning as such. However, the singularity when the jikimis of Gangjeong are regarded as commoners is that they are creating new commons when old ones are destroyed or under the condition where they were destroyed.

If so, let us now take a look at the activities of the jikimis that have made “common things” separately by time. The naval base opposition movement of Gangjeong can be divided into three periods. The first period is from 2007 to 2011, when the residents tried to withdraw the naval base construction plan. The second period is from 2011 to 2016, when the opposition movements spread nationwide and the construction of the naval base began so that the

TABLE 1
JIKIMI ACTIVITIES IN THE SECOND PERIOD
(FROM GANGJEONG PEACE TOUR GROUP 2017)

Time (routine movement activity)	07:00 100 Bows for Life and Peace: Make deep bows praying for life and peace. This was originally done at Guroembi, but it has been done in front of the gate of the naval base since Guroembi was destroyed. 11:00 Life Peace Mass: A Catholic Mass is conducted in a tent on the street. 12:00 Human BandJoining: As part of the non-violent resistance movement, various performances such as singing, poetry readings, and dances are held in front of the base.
Space (spatial base of sustainable movement)	Peace Center: This is the base of the opposition movement, where meetings and discussions are held and the history of the movement is recorded. Peace Bookshop: Donated books are displayed and various events such as debate forums are held. Guest house: This is used by jikimis and outsiders who come to participate in the opposition movement. Halmangmul restaurant: This is a restaurant in the village that can be used by anybody who participates in the opposition movement. Magaji cooperatives: makes container houses where jikimis can reside. Magaji is a Jeju word for "small hut."
Solidarity (domestic and international solidarity activities)	Gangjeong Friends: This is a nonprofit organization that supports the peace movement of Gangjeong. Solidarity of islands for sea of peace: This is an organization for forming solidarity with activists fighting for peace on East Asian islands such as Okinawa and Taiwan. Gangjeong Village International Team: This is a team for communication and exchange with international activists.
Report and records	Gangjeong Story: This is a newspaper that informs people about the daily lives in Gangjeong Village and movement activities. It also reports on peace activities outside the village.

struggle was intensified. The third period is since the completion of the naval base in 2016. The jikimis mainly came into Gangjeong Village in the second period. The opposition movement was prolonged so that the domain of struggles overlapped with the domain of living and in this situation, the jikimis produced "common things" in both life and movement together with the residents.

On reviewing the activities, it can be seen that during the time of

TABLE 2
JIKIMI ACTIVITIES IN THE THIRD PERIOD
(FROM GANGJEONG PEACE TOUR GROUP 2017)

Gangjeong Peace School	This school provides education to develop a peace sensibility in order to resist state violence and oppose the construction of the military base. In addition, it helps people learn about the history of violence in Jeju-do and experience the nature of the island.
Gangjeong Peace Tour Group	This group plans and executes history tours to talk about the peace of Jeju-do and Gangjeong Village. It strives to understand the lives of local residents and implements the values of saving life and the ecology to minimize environmental destruction and pollution with tours.
Gangjeong Village Art Museum “Salon de Moon”	This museum functions as a space for memory struggles and makes activities to see together and learn from each other. It exhibits records and creative works related to life, peace, and Gangjeong Village, and provides a space for learning and sharing related to life and peace.
Gangjeong Peace Commerce Group Cooperative	When those who support peace activities in Gangjeong Village bring products to sell such as tangerines and fish, the profits are used to make a life-and-peace village.

struggles, unique daily lives and times, spaces, and activities appeared in Gangjeong Village. While hardly continuing the opposition movement due to the inferiority in power, the community per se was reorganized through collective practice to foster communal lives. Here, we can see that the commons is more than just a set of theories and policies about how to improve society - it is also about how we lead our lives day-to-day (Ostrom et al. 2012).

Nevertheless, the opposition movement did not achieve its goal. The naval base was eventually built. However, the opposition movement continues with peace activities. After the establishment of the naval base, Gangjeong Village was rapidly transformed into a military camp town. In addition to the situation where warships and submarines loaded with weapons are anchored off the coast of the village and U.S. nuclear submarines enter the port, residents must routinely face violent situations. Military vehicles and soldiers pass on the roads in the village. These vehicles sometimes carry explosives or bombs, and soldiers have sometimes trained in front of Gangjeong Elementary School (Kim 2016, p. 63). Even after the

completion of the naval base, some jikimis remain in Gangjeong Village that is becoming a military camp town to make new “common activities.”

What significance do these “common activities” have as commons re-forming activities? Here, let us use the content set forth by Mitsumata Gaku regarding the function of Iriai (入り会い), which is a type of traditional commons in Japan, as a reference (Mitsumata 2008). He cites the following five major functions of Iriai: first, significance as self-sufficiency; second, significance as regional finances; third, the formation and maintenance of the unique culture of the region; fourth, the function to help the weak; and fifth, significance as environmental preservation.

Among them, the first one, “significance as self-sufficiency” is declining dramatically, even in traditional villages, as pointed out by Mitsumata himself. Even in traditional village communities, rather than having an economic area based on self-sufficiency, the economic area where external goods are distributed through the intermediation of the market is greatly expanded. However, the remaining four functions can be identified in the activities of jikimis. For instance, the Gangjeong Peace Commerce Group Cooperative Association is constantly achieving “significance as regional finances” and “the function to help the weak.” It uses the profits from the sales of agricultural products and seafood produced in the region for the promotion of the public interest termed “making a life and peace village.” It is also worth noting that the cooperative was established to continue the peace activities of jikimis. Since the jikimis have moved the foundation of their lives, they have to make a living here in order to continuously live and act in Gangjeong Village. In this sense, the Gangjeong Peace Commerce Group Cooperative Association can be said to be in charge of the “function to help the weak” for those jikimis who have no land or shop. Some jikimis and village residents also prepare fields together to raise crops to be sold by the cooperative. Sustainable movements are possible only when subsistence commons have been made.

In addition, with regard to “the formation and maintenance of the unique culture of the region,” the activities of Gangjeong Village art museum “Salon de Moon” should be noted. The re-creation of commons depends on social ties and common memories. Here, the memories of struggles and lives are commonized. In addition, the Gangjeong Peace School teaches the history and nature of Jeju-do, and the Gangjeong Peace Tour Group offers alternative tour programs for the understanding of the lives of local residents rather than consuming tour programs. With regard to significance as environmental preservation, the fact is that “peace,” which is the main

keyword of these activities, is closely linked to ecology. Not all of these activities regard the natural environment as their target, but they are intended to understand and preserve it by taking it as the basis of life. They place an emphasis on the necessity to include more-than-humans in our way of thinking about commons' communities (Breshninan 2016). In addition to these activities, the jikimis are investigating the effects of the naval base on marine ecology, including soft coral monitoring. To this end, they accumulate ecological knowledge and spread common knowledge through the Peace School and the Peace Tour Group. In this regard, it can be said that the jikimis are playing the role of "social-ecological stewardship" (Kofinas and Folkeeds 2009), which ensures the sustainability of the entire socio-ecosystem by increasing the biodiversity and adaptive capacity of living things (Armitage 2005).

In the situation where natural commons were lost, the jikimis produce new material and immaterial commons with commoning. Those who came to Gangjeong Village were called "Guroembi jikimis." They failed to protect Guroembi. However, after being robbed of the rock by the naval base, they are restoring the functions of Guroembi as commons by commoning. Of course, with their practice, they cannot produce salt, nor can they produce the Halmangmul, which was holy water. Their practice, however, is forming the core social networks and activities of the community.

Village communities do not mean the demographic sets of people who live close together. In the provinces in particular, village communities have created common assets shared and enjoyed together to maintain their own systems, and take on the functions of life, welfare, and education. However, with the trend of urbanization that has been individualized, these communities lose their functions and are regarded as old, or become interest groups to hand over commons, which are the basis of village communities, to national projects or private enterprises by themselves. In this context, the practice of jikimis can be said to be intended to restore the original meaning of these communities through joint labor, mutual care, and educational activities. As these examples also show, commons do not only produce what we need, they shape who we become: our values, practices, relationships, commitments and very identity.

Conclusion: Commoning as a Movement of Social Movements

Gangjeong Village is now becoming a base camp town and tourist

destination. The power of the state reigns on one side, while the penetration of the market is waiting on the other side. If the activities conducted in the village are viewed as a naval base construction opposition movement, the movement has already been defeated. Nevertheless, the movement continues. A “movement after a movement” is continuing. In order for the movement to continue after the movement, “a movement of a movement” is necessary. That is, the movement per se should be self-renewed. The Gangjeong jikimis should not only protect something, but also produce something that must be protected by themselves and reconstruct the base of life that was destroyed. Whereas their primary struggle was one to defend commons, the secondary struggle is to do commoning. The Gangjeong jikimis were defeated in the primary struggle. The loss of the commons robs people of their autonomy to meet basic needs for sustenance, economic security and social connections. As a result of defeat in the primary struggle, the village community was broken down and the collective ability of the people of the village to control their daily lives declined. In this situation, the jikimisas commoners are transforming their daily lives into communal ones, producing new commons, and raising collective ability for the sustainability of the movement. As Ash Amin and Philip Howell wrote, “The agent of change, the commoner, is no longer (and perhaps never was) a person a category such as the working class but an assemblage.” (Amin and Howell 2016, p. 18) Furthermore, they are focusing on the resilience of nature when seeking sustainable movements and the direction of life.

However, this paper is not intended to present the practice of the Gangjeong jikimis as a success story. It is an object of thought which must be actively explored by the commons paradigm-based social movement theory. The limitations of the Gangjeong jikimis' practice are obvious. The amount of change that can be brought about by their practice within the village is quite limited. Currently, there are around 20 of them, which is less than 2% of the village's entire population. In addition, the commonfare where they make new commons, is not stabilized. Due to rising land prices, some jikimis must live away from Gangjeong Village, and the operation of alternative spaces is becoming more difficult. The rules for commoning made by the jikimis are mainly valid only among them. In the village, which is changing rapidly as the naval base has been completed and development projects amounting to several billion won are planned, their voices are highly likely to be heard as normative and abstract. There are also those who are wary of them, believing that as peace activists, they will cause trouble. Moreover, the jikimis are newcomers in the village, and although they have moved their domiciles to

this village, they only have “partial membership.” They have difficulty in participating in important decisions of the village because they are not acknowledged as regular members of the village as their residence periods are short. They do not have the right to vote in the election of the chairperson of the village council until five years have passed after they moved their domicile. In the above-mentioned “Community Recovery Projects,” solutions to their livelihood problems are missing.

The limitations of the practice of the jikimis as such should be considered in terms of reconstruction of the village community based on the commons theory. In order for them to live and work stably in the village, the accommodation of the community should be enlarged. The Gangjeong Village community has lost the ability to construct “common areas” by itself after the commons were destroyed. In order for the jikimis to become an integral part of the community and for their principles of practice to be combined with the principles of village operation, the village community should enhance equity, sustainability, and interdependence. In addition, the formation of relationships between stakeholders in village-making activities should be open and expanded. They must be based on a basic equality of responsibility, entitlement and mutual respect while also recognizing the diversity and uniqueness of the community. This is not just a matter of moral or ethical preferences; it is a necessity for the operation of a stable, robust commons (Bollier and Helfrich 2015).

The following are the implications of the Gangjeong Village case toward social movement theory. First, social movement theory has to consider village as a unit of social movement from the perspective of commons theory. In other words, village should not only be seen as an administrative unit but also as the community space where inherent values and rules are regarded as the order of life. Second, social movement theory has to focus on the relationship between commons and community. Commons take a key role in the bond of village community and the joint memory and senses with regard to commons in the strife to protect village from national projects have took important roles. From the perspective of the commons theory, it can be said that a community is a group that exists based on the commons ecosystem consisting of natural resources and the institutions surrounding the natural resources. Third, social movement theory has to analyze the reorganization of village community taking place in the process of movements. The Gangjeong Village experienced the breakdown of the existing resident community in the process of protesting the construction of a naval base. Also, the naval men are becoming new members after migrating to the

village. In addition, jikimis, the outsiders, became the village residents after coming to the village as the movement participants and they are playing the role of mediating the bond with the outside world. The village community in the movement process is being reorganized while resonating with various networks. Fourth, social movement theory has to set the expansion of the commons as its criteria when evaluating social movements. The existing social movement theories have evaluated the success or the failure of social movements based on whether the demands of the social movement are reflected in the policy decisions. Furthermore, the theories have regarded the organizational structure, the strategies and tactics, and the circumstantial elements of social movements as the main targets of analysis. However, the Gangjeong Village Movement did not accomplish the objective 'the opposition of a naval base construction' but it is obtaining the formation of commoning and the reorganization of daily life amid the protest toward military logic. Thus, in the social movement assessment, the criteria have to be multiplied or converted. Understanding the current characteristics and meanings of the currently rising commons movement through the Gangjeong Village case can be helpful in organizing social movement theory based on the commons paradigm and drawing out diverse discussion points which could not be interpreted by the existing social movement theories.

The case of the Gangjeong jikimis is not a successful one. It can be said to be a pre-figurative case because first, they want to shape their struggles into the form of life they want. Their activities try to express the life they want in the struggle; second, the situation of Gangjeong shows in advance the situation that social movements in other parts of South Korean society will face. Seongsan, where the second Jeju International Airport will be built, is now called "the second Gangjeong." The expression "the second Gangjeong" can be encountered in regions such as Hanlim and Daejeong, where offshore wind turbines will be installed. Gangjeong Village has become synonymous with villages that have been driven to crisis due to national projects. In this regard, the situation of Gangjeong Village is worthy of note beyond the case of a village, and the practice of the Gangjeong jikimis provides other implications to other sites too.

In addition, the activities of the Gangjeong jikimis raise important questions for commons theory. Peter Linebaugh said, "There is no commons without commoning." This emphasizes the fact that not only the resources shared by commons but also the social practices and values to manage the resources are important. However, the activities of the Gangjeong jikimis are calling for thinking about the "commoning after losing commons." Although

it is important to pay attention to situations where a CPR is preserved well to find out the principle as shown in the study conducted by Ostrom, now when common resources are being destroyed due to national projects in many villages in developing countries including South Korea, taking note of commoning after the dissolution of commons should have great academic and practical meaning. In this case, commoning has not only affirmative but also transformative significance. In this respect, the case of Gangjeong can be said to be a singular one, and the commons theory in the future should play the role of giving a voice to and increase the visibility of the commons movement and offers a refreshing and practical lens for re-imagining social movements and politics.

(Submitted: April 30, 2018; Revised: June 7, 2018; Accepted: June 19, 2018)

References

- Gangjeong Village Council and Jeju Special Self-Governing Province. 2017. *Gangjeong Village community recovery project plan (proposal)*.
- Gangjeong Village Council Committee for the publication of the Jeju naval base opposition movement and Life and Peace movement materials. 2018. *Jeju naval base opposition movement and Life and Peace Movement intermediary source book 1*. Gangjeong Village council.
- Gangjeong Peace Tour Group. 2017. *Hello, Gangjeong*. Listen to the City.
- Goh, Byeong-gwon. 2009. *Exile and Escape*. Greenbee.
- Kim, Dong-won. 2016. "Peace that refuses peace." *Literary criticism of today* 103: 54-68.
- Eom, Mun-hee. 2018. Proposal of JejuNon-nuclear Movement through Gangjeong Naval Base Opposition Movement. *Jeju Wherea Nuclear Submarine Entered, What Shall We Do? Jeju 4.3 Resistance 70th anniversary, Sourcebook for Forum for Realization of the Island of Peace* (2018. 03.24).
- Jang, Hun-gyo. 2016. *The Miryang War*. NareumBooks.
- Jung, Yeong-shin. 2017. "Struggle of Community against the State and Military Base." *Creation and Criticism* 176: 316-335.
- Choi, Hyeon. 2017. "Present Situation and Prospect of South Korean Joint Resource Research." *Common Resources in East Asia*. Jin In-jin.
- Armitage, Derek. 2005. "Adaptive Capacity and Community-Based Natural Resource Management." *Environmental Management* 35(6): 703-715.
- Amin, Ash and Philip Howell. *Releasing the Commons: Rethinking the futures of the commons*. Routledge.

- Bollier, David. 2014. *Think Like a Commoner: A Short Introduction to the Life of the Commons*. New Society Publishers.
- _____. 2016a. *Commoning as a Transformative Social Paradigm*. <http://thenextsystem.org/commoning-as-a-transformative-social-paradigm/>
- _____. 2016b. *State Power and Commoning*. <http://www.bollier.org/>
- Bollier, David and Silke Helfrich. 2015. *Patterns of Commoning*. The Commons Strategies Group.
- G. P. Kofinas and C. Folke. 2009. *Principles of Ecosystem Stewardship*. Springer.
- Rosa, Hartmut et al. 2010. *Gemeinschaft zur Einführung Taschenbuch*. JUNIUS.
- Mitsumata, Gaku. 2008. "Evolution of the Japanese Commons in Response to Challenges: Contemporary Contributions to Community Well-being," a paper presented at 12th Biennial Conference of the International Association for the Study of Commons (IASC), 18th of July, 2008.
- Ostrom, Elinor. 1990. *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action*. Cambridge.
- _____. 2012. *The Institute of Economic Affairs*. The Institute of Economic Affairs.
- Peuter, Greig and Dyer-Witthford, Nick. 2010. "Commons and Cooperatives." *Communication Studies Faculty Publications* 15: 30-56.
- Linebaugh, Peter. 2009. *The Magna Carta Manifesto: Liberties and Commons for All*. University of California Press.

YEA-YL YOON is a research professor in Jeju National University, SSK Research Center on the Commons and Sustainable Society. He received Ph.D. in Sociology at Seoul National University. His research interests are social movement, historical sociology and social theory. Address: Jeju National University SSK Research Center on the Commons and Sustainable Society, 102 Jejudaehakno, Jeju-si, Jeju Special Self-Governing Province, 63243, Republic of Korea [E-mail: ekswnrrifl@hanmil.net]

