

New Evidence on North Korea

Introduction

By Kathryn Weathersby

Among the states that played a key role in the Cold War, none has been, or remains, more enigmatic than the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK). To its allies within the communist world, North Korea's secretiveness, its cult of Kim Il Sung, and its violent provocations against the South were a source of exasperation, embarrassment, and unease. Nonetheless, North Korea's fraternal allies never permanently withdrew their patronage from the Pyongyang regime, without which the DPRK could not survive. As O.B. Rakhmanin, Deputy Head of the International Department of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, explained to an East German party official in February 1973, "in the interest of our common tasks, we must sometimes overlook their stupidities. None of us agree with the idolatry of Kim Il Sung."¹

For the United States and its allies, North Korea's insistence on maintaining an outsized, forward deployed military force, its refusal to moderate its hostile rhetoric against Seoul and Washington, and its unpredictable outbursts of violence against South Korea, coupled with its extreme secretiveness and highly idiosyncratic version of communism, created the longest lasting and one of the most acute security problems of the Cold War era. With no history of diplomatic relations with Pyongyang and few sources of information on this unusually closed country, it has been, and remains, difficult for North Korea analysts in the non-communist world to assess the intentions behind the DPRK's troublesome actions, whether they are working with or without classified information. As former CIA officer in Korea and Ambassador to Seoul Donald P. Gregg recently noted, "North Korea remains one of the longest-running intelligence failures in the history of US espionage. North Koreans were difficult to approach and almost impossible to recruit and control."²

In an effort to fill part of this significant information gap, CWIHP has launched a special effort, begun with generous support from the Korea Foundation, to mine the archives of the DPRK's former allies for insights into North Korean policymaking. The Korea Initiative is combing East European and Russian archives, and to a more limited extent those of China, to uncover and analyze the documentary record of North Korea's relations with its fraternal allies. We have discovered that although Pyongyang's communist allies also suffered from the unusual secretiveness of Kim Il Sung's regime, their extensive dealings with the DPRK nonetheless provided them with a far more intimate view of North Korea than that enjoyed by persons outside the communist world. Moreover, in his communications with his East and Central European counterparts, such as Erich Honecker, Kim Il Sung



North Korea

spoke with striking candor about the international and domestic problems facing his embattled state. Thus, as long as the DPRK's own archives remain inaccessible, the records of its close allies provide the best available view from inside North Korea.

This special section of the *Bulletin* presents the results of the first two years of the Korea Initiative, during which the project has focused on the East German and Hungarian archives, as well as on Chinese sources that are available for analysis by selected researchers, though not for photocopying or translation in full.

In part one, the Beijing-based historian Shen Zhihua examines Chinese archival and memoir evidence regarding the serious tensions that complicated relations between China and North Korea during the Korean War. His analysis reveals that the characteristics of the Kim Il Sung regime that caused friction with its allies in the postwar period cannot be attributed solely to the impact of the devastating war of 1950-53, since they had, in fact, been prominent as early as 1949-50. Shen adds an important new perspective to the debate over the relative influence of China and the Soviet Union on

North Korea's war plans against South Korea. He demonstrates that Mao Zedong's government was quick to offer military support to the DPRK, but the North Korean leadership refused to accept Chinese assistance until forced to do so by the UN advance across the 38th parallel. Shen attributes Kim's reluctance to overconfidence in his military judgments and the long history of Chinese interference in Korean affairs. Kim's concerns over national sovereignty also led him to resist Chinese efforts to create a joint Sino-Korean com-

German Democratic Republic (GDR) based on a large body of records available in the archives of the Foreign Ministry and the Socialist Unity Party, as well as on the published memoir of the last GDR ambassador to Pyongyang, Hans Maretzki. Viewing North Korea's history within the context of the history of other small states within the communist camp, Schäfer pinpoints the distinctive features of the DPRK. After Khrushchev's denunciation of Stalin's cult of personality at the 20th Party Congress in 1956, GDR officials strongly disap-

In his communications with his East European counterparts, such as Erich Honecker, Kim Il Sung spoke with striking candor about the international and domestic problems facing his embattled state.

mand after Chinese troops entered the war. It was only under Soviet pressure that Kim eventually agreed to the militarily necessary joint command. He likewise resisted placing North Korean railroads under Chinese military management, agreeing to this important step only after he was pressured to do so by the Soviets—a capitulation that, in Shen's estimate, "left a shadow on the heart of Kim Il Sung."

In part two, the Hungarian scholar Balazs Szalontai analyzes North Korean relations with the Soviet Union during the Khrushchev years, drawing on extensive research in the Hungarian archives. Although Hungarian leaders did not develop a special relationship with Kim Il Sung comparable to that of the East Germans, their diplomats were able to gain excellent information on the internal workings of the Kim regime thanks to communications from Koreans who had been trained in Hungary and maintained contacts with Hungarian embassy personnel after returning to the DPRK. Comparing North Korea to other communist countries, Szalontai singles out the DPRK's dependence on foreign assistance, despotic political system, and isolationism as its distinguishing characteristics. In addition, Pyongyang's continued rivalry with Seoul shaped North Korea's domestic and foreign policies in distinctive ways. Attributing Moscow's failure to ensure de-Stalinization in the DPRK to Kim Il Sung's skill at exploiting events such as the Hungarian Revolution of 1956 and Khrushchev's purge of 1957, as well as to Soviet arrogance, Szalontai presents a persuasive and original analysis of the roots of North Korea's remarkable autonomy. He examines in detail the conflict with Moscow in 1959-60 over Pyongyang's unification plans and the sharp deterioration in relations following the Sino-Soviet split. Szalontai concludes that Kim's victory over the Soviet and Yenan factions in 1959 marked a turning point in Soviet-North Korean relations, after which Pyongyang pursued an increasingly independent and despotic course. Translations of selected documents follow the article.

In part three, the German historian Bernd Schäfer presents a cogent history of North Korea's relations with the

proved of the ongoing cult of Kim Il Sung. They were shocked by the scale of Korean demands for economic assistance and were offended by Pyongyang's refusal to acknowledge the considerable aid it received from its allies. After the Sino-Soviet split erupted into the open, Pyongyang enjoyed the anomalous position of being wooed by both its giant neighbors. Since the GDR had to remain absolutely faithful to the Soviet Union, East German representatives in Pyongyang banded together with their Soviet counterparts to exchange information and discuss the disturbingly unpredictable actions of the North Koreans. East German documents therefore provide important insight into Soviet attitudes toward the Kim Il Sung regime as Moscow attempted to exert leverage over Pyongyang. Schäfer traces the twists and turns in the DPRK's foreign policy as Kim turned back toward Moscow in the wake of Mao's Cultural Revolution, and then opened negotiations with Seoul in response to the Sino-American rapprochement of 1972. The warm personal relations that Kim developed with Erich Honecker following the East German leader's visit to the DPRK in 1977 led to what Schäfer terms "reciprocal byzantinism," the record of which reveals the autocratic delusions of both leaders. Translations of selected documents follow the article.

Part four presents translations of additional documents from the Hungarian National Archives, provided to the Korea Initiative by Csaba Békés of the Cold War History Research Center in Budapest, and a letter from Kim Il Sung to Wladyslaw Gomulka found in the Modern Records Archive in Warsaw by KI advisory board member Vojtech Mastny. A meeting with Hungarian Minister Károly Pásztor in March 1953, during the final phase of the Korean War, provides a starting point by revealing the warm relations that existed between the two countries during the war, buttressed by the material, technical, and educational aid provided by Hungary, and the increased stature Kim Il Sung had gained by the end of the war, despite his humiliating submission to Chinese military control. A meeting with Hungarian Ambassador Pál Szarvas in June 1955 suggests the extent to which domestic

political affairs of any one state were at that time regarded as the common concern of all states within the Soviet bloc. Such solidarity deteriorated sharply in the wake of Nikita Khrushchev's denunciations of Stalin at the 20th Party Congress in Moscow, as revealed in Kim Il Sung's meeting in September 1956 with Hungarian Ambassador Károly Práth. A letter from Kim Il Sung a decade later to Władysław Gomułka, First Secretary of the Polish Workers' Party, rejecting the Polish proposal to convene a conference of communist parties to discuss coordination of assistance to North Vietnam in its war against the United States, reveals how seriously Kim regarded the disagreements within the communist camp, by then greatly exacerbated by the Sino-Soviet split. The reports from the Hungarian embassies in Pyongyang and Beijing presented in this section are in some respects even more revealing than the records of conversations at the highest level, since they provide more detailed discussions of Pyongyang's domestic and international policies. The Hungarian diplomats reported on issues such as North Korea's approach to the political conference following the Korean War, Kim Il Sung's cult of personality, DPRK relations with the Third World, the complexities of North Korea's unification policy, and the effects of the Sino-Soviet split on the DPRK.

In its third year, the Korea Initiative is examining other East European archives, exploring the sources available in Russia, and continuing its research in East German, Hungarian, and Chinese documents. A second *Bulletin* section will offer additional new evidence indispensable for understanding the frame of mind that accounts for North Korea's continued preeminence as a source of international instability.

Dr. Kathryn Weathersby is a CWIHP Senior Research Scholar and the coordinator of CWIHP's Korea Initiative. Based on extensive research in Russian archives on the Soviet role in North Korea, her numerous publications include: "Should We Fear This? Stalin and the Danger of War with America," CWIHP Working Paper No. 39, July 2002; "Stalin, Mao and the End of the Korean War," in Odd Arne Westad, ed., Brothers in Arms: The Rise and Fall of the Sino-Soviet Alliance (Stanford University Press, 1998); "Deceiving the Deceivers: Moscow, Beijing, Pyongyang and the Allegations of Bacteriological Weapons Use in Korea," CWIHP Bulletin 11 (1998); "New Russian Documents on the Korean War: Introduction and Translations," CWIHP Bulletin 6/7 (1996); "To Attack or Not to Attack? Stalin, Kim Il Sung and the Prelude to War," CWIHP Bulletin 5 (1995).

NOTES

¹ Axen visits CC KPSS from 27 Feb—2 March 1973, East German Socialist Unity Party Archive [SAMPO], DY 30 IV B2/2.028 (Buro Norden), File 55. Translated by David Wolff for the conference, "The Sino-American Opening and the Cold War," held at George Washington University 8-9 February 2002. I am grateful to David Wolff for drawing my attention to this passage.

² Donald P. Gregg. "A Long Road to Pyongyang" *The Korea Society Quarterly*, Volume 3, Number 1 (Spring 2002), p 7.

CWIHP Working Papers Index

All CWIHP Working Papers are available online at <http://cwihip.si.edu>

- #1 **Chen Jian**, "The Sino-Soviet Alliance and China's Entry into the Korean War"
- #2 **P.J. Simmons**, "Archival Research on the Cold War Era: A Report from Budapest, Prague and Warsaw"
- #3 **James Richter**, "Reexamining Soviet Policy Towards Germany during the Beria Interregnum"
- #4 **Vladislav M. Zubok**, "Soviet Intelligence and the Cold War:
The 'Small' Committee of Information, 1952-53"
- #5 **Hope M. Harrison**, "Ulbricht and the Concrete 'Rose': New Archival Evidence on
the Dynamics of Soviet-East
German Relations and the Berlin Crisis, 1958-61"
- #6 **Vladislav M. Zubok**, "Khrushchev and the Berlin Crisis (1958-62)"
- #7 **Mark Bradley** and **Robert K. Brigham**, "Vietnamese Archives and Scholarship on the Cold War Period:
Two Reports"
- #8 **Kathryn Weathersby**, "Soviet Aims in Korea and the Origins of the Korean War, 1945-50:
New Evidence From Russian Archives"
- #9 **Scott D. Parrish** and **Mikhail M. Narinsky**, "New Evidence on the Soviet Rejection of
the Marshall Plan, 1947: Two Reports"

(continued on p. 8)

(continued on from p. 7)

- #10 **Norman M. Naimark**, “‘To Know Everything and To Report Everything Worth Knowing’: Building the East German Police State, 1945–49”
- #11 **Christian F. Ostermann**, “The United States, the East German Uprising of 1953, and the Limits of Rollback”
- #12 **Brian Murray**, “Stalin, the Cold War, and the Division of China: A Multi-Archival Mystery”
- #13 **Vladimir O. Pechatnov**, “The Big Three after World War II: New Documents on Soviet Thinking about Post-War Relations with the United States and Great Britain”
- #14 **Ruud van Dijk**, “The 1952 Stalin Note Debate: Myth or Missed Opportunity for German Unification?”
- #15 **Natalia I. Yegorova**, “The ‘Iran Crisis’ of 1945–46: A View from the Russian Archives”
- #16 **Csaba Bekes**, “The 1956 Hungarian Revolution and World Politics”
- #17 **Leszek W. Gluchowski**, “The Soviet-Polish Confrontation of October 1956: The Situation in the Polish Internal Security Corps”
- #18 **Qiang Zhai**, “Beijing and the Vietnam Peace Talks, 1965–68: New Evidence from Chinese Sources”
- #19 **Matthew Evangelista**, “‘Why Keep Such an Army?’” Khrushchev’s Troop Reductions”
- #20 **Patricia K. Grimsted**, “The Russian Archives Seven Years After: ‘Purveyors of Sensations’ or ‘Shadows Cast to the Past’?”
- #21 **Andrzej Paczkowski** and **Andrzej Werblan**, “‘On the Decision to Introduce Martial Law in Poland in 1981’ Two Historians Report to the Commission on Constitutional Oversight of the SEJM of the Republic of Poland”
- #22 **Odd Arne Westad**, **Chen Jian**, **Stein Tønnesson**, **Nguyen Vu Tung**, and **James G. Hershberg**, “77 Conversations Between Chinese and Foreign Leaders on the Wars in Indochina, 1964–77”
- #23 **Vojtech Mastny**, “The Soviet Non-Invasion of Poland in 1980–81 and the End of the Cold War”
- #24 **John P. C. Matthews**, “Majales: The Abortive Student Revolt in Czechoslovakia in 1956”
- #25 **Stephen J. Morris**, “The Soviet-Chinese-Vietnamese Triangle in the 1970’s: The View from Moscow”
- #26 **Vladimir O. Pechatnov**, translated by **Vladimir Zubok**, “‘The Allies are Pressing on You to Break Your Will...’ Foreign Policy Correspondence between Stalin and Molotov and Other Politburo Members, September 1945–December 1946”
- #27 **James G. Hershberg**, with the assistance of L.W. Gluchowski, “Who Murdered ‘Marigold’? New Evidence on the Mysterious Failure of Poland’s Secret Initiative to Start U.S.–North Vietnamese Peace Talks, 1966”
- #28 **Laszlo G. Borhi**, “The Merchants of the Kremlin—The Economic Roots of Soviet Expansion in Hungary”
- #29 **Rainer Karlsch** and **Zbynek Zeman**, “The End of the Soviet Uranium Gap: The Soviet Uranium Agreements with Czechoslovakia and East Germany (1945/1953)”
- #30 **David Wolff**, “‘One Finger’s Worth of Historical Events’: New Russian and Chinese Evidence on the Sino-Soviet Alliance and Split, 1948–1959”
- #31 **Eduard Mark**, “Revolution by Degrees: Stalin’s National-Front Strategy For Europe, 1941–1947”
- #32 **Douglas Selva**, “The Warsaw Pact and Nuclear Nonproliferation, 1963–1965”
- #33 **Ethan Pollock**, “Conversations with Stalin on Questions of Political Economy”
- #34 **Yang Kuisong**, “Changes in Mao Zedong’s Attitude towards the Indochina War, 1949–1973”
- #35 **Vojtech Mastny**, “NATO in the Beholder’s Eye: Soviet Perceptions and Policies, 1949–1956”
- #36 **Paul Wingrove**, “Mao’s Conversations with the Soviet Ambassador, 1953–55”
- #37 **Vladimir Tismaneanu**, “Gheorghiu-Dej and the Romanian Workers’ Party: From de-Sovietization to the Emergence of National Communism”
- #38 **János Rainer**, “The New Course in Hungary in 1953”
- #39 **Kathryn Weathersby**, “‘Should We Fear This?’ Stalin and the Danger of War with America”
- #40 **Vasilii Mitrokhin**, “The KGB in Afghanistan” (English Edition)
- #41 **Michael Share**, “The Soviet Union, Hong Kong, and The Cold War, 1945–1970”
- #42 **Sergey S. Radchenko**, “The Mongolian Dimension of the Sino-Soviet Split”

Special Working Papers Series

- #1 **Mark Kramer**, “Soviet Deliberations during the Polish Crisis, 1980–1981”

Sino-North Korean Conflict and its Resolution during the Korean War

By Shen Zhihua

Translated by Dong Gil Kim and Jeffrey Becker

Scholarship on intra-alliance relations during the Cold War, particularly on the Cold War in Asia, has focused primarily on relations between great powers such as the Soviet Union and China.¹ Relatively little research has been done on the development of relations between larger and smaller countries within the communist camp.² The subject of this case study, Sino-Korean relations during the Korean War, has been characterized as a friendship, forged by shared difficulties, that was “as close as lips to teeth.” While this ancient description of relations between China and Korea aptly describes some aspects of the wartime alliance, the simile fails to capture the significant conflict that existed between the two countries at the highest levels. This paper, which is based on archival documents and the recollections of individuals involved in the events, explores the tensions in Sino-Korean relations at the highest levels during the Korean War and the methods used to mitigate those tensions, which were shaped by the larger pattern of Cold War relations in Asia. Space limitations prevent me from making a comprehensive analysis of the cultural and historical causes behind these tensions and their repercussions, which would shape Sino-Korean relations for the remainder of the Cold War. It is my hope that this paper will serve as a basis for broader future studies on this subject.

China's Deployment of Troops to North Korea

Based on research into archival materials that have become available in the past several years, scholars have reached a near consensus of opinion that the leadership of the PRC—or at least Chairman Mao Zedong—firmly intended to assist North Korea even before the Korean War began.³ What has not become well known, however, is that the North Korean leadership steadfastly refused to accept Chinese offers of assistance until forced to do so by the UN advance across the 38th parallel.

As Russian archival documents have established, in January 1950 Soviet leader Joseph Stalin informed his North Korean protegee Kim Il Sung that he would support the latter's request to mount a military offensive against South Korea and would allow Kim to visit Moscow to discuss the matter.⁴ In the three meetings between the Soviet and North Korean leaders that followed, held 10-25 April, Stalin emphasized two preconditions that had to be met before he would give his final approval for military action against South Korea: that he could be assured that the US would not interfere, and that China would agree to support North Korea. Kim assured Stalin that since the DPRK had the support of the USSR and the PRC, the US would refrain from interfering because it would not risk a major war. On the second point, Kim stated that

Mao Zedong had always supported the idea of liberating all of Korea. Kim explained that Mao had repeatedly expressed his view that China would help Korea once it completed its own revolutionary victory, and, if necessary, would provide military assistance. Kim insisted that his own forces were sufficient, however. Stalin nonetheless emphasized that the Soviet Union was not prepared to get directly involved itself in Korea, especially if the United States risked deploying troops, and that Kim therefore had to consult with Mao and obtain his support.⁵

Accordingly, on 13 May Kim secretly visited Beijing and informed Mao of his plan to attack the South. Mao was surprised by this plan, but after he received a telegram from Stalin the following day confirming that the Soviet leader had agreed to the campaign, he expressed his support. In a meeting with Kim on the fifteenth, Mao suggested that the Korean People's Army (KPA) should fight a quick, decisive war. It should outflank the larger cities, in order to avoid a protracted war, and concentrate instead on destroying the enemy's main areas of strength. Mao explained that he had intended to help North Korea attack the South once Taiwan was liberated, but since North Korea had decided to attack now and this was their common cause, China was prepared to provide the necessary aid. Mao promised the North Koreans that if the Americans intervened in the war, China would send troops. He also asked whether it was necessary to deploy Chinese forces on the Korean border, and whether they should provide weapons and ammunition. Kim expressed his thanks for this offer, but did not accept it.⁶ In Kim's view, since Moscow had already agreed to give all necessary support, his trip to China was undertaken only to satisfy Stalin's order to secure Mao's approval to launch the war. Consequently, as soon as the meeting with Mao was concluded, Kim announced to Soviet Ambassador N.V. Roshchin, in Mao's presence, that he and Mao were in complete agreement on the matter.⁷ It is easy to picture how awkward Mao's position was in front of the smug Kim Il Sung.

The Chinese leadership received no prior notification of the launching of the attack on South Korea on 25 June. They, in fact, learned of it via foreign news services.⁸ Some Chinese leaders resented this lack of notification, but they nonetheless expressed their support for North Korea once the US became directly involved. In early July, the Chinese government agreed to send to the KPA two hundred Chinese cadres of Korean descent who were stationed in China's Northeast Military Region. At the same time, Chinese Foreign Minister Zhou Enlai informed Ambassador Roshchin that China agreed to the Soviet government's requests to use the Chinese Changchun Railroad to transport military supplies and to

travel through Chinese air space en route to North Korea.⁹

Chinese leaders also raised the issue of providing military support to the North Koreans during other conversations with Soviet representatives. In a meeting with Ambassador Roshchin on 2 July, Zhou Enlai relayed his government's estimate that the US might increase its forces in Korea by landing in southern ports and proceeding north via railroad. He thus recommended that the KPA hasten its southward push to occupy those ports. He also presciently recommended that the KPA strengthen the defenses around the western port of Inchon, both to protect Seoul and to prevent the US army from landing there. Zhou complained to the Soviet ambassador that the North Korean leaders had ignored Mao's repeated warnings that US military intervention was imminent. He emphasized that if US forces crossed the 38th parallel, China would organize an expeditionary force dressed in North Korean uniforms to engage the US army. Zhou reported that 120,000 troops of the 3rd Army Corps had already assembled in the Northeast, and he hoped the Soviet Union would be able to provide air cover for them.¹⁰ On 4 July, the head of the Chinese intelligence bureau, Zhou Dapeng, even described to Roshchin a plan to transport North Korean forces to South Korea via a port on the Shandong Peninsula, as well as to send Chinese military experts to South Korean battlefields to help the KPA.¹¹

Stalin immediately expressed his support of the Chinese suggestions. "We consider it correct," the Soviet leader wrote to Mao on 5 July, "immediately to concentrate nine Chinese divisions on the Sino-Korean border for volunteer actions in North Korea in case the enemy crosses the 38th parallel. We will try to provide air cover for these units."¹² Since the Chinese ambassador to North Korea, Ni Zhiliang, was still in China recuperating from illness, Stalin also urged Chinese leaders quickly to dispatch representatives to Korea to increase contact and to resolve the issues involved in China's intervention.¹³ In fact, Zhou Enlai had already on 30 June replaced Ni with Chai Junwu (who would later change his name to Chai Chengwen), with the goal of strengthening ties with North Korea. Before Chai departed, Zhou instructed him:

Right now, the Korean people are on the front lines of the struggle, and we must express support for our Korean comrades. If there is anything else they want us to do, tell them to ask and we will do our best. Maintaining contact between the two parties and armies, and quickly understanding the changing battlefield situations are currently the most important missions of the embassy.¹⁴

Chai Chengwen found it difficult, however, to fulfill this mission because North Korean leaders withheld all information from the Chinese embassy. According to Chai's recollections, Kim Il Sung received him with high protocol as soon as he arrived on 10 July, telling him "if you need anything else, just look for me at any time." He also instructed the Deputy Director of the Chief Political Department of the KPA, So Hwi, to give the Chinese Military Attaché daily briefings

on the battlefield situation. However, the Chinese embassy soon discovered that the briefings delivered by So Hwi were mostly just reports garnered that evening from the North Korean Foreign News Service. Moreover, Chai did not have regular access to top-level Korean leaders. DPRK leaders also declined to answer the Chinese embassy's request for permission to send a vice-attaché to study with the KPA. From his other contacts with North Koreans, Chai formed the opinion that they had been forbidden from sharing any military intelligence with the Chinese. Although Minister of Internal Affairs Pak Il-yu had worked in China and often went to the Chinese embassy for meals, Chai could never discuss the internal military situation due to the strict restrictions and discipline imposed by the North Korean government.¹⁵ At the same time, the Chinese Army's request to send a group of staff officers to North Korea for the purpose of understanding the current battlefield situation was refused.¹⁶

As the KPA's position worsened, the Chinese leaders felt that they had to prepare for military assistance to North Korea. On 11 August, the 13th Army Corp, which had already assembled in the Northeast on Mao's order, conducted a meeting of cadres from all the attached Army Corps and divisions. Gao Gang, head of the Northeast Bureau of the Chinese Communist Party, thoroughly explained the purpose and significance of preparing troops to fight abroad, stating that China had to take the initiative and help liberate the North Korean people in order to make Korea an independent, democratic, and unified country. "Going to Korea will be done in the name of the Volunteer Army, [hereafter referred to as the Chinese Volunteer Army, or CVA] wearing North Korean uniform and using the North Korean unit numbers, and flying the flag of the Korean People's Army, and major cadres must adopt Korean names."¹⁷

In meetings with Soviet adviser Pavel Yudin on 19 and 28 August, Mao stated that if the US army continued to escalate its troop numbers, the North Koreans would be unable to cope and would need direct assistance from China.¹⁸ That was the only way they could defeat the US army and postpone the outbreak of a third world war. Recent intelligence had made it clear that the US had decided quickly to increase its troop strength in Korea on a grand scale. Chinese leaders reminded the North Korean leaders that they needed to prepare for the worst in the war. Even though they did not directly refer to the issue of the entry of Chinese troops, the implication was clear. In August and early September, Mao met twice with North Korean representative Lee Sang Cho to discuss the progress of the war. Mao pointed out that the KPA's mistake was in not preparing sufficient reserve forces while deploying their troops on a broad front, and in conquering territory rather than destroying the enemy. Mao specifically pointed out that the enemy might suddenly attack the key areas from Inchon to Seoul and from Nampo to Pyongyang, and the Koreans should therefore consider retreating and redeploying their troops to protect these areas. CCP Politburo member Liu Shaoqi also pointed out that it would be necessary to prepare the people for the possibility

of a protracted war.¹⁹

The North Korean officials paid no heed to Chinese suggestions, even though these recommendations included warnings from Soviet advisers.²⁰ One reason is that their estimates for the war were overly optimistic. On 4 September, when Chai told Kim that the war was locked in a stalemate, the North Korean leader declared confidently that the Pusan campaign had already begun and that as soon as the highly

should play upon western fears that China and the Soviet Union would enter the war and “take steps to show our intentions.” Roshchin agreed to report immediately to Moscow, and suggested dispatching a cadre to Korea to clarify the situation and remove any misconceptions. On the twentieth Moscow responded that for North Korea not to provide Beijing with military intelligence was “abnormal,” but due to inexperience.²⁴ Moscow also agreed with Beijing’s recom-

Kim preferred to depend on Soviet aid and avoid having China intervene in the war.

trained strike forces went forward, the KPA would break the deadlock. When asked about the Americans’ ability to land troops behind the North Korean frontline, Kim answered “we estimate that presently, a US counterattack is not possible; they do not possess sufficient troop support, and therefore a landing in our rear ports would be difficult.”²¹

The North Koreans believed in a quick victory and also had a tendency towards adventurism. Chai reported that North Korean leaders had initially not planned on US intervention and had predicted victory within a month. Even after the US entered the war, they repeated the slogans “solve the problem before 15 August,” and “August is the month of victory.” We can see from their mobilization of large groups of technicians and students for military service and their serious waste of manpower and financial resources that the North Koreans had decided to “put all their eggs in one basket.” Chai returned to China on 10 September to deliver his report, and after his return to Pyongyang, told Kim, on Zhou’s order, that he hoped the North Korean army would consider a strategic withdrawal. Unmoved, Kim answered only, “I have never considered retreat.”²²

The North Koreans were thus not prepared to invite the Chinese to send troops, if for no other reason than the severe disagreements between China and North Korea concerning the state of the war and strategic planning. After the successful UN landing at Inchon, however, the situation changed completely. The Chinese leaders felt that sending troops to Korea was already unavoidable.²³ When Zhou met with Soviet Ambassador Roshchin and Moscow’s military attaché on 18 September he asked first about the situation in Korea, complaining that except for what they read in the newspapers and heard from Pyongyang Radio, the Chinese leaders knew nothing about the war situation. Even the Chinese ambassador to Pyongyang was unable to receive reports concerning the progress of the war. Zhou also pointed out that he had little contact with North Korean leaders regarding military matters and that the Chinese leadership did not even understand the basic strategies of the KPA. China had once attempted to send a high-level military mission to observe the developing situation, but to date, Pyongyang had not responded. Zhou suggested that if the KPA did not have sufficient reserve troops, they should withdraw their main forces north and establish reserve assault forces. They

mended that the main force of the People’s Army should withdraw north.

On 21 September Liu Shaoqi again reported to Roshchin that the CVA’s morale was high. If necessary, they would be willing to fight, and they were confident they could defeat the American armed forces. Chinese leaders believed that if the US threatened the existence of North Korea, the Chinese would have to aid their Korean comrades. On the same day Zhou told Roshchin that except for being told by Kim that “the Korean people were prepared for a long war,” Beijing had received no further information from Pyongyang.²⁵ Although Stalin’s personal representative to Pyongyang, General Matvei V. Zakharov, had urged Kim to seek Chinese aid,²⁶ it was only a week later, on 28 September, that the Politburo of the Korean Workers Party called an emergency meeting to discuss the issue. After heated debate, the Politburo unanimously decided that once Seoul fell, there would be no way to prevent UN forces from crossing the 38th parallel, and if they did so, it would be impossible for the remnants of the KPA to offer any effective resistance. Faced with imminent defeat, North Korean leaders unanimously agreed to send formal letters to Stalin and Mao requesting direct military assistance from the Soviet Union and China. Despite Stalin’s explicit warnings to Kim in April that he would not send Soviet troops to Korea if the Americans intervened, North Korean leaders nonetheless first turned to Moscow.

Before sending the letter to Stalin, Kim Il Sung asked Soviet Ambassador Shtykov how best to broach the subject of requesting Soviet troops. Shtykov avoided his question, and a “confused, lost, hopeless, and desperate” Kim Il Sung and his Foreign Minister Pak Hon-yong swallowed their pride and sent the letter to Moscow.²⁷ Stalin replied on 1 October that the best plan was to send the CVA, after first consulting with the Chinese.²⁸ With no other choice, Kim urgently summoned the Chinese ambassador late that night and requested that China send the 13th Army Corps, which had already been deployed along the Yalu River, to support the North Korean war effort.²⁹

Two factors led the North Korean leaders initially to refuse direct military assistance from China. The first was Kim’s excessive confidence in his estimates of the military situation. The second was the long history of Chinese interference in Korean affairs, which gave North Korean leaders

cause for alarm. For these two reasons, Kim preferred to depend on Soviet aid and avoid having China intervene in the war. Even after Chinese troops entered the war, these two issues would continue to strain Sino-Korean relations.

Creating a Unified Sino-North Korean Command

Due to the difference of opinion between the Chinese and Soviet leaderships as to whether to send Soviet air force units to provide cover for Chinese troops, the dispatch of Chinese forces to Korea was repeatedly delayed. However, Mao's personal commitment to the cause never wavered.³⁰ When Zhou went to the Soviet Union to discuss the issue of military equipment and air cover, the Chinese and North Koreans were already discussing specific issues concerning Chinese troop deployment. However, because of the pressing situation, the two sides had not yet had time to discuss command, communication, re-supply and transportation, much less arrive at an agreement on these matters.

On 8 October, Mao informed Kim Il Sung that China had decided to send troops, and asked that Pak Il-u meet with Gao Gang and CVA Commander Peng Dehuai in Shenyang to discuss the various issues involved. At dusk that day, Pak arrived in Shenyang, and on Kim's orders, urged the Chinese to send troops immediately to control the areas of Hamhung and Sinuiju, an intervention necessitated by the continued escalation of the American troop presence. He also specified that the CVA would use only North Korean currency while in the DPRK, for which they would be reimbursed later according to the exchange rate. Their firewood would be purchased by the local North Korean governments, and supplied to the Chinese army according to market price. Pak explained that Kim Il Sung was then in Tokchon, and that he was of the opinion that the CVA command should be established there. The issue of joint command for Chinese and Korean forces was thus raised. According to Chai's observations, Kim's initial thinking was rather simplistic. Considering the urgent circumstances, he believed that since he had asked China to send troops to help the KPA, the power to command those troops would naturally belong to Korean leaders. Only after receiving word that China was preparing to send several hundred thousand troops to Korea did he understand the enormity of the situation. He then realized that it was not feasible to have Koreans command the CVA, and suggested that the two sides merge their command structures.³¹

Naturally, Peng saw the situation differently. First, Stalin had clearly stated in his telegram of 1 October that "the CVA must naturally be commanded by Chinese leaders."³² Second, their experience in Korea made the Chinese question the North Korean command capability. In his report to the Central Military Commission, Peng stated:

The Korean Party's recruitment situation is extremely serious. All men between the ages of 16 and 45 have been inducted into service. No one is caring for the families of drafted workers, and the masses have nothing to eat. There are no long-term plans, and adventurism

is all one can see! Military control has been extremely childish. On the nineteenth Pyongyang issued an order to defend to the death. As a result, 30,000 defenders could not escape [from advancing UN forces]. The North Koreans agreed to conduct party and political work in the KPA, but they have not agreed to construct a political commission system.

After the Shenyang meeting, Peng Dehuai exclaimed to Chai Chengwen, "I have a responsibility to the Chinese and Korean people, and to the hundreds of thousands of soldiers!"³³ In Peng's view, there was simply no question of giving North Koreans control over Chinese forces. He did not even understand the views the North Koreans advocated concerning the command of their own troops. The KPA's main force had already been routed, and new troops were currently organizing and training in China. It was impossible for them to participate directly in military maneuvers. This was not the time to point out such facts, however, so when Kim Il Sung and Peng Dehuai met for the first time on 21 October, neither leader raised the issue of a unified command structure. During their discussions about how to coordinate the actions of their two armies, Kim agreed to send Pak Il-u to serve as Peng's liaison officer.³⁴ On 25 September, the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party formally appointed Pak as Assistant Commander of the CVA, Assistant Political Director and Assistant Secretary of the Party Committee.³⁵

With the expansion of the war, the issue of unified control of the two armies gradually reappeared on the agenda. During the first campaign, Peng repeatedly reported that the lack of coordination between the Chinese and North Koreans caused confusion over language, problems with Chinese unfamiliarity with the terrain, and the obstruction of roads from party, government, army, and civilian withdrawal, as a result of which "the CVA's ability to fight has been hindered."³⁶ Of special importance were the many incidents in which the Volunteer Army was mistakenly attacked by North Korean troops. One such incident occurred on 4 November, when the 39th Volunteer Army encircled the US 24th Division southeast of Pochon. There they were mistakenly attacked by a KPA tank division that had been ordered to proceed to Sunchon, and the US forces were consequently able to escape. Re-supply and transportation efforts were also hampered by a lack of coordination.³⁷

Because of such problems, Peng asked the Chinese embassy in Pyongyang to raise the issue of a coordinated command structure with Kim Il Sung, hoping that the KPA would relocate its headquarters closer to the CVA. Since Shtykov supported Peng's suggestion, Kim on 7 November reluctantly agreed to the Chinese proposal to open new fronts in the enemy's rear areas. He accordingly decided to send the Bang Hosan and Choi Inyang Army Corps behind enemy lines. However, although Kim continued to send advisers to act as liaison officers and trade intelligence, he did not agree to relocate the army's headquarters or to establish any kind of unified command. Kim disregarded Peng's personal letter

explaining the Chinese policy regarding prisoners of war (POW), which was prompted by North Korea's severe mistreatment of prisoners, particularly British and American embassy workers. Kim agreed to allow the CVA to help return Korean deserters to service, but in actuality planned to try them for treason.³⁸

Peng next asked the Central Military Commission to relay a message to Kim that the KPA's 6th Division still had

Peng's suggestion, reading:

I hope Comrade Kim and Comrade Shtykov will remain in the front line, and that Kim, Shtykov, and Peng will form a three-man group to decide military policy, including the establishment of military organization, the conduct of the war on the front and behind enemy lines, and all the working policies related to the war effort. In

With the expansion of the war, the issue of unified control of the two armies gradually reappeared. [...] Of special importance were the many incidents in which the Volunteer Army was mistakenly attacked by North Korean troops.

more than 6,200 soldiers, who had merged with the CVA's 125th Division. He hoped those men could remain with the Volunteer Army, but Kim refused. Later, more than 5,000 men of the 7th Division merged with the 125th Volunteer Army Division, and again Peng requested that those men remain. Kim did not respond. The North Korean leaders and Soviet military advisors also opposed Peng's proposal to withdraw several kilometers and prepare ambushes. They proposed instead that the CVA continue to pursue the enemy south along the Chongchon River.³⁹

At the core of these problems lay the issue of who was in command of the army. In order to solve the problem, Mao decided to invite the top-level commanders of the two armies for face-to-face talks, hoping to coordinate the positions of the two sides and to gain Moscow's support. On 15 November, Kim and Shtykov were invited to the CVA headquarters, and Gao Gang joined them from Shenyang. As soon as the meeting began, Peng stated frankly that the command structures of the two armies must be unified. Gao explained that because the Korean peninsula was so narrow, tactics required a combined command structure. Shtykov stated clearly that command should be exercised by the Chinese. He criticized the KPA for losing battles despite using the Soviet Union's best equipment, and praised the CVA for being able to neutralize large numbers of enemy troops despite having inferior equipment. In his opinion, there was no doubt that the Chinese should command.

When it was his turn, however, Kim spoke only of the current status of the KPA and did not mention the issue of a unified command structure. Given the pressing situation, Peng took the initiative and proposed his own plan, according to which he, Kim, and Shtykov would form a three-man group that would consult each other concerning problems and would exercise power through a unified command structure. Kim gave no response at all to this suggestion, and Shtykov was not able to respond without instructions from Moscow. They therefore decided to defer the issue until the end of the second campaign, at which time they would meet again for discussions.⁴⁰

On 13 November Mao sent a telegram to Stalin relaying

order to reach agreement, which will benefit the war effort, we agree with these suggestions and ask for your instructions. If you agree, please instruct your officers to advise comrades Shtykov and Kim appropriately. Right now, the most important issue is the unification of military and government policy of the leaders of the three countries of Korea, the Soviet Union, and China. If the Korean People's Army and the Chinese Volunteer Army can cooperate, coming together according to your suggestions (while preserving the institutions of the Korean People's Army) then victory is assured.⁴¹

On the seventeenth Mao sent a telegram to Peng and Gao informing them that Stalin had completely endorsed the plan of the Chinese comrades to establish a joint command structure and had sent a telegram to that effect to Kim and Shtykov. Mao instructed Peng to observe Kim's reaction to this development.⁴²

Once the Soviet Union made its position clear, Kim expressed a desire to go to Beijing for discussions with Mao. At a subsequent meeting on 3 December, Kim stated that Stalin, in his telegram, had agreed to a Sino-Korean joint command.⁴³ Kim further stated that because the CVA had experience, they should take the lead role while the Korean comrades would take supporting roles, which the Politburo of the Korean Workers Party had agreed to. After the meeting, Zhou Enlai drafted the "Sino-Korean Bilateral Agreement Regarding the Establishment of Sino-Korean Joint Command."⁴⁴ The main points of the agreement were that Mao recommended Peng to serve as Commander and Political Commissioner, while Kim recommended Kim Ung as Vice-Commander and Pak Il-u as Vice Political Commissioner. The KPA and all garrison forces, as well as the CVA, would be jointly directed by the unified command. All orders would be passed through the general headquarters of the KPA and the headquarters of the CVA. The unified command was given the power to direct all means of transportation related to the war effort (highways, railroads, ports, airports), as well as wire and wireless telephone and telegram communications, grain storage and the mobilization of manpower and resources.

The unified command would report and make suggestions to the North Korean government—based on the actual situation and the needs of the war—concerning rear mobilization work, supplemental training, and the reestablishment of local administration in Korea. The unified command would be responsible for clearing all news items concerning the war and distributing them to the Korean news agency, which would publish them in the name of the general headquarters of the KPA.

After Kim returned to Korea, he met with Peng again on 7 December in a very friendly atmosphere to discuss specific matters. The two leaders agreed to set up a unified command structure within several days, and Kim guaranteed that there would be no further interference in the military command. He also accepted the Chinese suggestion to abolish the previously deployed 3rd Army, and ordered them to merge with the Volunteer Army 9th Group.⁴⁵ Peng was satisfied with the situation and repeatedly pointed out that “the bravery and stubborn spirit of the People’s Army and its strict military command system are worthy of study.” He ordered the cadres of the 9th Military Group to study and learn from the situation of the Korean 3rd Army Corp, in order to “relay realistically the experience of the Chinese army in political and local work.” But should conflict arise with the established Korean system, the Chinese army “should not be harsh and unyielding.”⁴⁶

In early January 1951, Stalin’s envoy to Beijing, Semen Egorovich Zakharov announced that two divisions of the Soviet air force had recently entered Korea, and were providing two lines of air cover from Jian to Jiang Jie, and from Andong to Anju. In addition, by early April, the Chinese planned to send five air force divisions, and three Korean air force divisions were already participating in the war. Consequently, the Chinese expressed a desire to create a unified air force command structure. After consultations, a Sino-Korean unified command structure was established based on the coordinated command structure.⁴⁷

Thus, under pressure from Moscow, China and Korea were able to resolve the issue of joint command of their armed forces. Unlike the joint command of US and UN forces, which had been accomplished smoothly, the unified command of Chinese and Korean forces was only accomplished with great difficulty. The Koreans were concerned about national sovereignty. Korea’s long-standing relationship with China as a subsidiary and tributary state made handing over the command of their army very difficult for them to accept. For the Chinese, victory was paramount. Both in military power and in combat experience, the Chinese held a clear advantage. Thus, from a realistic viewpoint, it was essential to place the joint command in the hands of the Volunteer Army.

The Debate Over Advancing South of the 38th Parallel

After the CVA’s victorious second campaign, which pushed the front line toward the 38th parallel, Peng Dehuai requested permission for his forces to regroup. He reported to Beijing that due to the recent victories, the Korean Work-

ers Party, the North Korean government, as well as the army and the people were all in high spirits and looking for a quick victory. “The Soviet ambassador has said that the American army has retreated and [he] wanted our army to advance quickly. This was not only the attitude of the Soviet ambassador, but also the request of the majority of comrades in the North Korean Party.” Peng, however, believed “the Korean campaign was still difficult and long-term. Because the enemy had shifted from an offensive to a defensive strategy and the front lines had shortened and narrowed, enemy military power had become more concentrated, which benefited the UN forces.” Though enemy morale was lower, they still had approximately 260,000 soldiers and would not retreat from Korea. Consequently, he urged that the CVA “adopt a plan of gradual advancement.”⁴⁸ For political reasons, however, Mao overruled these suggestions and ordered the volunteer forces immediately to launch the third campaign and cross the 38th parallel.⁴⁹

With regard to tactics, Mao approved Peng’s recommendation to advance gradually and agreed that after crossing the 38th parallel, the main army forces (including the KPA) should withdraw several kilometers to rest and regroup.⁵⁰ Peng’s forecast proved accurate. Although the third campaign resulted in the KPA/CVA advance across the 38th parallel and the capture of Seoul, UN forces managed to carry out an orderly retreat. Thus, although the Sino-Korean army captured some territory, it did not inflict many casualties on the enemy. On 3 January 1951, Peng informed Kim Il Sung by telegram that the enemy had quickly retreated after its defenses had been broken, and the victory was therefore not very meaningful. Only 3,000 troops were captured. If the enemy continued to escape southward, the KPA/CVA would pursue them to Suwon and await orders, Peng explained. The third campaign would pause to reorganize and re-supply after Seoul, Inchon, Suwon, and Hongchon were taken. If the enemy mounted a heavy defense of Seoul, the CVA would not launch a strong attack, since conditions were not yet favorable.⁵¹ Mao relayed Peng’s decision to Stalin.⁵² Because the CVA was exhausted, like an arrow at the end of its flight, and “the enemy is trying to lure us into a trap along the Naktong River and lure us into assaulting its fortified position,”⁵³ on 8 January Peng ordered the advance to halt. This decision left the North Koreans extremely dissatisfied, and they strongly opposed it. In light of the lessons learned from earlier setbacks during the war, Kim agreed to regroup for two months after crossing the 38th parallel, but in his heart he still hoped to claim a quick victory. He was diplomatic, however, always pushing Pak Hon-yong and the newly appointed Soviet ambassador V.N. Razuvaev to the forefront. The day the attack halted, Kim told Chai Chengwen that the process of regrouping and reorganizing should not last very long, that one month should be sufficient. If too much time passed, he explained, the rivers and rice paddies would begin to thaw, hampering troop movements, while the enemy was attempting to slow the pace of the war in order to rest their forces and re-supply.⁵⁴

Kim was prepared to meet with Peng to discuss the

issue, and Peng agreed to send a telegram with Kim's proposal to Mao immediately. The CVA commander nonetheless maintained that his army had to regroup and rest.⁵⁵ On the morning of 9 January, when Zakharov was informed that the CVA and KPA had already stopped their advance, he expressed his objections, stating that he had never heard of any victorious army in the world not pursuing its enemies and not taking advantage of victory. This halt would give the enemy a chance to catch its breath and would thus squander the advantage that had been won. Even after listening to a patient explanation by Nie Rongzhen, Zakharov held to this opinion.⁵⁶ At this point, Stalin resolved the issue by sending a telegram stating that in order to avoid international condemnation of China, the CVA should remain north of the 38th parallel and its two coastal regions, while allowing the KPA to continue its southward advance. Mao immediately relayed this message to Peng.⁵⁷

On the evening of 10 January, Chai Chengwen accompanied Kim to Peng's headquarters, where Peng analyzed their military situation, emphasizing that their forces needed to regroup so that, after full preparation, they could destroy even more of the enemy during the next campaign. Kim agreed to regroup for one month. Peng thought that pushing the enemy right now might force them to relinquish a little more territory. But prematurely forcing them into a narrow region around Pusan would not help to divide and conquer the UN forces. Kim argued that even if they could not exterminate the enemy, it was still important to expand territory under CVA control. Peng replied that exterminating the enemy was better than expanding territory, because after the enemy army was destroyed, they would naturally gain territory. Kim, however, held his ground, arguing that it would be beneficial to have more territory and additional population under KPA control when the post-war elections and peace settlement took place. Peng replied that it was not necessary to consider this; the most important thing at present was to win victories and annihilate the enemy. Since the two could not agree, Peng showed Kim the telegram from Mao Zedong on the ninth. Kim still would not give ground, however, claiming that he was not expressing his individual opinion, but the collective opinion of the Politburo of the Korean Workers Party. To reinforce this point, Kim called Pak Hon-yong to join the meeting.⁵⁸

On 11 January, Peng received an emergency telegram from Mao concerning Kim's proposal to shorten the rest and reorganization period. Based on Stalin's telegram, Mao suggested that the 1st, 2nd, 3rd, and 5th People's Army Corps be deployed at the First Corps' line south of the Han river, while the CVA would withdraw to Inchon and north of the Han river, to rest and reorganize for two or three months. The CVA would take charge of defending Inchon and Seoul and the KPA would be re-supplied with the soldiers training in north-eastern China. If Kim felt it was unnecessary to re-supply and reorganize the Korean troops, they could continue their advance and the North Korean government could directly command their movements. The CVA would take charge of defending Inchon, Seoul, and the areas north of the 38th

Parallel.

That day at dusk, Peng Dehuai, Kim Il Sung, and Pak Hon-yong had a very heated debate. Kim and Pak thought that Stalin's idea of sending the KPA ahead alone was a sign that they held the advantage, and that the American troops would retreat from Korea. Pak mentioned several recent news items and intelligence reports provided by the Soviet Union indicating that the US army would soon withdraw from the Korean peninsula. The enemy would, however, not leave unless the Sino-Korean forces pursued them, Pak maintained, because they needed an excuse. Peng retorted that if the Chinese and Koreans did not pursue, the Americans could still withdraw on their own, with a perfectly good excuse. Pak stated once more that unless they pursued the Americans, the UN forces would not withdraw. China and Korea should utilize the internal contradictions of the American capitalist class, Pak declared. Peng replied that it was only after Sino-Korean forces had destroyed a few more US divisions that these contradictions would deepen. Only after the CVA had regrouped could it continue to fight.

Kim intervened at this point, repeating his idea of sending the 3rd Volunteer Army Corps south within half a month, then sending the remaining forces forward after a month's rest. Losing patience, Peng raised his voice and emotionally declared that their ideas were wrong and that they were dreaming.

In the past, you said that the US would never send troops. You never thought about what you would do if they did send troops. Now you say that the American army will definitely withdraw from Korea, but you are not considering what to do if the American army doesn't withdraw. You are just hoping for a quick victory and are not making concrete preparations, and this is only going to prolong the war. You are hoping to end this war based on luck. You are gambling with the fate of the people, and that's only going to lead this war to disaster. To reorganize and re-supply, the Volunteer Army needs two months, not one day less, maybe even three [months]. Without considerable preparation, not one division can advance south. I resolutely oppose this mistake you are making in misunderstanding the enemy. If you think I am not doing my job well, you can fire me, court marshal me, or even kill me.

Basing his remarks on a telegram from Mao, Peng Dehuai told Kim that the CVA would be responsible for all coastal defense, rear maintenance, transportation, and defense from north of the line between Inchon and Yangyang. "The 4th Army Corps, consisting of about 120,000 men, has already had approximately two months' rest. Command them yourself; let them advance south as you see fit. If the American army really does withdraw from Korea as you think, I will happily exclaim 'long live the liberation of Korea.' If the American army does not withdraw, the CVA will go ahead and attack south as planned." Under these circumstances, Kim had no choice but to admit that because the KPA was not pre-

pared, and had not recovered its strength, it could not advance alone. He admitted that he had hoped for quick victory, and reluctantly agreed to the CVA plan to regroup for two months. In the end, the two sides decided to call a joint meeting of top officers of the two armies to share experiences and unify their thinking.⁵⁹

After Stalin was informed of the argument concerning the military command, he stated in a telegram, “the leadership of the CVA is correct. Undoubtedly, the truth lies with com-

the war to an early end.”⁶³

The Struggle Over Railroad Management

Because of the successful UN counter offensive in the spring of 1951, the Sino-Korean plan to regroup was not carried out. After armistice negotiations opened in July 1951, the war became a matter of “negotiating while fighting.” This new situation highlighted the importance of the Sino-Korean army’s supply line, and as a result, the conflict between China

Beijing was in agreement with Pyongyang and Moscow in wishing to use military means to force UN troops off the Korean peninsula and solve the Korean problem completely.

mander Peng Dehuai.” He praised Peng’s ability to defeat the supremely powerful American imperialist forces using inferior equipment, and said that he was a military genius. Stalin also criticized the Soviet ambassador for lacking understanding of military matters, and forbade him to interfere with Peng again.⁶⁰ At this point, Mao also stepped up the pressure. On 14 January he sent a telegram to Kim pointing out:

In the next two to three months, the Chinese Volunteers and the Korean troops must carry out serious and major work, in particular to replenish the troops with newly trained soldiers, to make sure that the newly trained soldiers imitate the experience of the old soldiers, to strengthen the troop armaments, to rebuild the railways, to lay in store food and ammunition, to improve the work of transport and the rear service. Carrying out this work can secure the final victory.

Mao believed that “it is necessary for us to prepare well so that it will be possible to continue the fight. We might repeat the mistakes the Korean troops allowed between June and September 1950... The Chinese and Korean comrades must be patient and carry out the necessary preparations.” The next day Mao sent a copy of this telegram to Stalin.⁶¹

During meetings with Peng from 16-18 January, Kim admitted that the idea of the KPA advancing south alone was risky. The Politburo then discussed the matter and decided that the Chinese were correct in suggesting that in order to conduct better offensives in the future, it was necessary to spend two months reorganizing.⁶² From a military perspective, Peng’s plan was the more realistic for many reasons. The naïve enthusiasm of North Korean leaders was clearly influenced by political factors. But the disagreement between the Chinese and North Koreans was only over tactics, not overall strategy. Beijing was in agreement with Pyongyang and Moscow in wishing to use military means to force UN troops off the Korean peninsula and solve the Korean problem completely. It was in this spirit that Mao and Kim ignored UN calls for a cease-fire, losing a good opportunity to bring

and North Korea over how to manage the railroad system intensified. Due to the severe damage to the Korean infrastructure inflicted by American bombing and the difficulties of operating on foreign soil, the CVA faced a supply shortage. The army could not get supplies locally, and because the American army was so well equipped and maneuverable, getting supplies delivered in a timely manner was difficult. Most goods and equipment were imported from China and had to travel along lengthy, difficult mountain routes. Road conditions were extremely poor, and the CVA faced a shortage of transportation from the very beginning. Moreover, US planes continued to bomb day and night, causing great damage and placing even greater strain and importance on railroad transportation.⁶⁴

Already in the late fall of 1950 Peng Dehuai had requested that the Northeastern Bureau of the Party take steps to strengthen rail transportation, including establishing a unified management structure with the Koreans. He had also asked the central government to dispatch railway soldiers to Korea to improve maintenance ability. A group of railroad soldiers and workers was immediately dispatched and began working alongside the KPA railroad construction forces and the Korean railway workers.⁶⁵ Peng then met with Gao Gang on 16 November to suggest the establishment of a joint Sino-Korean railway command.⁶⁶ Chinese representatives were sent to Korea to discuss the issue and attempted several times to meet with Korean officials, but with little result. Only after Kim’s trip to Beijing to speak with Chinese leaders on 3 December did the two sides arrive at an agreement in principle.⁶⁷ In late December, the Chinese established the Northeastern Military District Railroad Transportation Command (later renamed the Northeastern Military District Military Transportation Command), headed by Chinese military and political officers. At the same time, the Korean Railroad Military Management Bureau in Qiu Chang was established, managed by both Chinese and North Koreans.⁶⁸

Following a January 1951 meeting in Shenyang between representatives of the logistical department of each CVA army corps and the relevant departments of the Northeast People’s

Government,⁶⁹ railroad transportation was restored to service.⁷⁰ However, the basic contradictions in logistical work were still unresolved. Besides the destruction caused by US bombing, the most serious problem was the chaos surrounding the internal management of railroad transportation, which still lacked unified coordination. Because the various departments and work units were not cooperating, but were constantly emphasizing their own importance and fighting with each other for vehicles, there was constant conflict and friction. Lack of manpower was a greater than the paucity of vital materials. Moreover, enemy forces occupying mountain caves near the front succeeded in delaying trains. The area north of the Hee Chun caves was severely congested. At the end of December 1951, there was a backup of 329 train cars which had yet to arrive at their destination.⁷¹

Even though the Railroad Management Bureau had been established, a great rift still existed between the Chinese and Koreans. The two sides had not yet decided whether to adopt a military management system or simply institute a system of military representatives. They also debated whether military supplies or supplies for civilian use and economic construction would be given priority. Moreover, the Bureau's organization had not yet been completed, and the ideological consciousness and morale of railway personnel was low. Rail transport thus continued to face extremely difficult problems. Peng complained to Mao that "if we don't find a way to resolve this quickly, it will definitely prolong the war."⁷²

Keeping the railroad running smoothly and safely was the most pressing concern related to joint coordination and unified command. When Kim Il Sung visited Beijing in early December, the two sides worked out the basic principles for the establishment of a joint Sino-Korean rail transportation command structure. Alluding to the objections among Koreans that such an arrangement would violate their national sovereignty, Kim told Chai Chengwen after his return from Beijing that "previously, we discussed the issue of a military management system for the railroad many times, but on our side, there were always some who did not understand that without military victory, principled discussions would be pointless." He stated to Chai that the matter had been taken care of in Beijing and asked him to "please inform Comrade Gao Gang and let him appoint railway personnel."⁷³ However, the discussions between the two sides proved to be extremely difficult.

On 19 February 1951 chief Chinese negotiators Ye Lin (Minister of Transportation for the Northeast Government of China), Zhang Mingyuan (Vice-Commander of the East Logistical Corps), and Peng Min (a railway soldier), reported that during negotiations, the North Koreans frequently did not put enough thought into issues, and the ideas they raised often contradicted each other. Moreover, the Koreans objected to the Chinese principle to "see first to the transportation needs of the army," and instead thought more about North Korean economic recovery. Pak Hon-yong commented that economics is politics. The issue was thus left to Kim and Gao to resolve by themselves.

The Koreans also requested that the North Korean Min-

istry of Transportation participate in the management of the railroad. They agreed to establish a joint military transportation command structure headed by the Chinese and led by the Sino-Korean joint command, but they insisted that the new structure work together with the DPRK Ministry of Transportation. Pak suggested that China also establish a unit similar to the Korean Military Transportation Bureau, and he opposed instituting a system of military management for the railroads. He suggested instead that they restore the old Korean management bureaus, incorporating into them the provisional railroad management bureau that had already been established.⁷⁴

By mid-March, the two sides still had rather different opinions on the basic principles of railroad management. Merging military management and railroad administration during wartime was an effective way to maximize the efficiency of the railroad, and a railroad military management bureau was a form of organization through which China and Korea could implement joint military management. The North Koreans therefore could not oppose this point directly. Instead, they established their own military transportation bureau to control the railroads and take over the work of the original management bureau (Order No. 21 of the transportation ministry). This action weakened and limited the Military Management Bureau, and made it unable to exercise full power.

To resolve this problem as quickly as possible, Zhou compromised, agreeing that "aside from maintaining the established unified military management command, and jointly conducting railroad repair, during the present situation the Korean railroad administration will still manage the Korean railroads." Kim expressed his basic agreement with this proposal, but during talks between the Chinese representative and the minister of the North Korean Transportation Department, the Koreans raised additional demands. Not only should railroad administration be directed by the DPRK Transportation Minister, but the Military Management Bureau should not be responsible for developing plans. Its role would be restricted to inspecting and supervising railway transportation. The North Koreans also demanded that railway maintenance work have a separate organization headed by the DPRK Ministry of Transportation.

In actuality, these demands amounted to canceling the Sino-Korean joint military organization. Given the unpredictability of the North Koreans during negotiations and the rift in basic thinking between the two sides, the Chinese representative believed the problem to be very complicated. Even though an agreement had been reached on paper, it was still difficult to change anything in actual practice. He thus requested that "an authoritative and influential comrade be dispatched again to discuss the matter further." Peng suggested that he offer for Kim's consideration the opinion of the transportation minister, and let the two governments meet to resolve the matter. He requested only that the Koreans "guarantee timely completion of all military transportation work [and] confirm the particulars of railroad management and transportation."⁷⁵

Shortly thereafter, Gao Gang offered five suggestions

that he believed were in accordance with North Korean principles: 1) to continue the military management system of the Korean railroad, but institute a military representative system and establish military representatives at all levels, under a joint transportation command headed by the Chinese. Military representatives would have final decisions over all military transportation matters; 2) the Joint Transportation Command established in Shenyang would appoint one person to the DPRK Transportation Ministry to serve as chief representative with the power to supervise implementation of plans for military transportation; 3) the Korean side would guarantee that the Joint Transportation Command, and its chief representatives and military representatives at all levels, would have uninterrupted telephone communication; 4) a unified maintenance command, would be established under the unified transportation command and directed by the Korean Ministry of Transportation (MKT); 5) Chinese railroad workers in North Korea would be led by the Korean Railroad Bureau, but their political work would be directly under the Chinese military representative.

With these basic principles, the Chinese negotiated again with the Korean Transportation Minister. Except for the issue of who had authority over the maintenance command, about which the Koreans did not take a clear position, they basically accepted Gao's five points, but demanded confirmation that the Korean Transportation Command would have jurisdiction over railway management bureaus. The Koreans agreed in principle to open the entire network to railroad traffic, and to establish a unified transportation command that would determine and approve the ratio of military materials transported to the ratio of civilian economic materials transported. The Koreans also asked China to send people to serve in vice-chairman posts in each management bureau controlled by the Ministry of Transportation. Zhou consequently asked the Chinese representatives to include in the records a statement regarding who had authority over the unified maintenance command, and agreed that Ye, Zhang, and Peng should sign the records and bring the entire document to Beijing.⁷⁶ It was precisely at this point that Moscow's opinion was received, which changed things completely.

According to Zhang Mingyuan's observations, the stumbling block was the question of who would control the Joint Transportation Command. The Chinese representative pointed out that because most of the Korean railroads and trains had been destroyed, the majority of trains in service on Korean rails were those brought over from China. Moreover, most of the maintenance and transportation troops and train crews were also Chinese, and even the equipment used for maintenance and supplies for the Korean railway crews were the responsibility of the Chinese. This being the case, it would be difficult for the Koreans to conduct the normal operations of rail transport. Therefore, for the duration of the war, the Chinese should control the Sino-Korean railroad transportation effort. But the Koreans and Soviet advisors stubbornly maintained that the management of railroad transportation involved questions of national sovereignty, and therefore must be controlled by the Koreans. In response to this, Zhou

pointed out that the source of the problem may not lie in Pyongyang, but rather in Moscow, and expressed his desire to negotiate with the Soviets to find an appropriate solution.⁷⁷

On the day Zhou sent a telegram to the Chinese representatives instructing them to prepare to sign the agreement, Stalin sent his own telegram, which made clear the Soviet position. The full text of the telegram reads:

Our consul in Shenyang, Ledovsky, has just sent us a telegram explaining Comrade Gao Gang's view that for the purpose of correct organization and transportation of military materials to the front, the Korean railroad should be managed by the Chinese command. From the consul's report, it is clear that Prime Minister Kim supports this idea, but the Korean ministers seem opposed to it. They believe this plan is detrimental to Korean sovereignty. If you need my opinion, and the opinion of the CPSU CC, then we feel we must tell you we completely support Comrade Gao Gang's opinion. In order to proceed smoothly with the war of liberation, it is absolutely necessary to adopt this plan. In general, we believe that for the good of Korea itself, a more intimate national relationship must be built between Korea and China.⁷⁸

Zhou immediately forwarded this telegram to Gao and Peng, telling them to "continue to strive to place the unified railroad maintenance command under the direction of the unified command or unified transportation command, or place the Korean railroad management bureau directly under the military management system." The Chinese representative could delay signing the document, and could invite the Korean Transportation Minister to Shenyang for further talks.⁷⁹

Hereafter, the Chinese side became more uncompromising. On 16 April Zhou sent a message to Ni Zhiliang, forwarded to Kim, proposing "that in order to adapt to the needs of the war, the Korean Railroad must be placed under a unified military command system."⁸⁰ On 4 May, the two sides concluded 'An Agreement Concerning Military Control of the Korean Railroad During the War,' which clearly stipulated the rules governing the management system and the organization and allocation of transportation resources. In July the Korean Railway Military Management Central Bureau was accordingly established, responsible for the management, organization, and implementation of rail transportation in the Korean War zone. Five branch bureaus were also established, staffed by a total of 12,000 Chinese volunteers. On 1 August, the Sino-Korean Joint Railroad Transportation Command was established in Shenyang, and in November the Frontline Transportation Command was established in Anju, responsible for directing and coordinating the work of the Chief Military Management Bureau, the Railway Maintenance Management Group, and the Railroad Artillery Group. The railway corps was increased to 4 divisions, 3 regiments, and a Volunteer Engineering Brigade, for a total of 52,000 men. From this time on, under unified direction and organiza-

tion, the railroad transportation forces, maintenance forces, and high artillery forces cooperated closely, acted in concert, and adopted the approach of “using concentration to fight concentration” and “using mobility to fight mobility.” This greatly improved the efficiency of transportation.⁸¹

The issue of railroad jurisdiction was a unique problem among the various causes of Sino-Korean tension, because it involved North Korean sovereignty and internal affairs. Peng Dehuai did not evade acknowledging this, even when he suffered criticism in 1959. However, as Peng emphasized, in the wartime situation it was impossible to avoid placing

POW problem too quickly “could only lead to a weakening of Sino-Korean forces. Li Kenong believes that if they do not mobilize the forces of international opinion, and do not prepare for a protracted war, the Americans will not yield. Comrade Mao shares this same judgment about the prospect of negotiations, and has given Li Kenong these directions: ‘Only by adopting an unyielding position can you win the initiative and force the enemy to yield. To achieve these objectives, you should prepare for a test of strength against the enemy through several more months of negotiation.’”⁸⁶

By 2 May, the negotiators at Panmunjom had reached

In February 1952 Kim told Mao bluntly that he had “no desire to continue the war.”

the railroads under military management. Moreover, the rail lines were returned to Korean control immediately after the armistice was signed.⁸² However, the way the Chinese, backed by the Soviets, forced the North Koreans to accept their views left a shadow on the heart of Kim Il Sung.

The Opportunity for a Cease-Fire

In the second half of 1952, when the two opposing sides in the war had basically reached a balance of power, the cease-fire negotiations at Panmunjom became deadlocked over the issue of voluntary repatriation of prisoners of war, the question Mao initially thought would be the easiest to solve.⁸³ Stalin, who viewed the war in Korea in terms of his global Cold War strategy, encouraged Mao to continue fighting, and by no means to capitulate during peace negotiations. The North Koreans, however, advocated signing an armistice as soon as possible because of the severe losses they were suffering from American bombing. In February 1952 Kim told Mao bluntly that he had “no desire to continue the war.”⁸⁴

Soviet Ambassador Razuvaev reported to Moscow in early 1952 that “when Kim was discussing the reasons for the deadlocked negotiations with [DPRK negotiator] Nam Il, he advocated signing the cease-fire agreement and turning over all unsolved problems to a political meeting for further research.” According to Kim, “delaying negotiations was not beneficial, because the US Air Force was continuing to inflict damage on the DPRK. He does not see the rationale behind continuing the debate over POWs, because this debate is now leading to great losses.” Moreover, Kim believed that most of the Chinese POWs were former soldiers of Chiang Kai-shek’s [Jiang Jieshi] army, and were thus politically unreliable. Therefore, “expending a lot of effort on them is somewhat meaningless.” Kim instructed Nam Il “to get a clear sense of the Chinese attitude on this question,” and suggested making concessions on the POW problem “in the name of [PRC negotiator] Li Kenong.”⁸⁵

The Chinese concerns were quite different. Razuvaev reported that the Chinese leaders worried that much of the Soviet military aid would decrease or cease altogether once the war ended. They therefore believed that resolving the

agreement on four of the five points. However, with regard to the repatriation of POWs, the American side proposed returning only those who wished to go back, while the Chinese insisted upon the repatriation of all POWs. As a result, negotiations became deadlocked. Korean leaders had hoped that the Americans would sign a cease-fire agreement by May, and had planned to begin political and economic reconstruction work by the second half of 1952. They never expected the dispute over the POW issue to delay the negotiations so long. Razuvaev reported that “this has made the Korean leaders extremely disappointed.” Kim suggested that the Chinese comrades make concessions on the POW issue and strive for a cease-fire agreement.⁸⁷ On 13 July, after ignoring repeated concessions by the Chinese and North Koreans (including dropping demands for full repatriation of POWs), the US suggested a repatriation of 83,000 men, a total which included 80 percent of the men captured from the KPA and 32 percent of those captured from the CVA).⁸⁸ They claimed that this was their final, unalterable offer. The Chinese and Koreans were forced to make a decision.

The Chinese leaders were very resolute in their position. On 15 July Mao sent a telegram to Kim saying that in the face of the horrific bombardment by the enemy, to accept the enemy’s offer, which was provocative and seductive but represented no real concessions, would be extremely disadvantageous for the Sino-Korean side, both politically and militarily. Although continuing the war would mean continued destruction for the Korean people and the CVA, the Chinese and Korean people were growing stronger with the war and were strengthening the cause of peace throughout the world. The war was keeping the Americans tied down in East Asia and was draining their strength, while Soviet reconstruction grew stronger, thus promoting the development of people’s revolutions in all countries and delaying the outbreak of another world war. Mao guaranteed that the Chinese people would give all possible help to the Korean people to resolve their difficulties. In sum “to accept the proposals of the enemy in the present situation will inevitably make the enemy even more ambitious and undermine our prestige.” Finally, Mao told Kim that he would relay the Koreans’ pro-

posal to Stalin and request his recommendations.⁸⁹ On the same day however, Mao sent a telegram to Stalin informing the Soviet leader that the Chinese “resolutely refuse this provocative and seductive plan of the enemy and are prepared to expand the war. Kim Il Sung does not agree with this proposal.”⁹⁰

Two days later Kim capitulated, endorsing Mao’s analysis of the situation and thanking China for its promise of full support.⁹¹ However, in a telegram to Stalin that same day, Kim complained that because of poor defensive strategy, Korean cities and their citizens were suffering great losses from enemy bombing. Although he agreed with Mao’s viewpoints,



Communist Officers at the Kaesong Peace Talks

Source: National Archives

he still hoped for a quick cease-fire. “We must quickly and resolutely negotiate a cease-fire, stop actual fighting and exchange all prisoners in accordance with the Geneva Conventions. These demands are supported by all peace-loving people and will rescue us from our present passive position.”⁹²

Part of the reason the two sides differed in their views on resolving the POW issue was the different policies they held toward POW’s in general. Due to China’s recent civil war and its lack of experience in international conflict, from the very beginning of the war the Chinese did not want to detain POWs. On 17 November 1950, Peng Dehuai sent a telegram to the Central Military Commission saying he was preparing to release one hundred POWs before the start of his campaign. On the eighteenth Mao replied that “releasing a group of POWs is a very good idea. From now on, to periodically release POWs, you do not need my permission.”⁹³ In actuality, the number of POWs the Chinese held was comparatively small. In November 1951, the Chinese and Koreans decided that the KPA would be responsible for South Korean POWs, while the CVA would handle POWs from other countries.⁹⁴ Thus, the small number of POWs in CVA custody limited

Chinese influence on the issue during the negotiations and was one reason Beijing demanded full repatriation.

By contrast, because of their need for labor after the war, the Koreans secretly detained large numbers of POWs. According to reports from Ambassador Razuvaev, “the Korean comrades believed that it would be better to retain large numbers of South Korean POWs, without considering their wish to return home.” As a result, they detained 13,094 of Syngman Rhee’s troops. Of those, 6,430 men served in the KPA, doing various work for the Ministry of Internal Affairs and the Railroad Ministry. They also detained 42,262 South Korean POWs who were “mobilized” in the early stages of the war for service in the KPA.⁹⁵ Under these circumstances, the Korean leaders could hardly call for “full repatriation.”

The issue was ultimately resolved in Moscow. In a 15 July telegram, Mao wrote Stalin “in the American plan, the proportion for the two sides was extremely unequal. The enemy is attempting to use this to break the wartime unity of the Korean and Chinese people. It would be extremely disadvantageous for us to submit to the enemy’s pressure.” Mao declared that even if talks broke down he would not concede, “because this is a question of politics, not just for Korea and China; it also has repercussions for the entire revolutionary camp.”⁹⁶ Two days later Stalin replied in a telegram to Mao, “Your position regarding the peace negotiations is completely correct.”⁹⁷

In August and September, Zhou Enlai had several discussions with Stalin in Moscow, joined in the later meetings by Kim Il Sung, Pak Hon-yong, and Peng Dehuai. Besides questions of Chinese economic development, the conversations focused on finalizing policy regarding the war. Zhou stated that the Sino-Korean forces are strong enough to launch longer offensives and had entrenched themselves well enough to withstand bombing raids. Regarding the POW issue, Stalin first pointed out that the Americans wanted to solve the issue according to their own wishes, whereas according to international law, hostile parties must repatriate all POWs, with the exception of war criminals. Stalin asked what Mao thought about the POW issue “Will he give in or will he hold his own?”⁹⁸

Zhou stated that the Koreans and Chinese had differing opinions on the matter, and that Mao’s viewpoint was that the Americans must repatriate all POWs. “The Koreans believe that the continuation of the war is not advantageous because the daily losses are greater than the number of POWs whose return is being discussed.” Mao, on the other hand, “believes that continuing the war is advantageous to us, since it detracts the USA from preparing for a new world war.” Stalin immediately affirmed that “Mao is right; this war is getting on America’s nerves. The North Koreans have lost nothing, except for casualties that they suffered during the war.” Stalin also touched a nerve with Chinese leaders by reminding Zhou that “one must be firm when dealing with America. The Chinese comrades must know that if America does not lose this war, then China will never recapture Taiwan.” Concerning the resolution of the POW question, Stalin and Zhou agreed to continue calling for full repatriation, and

to force the US to make the first concession. They could not shrink before the American threats.⁹⁹

After these talks, Kim did not again ask for a cease-fire, but instead focused on how to gain more material support from the Soviet Union. However, before the war ended, Sino-Korean conflict again emerged over the question of whether or not to sign the ceasefire immediately. This was the last difference between the two sides during the war. After Stalin's death in March 1953, the Soviet leadership changed its policy and promoted the conclusion of a ceasefire in Korea.¹⁰⁰ South Korean leader Syngman Rhee, however, did not want to conclude a ceasefire and tried to sabotage an agreement by releasing prisoners without authorization from the UN command. In response, the Chinese side wanted to launch a new offensive in order to secure more advantageous conditions for a ceasefire. The North Koreans demanded that an armistice be signed immediately, but Peng Dehuai, acting with Mao's support, overruled Kim Il Sung and began a new military campaign. Peng's final campaign was successful.¹⁰¹ Nonetheless, since Kim Il Sung was no longer hoping to obtain victory in the war, he believed it would be best to end the war as soon as possible and push forward with economic reconstruction.

In conclusion, the conflicts between China and North Korea during the Korean War were the result of a clash between the interests of the entire camp (as expressed by the Chinese) and local interests (as expressed by the Koreans). As a result, Stalin was generally inclined to support the Chinese, since the positions China advocated were more in accordance with his view of the overall interests of the socialist camp in Asia. However, common interests tended to be defined in accordance with the perceptions of the country that played the leading role in the socialist camp. As a result, as soon as a country within the camp ceased to recognize its interests as being in line with the common goals, or when a change in leadership occurred in the camp, the subordination of local interest to global interest no longer held, and the alliance ran the risk of breaking down. This was the case in Sino-Korean relations, as well as eventually in Sino-Soviet relations.

Shen Zhihua, an independent scholar, is a Fellow of the Modern History Research Center and Archives at Peking University and an Honorary Fellow of the Chinese University of Hong Kong. Among his numerous publications on Sino-Soviet relations and Cold War history are Mao Zedong, Stalin and the Korean War (Hong Kong: Tian Di Publishing Co., 1995).

NOTES

¹ The most influential books and articles on this topic in the past decade include: Gordon Chang, *Friends and Enemies: China, the United States, and the Soviet Union, 1948-1972* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1990); Mineo Nakajima, "The Sino-

Soviet Confrontation: Its Roots in the International Background of the Korean War," *Australian Journal of Chinese Affairs*, 1, 1991; S. Goncharov, J. Lewis, Xue Litai *Uncertain Partners: Stalin, Mao, and the Korean War* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1993); O.A. Westad, ed., *Brothers in Arms: The Rise and Fall of the Sino-Soviet Alliance 1945-1963* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1998); Yang Kuisong, *Mao Zedong yu Mosike En En Yuan Yuan* (Jiangxi: Peoples' Publishing Co., 1999); Shen Zhihua, *Mao Zedong, Stalin and the Korean War* (Hong Kong: Tian Di Publishing Co., 1998)

² During an CWIHP conference held in Hong Kong in 1996, Russian scholars discussed Soviet-North Korean relations during the Korean War, e.g., the paper by A. Mansourov, "Soviet-North Korean Relations and the Origins of the Korean War." Chinese scholars also discussed Sino-Vietnamese relations during the Vietnam War at the CWIHP conference held in Hong Kong in 2000 entitled "China, Vietnam and the Indo-China War." See, e.g., Li Danhui ed., *China, and the Indo-China War* (Hong Kong: Tian Di Publishing Co., 2000).

³ See Chen Jian, *China's Road to the Korean War: The Making of the Sino-American Confrontation* (New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 1994); Yang Kuisong, "Zhongguo Chubing Shimo," Inchoen University conference, 1999; Shen Zhihua, "Lun Zhongguo Chubing Chaoxian Juece de Shifei Cheng Bai," (21st Century, October 2000).

⁴ For the text of Stalin's telegram to Kim Il Sung on 30 January 1950, see Kathryn Weathersby, "To Attack or Not to Attack?: Stalin, Kim Il Sung and the Prelude to War," *Cold War International History Project Bulletin*, 5 (Spring 1995), p. 9. For additional details, see Shen Zhihua, "Zhongguo Tongmeng Tiaoyue yu Sulian Zai Yuandong de Zhanlue Mubiao" (*Dang Shi Yanjiu Ziliao*, No. 9, 1997), and "Sino-Soviet Relations and the Origin of the Korean War: Stalin's Strategic Goals in the Far East," *Journal of Cold War Studies*, Vol.2, No. 2 (Spring 2000), pp. 44-68.

⁵ E. P. Bajanov and N. Bajanova, *The Korean Conflict, 1950-1953: The Most Mysterious War of the 20th Century? Based on Secret Soviet Archives* (manuscript), pp. 40-42. For a detailed discussion of the documents presented by Bajanov and Bajanova, see Kathryn Weathersby, "Should We Fear This?, Stalin and the Danger of War with America," *CWIHP Working Paper* No. 39, (Spring 2002).

⁶ Ministerstvo inostrannykh del rossiiskoi federatsii (Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation), "Khronologiya osnovnykh sobytiia na kanuna i nachal' nogo perioda koreiskoi voyny, ianvar' 1949-oktiabr' 1950 gg." (Chronology of basic events on the eve of and in the first period of the Korean War, January 1949-October 1950) (Manuscript), pp. 30-31. From the collection of Russian archival documents on the Korean War obtained by CWIHP in 1995, available at the National Security Archive, Washington, DC.

⁷ Ibid. p. 31.

⁸ Li Haiwen "Zhonggong Zhongyang Jiujiang Heshi Jueding Zhiyuanjun Chuguo Zuozhan" *Dangde Wenxian* No. 5 (1993), p. 85.

⁹ "Research on Selected Documents of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party," *Zhou Enlai Nianpu (1949-1976)*, Vol. 1 (ZhongYang: WenXian Publishing Co., 1997), p. 54; "Khronologiya," p. 38.

¹⁰ "Khronologiya," pp. 35-37.

¹¹ 4 July 1950, *Memorandum of Roshchin's talks with Zhou Dapeng*, quoted from O.A. Westad's "The Sino-Soviet Alliance and the United States: Wars, Policies, and Perceptions, 1950-1961" paper presented at the 1996 CWIHP Hong Kong conference.

¹² Telegram from Stalin to Roshchin, 5 July 1950, sending message for Zhou Enlai. For the full text see Kathryn Weathersby, "New Russian Documents on the Korean War," *CWIHP Bulletin* 6/7 (Winter 1995/1996), p. 43.

¹³ Telegram from Stalin to Roshchin, 8 July 1950. For full text see *Ibid.*, p. 44.

¹⁴ *Zhou Enlai Nianpu*, Vol. 1, p. 51.

¹⁵ Interview with Chai Chengwen, 12 September 2000. The memoir of Wang Dagang, Chinese deputy military attaché in North Korea, also describes how they learned of the military situation only through overseas Chinese and Korean soldiers who had served in the People's Liberation Army. See David Tsui, "Did the DPRK and the PRC Sign a Mutual Security Pact?" paper presented at the CWIHP Hong Kong Conference in 1996. Pak Il-Yu, whose Chinese name was Wang Wei, had worked in the Balujun Denghua Zhidui during the war against Japan and subsequently served as a county magistrate in the Pinxi base area.

¹⁶ In a military meeting on 26 August 1950, Zhou Enlai said that the main reason for not dispatching a military mission to North Korea immediately was due to Chinese considerations. See Zhonggong Zhongyang Wenxian Yanjiushi (CCP Central Bureau of Archives and Manuscripts), Junshi Kexueyuan (Chinese PLA Academy of Military Sciences), ed., *Zhou Enlai Junshi Wenxian*, Vol. 4, (Renmin Press, 1997), pp. 45-46. However, he later told the Soviet Ambassador that the reason was that North Korea did not agree. See "Khronologiia," pp. 52-54; Goncharov, Lewis and Xue, *Uncertain Partners*, p. 163.

¹⁷ Gao Gang, Talks during the Shenyang military meeting of 13 August 1950, cited in *Kangmei Yuanchao Zhanzhengshi* (The War to Oppose America and Aid Korea) ed. Chinese Academy of Military Sciences (Academy of Military Sciences Publishing Co., 2000), pp. 91-92.

¹⁸ "Khronologiia," pp. 45-47.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 48-49; Chen Jian, *Op.Cit.*, p. 273. Lee Sang Cho confirmed this situation. See Sun Baosheng, "Mao Zedong ceng Yuyan Meijun Keneng zai Renchuan Denglu" [Mao Zedong had predicted that the US Army might land at Inchon] *Junshi Shilin* No. 5, 1990, p. 13.

²⁰ This is based on recollections of North Korean officers. Soviet military advisers also suggested the possibility of UN forces landing in rear ports. See Goncharov, Lewis and Xue, *Uncertain Partners*, p. 171.

²¹ Interview with Chai Chengwen, 12 September 2000.

²² Interview with Chai Chengwen, 12 September 2000.

²³ In a letter to Gao Gang, Mao Zedong said that based on the situation, we have to send our troops. You have to hastily prepare. See Chai Chenwen, Zhao Yongtian, *Banmendan Tanpan* (The Panmunjom Negotiations), (Beijing: PLA Press, 1989), p. 79.

²⁴ Khronologiia, pp. 52-54.

²⁵ *Ibid.* pp. 56-58.

²⁶ Goncharov, Lewis and Xue, *Uncertain Partners*, pp. 174-175.

²⁷ A. Mansourov, "Stalin, Mao, Kim, and China's Decision to Enter the Korean War: September 16-October 15, 1950" *CWIHP Bulletin* 6-7, (Winter 1995/1996), pp. 97-98.

²⁸ Telegram from Stalin to Shtykov and Matveev, 1 October, 1950. Collection of documents from the Archive of the President of the Russian Federation, obtained by CWIHP in 1995 and available at the National Security Archives, Washington, DC.

²⁹ Chai Chengwen, Zhao Yongtian, *Op. Cit.*, p. 80.

³⁰ Shen Zhihua, "Zhongguo Beipo Chubing Chaoxian: Juece Guocheng Jiqi Yuanyin," *Dangshi Yanjiu Ziliao*, Vol. 1, 1996; Shen Zhihua, "Zhongsu Tongmeng yu Zhongguo Chubing Chaoxian de Juece" (The Sino-Soviet Alliance and China's Decision to Send

Troops to Korea) *Dangdai Zhongguoshi Yanjiu* No. 5, 1996 and No. 1, 1997.

³¹ Telegram from Kim Il Sung to Mao Zedong, 8 October 1950; Telegram from Peng Dehuai to Mao Zedong, 10 October 1950; Interview with Chai Chengwen.

³² Telegram from Filippov (Stalin) to Roshchin, 1 October 1950, transmitting message to Mao Zedong and Zhou Enlai. For the full text see A. Mansourov, "Stalin, Mao, Kim and China's Decision to Enter the Korean War," *CWIHP Bulletin* 6/7 (Winter 1995/1996), pp. 116-117.

³³ Telegram from Peng Dehuai to Mao, 25 October 1950. Interview with Chai Chengwen, 12 September 2000.

³⁴ Interview with Chai Chengwen, 12 September 2000.

³⁵ Wang Yan, ed., *Peng Dehuai Nianpu* (Anhui: Renmin Publishing Co., 1998), p. 445.

³⁶ Telegram from Peng Dehuai to Mao, 25 October and 2 November 1950.

³⁷ Department of History, Chinese Academy of Military Science, ed., *Kangmei Yuanchao Zhanzhengshi* (Beijing: Military Science Publishing Co., 2000), Vol. 2, p. 167.

³⁸ Interview with Chai Chengwen; Department of History, Chinese Academy of Military Science, ed., *Kangmei Yuanchao Zhanzheng Shi* (Beijing: Military Science Publishing Co., 2000), Vol. 2, p. 167; Telegram from Peng Dehuai to Mao Zedong, 11 November 1950; Wang Yan, ed., *Peng Dehuai Nianpu*, p. 449.

³⁹ Telegram from Peng Dehuai via Central Military Commission to Kim Il Sung, 9 November 1950; Telegram from Peng Dehuai to Mao, 18 November 1950.

⁴⁰ Interview with Chai Chengwen; Department of History, Chinese Academy of Military Science, ed., *Kangmei Yuanchao Zhanzhengshi* (Beijing: Military Science Publishing Co., 2000), Vol. 2, p. 167; Telegram from Peng Dehuai to Mao Zedong in 18 November 1950.

⁴¹ Department of History, Chinese Academy of Military Science, ed., *Kangmei Yuanchao Zhanzheng Shi* (Beijing: Military Science Publishing Co., 2000), Vol. 2, pp. 167-168.

⁴² Chinese Academy of Military Science, ed., *Zhou Enlai Junshi Wenxuan*, (Selected Military Works of Zhou Enlai) Vol. 4 (Anhui: Renmin Publishing Co.) p. 100. It should be pointed out that Wenxuan published the words "command jointly by China Zhou Enlai," but the personnel of the Central Archive who looked at the manuscript of Zhou's telegram stated that "Tongzhi lai" (meaning Chinese comrade) was misread as "Zhou Enlai" in the Wenxuan compilation. See Xu Hong, Liu Deping: "Dingzheng (Zhou Enlai Junshi Wenxian) Zhong de Liangge Suowu" *Dangshi Yanjiu Ziliao*, No. 1, 2001, pp. 47-48.

⁴³ Chinese Academy of Military Science ed. *Kangmei Yuanchao Zhanzheng Shi*. Vol. 2, p. 167.

⁴⁴ Chinese Academy of Military Science, ed., *Zhou Enlai Junshi Wenxuan*, Vol. 4, pp. 122-123. According to the agreement, the unified Sino-North Korean command gave orders only on the Corps and Division level. See, e.g., *Peng Dehuai Nianpu*, p. 454.

⁴⁵ Interview with Chai Chengwen; Telegram from Mao Zedong to Peng Dehuai, 6 December, 1950; Telegram from Peng Dehuai to Mao, 7 December 1950; *Peng Dehuai Nianpu*, p. 453.

⁴⁶ Telegram from Peng Dehuai to the 9th Army Corps, 13, 16, 19 December, 1950; *Peng Dehuai Nianpu*, p. 465.

⁴⁷ Zhou Enlai Junshi Huadong Jishi. pp. 178-79. [For a detailed discussion of the Soviet air force's participation in the Korean War, see] Shen Zhihua "Kangmei Yuanchao Zhanzheng Juece Zhong de Sulian Kongjun," *Zhonggong Dangshi Yanjiu*, No. 2, 2000.

⁴⁸ Telegram from Peng Dehuai to Mao, 19 December 1950; *Peng Dehuai Nianpu*, p. 456.

⁴⁹ For more detail, see Shen Zhihua, “Kangmei Yuanchao Zhanzheng Juece Zhong de Sulian Yinshu”, *Dangdai Zhongguoshi Yanjiu*, No. 1, 2001.

⁵⁰ *Mao Zedong Junshi Wenxian* (Selected Military Works of Mao Zedong), Vol. 6 (Beijing: Military Science Publishing Co., 1993), pp. 245-246, 249-250.

⁵¹ *Peng Dehuai Junshi Wenxuan* (Selected Military Works of Peng Dehuai) (Central Documents Publishing Co., 1988), p. 383; Telegram from Peng Dehuai to Kim Il Sung, 3 January 1951; *Peng Dehuai Nianpu*, p. 464.

⁵² Telegram from Mao Zedong to Filippov [Stalin], 4 January 1951. For full text see K. Weathersby, “New Russian Documents on the Korean War,” *CWIHP Bulletin* 6/7 (Winter 1995/96), pp. 53-54.

⁵³ The report of the Volunteer Army Party Commission: “At this time our army does not have enough soldiers and re-supply is extremely insufficient. If there is no regrouping, re-supply, and no improvement of transportation and ammunitions, our army cannot fight anymore” Telegram from the Volunteer Army Party Commission to Central Military Commission, 8 January 1951. See Yang Fengcheng, Wang Tiancheng, *Jiayu Chaoxian Zhanzheng de Ren*. (Beijing: Zhongyang Dangxiao Press, 1993), p. 222.

⁵⁴ *Peng Dehuai Zishu*. [Peng’s account, internal edition], p. 350.

⁵⁵ Interview with Chai Chengwen, 12 September 2000. Telegram from Chai Chengwen to Peng Dehuai, 8 January 1951; Telegram from Peng Dehuai to Mao, 1 January, 1951: *Peng Dehuai Nianpu*, pp. 465-466.

⁵⁶ Wang Yazhi, “Kangmei Yuanchao Zhanzheng Zhongde Peng Dehuai, Nie Rongzhen”, *Junshi Shilin*, vol. 1, 1994, p.11.

⁵⁷ *Peng Dehuai Nianpu*, p. 465.

⁵⁸ Interview with Chai Chengwen, 12 September 2000. Record of talks between Peng Dehuai and Kim Il Sung, 10-11 January, 1951.

⁵⁹ Interview with Chai Chengwen, 12 September 2000. *Peng Dehuai Nianpu*, p. 466.

⁶⁰ *Peng Dehuai Nianpu*, p. 461; Hong Xuezhong, *Kangmei Yuanchao Zhanzheng Huiyilu*, (People’s Liberation Army Art Publishing Co., 1990), pp. 111-112; Lei Yingfu, “Kangmei Yuanchao Jige Zhongda Juece de Huiyi” *Dang de Wenxian*, 5 November 1994, p. 41.

⁶¹ Telegram from Mao to Filippov [Stalin], 16 January 1951, transmitting message from Mao to Peng Dehuai with message for Kim Il Sung. For the full text see Kathryn Weathersby, “New Russian Documents on the Korean War,” *CWIHP Bulletin* 6/7 (Winter 1995/1996), pp. 55-56.

⁶² Telegram from Mao to Filippov [Stalin], 27 January 1951, transmitting 19 January telegram from Peng Dehuai to Mao regarding meetings with Kim Il Sung. For the full text see K. Weathersby, “New Russian Documents on the Korean War,” pp. 56-57.

⁶³ For more details, see Shen Zhihua: “Kangmei Yuanchao Zhanzheng Juece Zhong de Sulian Yinshu” *Dangdai Zhongguoshi Yanjiu*, No.1, 2001; Shen Zhihua, “Lun Zhongguo Chubing Chaoxian Juece de Shifei Cheng Bai” *21st century*, October 2000.

⁶⁴ In 1951, the loss rate of the Volunteer Army transportation was 84.6 percent, *Kangmei Yuanchao Zhanzheng Houqin Jingyan Zongjie*. *Zhuanye Qinwu Xiace* (JinDun Publishing Co., 1987), p. 140.

⁶⁵ Zhang Mingyuan, “Fengxue Zhanqin—Yi Kangmei Yuanchao Zhanzheng de Houqin Baozhang” *Dangdai Zhongguoshi Yanjiu*, 2000, Vol. 6, p. 34; *Zhuanye Qinwu Xiace*, p. 6.

⁶⁶ *Peng Dehuai Nianpu*, p. 449; *Fengxue Zhanqin*, p. 29.

⁶⁷ Interview with Chai Chengwen, 12 September 2000.

⁶⁸ *Zhuanye Qinwu Xiace*, p. 6.

⁶⁹ *Kangmei Yuanchao Zhanzheng Houqin Jingyan Zongjie Jiben*

Jingyan (JinDun Publishing Co., 1987), pp. 41-42; *Fengxue Zhanqin*, p. 34.

⁷⁰ *Kangmei Yuanchao Zhanzheng Houqin Jingyan Zongjie*. *Zhiliao Xuanbian Tielu Yunshu lei Xiace* (People’s Liberation Army Publishing Co., 1988), pps. 273, 282, 285.

⁷¹ *Zhiliao Xuanbian Tielu Yunshu Lei Xiace*, 1988, pp. 283-284; *Fengxue Zhanqin*, p. 33.

⁷² *Zhuanye Qinwu Xiace*, pps. 6, 3-4.

⁷³ Interview with Chai Chengwen, 12 September 2000.

⁷⁴ Telegram from Ye, Zhang, Peng to Gao Gang, 19 February 1951.

⁷⁵ Telegram from Ye, Zhang, Peng to Gao Gang, 15 March 1951; Telegram from Peng Dehuai to Gao Gang and Zhou Enlai, 22 March 1951.

⁷⁶ Telegram from Zhou Enlai to Gao Gang and Peng Dehuai, 25 March 1951.

⁷⁷ *Fengxue Zhanqin*, p. 34.

⁷⁸ Telegram from Stalin to Mao Zedong, 25 March 1951.

⁷⁹ Telegram from Zhou Enlai to Gao Gang and Peng Dehuai, 25 March.

⁸⁰ *Zhou Enlai Junshi Huadong Jishi*, Vol. 2, pp. 204.

⁸¹ *Zhuanye Qinwu*, pp. 6-7; *Jiben Jingyan*, pp. 66-67.

⁸² *Peng Dehuai Zishu* (Peng’s account, internal edition), p. 352.

⁸³ At least until November 1951, Mao still believed that the POW problem would not be difficult to solve; See Telegram from Mao to Stalin, 14 November 1951, in K. Weathersby, “New Russian Documents on the Korean War,” *CWIHP Bulletin* 6/7 (Winter 1995/1996), pp. 70-71.

⁸⁴ Telegram from Mao to Stalin, 8 February 1952.

⁸⁵ The first quarter working report of Razuvaev in 1952, cited in A. Volokhova, “Peregovor o peremirii v Koree, 1951-1953 gg.,” *Problemy Dal’nego Vostoka*, 2000 No.2, p.104.

⁸⁶ *Ibid*.

⁸⁷ The second quarter working report of Razuvaev in 1952, cited in A. Volokhova, p. 104.

⁸⁸ *Zhou Enlai Nianpu*, Vol 1, p.249-250.

⁸⁹ *Zhou Enlai Junshi Wenxuan*, Vol. 4, pp. 289-290. For the full text, see K. Weathersby, “New Russian Documents on the Korean War,” *CWIHP Bulletin* 6/7 (Winter 1995/1996), p.78.

⁹⁰ *Zhou Enlai Junshi Huadong Jishi*, p. 280. For an extended discussion of Mao’s thinking regarding the need to continue fighting, see Zhang Shu Guang, *Mao’s Military Romanticism: China and the Korean War, 1950-1953* (Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 1995), pp. 216-246.

⁹¹ Telegram from Mao Zedong to Stalin, 18 July, 1952. For the full text, see K. Weathersby, “New Russian Documents on the Korean War,” *CWIHP Bulletin* 6/7 (Winter 1995/1996), pp. 78-79.

⁹² Telegram from Razuvaev to Vasilevsky 17 July 1952.

⁹³ *Peng Dehuai Nianpu*, p. 449.

⁹⁴ *Zhou Enlai Junshi Huadong Jishi*, Vol. II, pp. 242.

⁹⁵ A. Volokhova, pp.106 and 108.

⁹⁶ *Zhou Enlai Nianpu*, Vol. 1, p. 250.

⁹⁷ Telegram from Filippov [Stalin] to Mao Zedong, 16 July 1952. For the full text see K. Weathersby, “New Russian Documents on the Korean War,” *CWIHP Bulletin*, 6/7, pp. 77-78.

⁹⁸ Record of conversation between Stalin and Zhou Enlai, 20 August 1952. For full text, see *CWIHP Bulletin*, 6/7 (Winter 1995/1996), pp. 10-14.

⁹⁹ Record of meeting between Stalin and Zhou Enlai, 20 August and 19 September 1952. For the full text, see *CWIHP Bulletin* 6/7 (Winter 1995/1996), pp. 9-20. For differing interpretations, see Haruki Wada, paper submitted to the CWIHP Hong Kong conference; Vojtech Mastny, *The Cold War and Soviet Insecurity: The*

Stalin Years (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), pp. 147-148.

¹⁰⁰ Concerning discussions on this question, see “1953 Nian Chaoxian Tingzhan – ZhongSu Lingdaoren de Zhengzhi Kaolu”

Shijie Shi No.3, 2001. For the text of the resolution of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union, 19 March 1953, calling for an end to the war, see K. Weathersby, “New Russian Documents on the Korean War,” *CWHP Bulletin* 6/7, (Winter 1995/1996), pp. 80-83.

¹⁰¹ *Peng Dehuai Zishu*. (Peng’s account, internal edition), p. 352.

CWHP e-Dossiers

CWHP e-Dossiers present new and important accessions to the to the CWHP ‘Virtual Archive.’ All documents featured here are can also be accessed through the CWHP website’s (<http://cwihp.si.edu>) “Virtual Archive” search engine and downloaded at no charge. Copies of the documents are available to the public through the Russian and East-Bloc Documents Database, jointly sponsored by CWHP and the National Security Archive at George Washington University.

CWHP e-Dossier No. 11: Was Oppenheimer a Soviet Spy? A Roundtable Discussion with Jerrold and Leona Schecter, Gregg Herken, and Hayden Peake

CWHP e-Dossier No. 10: Poland and the Sino-Soviet Rift, 1963-1965, by Douglas Selvage

CWHP e-Dossier No. 9: East German Spying Reveals NATO War Plans, by Bernd Schäfer

CWHP e-Dossier No. 8: The Soviet Union and The Six-Day War: Revelations from the Polish Archives, by Uri Bar-Noi

CWHP e-Dossier No. 7: Operation Manuel: Czechoslovakia and Cuba, by Daniela Spenser

CWHP e-Dossier No. 6: New Evidence on Romania and the Warsaw Pact, 1955-1989, by Dennis Deletant

CWHP e-Dossier No. 5: New Evidence on the 1989 Crisis in Romania, by Mircea Munteanu

CWHP e-Dossier No. 4: New Evidence on the Soviet Invasion of Afghanistan

Weathering the Sino-Soviet Conflict: The GDR and North Korea, 1949-1989

By Bernd Schäfer

The North Korean government has always been unusually secretive not only to the outside world and to the vast majority of its own citizens, but also to its supposed friends in the communist world. To the best of their ability, North Korea's rulers tried during the Cold War to hide "internal matters" from their comrades in the Soviet Union, China and the Eastern European countries of the Soviet bloc—the states on whom they depended for their country's existence. Nonetheless, banding together in the strange world of Pyongyang, the representatives of several of those allies learned much about their host country by exchanging pieces of information among themselves and puzzling out their meaning together.¹ Moreover, in the later years of his rule, North Korean leader Kim Il Sung spoke quite freely and frankly in his correspondence and conversations with leaders of other medium size communist countries. The archival record of the East European states' dealings with the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) can therefore shed considerable light on this enigmatic country. The evidence presented below comes from the files of the embassy of the German Democratic Republic (GDR) in Pyongyang, the East German Foreign Ministry, the Department of International Relations of the Socialist Unity Party of the GDR, and Erich Honecker's personal files on his meetings with Kim Il Sung, all of which became accessible to scholars following the demise of the GDR in 1989/90. In addition, the essay draws on the published memoir of the last East German ambassador to Pyongyang, Hans Maretzki, which provides a vivid account of the DPRK during the final years of the Soviet bloc alliance.

Setting the Stage, 1949-1955

The establishment of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) in the Soviet occupation zone three months after the founding of the Republic of Korea (ROK) in the American zone resembled what occurred in Germany just one year later. In May 1949 the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) was established in the West and in October the German Democratic Republic was proclaimed in the East, again transforming former occupation zones into states under the tutelage of their former liberators. On 11 November 1949, one month after the GDR came into existence, the DPRK exchanged letters of mutual diplomatic recognition with the German communist state, but the outbreak of the Korean War in June of the following year delayed the establishment of official relations. In April 1951, as communist forces mounted what was to be their final offensive of the war, the GDR and DPRK agreed to conduct diplomatic communication using the channels of their respective ambassadors in the People's Republic of China. They then established full embassies in the first

half of 1954, several months after the conclusion of the armistice ending hostilities on the peninsula.² Kim Il Sung received GDR representative Richard Fischer on 5 August 1954 for a lengthy audience of three and a half hours, giving him lively demonstrations on ferrous metals and a lecture on cement. The North Korean leader predicted that Germany would be unified sooner than Korea due to its higher standard of living, which, according to Kim, made it easier to educate the population.³

The armistice signed in July 1953 created a heavily fortified demilitarized border zone between North and South Korea. Three years of intense fighting had left both Korean states in a deplorable condition, but the US bombing of the North had brought nearly total destruction of the physical infrastructure of the DPRK. Consequently, even though the Soviet Union, China, and most of the East European socialist states were themselves preoccupied with postwar rebuilding and economic competition with the West, they granted substantial aid and generous credits to the DPRK. Taken together, the result of this aid was enormous.⁴ To a large extent, the DPRK was rebuilt from the outside, with the North Koreans providing the labor force and their political leaders increasingly countering reality with an ideology of alleged self-reliance.

The GDR contributed its share to the reconstruction of the DPRK. Following Kim Il Sung's visit to Moscow in September 1953, a North Korean delegation headed by Minister of Finance Yi Chu-yon traveled to Berlin to negotiate the first of many bilateral agreements on economic and technological aid for the DPRK.⁵ The North Korean government sent an enthusiastic letter of thanks for this aid in December, signed by Kim Il Sung.⁶ East German support for the embattled North Koreans had in fact begun much earlier, when in September 1950, with UN forces advancing into North Korean territory, the GDR founded a Korea Solidarity Committee of the National Council, a mass organization representing all East German parties. The Korea Solidarity Committee channeled aid to the DPRK, raising a portion of the money by direct appeals to the East German population.⁷ As will be discussed below, between 1950 and 1957 the GDR sent aid to the DPRK totaling 60 million East German marks, a remarkable sum for a country that was itself suffering from wartime destruction.⁸ Between 1954 and 1956 alone, six East German "solidarity trains" with more than 160 cars full of consumer goods and medicine rolled through the USSR and China into North Korea.⁹

Most spectacular was the East German reconstruction of the city of Hamhung between 1955 and 1962. A group of 457 specialists from the GDR, headed by Prime Minister Otto Grotewohl's brother, directed a Korean workforce in con-

structing a complete city with 5,236 apartments, factories, power plants, hospitals, restaurants, and recreation facilities.¹⁰ The East German prime minister made this offer to his DPRK counterpart during the 1954 Geneva conference of foreign ministers. Kim Il Sung responded promptly, expressing deep gratitude and announcing the selection of the city of Hamhung.¹¹ The North Korean leader visited Hamhung on 15 May 1956, inspecting the work in progress, asking a

ing its 2 January session.¹⁶ The first Asian communists to take the GDR's offer for cooperation at face value were the North Koreans, since they were in desperate need of foreign aid. An extensive visit to the GDR was arranged for them for May 1956.

As a consequence of this prospective visit, GDR diplomats closely watched the Third Party Congress of the Korean Workers Party (KWP) held 24-30 April 1956. The Polit-

Khrushchev's de-Stalinization initiative was particularly problematical for Kim Il Sung since the North Korean leader had shaped and "Koreanized" his autocracy and personality cult according to the model he had learned from the now suddenly demystified Joseph Stalin.

wide range of technical questions and giving instructions of his own.¹² He made several return visits until the construction was completed in 1962, on each occasion meeting with the East German specialists and inquiring about their grievances. For the Korean leadership, the main problem seemed to have been to prevent Hamhung from becoming more advanced and attractive than Pyongyang. To avoid this politically unacceptable eventuality, they diverted substantial material designed for Hamhung to the capital.¹³

In contrast to Moscow's commitment to preserve its North Korean creation by mobilizing the Chinese as a military substitute, the Soviet Union did not unequivocally guarantee the existence of the GDR until after the failed domestic uprising in East Germany in June 1953.¹⁴ As a consequence of this uncertainty, contacts with East Asian states were not on the political agenda of the communists in East Berlin for quite some time. The first high-ranking communist leader from East Asia to pay an official visit to the GDR after 1949 was Chinese Premier Zhou Enlai, who was in the country 23-26 July 1954.¹⁵ His East German counterpart Otto Grotewohl led a return trip seventeen months later in December 1955 to the capitals of the People's Republic of China, the DPRK and Mongolia—the first visit by a GDR state and party delegation to their Asian comrades.

First Observations and Patterns, 1956-1961

When Grotewohl and his delegation returned from their mission to East Asia, the Prime Minister reported the results at the next session of the GDR Politburo, on 2 January 1956. He emphasized the joint bilateral declarations issued with all countries visited and the Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation concluded with the People's Republic of China (PRC). The conclusions the East German leadership drew at this time marked the beginning of the GDR's modest "Asia Policy," the first stage of which consisted of creating a basic awareness of the situation in East Asia. This meant intense work for GDR embassies and multiple forms of internal and public propaganda, all of which the Politburo ordered in detail dur-

buro sent a two-member delegation to the Congress from Berlin, headed by Deputy Foreign Minister Otto Winzer.¹⁷ The East German embassy in Pyongyang received advance copies of the draft party statute that was to be discussed at the congress, and it obtained the texts of all the speeches given by the North Korean leadership. GDR officials paid particular attention to the party statute, subjecting it to a very meticulous and somewhat arrogant exegesis. The East Germans criticized the absence of a reference to a "peaceful way" to reunite Korea and the party's "shallow" notions of how to bring about reunification. They also judged the requirements imposed on members of the KWP as hardly sufficient in light of the allegedly poor qualifications of the vast majority of its membership. GDR officials also cited the lack of an appropriate awareness of the danger allegedly posed by many "hostile agents" supposedly still present in the DPRK after the chaotic transfer of people across the 38th parallel during the war. On the other hand, they sensed from the statute an awareness of the imminent danger posed by influential factions of "party enemies" within the KWP itself. They also noted critically that the obvious "problem" of personality cult in the DPRK had not been addressed.¹⁸ This "problem" had, of course, been tackled by Soviet leader Nikita S. Khrushchev in shocking detail before the worldwide communist movement just two months earlier at the CPSU 20th Party Congress in Moscow.

Khrushchev's de-Stalinization initiative was particularly problematical for Kim Il Sung since the North Korean leader had shaped and "Koreanized" his autocracy and personality cult according to the model he had learned from the now suddenly demystified Joseph Stalin. Kim had lived as a Korean partisan in the Soviet Union during World War II and had arrived in Pyongyang only on 19 September 1945, after the Soviet liberation of Northern Korea from Japanese occupation had been completed. In subsequent years, he skillfully played to Korean nationalism and exceptionalism, minimizing the Soviet role in defeating Japan and posing instead as the triumphant liberator of the country from its foreign

yoke. He invented fictional battles against the Japanese in the North Korean Paekdu Mountains, followed by a military liberation campaign led by himself that culminated in a widely cheered public victory speech in Pyongyang.¹⁹ Even though he had advanced to the top position in the Korean Workers Party as a consequence of Soviet support, in November 1950 he purged Soviet-leaning members from the party leadership, primarily because of Moscow's failure to send troops to Korea during the Korean War. After the 1953 armistice, he turned against indigenous former partisans of Korea.²⁰

Since Kim Il Sung had criticized many failed practices and many functionaries at the Third Party Congress without suffering any openly voiced challenges to his leadership, he embarked soon afterwards on a lengthy tour to the USSR, Eastern Europe, and the GDR. The DPRK delegation was scheduled to stay in East Germany from 1 June through 11 June, visiting factories, memorial sites, and tourist attractions in all parts of the country, following the usual pattern of a "friendship visit." The East German Politburo carefully prepared the itinerary for the Korean guests and drafted a bilateral contract on cultural and economic cooperation as well as a joint government declaration stating, among other things, a determination to overcome the "imperialist" division of their respective countries by peaceful means.²¹

As it turned out, however, the Korean guests were much more practical and went straight to what their mission to Europe was really about; at their meeting with the GDR Politburo on June 8 they asked for extensive aid. The startled East German Politburo had to call an extraordinary session to discuss the new situation as soon as the North Korean delegation departed.²² In sharp contrast to his report at the KWP Party Congress a few weeks before, in his meetings with the East German communists Kim Il Sung painted a bleak picture of the economic situation in North Korea. The North Koreans were presently struggling to accomplish their three-year-plan to achieve the pre-war standard of 1950, Kim explained. They lacked sufficient quantities of many basic utilities, products, and goods: coal, electricity, fertilizer, textiles, iron, cement, and grain. Livestock breeding was inadequate, as were the catches of fish, and the country faced a grave housing shortage.

East German leader Walter Ulbricht asked the North Korean delegation to submit their requests in writing and the East Germans asked some tentative questions about North Korean reunification policy and living conditions in South Korea. The GDR was neither willing nor able to meet all the costly North Korean demands, but the Politburo was worried that their failure to do so would prompt the North Koreans to complain to the Soviet Union and the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (Comecon).²³ East German negotiators had sensed some disappointment in the DPRK delegation as some of its expectations were not fully met.²⁴ Consequently, at their extraordinary session on 12 June the Politburo decided to inform Comecon in detail about the GDR's limited capacity to support the DPRK. East Germany was ready to send various technical experts to North Korea and to deliver basic goods worth 54 million rubles between 1956 and 1958,

in place of the assistance it had earlier pledged to the construction of a diesel engine factory and a metallurgical plant. But the GDR refused to grant North Korea the financial credits it requested and it postponed a decision on sending steel to the DPRK due to problems in domestic production. The Politburo also turned down the even more far-reaching Korean requests made later in 1956 and in subsequent years.²⁵ Altogether the GDR delivered roughly 500 million rubles of aid to the DPRK between 1950 and 1962.²⁶

Soon after returning from his visit to the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe in 1956, Kim Il Sung had to face an internal revolt in the KWP. Kim's leadership was called into question because of the country's economic problems, differences over strategies for achieving national unification, and, most importantly in the eyes of his opponents within the party, his personality cult, which continued to increase despite the new policy coming out of the USSR after the CPSU's 20th Party Congress. In two extraordinary plenary sessions of the KWP Central Committee in Pyongyang on 30-31 August and on 23 September, Kim and his loyalists managed to suppress the revolt of their opponents, who were officially denounced as "splittists." Some of them had walked into the Soviet embassy in P'yongyang and complained about Kim, and subsequently the Moscow leadership had asked Kim for an explanation of these events.²⁷

After a joint Soviet-Chinese intervention by a delegation sent to Pyongyang, some party functionaries ousted from the Central Committee in the August session were readmitted for "reeducation" purposes three weeks later only to be finally "purged" in March 1958.²⁸ Using a method adopted from the Soviet Union for organizing comprehensive "purges," in 1956 and 1957 all members of the KWP had to re-apply for party membership in order to "exchange party documents."²⁹

Kim Il Sung also demoted his ambassador to Moscow, Yi Sang-cho, who had criticized the North Korean leader's personality cult and refused to distribute official North Korean propaganda in Moscow. Yi Sang-cho decided to remain in exile in the Soviet Union, and Moscow refused Pyongyang's demands for his extradition.³⁰ In March 1958, after the final withdrawal of the Chinese "volunteers" who had been in the country since their intervention in the Korean War, Kim Il Sung removed his main rival, Chairman of the Supreme People's Assembly Kim Tu-bong, a well-respected partisan leader who operated from China during World War II and became the first chairman of the KWP in 1946. Even though Kim Il Sung had prevailed over all internal rivals, he nonetheless never lost his vindictiveness against perceived "enemies" in the party. In the changed political environment of 1962, for example, on a North Korean request the PRC extradited four former KWP Central Committee members. The four had been denounced as "enemies of the party" in 1956 and had fled the country to the North,³¹ only to be sent back six years later, presumably to their deaths.

Imitating foreign models while defining them as uniquely North Korean, Kim Il Sung imaginatively attempted to eternalize his autocracy by constructing a comprehensive nationalist ideology for domestic purposes—the infamous

“Juche.” He accepted the vital economic support provided by the USSR and Eastern Europe without acknowledgment. After 1958 he adapted the Chinese pretensions of “great leaps forward” in the economy, calling his version “Chollima” (flying horse). The Koreanized Great Leaps Forward proved as disastrous as those in the PRC, creating huge disproportions in economic development. These disruptions were aggravated by the economic problems China experienced after the failed “great leaps,” which prompted Beijing to cancel deliveries to the DPRK that the North Koreans sorely needed.

As the Sino-Soviet rivalry for leadership in the communist camp continued to grow, but before it had turned into an open split, the DPRK enjoyed the comfortable position of being politically wooed by both socialist neighbors. The GDR, however, was unable to match Pyongyang’s position. The East German state relied heavily on Soviet political support throughout its existence, but it was especially dependent on Moscow during the Berlin crisis of 1958-1961. During those years, the ties between East Germany and North Korea were a mirror image of the USSR-DPRK relationship. In fact, the Soviet and the Eastern European ambassadors in Pyongyang banded together to exchange information and share assessments of developments in the domestic and foreign policy of the secretive North Korean state.³²

For example, it was through his Soviet colleague Pusanov that GDR ambassador Kurt Schneidewind was informed in August 1960 about the trip Kim Il Sung took to the Soviet Union after his meetings with Mao Zedong in Beijing in May. In Moscow Kim had allegedly promised not to follow the Chinese on their course against the Soviets and had rejected Mao’s overtures. Khrushchev had promised him more economic support if the DPRK gave up the Chinese-inspired “flying horse” (Chollima). The Soviet leader had also advised him to become more flexible towards South Korea by learning from the experience of the supposedly more sophisticated East Germans. According to Pusanov, the Presidium of the KWP followed these suggestions by refraining from disproportionate leaps in the economy, by creating a special office for South Korean affairs and by financially supporting the Socialist Mass Party in the ROK. After Ambassador Schneidewind received his confidential briefing on these developments, he noted privately that his Soviet colleague was too optimistic and had minimized the problems posed by the ongoing economic and political “mistakes” of the North Korean communists. Schneidewind shared this more realistic assessment with his ambassadorial colleagues from Czechoslovakia, Poland and with “other diplomats from socialist countries.”³³

In a meeting with Czechoslovak Ambassador Kohousek on 2 February 1961, Ambassador Schneidewind exchanged impressions about what the KWP rank and file knew about the conflicts between the USSR and the PRC. Both came to the conclusion that the North Korean leadership was hiding such information even from members of their Central Committee, not to mention regional and local officials, in order not to disturb the faithful party functionaries. Furthermore, Schneidewind and Kohousek noted North Korean hypocr-

isy. Even in internal conversations the DPRK leadership had still not acknowledged the assistance the DPRK had received from the Soviet Union and East Europe since 1956, and instead maintained that they had achieved economic success “without foreign aid.” While the North Koreans were pressuring the Eastern Europeans for further credits, they simultaneously increased the service fees charged to foreign embassies, which prompted the Czechoslovak ambassador to request that the North Korean embassy in Prague be charged the same amount. What disturbed the socialist ambassadors even more was the increasing level of investment and trade in North Korea by Japan, West Germany and other Western countries.³⁴

In a report to the GDR Foreign Ministry the following month, [See Document 1] the Pyongyang Embassy noted that the DPRK still seriously underestimated the role of the Soviet Union and relied heavily on the Chinese Communist Party. The embassy harshly criticized the personality cult and the historical legends about Kim Il Sung displayed in the Museum of the Patriotic Liberation War, as well as all over the country. Instead of studying the works of Marx, Engels, and Lenin, the embassy reported, North Korean party propaganda was solely and completely oriented toward the “wise teachings of our glorious leader, Comrade Kim Il Sung.” “Mystic ideas of Confucianism” were prevalent, as well as “nationalist tendencies” to falsely portray feats accomplished in the DPRK by foreigners as resulting from indigenous “heroism” of a sort found exclusively in North Korea.³⁵

In a report from June 1961, however, the GDR embassy reported significant improvement with respect to each of these problems, with the notable exception of the personality cult. The North Koreans had publicly acknowledged the leading role of the Soviet Union in world communism, had recognized the economic support they had received from their Soviet and East European allies, and had followed the latter’s advice to distance themselves from the Chinese and Albanian communists. According to Ambassador Schneidewind’s analysis, the massive economic problems created by the reductions in Chinese exports to the DPRK made the North Koreans increasingly turn to the Soviet Union for economic help. For political reasons the USSR was ever more eager to comply, although, suffering from domestic economic shortages, it was not to able to meet all the North Korean demands.³⁶

In the wake of these concessions, there was a honeymoon period in North Korean-Soviet relations, and consequently in North Korean-GDR relations as well. From 29 June to 10 July 1961, a DPRK delegation led by Kim Il Sung visited the Soviet Union and signed a Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation that required both sides to fight with “Leninist unforgiveness against all forms of revisionism, dogmatism, sectarianism and deviations from the principles of socialist internationalism.” The Soviet Union was very pleased with this anti-Chinese commitment and Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko generously declared that the earlier North Korean orientation toward China had been a temporary aberration. Soon after the visit to Moscow, Kim Il Sung and his delega-

tion traveled to Beijing and signed a friendship communiqué with China that welcomed the Soviet-North Korean treaty and focused its rhetorical attacks on the USA and South Korea, rather than on the Soviet Union.³⁷ The Fourth KWP Party Congress held 11-18 September 1961 confirmed in the eyes of the GDR and its allies the substantial progress made in relations with the DPRK. In his speech to the congress, Kim Il Sung recognized the leading role of the Soviet Union, accepted its policy of “peaceful coexistence” and acknowl-

Taiwan, during the first half of 1962 leading representatives of the DPRK began to discuss an offensive “liberation” of South Korea while ridiculing the Soviet concept of “peaceful coexistence” with capitalist countries. When Pak Chun-hyok, head of the International Division of the KWP Central Committee, volunteered aggressive remarks to this effect to the acting GDR ambassador, the latter immediately informed his Czechoslovak colleague, who in turn briefed the Soviet ambassador, who then invited the GDR representative to the

Since Kim was wedded to his own “personality cult,” he naturally viewed the Soviet critique of this phenomenon as a threat and thus shifted to an anti-Soviet, pro-Chinese stance.

edged the international support North Korea had received. Kim proposed the creation of a Marxist-Leninist party for South Korea and made a commitment to the peaceful reunification of the country. With delegations from communist parties all over the world present and a second wave of de-Stalinization underway in the USSR, the KWP leadership made no reference to the personality cult. Even the display of propaganda in Pyongyang was toned down during the congress.³⁸

By the end of 1961, however, the honeymoon was over. Although Moscow and its allies counted the DPRK in the Soviet camp in September 1961, on 12 December Soviet Ambassador Pusanov reported to his communist colleagues in P'yongyang (except those from the PRC, Albania and Vietnam, who were pointedly excluded from his briefing) that the recent KWP Central Committee session had made unsatisfactory commentaries on the 22nd Party Congress of the CPSU, where excessive personality cult had been condemned. The Soviet ambassador further noted that nationalistic propaganda was again appearing in the DPRK. For example, the North Koreans had boasted that they had created an entirely new type of tractor within one month. In fact, the tractor in question was an exact copy of a model from a factory in the Soviet city of Kharkov, a blueprint of which had been brought back by North Korean specialists who had been trained there. Such examples were not rare: “The present comrades ambassadors confirmed this by providing additional cases.”³⁹ Three days later the ambassadors of Bulgaria, Poland, Hungary, and the GDR met as a small group to further discuss the recent developments in the Soviet Union and in their host country. All of them agreed that the influence of the pro-Chinese forces in the KWP leadership had increased and that Kim Il Sung had made concessions to them. Since Kim was wedded to his own “personality cult,” he naturally viewed the Soviet critique of this phenomenon as a threat and thus shifted to an anti-Soviet, pro-Chinese stance.⁴⁰

Taking Sides in the Sino-Soviet Conflict, 1962-1965

Pro-Chinese tendencies markedly increased beginning in early 1962. Mirroring the PRC's aggressive stance toward

Soviet embassy to discuss the conversation. The East German reported that Park had stated that real “war cannot be separated from class warfare” and that “peaceful reunification” could only come about by driving the “US imperialists” out of the South by force. After news of this report circulated among the fraternal diplomats, they all became worried about the unpredictable North Koreans, who were apparently following the radicalism of the Chinese and Albanians in disregarding the principle of “peaceful coexistence” propagated by Moscow.[See Document 2] The communist countries of the Soviet camp, whose support for an armed incursion into South Korea the DPRK wanted to solicit, regarded such military action against the South as extremely dangerous and “adventurist.”⁴¹ After the Soviet and East European governments signaled this position to Kim Il Sung in June 1962, the North Korean leader softened his rhetoric, and the talk about imminent military actions against the South subsided. A few months later Kim Il Sung again referred to the “peaceful solution” of the Korean question.

The DPRK leadership nonetheless did not completely abandon its anti-Soviet polemics and pro-Chinese stance. During and after the Cuban Missile Crisis of October 1962, the Chinese declarations on the crisis were widely reported to the North Korean public, along with declarations of DPRK solidarity with the Caribbean island, but almost no mention was made of Moscow's statements. Soviet reactions to the US ultimatum were portrayed as cowardly and defensive. One should not “beg the imperialists for peace, but fight them over it,” Pyongyang declared. To the even further dismay of the USSR, the DPRK fully sided with the PRC during the Sino-Indian border clashes. Subsequently, the Soviet Union decided to defer a decision on the North Korean request made by a DPRK military delegation to Moscow to deliver modern anti-aircraft systems free of charge.⁴²

Further evidence that North Korea was siding with the PRC came from reports the GDR embassy obtained from the new Czechoslovak ambassador to Pyongyang, Moravec, after he returned from the Party Congress in Prague in December 1962. The DPRK guest at the Czechoslovak Party Congress had fully supported the “provocative” statements

of the PRC delegation and the North Korean delegation's leader, Vice-premier Yi Chu-yon, had provided East European delegates with a telling performance. He had placed two apples on the table, defining the left one as China and the right one as the Soviet Union. He then placed a third one in the middle, called it "Korea" and cut it right through with a knife. He asked the bystanders whether one half of "Korea" should go to the right and one to the left. Answering the question himself, he declared that to be impossible and asked his listeners for understanding of North Korea's difficult situation. After Sino-Soviet differences became public, the North Koreans were forced to make a decision, Yi explained, but they would have preferred to maintain friendship with both the PRC and the USSR.⁴³

North Korean polemics against "peaceful coexistence" continued as the DPRK now openly adopted Chinese positions. To the GDR, these statements were "un-marxist and adventurist," according to an analysis of April 1963. It was indeed "adventurist," when the KWP declared in December 1962 that only "massive strikes" against the "imperialist enemy" would eliminate the danger of war in the long run, and that nuclear confrontation should not be feared since the "power of revolutionary spirit is stronger than any nuclear bomb." When Yi Chu-yon led a North Korean delegation to the GDR in September 1962, he lectured the East Germans that the building of the Berlin Wall in August 1961 had been a half-hearted measure. Had they acted more aggressively, the moment would have arrived "to finish up Berlin." The "imperialists," according to Yi Chu-yon, would not go to war over Berlin. Now "the time had come" to courageously explore a favorable moment for action.⁴⁴

In October 1962 Kim Il Sung's speeches for domestic consumption again oriented the KWP towards the autarkic "Juche" policy, exhorting North Koreans that the proper course was to "create everything by one's own strength."⁴⁵ Aside from this rhetoric, however, which was intended for the general population and for lower-ranking party members, the North Korean leadership was actually quite pragmatic with regard to matters of foreign economic assistance. Their policy was to attempt to reap the utmost benefits from any socialist or capitalist country while giving as little as possible in return. In contrast to the political sphere, there were no real ideological predispositions in economic matters. In 1962 and 1963, despite all the pro-Chinese rhetoric, trade with the Soviet Union was greater than with the PRC. Such pragmatism, however, was rather the result of economic desperation than of astuteness.

When the Soviet ambassador in Pyongyang met with the first secretaries of the embassies of the GDR, Poland, and Czechoslovakia in October 1963, the Soviet representative complained about the difficult negotiations with the North Koreans, the futile attempts to agree on trade based on reciprocity (Korean exports of precious and non-ferrous metals vs. imports of basic goods) and the tendency of the DPRK to play the socialist countries off their capitalist partners.⁴⁶ But the latter was not a realistic option. In 1964 the DPRK planned to have 10 percent of its foreign trade with non-socialist coun-

tries but it fell far short of those ambitions. In actuality, despite the boastful rhetoric of "Juche," North Korea relied heavily on other socialist countries. It had to accept massive trade deficits and repeatedly admit that the goods it had promised to deliver to its partners were of low quality and in insufficient quantity. Overall the DPRK lagged behind such obligations by 15 to 20 percent. When GDR Ambassador Otto Becker invited a North Korean delegation to the bi-annual Leipzig Spring Fair in 1964, Deputy Premier Yi Chu-yon had to turn down this offer, explaining that it would be 1967 before the DPRK would reach a quality standard for its products high enough to qualify it to attend a fair in Europe.⁴⁷

After 1963, North Korea's pro-Chinese policy resulted in its decision to significantly reduce its political contacts with all the East European socialist countries and the USSR, and the economic aid from those countries was consequently on the verge of expiring. Instead, the DPRK promoted contacts with "revolutionary" forces in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. The years 1963 and 1964 marked the lowest point in the relations between the DPRK and the GDR,⁴⁸ notable for incidents of stone throwing, attempted burglaries and the "kidnapping" of the GDR embassy dog, named Dina.⁴⁹ With regard to cultural contacts, the GDR had no exchange with North Korea besides official delegations. Instead, the DPRK promoted contacts with "revolutionary" forces in Asia, Africa and Latin America. Even marriages between Koreans and citizens from Eastern Europe were unwelcome. Without shying away from racism, the DPRK regime demoted Korean partners of such couples from Pyongyang to the countryside and pressured them to divorce their European spouses.⁵⁰ The GDR embassy, internally comparing those practices to Nazi Germany, sometimes obtained information about the fear, mistrust, poverty, and ignorance that increasingly characterized the DPRK. [See Document 5.] Their sources were North Koreans who had previously lived in the GDR or East German citizens who had joined them as spouses.⁵¹

In 1964, tensions between the DPRK and the Soviet bloc increased. Yi Chu-yon went on a tirade in an exchange with Soviet Ambassador Moskovski in June 1964, accusing the USSR, the GDR, and Czechoslovakia of unwillingness to help North Korea. The DPRK was poor, the vice-premier said, and in need of outside help. Even capitalist states would grant credits, but the socialist countries refuse them and "just like to see money." After having generously extended credits to North Korea for many years without realistic expectation of their being repaid, the East Europeans now turned a cold shoulder to the DPRK. Pyongyang's attempts to lure countries like the GDR from the Soviet orbit and improve economic relations with them one at a time were unsuccessful. The East Europeans and the Soviets resisted such pressure, calculating correctly that in the long run China's poor economic performance would aggravate problems within the DPRK and make Pyongyang reconsider its ideological leanings toward the PRC.⁵²

In July, the CPSU Central Committee sent a letter to the KWP Central Committee calling for an international meeting of all communist parties to discuss current tensions. The

Korean party responded the following month with a lengthy statement that it forwarded to all the foreign communist representatives in Pyongyang. This message was delivered to the GDR embassy in a sealed envelope without an address, cover letter or any further explanation. The North Korean statement blamed the USSR for being solely responsible for the division and consequent potential weakening of the worldwide communist movement.⁵³ At the time, this reply seemed to signal Pyongyang's definitive break with Moscow, but in actuality, North Korea never fully broke with any partner it regarded as potentially useful for navigating through the constantly changing politics of the communist camp. When a new Soviet ambassador arrived in Pyongyang in June 1965, Kim Il Sung received him personally just five days after he presented his credentials. At the meeting, Kim seemed pleased by the recent visit of Soviet premier Alexei Kosygin and thanked the ambassador for Moscow's renewed military aid. He stressed the need for unity within the communist movement, regretted that the Sino-Soviet conflict made it impossible for him to visit Moscow, and gave his approval for North Korean-Soviet contacts below the "official" level.⁵⁴ Soviet military and economic assistance then resumed and even substantially increased,⁵⁵ as the Chinese partners, true to Soviet predictions, proved their limited economic usefulness.

Indeed, according to a lucid analysis by GDR ambassador Horst Brie in July 1965, Kim Il Sung maintained that no country had suffered as much from the Sino-Soviet rivalry as the DPRK. North Korea had been unable to develop economically, and instead had been forced to endure four years of stagnation since 1961. They had quickly regretted their shift to the Chinese in late 1961 because they suspected that the Chinese aim was to make the DPRK "dependent" on the PRC. The Chinese had requested that a commission be established to monitor the use of aid from the PRC, which contributed to an anti-Chinese backlash among the North Korean leadership. Furthermore, the passive, anti-Moscow attitude of the PRC with regard to aiding North Vietnam demonstrated to the North Koreans that only the Soviet Union could deliver the desired military hardware and serve as a guarantor of the DPRK's existence. When in 1966 the Cultural Revolution suddenly turned the PRC into a threat to the survival of the Pyongyang leadership, China forever lost its exclusive grip on North Korea.

Equidistant and Back in Business, 1966-1977

China's Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, which Mao Zedong instigated in 1966, represented a serious threat to Kim Il Sung's autocracy, and consequently changed once again the course of DPRK foreign relations. At the KWP party conference held 5-12 October 1966, Kim Il Sung denounced the PRC ideologically, without calling it by name, as practicing "left opportunism," stimulating people with "arch-revolutionary slogans to act in extremes" and promoting "nihilist tendencies renouncing all of the past." This would be no less dangerous for the communist movement, he declared, than the "modern revisionism" with which he had

charged the Soviet Union.⁵⁶ As the Cultural Revolution progressed, Kim Il Sung was denounced in China as a "bourgeois revisionist." The PRC and the DPRK massed troops along their Yalu River border and even fought some minor clashes.⁵⁷ Kim perceived himself to be in a two-front-war against the Americans in the south and the Chinese in the north, a struggle he could not sustain.

This period was apparently traumatic for Kim Il Sung, as he confided years later to East German leader Erich Honecker. "Relations with China were poor during the Cultural Revolution," the North Korean leader told Honecker in 6 December 1977. [See Document 6.] "China agitated against the 'Korean revisionists' over loudspeakers that were set up along the entire Sino-Korean border. But if the DPRK improves relations with China, it need not worry about the US. The DPRK cannot simultaneously concentrate troops in the North and in the South. This is why the DPRK has endeavored to improve relations since the end of the 'Cultural Revolution.'"⁵⁸ It had to wait five years for this improvement, however. "We had to be patient," Kim told Honecker in May 1984. He also admitted that both countries had been on the brink of war in 1969; "There were provocations in North Korea at the time of the Chinese/Soviet conflicts on the Ussuri. While I was recuperating in the countryside, I received a call from our Minister of State Security [telling me] that Chinese troops were crossing the Tyumen River onto our territory. I gave the order not to shoot, but to let them come ahead so that we could take them on our territory, if necessary. We sent a group of soldiers there. Then the Chinese withdrew."⁵⁹

During the years of the Cultural Revolution in China, the DPRK again moved closer to the USSR and its East European allies. Officially Pyongyang now claimed to maintain equidistance from Moscow and Beijing, but it signed a major economic assistance agreement with the Soviet Union on 2 March 1967.⁶⁰ The GDR had received several DPRK delegations since 1965, including ones from the North Korean military, and by 1967 Berlin again characterized the bilateral relations as positive.⁶¹ On a visit to the GDR in July 1967, Yi Yong-ho, deputy chairman of the Presidium of the DPRK's Supreme People's Assembly, pleaded for concerted efforts by all socialist countries to save North Vietnam "using every means." [See Document 4.] The KWP advocated "unity and solidarity among all the socialist countries," and insisted that the communist parties "must truly fulfill the Moscow Declaration" of 1960, which had by then also been signed by the PRC. Differences between parties should be regarded as "internal matters of the parties," according to Pyongyang's new line.⁶²

While Sino-Soviet tensions were at their peak, the GDR and the DPRK exchanged several official delegations. Two of these visits resulted in agreements to extend credit and economic assistance to North Korea—the 5 February 1966 "Agreement between the Ministry of Foreign Trade and Domestic German Trade of the GDR and the Ministry of Foreign Trade of the DPRK on the Supply of Complete Systems and Equipment" and the 20 March 1972 "Agreement on Providing a Loan from the GDR for Supplies and Services for Estab-

lishing a Facility for Processing Zinc Residue in the DPRK.” However, the Korean side was either unable or unwilling to meet the obligations it had agreed to. As a consequence, in December 1977 these agreements were annulled—treated as though they had never been active—and replaced with a new long-term and comprehensive follow-up agreement.⁶³

Domestically, after 1966 the DPRK increased military readiness and incited war hysteria. Although the policy of strengthening defense at the expense of economic develop-

considered it a privilege that the visit of its highest-ranking Politburo delegation since 1956 went ahead as scheduled in April 1968. Despite the tensions following the Pueblo affair, Kim Il Sung received the East German visitors and briefed them on DPRK-PRC relations.⁶⁹

Pyongyang’s bellicose stand changed abruptly in response to the Sino-American rapprochement that culminated in US President Richard Nixon’s trip to China in February 1972. In response to this political earthquake, the DPRK

China’s Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, which Mao Zedong instigated in 1966, represented a serious threat to Kim Il Sung’s autocracy.

ment was apparently disputed within the KWP, at the plenary session held 28 June to 3 July 1963 Kim Il Sung succeeded in purging the Central Committee of opponents voicing such concerns.⁶⁴ In the aftermath of that event the personality cult around Kim Il Sung reached new heights. He was portrayed as having been the sole leader against the Japanese occupation before 1945. In the forest of the Paekdu Mountains historic fireplaces and trees were “discovered” where Kim Il Sung allegedly led the partisans in their struggle against the Japanese. North Korean propaganda announced that in the whole world there was no mother with such a magnificent son as Kim Il Sung. When the Foreign Minister of Cambodia visited the DPRK, he was encouraged to lay memorial wreaths at the graves of Kim Il Sung’s parents and grandparents.⁶⁵

The DPRK instigated numerous violent border incidents, and infiltrated special forces into South Korean territory as far as seven to ten kilometers south of the armistice line. These acts were accompanied by claims that “revolutionary uprisings” by “armed partisans” had occurred in the South and “patriotic forces” would further gain strength there. “Liberation” was near, and the North Korean masses were ready to “destroy the enemy” in the South whenever Kim Il Sung ordered them to do so.⁶⁶ North Korea gained international notoriety for the spectacular seizure of the American electronic intelligence ship USS Pueblo in January 1968.⁶⁷ For domestic consumption by the KWP membership and the North Korean population, official propaganda invented fictitious American and South Korean attacks and heroic stories about how those had been successfully repelled by the vigilant DPRK. Foreshadowing the seizure of the Pueblo, Yi Yong-ho had already announced to the East Germans in July 1967 the DPRK’s readiness to strike at the Americans when they were “doing dumb things.” As he explained, “now and then we have to break their bones so that they don’t get even more fresh. [...] The Korean People’s Army is trained as cadre. The people are armed. [...] More than 30 percent of the budget annually goes to military purposes. If our enemies attack us again, we fully intend to liberate South Korea.”⁶⁸ The GDR

joined the ROK in an unprecedented joint unification statement issued 4 July 1972, surprising both the communist and the non-communist worlds. In a conversation with East German communists on 31 July, DPRK ambassador to East Berlin, Lee Chang Su, explained this move as a “tactical measure” intended to reunite Korea by forcing American troops and Japanese investors out of the South. He claimed this new strategy had been authorized at a KWP meeting in November 1971,⁷⁰ shortly after Henry Kissinger’s second and “open” visit to Beijing that year. Regardless of their provenance, the plans for a confederation quickly fell apart over the insurmountable differences between the two Korean states and their rulers, as well as over the all too obvious strategy of the DPRK to gain everything while yielding little. Kim Il Sung explained the turn back to confrontation in a lengthy letter to the leaders of the communist parties in July 1973,⁷¹ predictably placing blame exclusively on the Americans and South Koreans.[See Document 5]

Bilateral relations between the DPRK and the GDR went smoothly and unspectacularly after the early 1970’s. Berlin and Pyongyang maintained a rather low key but constant exchange of delegations, conducted negotiations on trade issues, signed agreements and sometimes implemented them. Since the socialist countries loyal to Moscow came to view the PRC as an ever more dangerous enemy, the GDR considered its relations with the DPRK as a contribution toward helping the North Koreans steer the proper course between Moscow and Beijing.⁷²

In 1977 East German Secretary General Erich Honecker made the first visit ever by a GDR leader to East Asia, staying in Mongolia, Vietnam, and North Korea. In Pyongyang⁷³ he issued a joint declaration with Kim Il Sung [See Document 6]. His delegation signed a Consular Treaty and a carefully crafted Agreement of Economic and Scientific-Technological Cooperation for 1978 to 1984, which was based on a pattern of reciprocity proposed to Honecker by Kim Il Sung himself: East German technology and facilities vs. North Korean raw materials and labor. Besides the official talks, the GDR visitors received an “impressive reception by the people of

Pyongyang,” toured a tractor plant, attended an opera performance, and enjoyed a rally staged for both leaders in the Sports Palace, attended by 20,000 people.

As a matter of course, during their personal meeting, Honecker and Kim boasted to each other about the successful performance of their respective countries on the path towards socialism. Kim, the absolute ruler of a country famous as an economic laggard made the astonishing claim that “the higher the standard of living climbs, the more ideologically lazy and the more careless the activity” of the people is—a statement no East German leader could have gotten away with making. Concerning foreign policy, Honecker emphasized the leading role of the Soviet Union and the close and unshakeable ties between the GDR and the USSR. In harsh words the East German leader criticized the PRC, which had characterized the Soviet Union as the “number one enemy.” Beijing’s criticism of NATO for not building up enough arms against the Soviet Union was tantamount to “an encouragement to wage war against the GDR,” Honecker declared. Kim Il Sung was less willing to commit himself, invoking North Korean non-interference in the polemics between the PRC and the USSR. He cautiously put some distance between the DPRK and China, but also reminded Honecker that Korea had a 1,500 kilometer-long border with China. Although acknowledging that their bilateral relations had improved after the “Cultural Revolution,” Kim declared that the DPRK would “not agree with everything China does,” would not be a “blind follower” of the PRC and would not accept “Chinese assertions such as the characterization of the Soviet Union as Social Imperialism.” Noting that “there are people who believe the DPRK is more on China’s side,” Kim emphatically asserted that “this is not the case.”

Finally, the North Korean leader agreed to the drafting of a treaty of mutual friendship between the two countries in preparation for his forthcoming visit to the GDR. Although this visit would not take place any time soon, allegedly for reasons of Kim’s health and the situation on the Korean peninsula, drafting the various agreements between the two countries kept political and technical delegations busy. As a result of Honecker’s stay in Pyongyang, the GDR Politburo even followed suggestions from Pyongyang to change, effective immediately, the official German name for North Korea from KVDR (Korean People’s Democratic Republic) to KDVR (Korean Democratic People’s Republic). The newly emerged personal ties between the two leaders also sent a clear message to the East German embassy in Pyongyang and the Foreign Ministry in Berlin. Internal criticism of Kim Il Sung and his personality cult or open hints at the poor North Korean performance with regard to trade were from now on the equivalent of doubting the judgment of Erich Honecker, and thus suicidal for a political career in the GDR. An era of reciprocal byzantinism in North Korean–East German relations was emerging.

Byzantinism and the Embrace of the Autocrats, 1978-1989

Even though the exchange of delegation visits contin-

ued, as did GDR economic and technological assistance to the DPRK, it nonetheless took almost seven years for Honecker and Kim to resume where they had left off in December 1977. In May 1984, Kim Il Sung departed on an extensive tour to the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, and East Germany, his first stay in Eastern Europe since his visits in 1956. Everywhere during his journey, the 72-year-old Kim had his special bed, his personal toilet, and his personal doctors from Eastern Europe.⁷⁴ In addition he received a staged North-Korean-style welcome, especially from the East Germans, with “enthusiastic masses” lining up along his travel route. Taking this organized demonstration of devotion at face value as an expression of friendship, he was even more deeply impressed that the people had gathered despite the rainy weather. Kim Il Sung mentioned the GDR “masses in the rain” frequently during his visit and over and over again years later to East German political visitors in Pyongyang.

In his first political talk with Erich Honecker on 30 May, [See Document 7] Kim Il Sung focused on the achievements and prospects of his country. With the achievement of the goals identified at the 6th Party Congress of the KWP in 1981, the DPRK would approach the economic level of developed nations by 1990, Kim declared. In order to fulfill these ambitious plans, the KWP set as its first task the reclaiming of marshland from the sea, to overcome the problem of limited arable land. “The entire party and all of the members of the army are engaged in realizing this,” Kim informed Honecker. Once the problem of water supply has been resolved, the North Korean slogan encapsulated all that would come true: “Rice—that’s Communism!”

If the planned output level of non-ferrous heavy metals was also achieved, then, according to Kim, the “currency” issue would be solved as well, and the DPRK could repay its foreign debt of 400 million dollars, which it owed primarily to France, Austria, Sweden, and Denmark. For exploiting brown coal deposits, constructing electrical power plants and automating its industry, however, North Korea would rely on support from its socialist friends. According to Kim, the DPRK currently suffered from a shortage of labor because so many young people had to join the army to “confront imperialism.” With some East German help in setting up automated production, this problem could also be overcome. Since South Korean forces combined with the American troops stationed in the ROK would be militarily superior to the DPRK, there would be no way to attack them with any chance of victory. Therefore, with his vision focused on economic realities, Kim told Honecker how to bring about Korean unification: “We must also show the South Koreans the superiority of socialism, just as you show that to the West Germans.”⁷⁵

The second day of talks, 31 May, was devoted to a long presentation of East German achievements in building “socialism” and a discussion of foreign policy matters. [See Document 8.] Honecker primarily asked Kim questions about China, since the GDR had no “party relations” with the PRC, nor did the East Europeans or Soviets. Kim used this opportunity to praise his “long-time friend” Deng Xiaoping and the new party chairman Hu Yaobang. According to Kim, the

latter had a sincere desire to improve relations with Moscow and had asked him to convey that message to the Soviet leadership. The Chinese, Kim stated, “did not want war.” They would instead need time to overcome the negative consequences of the Cultural Revolution. For that reason, their relations with the United States and Japan were not directed against the Soviet Union, but rather toward “obtain[ing] developed technology and credit” from the capitalist countries. Every time the Chinese had met with the Japanese and the Americans, they had conveyed such an explanation to the DPRK, beginning with Mao and Zhou Enlai back in 1972. Urging that all socialist countries improve relations with the PRC, Kim Il Sung pleaded, “If we leave China to the capitalists, there is the risk that China will become a quasi-colony again. We should not close the door in China’s face [...] How good would it be for all of us if the Soviet Union and China would reconcile.”⁷⁶

In their concluding conversation the next day [See Document 9], Kim Il Sung and Erich Honecker agreed finally to sign the first Treaty of GDR-DPRK Friendship and Cooperation, originally drafted in late 1977. They furthermore agreed on a new Agreement on Economic and Scientific Cooperation between the two states covering the period up to 1990. Kim Il Sung was delighted about the prospective East German support, particularly the delivery of a semi-conductor plant. He admitted that the DPRK had purchased “through unofficial channels” an incomplete plant from Japan. This purchase would not have been necessary, Kim explained, if he had learned earlier, and not just during the preparation for his visit to the GDR, of the advanced status of electronics in East Germany. He also stated that he had not known of the East German production of synthetic rubber and herbicides, goods the DPRK had thus far purchased from capitalist countries. Unfortunately, the North Korean “cadres had not been provided sufficient guidance” on assessing the economic power of the GDR, so that Kim, the infallible leader, “had to criticize the comrades in our embassy for their lack of information” on the spot in Berlin. All that had to change, Kim concluded, and the technological cooperation between the GDR and the DPRK had to be significantly expanded.⁷⁷

What expanded even more were the heartfelt personal ties between the autocrats in Berlin and in Pyongyang, although the former still could not rival the absolute power of the latter, not to mention his unparalleled personality cult. According to the last GDR ambassador in Pyongyang, Hans Maretzki, Honecker felt attracted to Kim Il Sung’s unrestrained personal power and was sincerely impressed by the orchestrated ceremonies during his second visit to the DPRK.⁷⁸ When the Deputy Chairman of the GDR State Council, Manfred Gerlach, talked to Kim Il Sung during a trip to Asia in May 1986 [See Document 10], the North Korean leader expressed his impatience while waiting for the arrival of Erich Honecker, “his best friend and comrade-in-arms.” Referring to the unforgettable “jubilation” of the East German people in 1984, Kim promised to receive Honecker “with extraordinary warmth and personally show him the progress that has been made over the nearly ten years since his last trip to the DPRK.”

Since he had received such a warm visit in the GDR, Kim had asked Honecker to come to North Korea this time in the warm season.⁷⁹

The East German leader reciprocated with an “official friendship visit” to the DPRK from 18-21 October 1986 [See Document 11], which the GDR later called “an impressive and powerful demonstration of the friendship and fraternity between the two parties, states and peoples.” Kim Il Sung pulled out all the stops orchestrating jubilation. In Pyongyang and Nampo hundreds of thousands lined up for Erich Honecker, who was totally taken aback. As he told Kim the next day: “I don’t have the words to describe this. These hours will be unforgettable in the life of our peoples.” The North Korean leader, who had pictures of his 1984 GDR visit shown beforehand on TV to motivate “his people,” seconded: “I do know how guests are welcomed here. But never has it been like yesterday.”

During his four-day stay in the DPRK the East German leader visited Kim’s birthplace in Mangyongdae, the heavy machinery construction plant in Taean and the new West Sea barrage and locks complex. A political demonstration in a P’yongyang stadium and a sports exhibition by 50,000 athletes completed the visit. The two states agreed to intensify relations between the People’s Assemblies and the Foreign Ministries, and signed a new trade agreement and a joint proposal for cultural exchange between 1987 and 1990. Finally, “Comrade Erich Honecker invited Comrade Kim Il Sung to visit the GDR. The invitation was accepted with great joy and sincere thanks.”⁸⁰

In their official meeting on 19 October in Pyongyang’s Presidential Palace, Kim and Honecker displayed a cordial and fraternal harmony in every respect. This time the guest began with an hour-long talk on GDR successes across the board. Re-opening the conversation after a break, the North Korean leader referred to the high chairs especially designed for him because of his back problems and informed his guest that he had his doctor’s permission to use airplanes to travel, for instance, to Moscow or the GDR. In contrast to Honecker, Kim began with a rather critical assessment of the conditions in his country. After almost 40 years of socialism and “juche” propaganda in the DPRK, he bluntly confessed in this intimate setting that North Korea is a “developing country confronted with three basic problems: supplying the population with food, housing and clothing.” He described in detail the process of reclaiming land from the sea by having 300,000 soldiers build the West Sea barrage at Nampo to filter salt water and grow rice on newly acquired fertile soil. On and on Kim Il Sung went in laying out ambitious plans for producing textiles for clothing, building apartments and introducing automation in factories to relieve the people of hard physical labor. Every North Korean citizen would be required to acquire at least one special degree of higher education, since only when they have “achieved a high ideological level, can we train our people to think in collective terms.”

In his foreign policy remarks Kim maintained firmly that the DPRK had no intention of invading South Korea: “We could not do that anyway and we are not going to do it.”

According to Kim, the American forces in the South had stationed 1,000 nuclear warheads and just two of them would be sufficient to completely destroy all of North Korea. He supported Soviet leader Gorbachev's disarmament proposals and enthusiastically welcomed the upcoming visit of Honecker to the PRC: "How nice that is, how positive for socialism," he exclaimed.⁸¹

In the following years several high level talks further deepened the GDR-DPRK relationship. When the First Party Secretary of the District of Berlin, Günter Schabowski, visited Pyongyang on his Asian tour to China, Mongolia, and North Korea, he met Kim Il Sung on 10 May 1988. [See Document 12] At that meeting byzantinism with greetings from and to Honecker continued as well as the relatively open talk by the North Korean leader. According to Kim's assertion, the explanation for the DPRK backlog in trade obligations, as he allegedly confided for the first time to a foreign delegation, were major floods in the DPRK in 1986 and 1987, which "had not been made publicly known internationally. All of the production facilities, railroad tracks, and roads were flooded in the valley where the sintered magnesite is found, production came to a standstill, and there was a great deal of destruction." But now, Kim maintained, all operations had fully resumed and everything that the DPRK had pledged would be delivered. At the same time the massive construction in the capital would continue, as thousands of military personnel engaged in a "200-day-battle" to complete the sites in time for the 13th World Games of Youth and Students in P'yongyang in 1989.⁸²

In July 1988 an official military delegation from the GDR led by Defense Minister Heinz Keßler visited North Korea for a full week, signed a mutual defense agreement, and enjoyed a tour of all the propagandistic sites of Kim Il Sung's regime. [See Document 13] Only the helicopter flight to the demarcation line at the 38th parallel had to be cancelled due to weather conditions. The East German delegation together with the DPRK Defense Minister even climbed 2,744 meters to the peak of Mount Paekdu at the Chinese border. When Minister Keßler handed a letter from Honecker to the North Korean leader, Kim Il Sung asked: "How is my brother and best friend Erich Honecker doing?"⁸³

During the meeting with his "best friend" in October 1986, Kim Il Sung had shared something that he personally claimed to have sensed among the North Korean people, after they had read Erich Honecker's curriculum vitae in their press. "People are sad that such deserving revolutionaries also grow older. We don't have to worry, however, since we have done everything to ensure that future generations will continue our struggle."⁸⁴ It is difficult to imagine the shock and grief Kim Il Sung must have felt upon seeing Honecker ousted from power in October 1989, watching the GDR disintegrate and disappear from the map and seeing another close "friend" from Eastern Europe, Romania's Nicolae Ceausescu, being executed in December 1989.

As if to ensure that the Kim Il Sung dynasty was destined for a very different fate, Kim's distinctive cult reached new heights. The number of trees in the Paekdu Mountains

found with allegedly 50-year old inscriptions on their bark proliferated miraculously. The trees bore messages announcing to Kim Il Sung, the "Sun of Korea," in numerous variations, the birth of his son and worthy successor Kim Jong Il, the "Guiding Star of Korea." As the Soviet Union lost all of its former empire in Eastern Europe and all the socialist rulers of those countries fell from power, the official North Korean news agency announced on 6 January 1990 the discovery of 9,000 trees heralding the rise of Kim Jong Il—the next generation.⁸⁵

Dr. Bernd Schäfer is a Research Fellow at the German Historical Institute in Washington and a Senior Research Scholar of CWIHP. His publications include American Détente and German Ostpolitik, 1969-1972 (Washington, DC: German Historical Institute, 2003); Staat und katholische Kirche in der DDR (The State and the Catholic Church in the GDR) (Köln/Weimar: Böhlau, 2nd edition 1999); The GDR in German Archives: A Guide to Primary Sources and Research Institutions on the History of the Soviet Zone of Occupation and the German Democratic Republic, 1945-1990 (Washington, DC: German Historical Institute, 2002). His current research is on American "Triangular Diplomacy" toward the USSR and China, 1969-1976.

NOTES

¹ Foreign diplomats comprised a small community in Pyongyang. By 1964 there were only twelve foreign embassies in the DPRK.

² Ingrid Muth. *Die DDR-Aussenpolitik 1949-1972. Inhalte, Strukturen, Mechanismen* (Berlin: Ch. Links, 2000): 281.

³ Visit with the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the DPRK on 5 August 1954. GDR Embassy in P'yongyang. Political Archive of the Foreign Office (PolArch AA), Ministry for Foreign Relations (MfAA), A 5575.

⁴ See, e.g. Compilation of material on the aid of friendly countries for the reconstruction of the DPRK economy as summarized from the presentations of the friendly embassies in the Meeting of 24 January 1956. GDR Embassy P'yongyang. PolArch AA, MfAA, A 7013.

⁵ Report on the relations between the GDR and DPRK between 1950 and 1954. GDR Foreign Ministry. PolArch AA, MfAA, A 7077.

⁶ DPRK Embassy in Beijing to GDR Embassy in Beijing. 14 January 1954. GDR Foreign Ministry. PolArch AA, MfAA, A 10213.

⁷ In November 1954 the Korea Solidarity Committee's assignments were extended to Vietnam. It finally ceased such activity in October 1957, when other Soviet bloc countries also replaced their respective solidarity committees with regular bilateral trade relations.

⁸ Communiqué of the Solidarity Committee for Korea and Vietnam with the National Council. 25 October 1957. PolArch AA, MfAA, A 5599.

⁹ Working results of the Solidarity Committee for Korea and Vietnam with the National Council regarding Korea. Undated. PolArch AA, MfAA, C 152/75.

¹⁰ Aid of the socialist states to the DPRK during and after the Korean War. GDR Embassy in Pyongyang. Undated. PolArch, MfAA, C 152/75.

¹¹ Kim Il Sung to Otto Grotewohl, July 1954. PolArch AA, MfAA, A 15148.

¹² Protocol on the visit of the DPRK Prime Minister in Hamhung. German Working Committee Hamhung. 18 May 1956. PolArch AA, MfAA, A 10211.

¹³ Protocol on the meeting with DPRK Prime Minister Kim Il Sung. German Working Committee Hamhung. 1 February 1958. PolArch AA, MfAA, A 10257. Cf. also Rüdiger Frank, *Die DDR und Nordkorea: Der Wiederaufbau der Stadt Hamhung von 1954 bis 1962* (Aachen: Shaker, 1996).

¹⁴ Christian Ostermann, ed., *Uprising in East Germany 1953: The Cold War, the German Question and the First Major Upheaval behind the Iron Curtain* (New York/Budapest: Central European University Press, 2001).

¹⁵ Werner Meissner, ed., *Die DDR und China 1949 bis 1990. Eine Quellensammlung* (Berlin: Akademie, 1995): 74-76.

¹⁶ Protocol of the extraordinary Session of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany (SED) Politburo. January 2, 1956. Foundation Archive of the Parties and Mass Organizations in the Federal Archive (SAPMO-BA), SED Archive (DY 30), J IV 2/2A/464.

¹⁷ Protocol of the Session of SED Politburo. 17 April 1956. SAPMO-BA, DY 30, J IV 2/2 A/491.

¹⁸ On the Draft of the KWP Statute. 11 April 1956. SAPMO-BA, DY 30, J IV 2/20/135.

¹⁹ Cf. an East German assessment of an internal KWP brochure from July 1962. Although the GDR Foreign Ministry could not imagine at that time that those distortions would become ever more fantastical, it bluntly called them in 1963 a 'new link in the chain of misrepresentations of Korean history between 1930 and 1945'. Commentary on the internal party brochure "Our party's revolutionary traditions, acquired during the period of the armed anti-Japanese struggle." GDR Foreign Ministry. 16 May 1963. SAPMO-BA, DY 30, IV A2/20/250.

²⁰ Hans Maretzki. *Kim-ismus in Nordkorea* (Böblingen: Tykve): 13, 14, 17, 33, 43, 45. The author was the last ambassador of the GDR in the DPRK, serving from 1987 through 1990.

²¹ Protocol of the Session of SED Politburo. 15 May 1956. SAPMO-BA, DY 30, J IV 2/2A/496.

²² Protocol of the Extraordinary Session of SED Politburo. 12 June 1956. Protocol of the Meeting of the Politburo with the Korean comrades. 8 June 1956. SAPMO-BA, DY 30, J IV 2/2A/500.

²³ The DPRK had joined Comecon in 1957 as an observer, but withdrew from the organization for good in 1964 to avoid too much foreign knowledge of North Korean affairs and outside "interference" with the DPRK's "independence."

²⁴ Report on the Negotiations conducted in Berlin during the visit of the DPRK Government Delegation. GDR Foreign Ministry. 29 June 1956. PolArch AA, MfAA, A 10276.

²⁵ Protocol of Session of SED Politburo. 2 October 1956. SAPMO-BA, DY 30, J IV 2/2A/521. In 1960, when the GDR ran into serious economic trouble due to the increasing migration of East Germans to the West, Prime Minister Otto Grotewohl sent a letter to Kim Il Sung asking for his understanding of the GDR's inability to fulfill its aid obligations regarding rebuilding the North Korean city of Hamhung (Telegram from Ambassador Kurt Schneidewind to Deputy Foreign Minister Sepp Schwab. 11 November 1960. SAPMO-BA, DY 30, 3646). In May 1961 the DPRK Ambassador in Berlin urgently asked the GDR for 20,000 tons of wheat flour and offered 1,000 kilograms of gold in early 1962 in return. At that time, however, the GDR had no flour itself, nor hard

currency to buy it in the West, nor money to grant the DPRK a credit (Notice on some problems of economic aid for the DPRK. 29 May 1961. SAPMO-BA, DY 30, J IV 2/20/134).

²⁶ Overview on the relations between the GDR and the KDVR. GDR Foreign Ministry. 9 April 1964. SAPMO-BA, DY 30, IV A2/20/253.

²⁷ Note on a conversation between Ambassador Fischer, USSR Ambassador Ivanov and Romanian Ambassador Tatu Shianu on 30 October 1956. GDR Embassy in Pyongyang. 27 November 1956. PolArch AA, MfAA, A 5651.

²⁸ For a discussion of this revolt and purge, see the article by Balazs Szalontai in this issue.

²⁹ Maretzki, p. 45. See also Overview. The sessions of the KWP Central Committee between the 3rd and 4th Party Congress. GDR Foreign Ministry. 4 September 1961. SAPMO-BA, DY 30, IV 2/20/136.

³⁰ Transcript of handwritten Memorandum of GDR Embassy Attaché Glückauf on his conversation with First Secretary of USSR Embassy, Pimenov on 8 November 1956. Pyongyang, 28 November 1956. SAPMO-BA, DY 30, 3646.

³¹ Information. GDR Embassy Pyongyang. 16 February 1962. SAPMO-BA, DY 30, 3646 (Information from CSSR Ambassador Kohousek to GDR Ambassador Schneidewind).

³² By 1964 there were only twelve foreign embassies in the DPRK.

³³ Memorandum on a Conversation in the Soviet Embassy with Comrade Pusanov. GDR Embassy Pyongyang, 30 August 1960. SAPMO-BA, DY 30, IV 2/20/137.

³⁴ Notice on a conversation with CSSR Ambassador, Comrade Kohusek, on February 3, 1961. GDR Embassy Pyongyang. 8 February 1961. SAPMO-BA, DY 30, IV 2/20/137.

³⁵ Information on a few problems in the KWP and in the DPRK. GDR Foreign Ministry. 14 March 1961. SAPMO-BA, DY 30, IV 2/20/137.

³⁶ Some remarks on developments in the DPRK and its relationships. GDR Embassy Pyongyang. 13 June 1961. SAPMO-BA, DY 30, IV 2/20/137.

³⁷ Some problems in the DPRK. GDR Foreign Ministry. 8 August 1961. SAPMO-BA, DY 30, J UV 2/20/136.

³⁸ Ambassador Schneidewind to Deputy Foreign Minister Schwab. Report on the 4th KWP Party Congress. 20 September 1961. SAPMO-BA, DY 30, IV 2/20/135.

³⁹ Report on information from the Ambassador of the USSR in the DPRK received on 12 December 1961. GDR Embassy Pyongyang, 20 December 1961. SAPMO-BA, DY 30, IV 2/20/137.

⁴⁰ Report on a dinner with the Ambassador of the PR Bulgaria on 15 December 1961. GDR Embassy Pyongyang. 21 December 1961. SAPMO-BA, DY 30, IV 2/20/137.

⁴¹ Notice on a conversation of Comrade Stark with Comrade Torbenkov, counselor at the USSR Embassy in the DPRK on 28 March 1962. GDR Embassy Pyongyang. 29 March 1962. SAPMO-BA, DY 30, IV 2/20/137; Information on the reunification policy of the KWP. GDR Foreign Ministry. 5 May 1962. SAPMO-BA, DY 30, IV 2/20/136.

⁴² Information on the DPRK position regarding the measures of the Soviet government on peacefully solving the Cuban conflict and on the Chinese-Indian border conflict. GDR Foreign Ministry. 16 November 1962. SAPMO-BA, IV 2/20/136; Information on the 5th KWP Plenary Session from 10-14 December 1962. GDR Foreign Ministry. 22 December 1962. SAPMO-BA, DY 30, IV 2/20/136.

⁴³ According to the Czechoslovak Ambassador, who returned to Pyongyang on the same airplane as the North Korean delegation, Yi Chu-yon was nervous during the flight about the consequences

awaiting him at home because of his frank political demonstration with the apples. Information on a conversation with the Czechoslovak Ambassador in the DPRK, Comrade Moravec., in the GDR Embassy on 21 December 1962. GDR Embassy Pyongyang. 7 January 1963. SAPMO-BA, DY 30, IV 2/20/137.

⁴⁴ The influence of the Communist Party of China on the policy of the KWP. GDR Foreign Ministry. 8 April 1963. SAPMO-BA, DY 30, IV A2/20/250.

⁴⁵ Information on the governmental statement of Comrade Kim Ir Sen [Kim Il Sung] at the 5th Session of the Supreme People's Assembly of the DPRK on 23 October 1962. GDR Foreign Ministry. 17 November 1962. SAPMO-BA, DY 30, IV 2/20/136.

⁴⁶ Memorandum on a conversation with Comrades Pimenow, Witek and Cicha on 27 October 1963. GDR Embassy Pyongyang. 8 November 1963. SAPMO-BA, DY 30, IV A2/20/253.

⁴⁷ Notice on a conversation with deputy premier and candidate of the Politburo of the KWP Central Committee, Comrade Yi Chuyon, on 9 January 1964. GDR Embassy Pyongyang. 10 January 1964. SAPMO-BA, DY 30, IV A2/20/253.

⁴⁸ Information on positions of KWP leadership concerning the German Question and results of KWP policy on relations between the GDR and the DPRK. GDR Foreign Ministry. 2 September 1964. PolArch AA, MfAA, C 1087/70.

⁴⁹ Information on incidents concerning the GDR Embassy in P'yongyang and the DPRK Embassy in Berlin. GDR Foreign Ministry. 3 April 1964. PolArch AA, MfAA, A 7131.

⁵⁰ Short Version of the Report on Relations by the Embassy of the GDR in the DPRK for the Year 1963. GDR Foreign Ministry. 20 February 1964. SAPMO-BA, DY 30, IV A2/20/251.

⁵¹ Memorandum on information from 29 April 1965. GDR Embassy Pyongyang. 19 May 1965. SAPMO-BA, DY 30, IV A2/20/251. Quite spectacular were the attack on the dark-skinned Cuban ambassador in Pyongyang in March 1965 and the brutal reaction of the DPRK government to the incident. The GDR ambassador and his wife were immediately informed of the event by the shocked Cuban ambassadorial couple. See Incident with the Cuban ambassador and the delegation of physicians from Cuba. GDR Embassy Pyongyang. 2 April 1965. SAPMO-BA, DY 30, IV A2/20/251.

⁵² Memorandum on a conversation with the Ambassador of the USSR, Comrade Moskovski, on 27 June 1964. GDR Embassy Pyongyang. 2 July 1964. SAPMO-BA, DY 30, IV A2/20/251.

⁵³ Unofficial Translation of a Copy of the Letter from the KWP Central Committee to the Central Committee of the CPSU. 28 August 1964. SAPMO-BA, DY 30, 3646.

⁵⁴ Memorandum on the first visit of the Soviet Ambassador, Comrade Gortschakov, on 6 June 1965. GDR Embassy Pyongyang. 11 June 1965. SAPMO-BA, DY 30, IV A2/20/251.

⁵⁵ Lerner, *Failure of Perception*, pp. 663-664.

⁵⁶ Evaluation of the KWP Conference from 5-12 October 1966. GDR Foreign Ministry. 18 November 1966. MfAA Archive.

⁵⁷ Lerner, *Failure of Perception*, pp. 664-665.

⁵⁸ Report on the official friendship visit to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea by the party and state delegation of the German Democratic Republic, led by Comrade Erich Honecker, Secretary General of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany and Chairman of the State Council of the German Democratic Republic, from 8 to 11 December, 1977. 13 December 1977. SAPMO-BA, DY 30, J IV 2/2A/2123, p. 40.

⁵⁹ Memorandum of the meeting between Erich Honecker and Kim Il Sung on 31 May 1984. SAPMO-BA, DY 30, 2460.

⁶⁰ See details on the Soviet aid pledged and delivered in Memorandum on a conversation between Comrade Hermann and Comrade Putivez, 2nd Secretary of the USSR Embassy, on 12 December

1968 in the USSR Embassy. GDR Embassy Pyongyang. 23 December 1968. MfAA Archive.

⁶¹ On the relations between the GDR and the DPRK. GDR Foreign Ministry. 19 April 1967. PolArch AA, MfAA, C 1089/70.

⁶² Memorandum of a meeting between Comrade Hermann Matern, member of the Politburo of the Central Committee, Comrade Hermann Axen, candidate for the Politburo and secretary of the Central Committee, and the delegation from the Supreme People's Assembly of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea on 3 July 1967. Central Committee of the SED, Department of International Relations. 18 July 1967. SAPMO-BA, DY 30, IV 2/2.035.

⁶³ Agreement on the development of economic and scientific-technological cooperation between the government of the German Democratic Republic and the government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. December 1977. SAPMO-BA, DY 30, J IV 2/2A/2123.

⁶⁴ Information on the plenary session of the KWP Central Committee from June 28 to July 3, 1967. GDR Embassy Pyongyang. 4 July 1967. MfAA Archive.

⁶⁵ Information on some new aspects of the KWP position in domestic and foreign policy matters. GDR Embassy Pyongyang. 18 August 1967. MfAA Archive.

⁶⁶ Ibid. See also Memorandum on a conversation of Comrade Werner Lamberz, secretary of the Central Committee, with the ambassador of the DPRK in the GDR, Comrade Ro Su Ek, on 26 February 1968. Central Committee of the SED, Department of International Relations. 26 February 1968. SAPMO-BA, DY 30, 3646.

⁶⁷ See Lerner, *Failure of Perception*; and James Bamford, (New York: Doubleday, 2001): 240-282.

⁶⁸ Memorandum of a meeting between Comrade Hermann Matern, member of the Politburo of the Central Committee, Comrade Hermann Axen, candidate for the Politburo and secretary of the Central Committee, and the delegation from the Supreme People's Assembly of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea on 3 July 1967. Central Committee of the SED, Department of International Relations. 18 July 1967. SAPMO-BA, DY 30, IV 2/2.035.

⁶⁹ Note on the conversations between the Party and Government Delegations of the GDR and the DPRK in Pyongyang on 12 April 1968. Note on Visit of GDR Party and Government Delegation led by Comrade Prof. Kurt Hager with the General Secretary of the KWP and Prime Minister of the DPRK on 16 April 1968. Central Committee of the SED, Department of International Relations. 23 April 1968. PolArch AA, MfAA, C 159/75.

⁷⁰ Don Oberdorfer. *The Two Koreas, A Contemporary History* (New York: Addison Wesley, 1997): p. 25 (Conversation with SED Politburo Member and Secretary of the Central Committee of the SED, Hermann Axen. 31 July 1972).

⁷¹ Information for the Politburo of the Central Committee of the SED. 3 August 1973. Subject: Correspondence from Kim Ir Sen [Kim Il Sung], Secretary General of the Central Committee of the Korean Workers Party, to Comrade Erich Honecker, First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party. 7 July 1973. SAPMO-BA, DY 30, 2460.

⁷² Continuous Chronology DPRK, 1973 (1972, 1971). GDR Foreign Ministry. 15 May 1973 etc. PolArch AA, MfAA, C 161/75.

⁷³ The following paragraphs are based on "Report on the official friendship visit to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea by the party and state delegation of the German Democratic Republic, led by Comrade Erich Honecker, Secretary General of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany and Chairman of the State Council of the German Democratic Republic, from 8-11

December 1977.” 13 December 1977. SAPMO-BA, DY 30, J IV 2/ 2A/2123.

⁷⁴ Oberdorfer, *The Two Koreas*, p. 18.

⁷⁵ Stenographic record. Official friendship visit to the GDR by the Party and State Delegation of the Korean Democratic People’s Republic led by Kim Il Sung, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the KWP and President of the DPRK. 30 May 1984. SAPMO-BA, DY 30, 2460.

⁷⁶ Memorandum on the meeting between Erich Honecker and Kim Il Sung on 31 May 1984. SAPMO-BA, DY 30, 2460.

⁷⁷ Memorandum on the meeting between Erich Honecker and Kim Il Sung on 1 June 1984. SAPMO-BA, DY 30, 2460.

⁷⁸ Maretzki, *Kim-ismus in Nordkorea*, p. 101.

⁷⁹ Joachim Herrmann to Erich Honecker, Enclosure: On the meeting with Kim Il Sung (Report by Manfred Gerlach, ordered by Erich Honecker to be forwarded to all members and candidates of the GDR Politburo). 26 May 1986. SAPMO-BA, DY 30, 2460.

⁸⁰ Report on the official friendship visit by Comrade Erich Honecker, Secretary General of the Central Committee of the SED and Chairman of the State Council of the GDR, to the DPRK from 18-21 October 1986. SAPMO-BA, DY 30, 2460.

⁸¹ Stenographic report on the official negotiations between Comrade Erich Honecker, Secretary General of the Central Committee of the SED and Chairman of the State Council of the GDR, and Comrade Kim Il Sung, Secretary General of the Central Committee of the KWP and President of the DPRK, on 19 October 1986 in the Presidential Palace in Pyongyang. SAPMO-BA, DY 30, 2460.

⁸² Memorandum on the meeting between Kim Il Sung, Secretary General of the KWP, and Comrade Günter Schabowski in Pyongyang on 10 May 1988. SAPMO-BA, DY 30, 2205.

⁸³ Report on a visit of an official GDR military delegation in the DPRK in July 1988; Erich Honecker to Kim Il Sung. 18 July 1988. SAPMO-BA, DY 30, 2508.

⁸⁴ Stenographic report on the official negotiations between Comrade Erich Honecker, Secretary General of the Central Committee of the SED and Chairman of the State Council of the GDR, and Comrade Kim Il Sung, Secretary General of the Central Committee of the KWP and President of the DPRK, on 19 October 1986 in the Presidential Palace in P’yongyang. SAPMO-BA, DY 30, 2460.

⁸⁵ Maretzki, *Kim-ismus in Nordkorea*, p. 34.

DOCUMENT No. 1**Report, Embassy of the GDR in the DPRK to the Foreign Policy and International Department of the Socialist Unity Party, GDR, 14 March 1961**

[Source: SAPMO-BA, Dy 30, IV 2/20/137. Translated by Grace Leonard.]

Foreign Policy and International
19 and 22 March 61
Relations Department
Berlin, 14 March 1961
Confidential

Democratic People's Republic of Korea

Information on a few problems in the Korean Workers Party
and in the Democratic People's Republic of China.

(Prepared by the embassy of the GDR in the DPRK)

Addressing the following issues:

- I. The influence of Chinese interpretations and theories in the DPRK
- II. Kim Il Sung's cult of personality
- III. The status of repatriation to the DPRK of the Koreans living in Japan

I. The influence of Chinese interpretations and theories in the DPRK

1. Corresponding to the Chinese theory of the national economy developing in leaps, our Korean comrades have also attempted to achieve Socialism in great leaps. The Korean version is the so-called "Ch'ollima" movement. As in China, the symbol for it is a winged horse on which a worker is mounted.

(Ch'ollima = winged horse)

Even after the publication of the Moscow declaration, there is talk of "new, even greater and more successful leaps" in reports on the satisfaction of the Five Year Plan and in the formulation of tasks for the Seven Year Plan.

During the course of the Five Year Plan, this theory of leaps led to major disproportions in the national economy, just as it did in the People's Republic of China, and these disproportions were considered legitimate occurrences linked to the building of Socialism.

2. Only in the last year there were measures implemented with the consent agreement of the Central Committee of the Korean Workers Party that amounted to over-centralizing the management of the national economy. Having eliminated nearly all of the ministries and established two super-committees for managing the national economy, now they are again undertaking to form ministries for the individual branches of the national economy.

3. So-called "experimental economies" were created in two areas that include regions of up to 12,000 hectares, and they are organized in precisely the same manner as the Chinese people's communes.

They have even begun to establish a type of urban people's commune, called Housewives Street Brigades, in that housewives and family members form so-called home-worker cooperatives that decide issues of production, societal life, and other things.

4. The same managerial methods are applied in the army as in the Chinese army. The generals must serve as soldiers. There is no individual responsibility. Orders are decided in advance in the Party organization. The army is both a military unit and self-reliant in all areas. Chinese methods have been applied with even greater vigor, especially since the visit by the Chinese military delegation during the last months of last year.

5. There is a strong orientation toward "black and yellow" brothers. This leads to violation of the principle of proletarian Internationalism, especially with regard to the importance of the struggle by the worker class in Europe and in other regions of the world. The roles of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union are still seriously underestimated and the role of the Communist Party of China is overestimated.

II. Kim Il Sung's cult of personality

The cult of personality surrounding Comrade Kim Il Sung has been growing steadily for some time. Everything the Party and the Korean people earn is attributed to Comrade Kim Il Sung. There is no room, no classroom, no public building in which a photo of Kim Il Sung cannot be found. The Museum of the War of National Liberation is designed entirely around the role of Kim Il Sung. There are no less than 12 figures of Kim Il Sung in the rooms of the museum, each larger than the next.

The history of the revolutionary war and the formation of the Communist Party of Korea are not correctly portrayed. The decisive role of the Soviet Union in the liberation of Korea is completely downplayed. Its role is addressed on only a single panel. This is also expressed in the materials as well as in films and depictions. Thus, a legend of Kim Il Sung has been created that does not correspond to the actual facts if one considers what Comrade Kim Il Sung has actually done.

Party propaganda is not oriented toward studying the works of Marxism/Leninism, but rather is solely and completely oriented toward the "wise teachings of our glorious leader, Comrade Kim Il Sung". Many rules of Party life, such as the link to the masses, are portrayed as if they were discovered by Kim Il Sung rather than by Marx, Engels, and Lenin. There are almost no articles or events in which Comrade Kim Il Sung is not mentioned. It is also a fact that all of those who are not in agreement with such an approach are

characterized as sectarians, and recently as revisionists. This demonstrates that criticism and self-criticism in the Party are very poorly developed and in many cases democratic rule is not guaranteed. This is particularly true of the army and state organizations.

How the Korean Comrades view the fight against domination is evident from a statement by Comrade Pak Tin Tsches (spelling from original German document) which he made in his lecture at the 15th anniversary of the foundation of the KWP: "We as Korean comrades have always fought the battle against dogmatism, we have always pursued our own standpoint against that of others". That is naturally a vulgar and false interpretation of the battle against dogmatism. Dogmatism in the Korean Workers Party is closely linked to the mystic ideas of Confucianism, which extend to certain nationalist tendencies. It is frequently stated that only a people like the Korean people is capable of such feats and heroism. All successes, not the least those achieved with the great assistance of the fraternal Socialist nations, especially with the aid of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet people, are portrayed as their own successes. Great feats that were accomplished by the Soviet Union, the CSSR, Poland, and the GDR are portrayed as accomplishments of the Korean workers "without foreign" assistance. It is not coincidental that even after the Statement of the Communist and Workers Parties, neither international cooperation in all fields nor fraternal assistance from the Socialist nations were mentioned or shown any appreciation. Connected to this are also certain efforts not to take part in Socialist works and to underestimate the successes of other peoples in the Socialist camp. These nationalist tendencies are particularly prevalent in films, in the theater and performances, and in lectures.

III. The status of repatriation to the DPRK of the Koreans living in Japan

By the end of 1960, the DPRK had sent 54 repatriation ships to Japan to bring about 53,000 Koreans back to the DPRK. 94% of them had lived in South Korea prior to emigrating to Japan. Among these Koreans are 700 specialists, 300 scientists and artists, 3 doctors of medicine, and 1 doctor in another field. In addition, this group includes 1500 Japanese who also emigrated to the DPRK. (These were primarily Japanese spouses.)

By January 1961 there were markedly fewer announcements and reports on repatriations in the press and on the radio in the DPRK than there had been previously. On 3 February 1961 the Japanese Red Cross announced that the Red Cross of the DPRK had sent a telegram to its Japanese counterpart which read: "To prevent an epidemic of the flu that is in Japan, the repatriation transports are being temporarily suspended." (Announcement in Vertr. Bulletin of the Ztak.)

On 8 February 1961, the Tokyo-based Japanese broadcaster "International Radio" reported that the Japanese Red Cross had sent a telegram to the DPRK that contained the

following:

- Request for immediate dispatch of the 55th repatriation ship
- There are 735 repatriates in Niigata, none of whom are ill with the flu
- Proposal that the repatriates be provided prophylactic inoculations
- Proposal that the DPRK send with the 55th ship physicians whose duties would be to conduct examinations and administer inoculations.

The reasons the repatriation activities were halted are as follows:

1. The repatriates who are already in the DPRK have sent word to those still living in Japan not to come to the DPRK due to the living conditions.
2. Keeping track of the repatriates has proved difficult for DPRK organizations. For instance, our embassy has been able to observe that the younger repatriates, in particular, form groups and show up in Pyongyang, for example. They have their meeting points in the city and in some cases turn out to be "troublemakers".
3. Their clothing, attitude, and manner of personal appearance make them immediately recognizable in the DPRK. Some amenities that were commonplace for them in the past — portable radios, record players, etc., reach the Korean populace this way and lead to inconsistencies and complications in the education of the people, particularly the youth. (Tasks set forth for the youth at the last Central Committee meeting of the Democratic Youth Association: "Resolve difficult and complicated issues — Members of youth organization must be developed into "red soldiers of the Party".
4. The so-called Order Shops (purchasing centrals) currently offer items repatriates brought with them from Japan. Especially bicycles, portable radios, watches, leather jackets, suits, record players, leather purses, records, etc. These things are sold for cash to provide the so-called "material foundation" for the repatriates. Young repatriates in particular sometimes live up to six months on this money and do not pursue any regular employment. They use this time to make deals. This results in perceptible stimulation of the "black market" in the streets.
5. The repatriates, settled by DPRK organizations across the entire country, even in the most remote villages, frequently leave, migrating primarily to major cities.
6. There is dissatisfaction among the women repatriates, as well. In Japan, they were accustomed to having access to a broad range of products in shops and department stores, which is currently not the case in the DPRK.
7. The independent Capitalists and former owners of small and mid-size businesses adapt best and most rapidly to life in the DPRK. The sale of the complete factory equipment they bring with them and models (machines,

spare parts, cars, etc. gave them high profits and great advantages, such as top jobs.

The specialists among the repatriates also fare well, since they are employed in accordance with their special knowledge and abilities. Repatriation has for the most part improved the lot of the farmers, since they were among the groups that suffered most in Japan. (High taxes, extremely poor living conditions.)

Repatriation also brought with it a host of problems for the DPRK in terms of security and vigilance. Since the border between North and South Korea is hermetically sealed, the enemy attempts to infiltrate agents and spies, especially through Japan. The great number of those returning to the DPRK makes it easier for certain trained cadre from foreign intelligence services to penetrate. The possibility of taking personal property [illegible lines]

[illegible] the repatriates also provides an opportunity to introduce technical means of espionage and sabotage into the DPRK (portable radios as transmitters, etc.)

This problem is not acknowledged publicly at all. The facts listed above are observations that have also been made by diplomats from other embassies and that have been confirmed in talks and meetings.



DOCUMENT No. 2

Report, First Extra-European Department, 3 May 1962

[Source: SAPMO-BA, DY 30, IV 2/20/136. Translated by Grace Leonard.]

First Extra-European Department
A/27/219

Berlin, 3 May 1962

Classified Materials no. 101/62

6 copies

Copy 2, 5 pages

Information on the reunification policy of the Korean Workers Party

A new trend has become evident in the reunification policy of the Korean Workers Party since the call by the United Fatherland Front on 15 February 1962. Neither the call nor the campaign conducted thereafter contained any mention of peaceful reunification. This possibility has been replaced with "independent unification of Korea".

1. Comrade Pak Chun-hyok, Director of the First Department, laid out the Korean Workers Party's stance on reunification for the first time in a conversation with Comrade

Stark.

Comrade Pak stated that the current goal is to chase US imperialists out of South Korea. He said this was critical for resolving the national issue in Korea. He stressed that every resource must be used to force the US imperialists to withdraw, since they will not go willingly. This mission also promotes building socialism in the DPRK. He said that the socialist camp is very strong, the national liberation movement is becoming even stronger, etc., and therefore there is no need to ask the imperialists for anything. In this context, regarding the armistice of 1953, he stated that although the DPRK agreed to the armistice, it also agreed to continue to wage the war. There is no other way to wage the war against imperialism. He stressed that war and class struggle are integral parts of one another.

On the issue of driving the US imperialists out of South Korea, he stated that this is a matter for the entire Korean people and one could not wait until the population of South Korea starves. South Korea does not have the strength to drive the US imperialists out by itself.

On the issue of how to drive the US imperialists out, since they will not withdraw peacefully and this would mean war, Comrade Pak responded again that war cannot be separated from class struggle and stressed that the DPRK is fighting for what it sees in the future, that is, reunification of the homeland. He stated that the socialist revolution means eliminating the power of the bourgeoisie and establishing socialism. The only path to socialism is class struggle and socialist revolution.

Comrade Pak furthermore stated that the struggle against imperialism must be waged in all areas, not just in one realm, such as, for example, the economic realm. He stated that peaceful coexistence must serve the socialist revolution, the struggle against colonialism, national liberation, and class liberation. The struggle for peace alone would be something different.

He remarked that disarmament would also be good and that the DPRK would therefore support it, as well.

2. Comrade Kim Tae-hui, Deputy Foreign Minister, spoke to ambassadors and charges d'affaires on 13 April. Comrade Kim stated that the US imperialists had increased their hostile provocations and direct preparations for war in Korea to a new high. In lengthy remarks, he told about specific steps the US had taken and then said that our Korean comrades are currently increasing their defense readiness and have taken measures "to arm the entire population" in order to be prepared for an act of aggression.

He stated that nothing had changed in terms of reunification policy as it had been established at the IV Party Congress. The DPRK has made proposals for peaceful reunification and the population has fought valiantly to make these proposals a reality because there was the possibility of toppling the colonial system in the south. The Americans created a fascist regime since they saw this happening. He said that under these conditions there can be no talk of a policy of peaceful coexistence with respect to the American occupiers.

There can be no negotiations with South Korea if there is no democracy. Therefore, given current conditions, the main task is to fight for democratic rights and freedoms and to fight to topple the Park Chung Hee regime.

Our Korean comrades are for peaceful reunification, but if American imperialism pushes its war propaganda to the extreme, all resources must be used for defense readiness. There can be no peaceful reunification until the American occupiers have been chased out and the Park Chung Hee regime has toppled.

He said that the current situation must be considered more serious than the events in April of 1960. He stated that if the entire Korean populace rose up, as in April 1960, it will be possible to chase the American occupiers out. In conclusion, he said that our Korean comrades are mobilizing all their resources to maintain peace in Korea.

3. Foreign Minister Pak Song-ch'ol also addressed this problem at a meeting with Comrade Schneidewind. Comrade Pak remarked that, based on the situation in South Korea, there could be no talk of the DPRK pursuing a policy of peaceful coexistence or confederation with respect to the south and the occupiers. But this does not mean that the liberation of South Korea will be accomplished by war. The DPRK continues to favor peaceful reunification. But if the DPRK were to speak of peaceful coexistence with regard to the south, democratic forces would lose hope that the Park Chung Hee regime will topple and that the Americans will withdraw.

Our Korean comrades are mobilizing all of their resources in the southern part of the country for toppling the Park Chung Hee regime and are increasing their endeavors for building socialism. They are firmly convinced that the democratic forces in their nation will find the strength to topple Park Chung Hee and to liberate the country from its American occupiers.

Remarks:

1. Comrade Pak Chun-hyok's remarks give the impression that the Korean Workers Party has now backed away from its line supporting peaceful reunification.

On the other hand, Comrades Pak Song-ch'ol and Kim Tae-hui assert that nothing has changed in terms of the objective of peaceful reunification. They base their rejection of the confederation and of peaceful coexistence between the two parts of Korea, and the measures they have undertaken to arm the populace, on stepped-up war preparations on the part of the US Imperialists and on the existence of a Fascist power in South Korea.

It must also be mentioned that Comrade Ch'oe Yong-gon spoke again of peaceful reunification of Korea on 25 April 1962 during an announcement.

It is therefore evident that our Korean comrades' remarks are contradictory.

4. The manner in which Pak Chun-hyok stressed the

strength of the socialist camp in his statements is meant to express the expectation that the socialist nations support this policy.

5. In its current policies, the DPRK is not willing to conduct negotiations with Imperialism. Negotiations with the Imperialists are portrayed as supplications to and weakness before the Imperialists.

6. The statements made by our Korean comrades indicate that they no longer agree that peaceful coexistence is the foundation for the foreign policy of the Socialist nations. This openly places in question the correctness of the resolutions regarding foreign policy at the Moscow Conference and the XXII Party Congress.

7. This Korean Workers Party policy reflects a stronger Chinese/Albanian interpretation.

[signature]
(Stude)
Department Director

Distribution:

1 x Min. Schwab
1 x Central Committee, Foreign Policy Department,
Comrade Ott
1 x Comrade Stude
1 x Information Department
1 x Embassy in Pyongyang
1 x Korea Section Remarks



DOCUMENT No. 3

Report, GDR Embassy in the DPRK, 2 April 1965

[Source: SAPMO-BA, DY 30, IV A2/20/251. Translated by Grace Leonard.]

GDR Embassy in the DPRK
Pyongyang, 2 April 1965

Confidential Matter No. 24/65
3 Copies

Subject: Incident with the Cuban ambassador and the delegation of physicians from Cuba

On 28 March, there was a serious incident at 6:00 p.m. while the Cuban ambassador, his family, and a delegation of physicians from Cuba were touring the city. The Cuban physicians wanted to photograph three columns of a destroyed building that was in an area of new construction and that

dated from the war against the US. A Korean passerby called to Korean residents in the vicinity to act against the Cuban delegation. A large crowd of people gathered quickly, including 100 children, and the crowd pounded the car with their fists, ordered the occupants to get out, and hurled insults, especially against the Cuban ambassador as a black man. It should be added that the Cuban ambassador is currently the only ambassador who has a relatively good basic knowledge of the Korean language and can take part in simple conversations in Korean. Although the Cuban ambassador identified himself as the ambassador of Cuba, both in Korean and in Russian, this had no effect on the crowd's actions.

The militia in the vicinity took no action at all.

The Cuban physicians urged the ambassador to open the car to get out. Once the Cuban ambassador exited the car, the delegation's cameras were taken away from them. At about this time a member of the security service arrived, and when he realized what was going on, he put his hands in front of his face, and, as the Cuban ambassador said, groaned. The Cuban ambassador told me that he believed that this security service member in part recognized the seriousness of what had happened. This member of the security service apparently called an armed security service unit for assistance. As the unit's troops arrived, they proceeded to exercise extraordinary brutality against the crowd, including the children. They struck these people, including the children, with the butts of their weapons. Once the crowd had been driven away from the car, the Cuban ambassador established that the Cuban flag had been torn off and was no longer there. He asked the leader of the security troops to return the flag. Then the security service troops committed even worse acts of brutality against the people in the street and in the nearby houses, demanding that the flag be returned. The Cuban ambassador remarked to me that their actions were so brutal that if he had been Korean and had had the flag, he would have preferred to eat it rather than to give it back.

The Cuban ambassador then proceeded to the Foreign Ministry, where he met first with the department director, then with Deputy Foreign Minister Ho Dam and acting Foreign Minister Kim Yong-nam. According to the Cuban ambassador, the meeting did not end until 3:00 a.m. The Cuban ambassador told me that during this meeting he said that this incident was the result of incorrect political education in the DPRK. He furthermore asserted that during this long meeting he expressed his opinion on all issues related to the behavior of our Korean comrades with respect to foreigners and on issues of internal development (apart from questions about the cult of personality).

The main issue in this meeting was the issue of how this incident should be handled. The Cuban ambassador said that there were two ways to handle the incident. At the state level or at the Party level. The Korean side had to decide how it wanted to handle the incident. He said he was not in communication with Cuba and was thus acting on his own. However, if the decision was made to deal with this at the state level, he would be forced to take the next plane to Moscow and would not be able to return until the incident had been

resolved.

He said that after lengthy discussion our Korean comrades agreed to deal with it at the Party level. The Cuban ambassador then asked to speak with Kim Il Sung. Kim Yong-nam, acting Foreign Minister tried to prevent this at all costs. He proposed to the Cuban ambassador that he speak to Foreign Minister [illegible] in the hospital, since he was also a candidate for the Politburo. Finally, after the Cuban ambassador could not be dissuaded from his request, Kim Yong-nam agreed to convey the request to Kim Il Sung.

Kim Il Sung received the ambassador two days later. He said that he asked for understanding that this meeting had to be brief. This was not because of the incident, but because he was very busy. He asked the ambassador to express his regret for the incident to Fidel Castro and the Cuban leadership, and made assurances that the guilty parties would be punished and measures would be taken to prevent similar incidents in the future. He furthermore said that his deputy, Yi Hyo-sun, was authorized to see to all of the details involved with handling the incident.

Yi Hyo-sun received the Cuban ambassador on the same day for a four-hour meeting. The meeting took place in the building in which the work for South Korea is performed. As they entered these spaces, Yi Hyo-sun told him that no ambassador had ever entered this house outside of Pyongyang. [Apparently a gesture meant to impress the Cuban ambassador..] First Yi Hyo-sun lectured for nearly an hour, stating among other things that the leadership of the Party in the DPRK was at a very low level. He said the cadre do not understand how to perform true political and ideological education, they command the masses and work with instructions and orders. The level of training of the masses is extremely low. They cannot differentiate between friends and foes. They completely misinterpret our call for revolutionary vigilance. All of the militia members who were involved in the incident have been arrested, as well as the members of the Party's district leadership and the Party cadre of the street committee. The Party secretaries of the district committee were also arrested; they were not in Pyongyang during the incident. Those arrested will be held until the investigation has concluded. The Cuban ambassador will be informed of the results. He said Kim Il Sung had also authorized him to hold meetings with the Party cadre in Pyongyang, and that officials from the Foreign Ministry would address issues of behavior toward foreigners at these meetings.

During this meeting, Yi Hyo-sun is also said to have made the following remarks about the issue of differences in views: The leadership of the Korean Workers Party is in complete agreement with Fidel Castro's speech. The DPRK would also like to take the same stance on issues of differences in views as the Cuban leadership. This is not possible at present. We will also not publish Soviet or Chinese articles in the future. We will make our own opinion on these issues known if it becomes necessary. But this will be a neutral stance—neither for the one side nor the other. Our actions will be reserved.

Remarks:

The incident is indicative of the difficult internal situation and of how little influence the leadership really has on the Korean masses. The incident transpired on the day on which approx. 10% of the residents of Pyongyang participated in a major rally against the Japanese/South Korean negotiations. And approx. 8 days after a similar rally in support of Vietnam, in which the Revolutionary Forces of Asia, Africa, and Latin America were at the center of the agitprop. The Cuban flag had to be familiar to many people from the agitprop. The Cuban ambassador has been in Korea for approx. 3 years, his picture has been published in the press many times.

The remarks by Yi Hyo-sun on not publishing Chinese and Soviet articles in the future appear credible.

We believe the Cuban ambassador has provided a faithful account of the incident. We have a particularly close relationship to the Cuban ambassador and were the only embassy that was immediately informed about the incident. The Soviet embassy was not told about it for 8 days. My wife also has a very close relationship to the Cuban ambassador's wife, to whom she provides weekly German lessons, and who described the events in the same manner. Witnessing the brutality the security services used against adults and children brought the wife of the Cuban ambassador to the brink of a nervous breakdown.

Horst Brie

Distribution:

1 x First AEA, Comrade Schneidewind

1 x Embassy/Secretariat

**DOCUMENT No. 4**

Memorandum on a meeting with a delegation from the Supreme People's Assembly of the DPRK on 3 July 1967.

[Source: SAPMO-BA, DY 30, IV 2/2.035. Translated by Grace Leonard.]

Department of International Relations
Berlin, 18 July 1967
Kö/ka

Memorandum

On a meeting between Comrade Hermann Matern, member of the Politburo of the Central Committee, Comrade Hermann Axen, candidate for the Politburo and Secretary of the Central Committee, and the delegation from the Supreme People's Assembly of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea on 3

July 1967.

The delegation was led by Comrade Yi Yong-ho, member of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Korean Workers Party and Deputy Chairman of the Presidium of the DPRK's Supreme People's Assembly. Participants on the Korean side were the members of the delegation, two escorts, and the DPRK's ambassador to the GDR.

Participating from our side were:

Comrade Horst Schumann, member of the Central Committee

Comrade Paul Markowski, candidate for the Central Committee

Comrade Gerd König, Section Leader, Department of International Relations

Comrade Matern welcomed the delegation warmly and outlined a few issues that were identified at the VII Party Congress of the Socialist Unity Party and at the Karlovy Vary conference. He stated that the conference in Karlovy Vary was very important for the development of the international Communist and workers movement. Agreement was reached on the basic issues of further development in Europe. Also, the conference of 46 fraternal parties, which took place in mid-June in Prague on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, demonstrated that cooperation between the fraternal parties is necessary and possible. The US imperialist global strategy would not be possible if we acted with unity and resolve. Comrade Matern then explained the imperialists' intentions to push back the socialist countries in a frontal attack—intentions that failed. Because of this fact, the imperialists attempt to light small fires in every corner. They strengthen the reactionary movement, as the Israeli aggression, the military coup in Greece, and the events in Ghana and Brazil have indicated. They try to bring reactionary regimes to power wherever they can. The events in Indonesia were a serious blow for the world Communist movement. The events in Vietnam speak for themselves. The US is using every resource to support the reactionary regime in South Vietnam and to force the Vietnamese people to their knees. All of these events demonstrate that they are trying to attack at as many points as possible. All of the events are closely related. Imperialist thrusts against the DPRK from South Korea also testify to this. The military coup in Greece is an attempt by imperialism to push into the Balkans. They are primarily attempting to penetrate into Albania, Yugoslavia, and Bulgaria. The unusual policy of our Romanian comrades is therefore no coincidence. Israel's aggression is meant to expand imperialism's base in this region. But this attempt will also fail, as did so many attempts in the past.

We hold that many meetings should be held among fraternal parties in order to create the conditions for preparing for an international conference. We believe that it is neces-

sary and possible to prepare for and hold such a conference. Unfortunately the US can still exploit the sharply different opinions the fraternal parties have. The unity and solidarity of the world Communist movement is particularly important for us and for you. West Germany has the strongest army in western Europe. It is also the strongest economic power. This military and economic force is hostile to the GDR, and is located right next to us.

The discord between the imperialist powers continues to increase. Today NATO is not what it was a few years ago. France is withdrawing from military integration. It also opposes letting England join the European Economic Community and opposes the Israeli aggression. It is ironic that Couve de Murville demanded that Israel return the territories taken and at the UN meeting told Romanian Foreign Minister Manescu that Romania should at least support France's position. Couve de Murville is a French nobleman, while Manescu is a member of the Communist Party. In other words, Romania currently stands to the right of France. Our Romanian comrades have demanded that Israel and the Arab nations negotiate directly with one another and that in this manner the UN be excluded from the process.

Discord is developing between the classes in West Germany, although slowly. Representatives of both the reactionary monopoly capital and the Social Democratic Party's leadership are currently included in the Bonn government. Students play a major role in West Germany in the opposition against the government. Apart from platonic statements in favor of the West German stance, West German monopoly capital will obtain hardly any active assistance from the other imperialist states in accomplishing their revanchist objectives. Their objective is to separate the GDR from the other socialist countries in order to be able to work on the GDR. West German imperialists are involved in all of the reactionary thrusts in the world.

It is becoming more and more difficult for the imperialists to spread their lies about the GDR. Two million West Germans come to the GDR every year, and 1 million travel to West Germany. You can draw your own conclusions about developments in the two German states. The backwardness the GDR experienced at first in a few areas has slowly been overcome. Today the fundamental differences between West Germany and the GDR are becoming increasingly evident, to the benefit of the GDR. At first there was a tremendous boom in West Germany. Eighty percent of Germany's heavy industry was in West Germany. It had a stronger raw material base than we did, and US imperialism pumped huge amounts into West Germany. West Germany was built up more rapidly. In addition, a fairy tale was spread around that capitalism had changed, that everyone had work and a high standard of living. This was not without its effect on the GDR. But now trends in West Germany are reaching crisis proportions, rising unemployment, and assaults on the populace's standard of living resulting from increased taxes, wage freezes, and other measures. The West German government is in fact to be militarized by the elimination of democratic rights, adoption of emergency laws, and other measures. In fact the same

thing is to be prepared that we already experienced in Greece. So conditions in Germany have changed rapidly since 1961. Our job is to force the Kiesinger government to accept that both German states can exist adjacent to one another. We do not stress unity for Germany. This process will take a long time and will require fundamental changes in West Germany. The current priorities are, first, a binding agreement on non-aggression by West Germany against the GDR, and second, reducing by half the number of arms in the two German states.

Our Party is extremely interested in an agreement among the Communist and workers parties. The Moscow Declaration of 1957 and 1960 was unanimously adopted by those present, including even the Communist Party of China. These documents established that we are in the transition phase from capitalism to socialism, that the socialist world system is increasingly becoming a determining factor in the world. Today communists in all nations of the world stand at the forefront of the movement for socialism, peace, and democracy. It is our goal to prevent a new world war, all of our policies are oriented toward achieving this goal. The socialist camp must be strengthened on all sides such that it is no longer possible for there to be world war. The urgent task is to make Israeli aggression ineffective. Perhaps it is healthy that some leaders of the Arab countries learn to find their support in the masses. We believe Nasser would have been overthrown had it not been for the Soviet Union. Naturally the Israeli aggression and its repercussions are a blow for the national liberation movement. The Soviet Union will certainly continue to supply weapons to the UAR and Syria and to support the strengthening of progressive forces.

Of course assistance for the Vietnamese people must also be increased. The war demonstrates that the Vietnamese people cannot be destroyed. We believe that the military, political, and diplomatic struggle must be coordinated even more. We must get the US to a point in which the war holds no prospects for the future. It cannot be waged until the last Vietnamese is annihilated. Our Vietnamese comrades will not be able to win by themselves, even with our substantial aid. They can see to it that the path is blocked to US imperialism, but victory will only be possible as a result of a worldwide political action. If all socialist countries were to come together, including the major fraternal parties in the capitalist lands, and using commensurate countermeasures were to demand that the war be ended, then it would probably be possible to end the war.

This is a broad-brush overview of how we see the international situation.

Comrade Yi Yong-ho expressed his thanks for the detailed information. He stated that militarism in West Germany has reappeared due to support from US imperialism, that the policies of West German imperialism have been directed against the GDR from the very beginning. The DPRK supported and continues to support the GDR. We must also support Vietnam in every way possible so that the US withdraws its troops and soldiers. The socialist camp must use every means to rescue Vietnam. If things go badly in Vietnam, then all socialist countries and the international revolu-

tionary movement will have suffered a great blow. We must therefore do everything we can to prevent this.

The Korean Workers Party has always advocated unity and solidarity among the socialist nations and the communist and worker's parties. We have urged this in the past, and we continue to urge it now. This is why all Marxist/Leninist parties and socialist countries must truly fulfill the Moscow Declaration. The socialist camp must be united and must act in a united fashion and exercise strong influence on the communist parties in the capitalist nations. It will not be possible to achieve this objective unless endeavors are consistent on all sides. We must consider the differences in views between the Parties to be an internal matter for the Parties.

West Germany is pursuing a policy of war against the GDR. Everyone must therefore protect the GDR. While West Germany is the warmonger in Europe, Japan is the warmonger in Asia.

Comrade Matern asked for an assessment of the situation in South Korea since the visits by Humphrey, Lübke, and Sato.

Comrade Yi Yong-ho said that Japan is a vassal state of the US. The Japanese government is pursuing the same imperialist policies as the US. The Japanese imperialists want to re-conquer Korea. Japanese capital has penetrated South Korea in 100,000 capitalist undertakings. They cloak this penetration with pretenses such as reparations to South Korea, assistance in developing mineral resources, developing the land, etc. But the purpose of all of it is to conquer Korea and to make the old Japanese dream a reality. The Japanese government is in fact involved in the war against Vietnam by making airfields available, repairing war materials, etc. Japan sends technical assistance to South Vietnam. But Japanese monopolies have also gotten a foot in the door in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. They have invested more than \$3.6 billion there. The situation is similar to that with West Germany. Therefore the united anti-imperialist front absolutely must be created. The Korean government understands very well the issues of unity for Germany.

In closing, Comrade Yi Yong-ho conveyed his best wishes for a very successful election. He expressed his sincere wishes for great success, both economically and politically.

Comrade Hermann Matern responded to Comrade Yi Yong-ho's statements. He said that Japan is playing a role in the US' global strategy that is similar to the role West Germany plays. There is one difference, however. While the two superpowers, the US and the Soviet Union, are head to head in Germany, this is not the case in Korea. So the situation is somewhat different. The US would run directly into the Soviet Union and the other Warsaw Pact nations in Germany. There would be a blitzkrieg there provoked by them. The "October Storm" exercise proved this clearly. So the military path is closed to the West German imperialists. We must push back the power of monopoly capital in West Germany. Although this is complicated to do, progress is slowly being made. The classes in West Germany are becoming increasingly polarized. Both the reactionaries and the progressive

democratic forces are growing in number. But reactionary forces are growing more rapidly. Therefore we must make great efforts to promote the growing process for the progressive forces.

The economy of the GDR has made great progress. The process of developing agriculture was a stormy one. There were a good number of people who worried about whether we could create socialist agriculture. Now it has been proved that socialism can be employed in agriculture, as well. We have good returns and are transitioning to industrial types of production and management in agriculture. The most important thing is that our Party acts with complete unity. We have solid development. There is no change in Party or state leadership. We have found a correct transition in attracting younger people, and last but not least, our Party has always had a clear, proper relationship to the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, to the Soviet Union. We are quite intentionally aiming for an even closer melding of the GDR's economy with that of the Soviet Union. At the conference in Prague, which our Romanian comrades also attended, they stated that the Romanian workers movement was already further along in the last century than the Russian workers movement, and that the Romanian people had liberated themselves and the Hungarian people in 1944. It is hard to understand Romania's economic policy in some ways. They currently owe West Germany more than 1 billion marks. They built up 158 million marks of debt just in the first 4 months of 1967 alone. Now West Germany is to build major operations in Romania. But that is our Romanian comrades' business. We are not doing anything like that, anyway.

If we have debt in capitalist countries, we do not relinquish our positions by any means. Our policy toward West Germany has proved this clearly. The struggle against West German imperialism is very complicated. The main thing is the issue of who and whom, so you can't do something dumb and make mistakes, you have to proceed with great cleverness and deliberateness.

Comrade Yi Yong-ho responded that the Americans frequently do dumb things (he was referring to the raids on the South Korean border), so that now and then we have to give them a whipping so that they don't get even more fresh. He said it is no coincidence that provocative incidents on the border became more frequent after Johnson's visit in October 1966 and after Lübke's visit in early 1967. The Korean Workers Party paid close attention to this. The Korean People's Army is trained as cadre. The people are armed. The 7-year plan was extended by three years in order to improve defense readiness. We have 14 percent growth in industrial production annually in industry. Now our job is to build up the economy and at the same time improve defense readiness. More than 30 percent of the budget annually goes to military purposes. If our enemies attack us again, we fully intend to liberate South Korea. This is why the Korean People's Army is well armed, it has sufficient experience and well trained specialists. Both the People's Army and the populace are politically well prepared.

Comrade Yi Yong-ho then established that there will still

be an opportunity to discuss these issues in more detail.

Our Korean comrades once again thanked us for meeting with them and took their leave.



DOCUMENT No. 5

Letter to Erich Honecker from Kim Il Sung, 7 July 1973

*[Source: SAPMO-BA, DY 30, 2460. Translated for
CWIHP by Grace Leonard.]*

Department of
Berlin, 3 August 1973
International Affairs

-
80-

-
46 copies, each 7 pages

Copy 28, 7 pages

Information

for the Politburo of the Central Committee

Subj.: Correspondence from Kim Il Sung, Secretary
General of the Central Committee of the Korean Workers
Party, to Comrade Erich Honecker, First Secretary of the
Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party

[s]

Markowski

Distribution:

Copies 1 - 28: Politburo

Copies 29 - 46: Department of International Relations
Berlin

To Comrade Erich Honecker

First Secretary of the Central Committee of the
Socialist Unity Party of Germany

Dear Comrade Erich Honecker!

Highly gratified that friendly and cooperative relations between the Parties, governments, and peoples of our two countries are developing well, I hereby convey our sincerest fraternal greetings to you, and through you to your Party and government and the people of the German Democratic Republic.

I would like to express to you, the Central Committee of your Party, and your government deep gratitude that your country is taking an active role internationally in supporting the great issue of unifying our people's fatherland and that it supports the letter to the parliaments and governments of all of the countries in the world that was adopted at the second meeting of the 5th legislative period of our nation's Supreme People's Assembly, and has undertaken measures of solidar-

ity.

Permit me to take this opportunity to tell you, and through you to tell the Central Committee of your Party and your government, about the situation that has most recently arisen in our country and about our recently prepared Five Point Course for independent peaceful unification.

Today the division of Korea causes our people—a people that developed as one nation during a long history—great unhappiness and suffering day after day and also creates obstacles for achieving and maintaining peace in Asia and the world.

The US, which has compelled the territory to be divided and our nation to be cut in half for 28 years now, currently employs two-sided tactics and wants in this manner to let Koreans fight one another, to perpetuate the division of Korea, and to create two Koreas. In lockstep with these US machinations, the rulers in South Korea prattle on about a “confrontation” between South and North, employ every resource to increase South Korea's military might, and obstinately hold fast to intrigues for perpetuating the division of the country. Recently they went so far as to conspire to make two Korea's their policy and to announce this policy of division publicly.

Through all of this the dialogue between North and South has not developed as it should have, with no regard for our consistent efforts for independent peaceful unification, and the bright prospect that emerged for our people for unification of the fatherland when the Joint Communiqué between South and North was published a year ago has darkened again.

At a time in which there are unusual movements meant to bring about the permanent division of Korea, on 23 June of this year we again set forth the following policy line for independent peaceful unification, based on a sincere desire to overcome the difficulties that have occurred and to satisfy the national yearning for peaceful unification of the fatherland as soon as possible.

First, we have proposed eliminating the military confrontation between South and North and reducing tensions. Eliminating the military confrontation between North and South and reducing tensions are the most urgent and critical issues for dispelling misunderstanding and mistrust between North and South, for deepening mutual understanding and trust, for creating an atmosphere of great national coalition for improving relations between South and North, and for accomplishing peaceful unification of the country.

If the hidden knife is not discarded, it will not be possible to create an atmosphere of mutual trust and satisfactorily resolve the issue of cooperation and exchange between North and South. This is why we have repeatedly proposed to South Korean authorities that the build-up of military forces and arms be halted, all foreign troops be withdrawn, troops and arms be reduced, the importation of weapons from abroad be halted, and a peace treaty be signed as the first steps for achieving peaceful unification of the country.

Secondly, we have proposed that North and South cooperate and conduct exchanges in all areas of the various

arenas of politics, military affairs, foreign policy, the economy, and culture. We believe that accomplishing comprehensive cooperation and exchanges between North and South is very important to repair national bonds that have been torn asunder, to improve relations between South and North, and to bring about the conditions for unification.



**Erich Honecker and Kim Il Sung,
18 October 1986**

Source: Bundesarchiv, Berlin

Once again, we stress that South Korean rulers must not rely on foreign forces, but must transition to developing the nation's natural resources with us and thus develop the economy in the best interest of our nation and make national cooperation in all areas a reality.

Third, we have proposed ensuring that the population, in all classes and walks of life of North and South, be able to participate in overall national patriotic work for unifying the fatherland.

Since, given the will of the entire population of South and North Korea, unification of the fatherland is an issue that must be resolved, we believe that the dialog between North and South must not be restricted to representatives of North and South, but must be conducted in an overall national framework.

We have therefore proposed calling a great national conference composed of representatives of the people from all classes and walks of life and all political parties and social organizations of the North and South, and discussing and resolving there the issue of unifying our nation according to the will and demands of our people.

Fourth, we have again proposed forming a confederation of South and North and calling it the Federative Republic of Koryo. We believe that forming a confederation between South and North, while maintaining the two systems currently existing in the North and South for a certain period based on the convocation of a great national confer-

ence and achieving a great national coalition is the most logical way to accomplish the unification of the country.

If a confederation between South and North is formed using the name Koryo, we have proposed calling it the Federative Republic of Koryo, under which name our country will become known in the world as a single nation.

Fifth, we have proposed that North and South pursue foreign relations jointly in order to prevent the division from becoming cemented in place and thus dividing our nation into two Koreas for all time. As one nation, which developed as a single entity with one culture and one language over a long history, our nation must not be cut in two. We believe that North and South must have common stances in the area of international relations, as well, in order to prevent the country from being divided forever.

In terms of establishing diplomatic relations with other countries, we also decisively oppose all machinations for creating two Koreas. We strongly maintain that North and South cannot separately join the UN and believe that if joining the UN is a goal, at the minimum this must not occur until the confederation is formed under the name of the Federative Republic of Koryo, at which time the UN can be joined as one nation. But if, distinct from the issue of joining the UN, issues regarding Korea are included in the UN's agenda and are to be discussed, we believe that a representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea must take part and participate as an interested party.

We believe that all of our proposals reflect the urgent desire of all Korean people to prevent the division of the country, to fundamentally improve and develop relations between South and North, to accomplish in the most rapid manner possible the unification of our fatherland, and furthermore reflect current demands for independence and peace and are therefore extremely reasonable and realistic proposals that can be accepted by anyone.

It has now become completely clear who wants peace and unification in Korea and who is really planning for war and division.

I am convinced that your Party, your government, and your people are very interested in the situation that has developed in our nation, and that you will actively undertake various measures to support this new policy of the government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea for independent and peaceful unification of the country on a democratic basis, without outside intervention.

I am convinced that the close relations of friendship and cooperation that exist between the Parties, governments, and peoples of our two nations will continue to improve and develop, as in the past, so also in the future, based on the principles of Marxism/Leninism and proletarian internationalism, and send you my sincere wishes for great success in your professional endeavors and for good health for you personally.

With comradely greetings

Secretary General of the Central Committee of the Korean Workers Party
Kim Il Sung
Pyongyang, 7 July 1973



DOCUMENT No. 6

Report on the official friendship visit to the DPRK by the Party and state delegation of the GDR, led by Com. Erich Honecker, 8-11 December 1977

[Source: SAPMO-BA, DY 30, J IV 2/2A/2123.

Translated by Grace Leonard.]

CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE SOCIALIST UNITY PARTY
– Internal Party Archives –
From the files of: Politburo

Memorandum
No. 48
13 December 1977
DY30/
Sign.: J IV 2/2A–2123

Report on the official friendship visit to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea by the Party and state delegation of the German Democratic Republic, led by Comrade Erich Honecker, Secretary General of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany and Chairman of the State Council of the German Democratic Republic, from 8 to 11 December 1977.

At the invitation of the Central Committee of the Korean Workers Party and the Council of Ministers of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, a Party and state delegation from the German Democratic Republic, led by Comrade Erich Honecker, Secretary General of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany and Chairman of the State Council of the German Democratic Republic, made an official friendship visit to the DPRK from 8 to 11 December 1977.

I.

The visit was the first meeting of the highest representatives of the GDR and DPRK since Comrade Kim Il Sung's visit to the GDR in 1956. The meetings between Comrade Erich Honecker and Comrade Kim Il Sung, with both delegations present, were friendly.

The visit resulted in an agreement on a joint communiqué. A Consular Treaty and an Agreement on the Further Development of Economic and Scientific/Technical Cooperation were signed.

The Party and government of the DPRK organized an

impressive reception by the people of Pyongyang for the GDR's Party and state delegation. During its stay, the delegation toured the Kimsong tractor plant and attended the opera, "The Flower Girl," in the Mansuda Palace.

Comrades Erich Honecker and Kim Il Sung spoke at a celebration of friendship, at which there were 20,000 participants and which took place in the Athletic Palace in Pyongyang.

During the official proceedings each side reported to the other about the realization of the resolutions of the IX Party Congress of the Socialist Unity Party and of the V Party Congress of the Korean Workers Party. There was a comprehensive exchange of views on the development of relations between the two Parties and nations, the international situation, and the Communist world movement. Willingness was expressed to expand in all respects the cooperation between the Socialist Unity Party and the Korean Workers Party, and between the GDR and the DPRK. Comrade Kim Il Sung repeatedly stressed the great importance of Comrade Erich Honecker's visit for deepening mutual understanding and bilateral relations.

The mass media of the DPRK reported in detail about the visit by the GDR's Party and state delegation. Press accounts of the toast by Comrade Erich Honecker at the reception by the Korean side did not report remarks on issues of European security and disarmament.

II.

In his remarks, Comrade Erich Honecker praised the DPRK's great achievements in building socialism and affirmed the GDR's support for proposals by the DPRK for resolving problems on the Korean peninsula.

Comrade Honecker reported in detail about the domestic and foreign policy of the GDR in realizing the resolutions of the IX Party Congress of the Socialist Unity Party. He stressed that the successes of the GDR in building a developed socialist society are the result of intense work and creative initiative on the part of the workers of the GDR under the leadership of their Marxist/Leninist party. The indestructible bonds to and cooperation with the Soviet Union and fraternal Socialist nations are very important for stable and dynamic development in the GDR.

Preparations for the 60th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution have turned into the greatest competition in the GDR.

The Socialist Unity Party is devoting special attention to further improving social democracy, especially in terms of broad inclusion of citizens in leading the state. Political/ideological work is the heart and soul of the Party's efforts. Its centerpiece is disseminating and popularizing the works of Marx and Lenin, educating for socialist patriotism and proletarian internationalism.

The Socialist Unity Party strongly opposes the increasing ideological diversion and stepped-up agitation by FRG imperialism against the GDR. It completely rejects all appearances of anti-communism and anti-Sovietism.

Comrade Honecker outlined the mutual foreign policy

positions of the community of socialist states on issues of international development. He stressed that the solid alliance with the Soviet Union and the other fraternal nations is the foundation of our foreign policy. New friendship treaties entered into with the Soviet Union and other socialist nations are particularly important. They play an important role in consolidating the socialist world system as the greatest achievement of the international working class. He stressed the necessity of strengthening the Warsaw Pact in order to protect the peaceful building [of socialism] in our countries from NATO's aggressive intentions.

Relations between the GDR and the People's Republic of China are poor for reasons that are known. There are no Party relations. The XI Party Congress of the Communist Party of China characterized the Soviet Union as the number one enemy. Beijing is further improving its reactionary interplay with imperialism. Subversive activity with regard to the international Communist movement continues. Beijing criticizes NATO for not building up enough arms for a war against the Soviet Union. This is tantamount to a challenge to wage war against the GDR. The GDR completely rejects the policies of the Chinese leaders, which run counter to the interests of Socialist countries, the international workers movement, and the national liberation movement. At the same time, it advocates normal development of state relations with the People's Republic of China and, given proper conditions, resuming Party relations, as well. But this is not possible at the cost of compromising principle issues, such as the unbreakable bond to the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and to the Soviet Union itself.

Comrade Honecker addressed in detail the situation in Europe, especially in the FRG, and the status of relations between the GDR and the FRG. He spoke about the NATO military forces directly arrayed against the GDR and relations between the FRG and South Korea.

In its policies towards developing nations, the GDR concentrates on supporting nations with a socialist orientation, such as Angola, Mozambique, Ethiopia, and Guinea-Bissau. It supports the efforts by many Asian states to create stable relations of peaceful coexistence on this continent, and thereby to ensure important conditions required for guaranteeing security in Asia. This includes ensuring peace on the Korean peninsula.

In his statements on the communist world movement, Comrade Honecker stressed that the Socialist Unity Party maintains good relations with the overwhelming majority of fraternal parties based on Marxism/Leninism and proletarian internationalism. He stressed the mutual responsibility of the communist parties and praised the Berlin Conference as a meaningful success by the Communist movement.

Comrade Kim Il Sung expressed his gratitude for the selfless aid and support of the GDR, especially during the War of Liberation of the Fatherland and during the period that followed. Even today the GDR is providing valuable support to the Korean people in the struggle to unify the country.

The Korean Workers Party considers unification of the

fatherland to be its primary mission. To achieve this goal, at its V Party Congress the Party resolved to build up socialism in the north, to support the struggle of revolutionary forces in South Korea, and to consolidate solidarity with international revolutionary forces. Building Socialism in the DPRK is the foundation for establishing the new social order in the entire nation.

It is worthwhile to demonstrate the superiority of the socialist order to the south and to show the entire world that the DPRK is a sovereign, independent state. In contrast, South Korea is a base for American imperialism. After the victory over the Japanese militarists, the socialist countries, the Soviet Union, the People's Republic of China, and the GDR as well provided great assistance to the Korean people. But this alone could not resolve every problem. So it was necessary to do everything in our power to become self-reliant. Since then an independent national economy has been created. Currently the ideological, technical, and cultural revolution are the focal points, which is in accord with the resolutions of the V Party Congress.

The DPRK stands directly before the enemy. Since there was no bourgeois revolution in Korea, the transition period to socialism and communism is relatively long. There is residual feudalism, Confucianism, Buddhism, sectarianism. Since Korea is surrounded by large countries, toadyism before the great foreign powers was very prevalent. The ideological revolution is no less important than creating the material foundations for socialism. The experience of the Korean Workers Party demonstrates that people very actively take part in the revolution, in smashing the old social order. The higher the material standard of living climbs, the more ideologically lazy people become and the more careless their activity is. All people must be transformed according to the model of the worker class.

The Korean Workers Party today has 2.2 million members. All of the other members of society are included in the various organizations. Organized Party life and learning occupy an important place in the ideological work. Nearly the entire population takes part in training that is conducted every Saturday. In addition, two hours of self-study are conducted daily.

The technical revolution is very important. The primary issues are reducing the differences between light and heavy physical labor, between industry and agriculture, and liberating women from heavy housework, actively drawing them into societal life.

Our cultural revolution is different from that in other countries. Its goal is to provide all people with knowledge. This is why the mandatory 11-year polytechnical school system was introduced. One million intellectuals have already been trained in the DPRK. The issue is repelling enemy attempts to infiltrate the cultural realm.

Turning to the economic situation, Comrade Kim Il Sung reported that a new 7-year plan begins in 1978. The objective of this plan is to develop modern industry, pervaded with science and based on the Juche principle. This does not mean rejecting economic cooperation with other countries.

But industry must still support itself based on native raw materials.

The main points of the 7-year plan cited by Kim Il Sung provide for industrial production to increase by approximately 100 percent and are to be approved at a Central Committee meeting and thereafter at a meeting of the Supreme People's Assembly on 15 December 1977.

Comrade Kim Il Sung addressed the complicated situation in the development of the South Korean revolution.

Comrade Kim Il Sung spoke out against the concept of two Korean states and rejected the US proposal for so-called cross-recognition (Soviet Union recognizes South Korea, US recognizes the DPRK). The DPRK will patiently continue its work with respect to the South, so that Park Chung Hee becomes even more isolated and the struggle for democratization can be continued. The DPRK holds fast to the three principles for unifying the land, which were announced in 1972. Negotiations with the South, which began in 1972 based on this foundation, have currently been broken off because those in power in South Korea have publicly come out in favor of two Koreas.

Comrade Kim Il Sung stressed the differences in the situations of the GDR and DPRK, both in the negotiations and in his speech at the friendship celebration. He stated that the existence of the GDR was historically necessary.

In his remarks on the international situation, Comrade Kim Il Sung stressed that the Korean Workers Party advocates joining all revolutionary forces, especially those of socialist nations, "Third World" countries, the non-aligned nations, the international workers movement, and the national liberation movement.

There are difficulties in joining the forces of Socialist nations due to relations between the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China. Seen from a historical perspective, the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China are comrades-in-arms of the DPRK. The DPRK has a common border with the People's Republic of China that is approximately 1500 kilometers in length. Although the two countries are close, the DPRK does not agree with everything China does. Relations with China were poor during the "Cultural Revolution." China agitated against the "Korean revisionists" over loudspeakers that were set up along the entire Sino-Korean border.

But if the DPRK improves relations with China, it need not worry about the US. The DPRK cannot concentrate troops in the north and in the south simultaneously. This is why the DPRK has endeavored to improve relations since the end of the "Cultural Revolution." It has succeeded. However, the DPRK does not accept Chinese assertions such as the characterization of the Soviet Union as "Social Imperialism." The DPRK is not a blind follower of China.

The Soviet Union supported Korea in its war of liberation. After the war it provided political and material assistance in the amount of 2,220 billion [old denomination] rubles. The DPRK is striving for better, amicable relations, but cannot get involved in the polemics between the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China. In this issue, it favors

maintaining strict independence and supports anything that promotes joining forces.

There are people who believe that the DPRK is more on China's side. This is not the case. The principles of the DPRK for the joining of forces in the Communist world movement are the struggle against imperialism, for socialism and communism, for support of the international workers and democratic movements, and non-intervention in domestic matters. The DPRK maintains normal relations with the other socialist nations and has no differences of opinion with them.

The DPRK participates in the non-aligned movement because it is highly anti-imperialist in character. Relations between the DPRK and the countries of the Third World are good.

Comrade Kim Il Sung remarked on the danger of Japanese militarism recurring. Japanese militarists are no less dangerous than those in West Germany. He opposed the stationing of US troops in Asia and the transformation of ASEAN into a military organization.

III.

Comrade Erich Honecker and Comrade Kim Il Sung praised how well relations between the two Parties and states have developed. The results of the visit have created favorable conditions for successfully further developing cooperation between the Socialist Unity Party and the Korean Workers Party, the GDR and the DPRK. Comrade Erich Honecker addressed in detail the status of relations between the two Parties and states and passed on to Comrade Kim Il Sung written proposals for further cooperation in the political and economic arenas. The proposals he set forth for further developing scientific/technical and economic cooperation, and the written draft of a governmental agreement in this regard, were appraised by Comrade Kim Il Sung as a very useful foundation for further developing economic cooperation.

Comrade Kim Il Sung explained that a trade deficit has come about in the last five years due to certain economic difficulties in the DPRK, and the loans could not be repaid on time. The DPRK thinks it is possible to cooperate with the GDR in mining heavy metals. The GDR could supply facilities, while the DPRK has labor and raw materials. The FRG works very actively in South Korea, and this is why the DPRK and the GDR should work closely with one another.

He particularly stressed developing cooperation in joint development of heavy metals and the production of sintered magnesite.

He was particularly grateful for the GDR's willingness to intensify its scientific/technical support precisely in those areas that are of great importance for developing North Korea's own raw material resources, such as, for instance, calcium carbide chemistry and upgrading coal. He requested that the GDR provide good support in developing microelectronics for automation.

Comrade Kim Il Sung accepted the invitation Comrade Erich Honecker extended to visit the GDR and agreed to prepare an Agreement on Friendship and Cooperation and to

enter into a long-term trade agreement.

IV.

In preparing for the visit, negotiations on communiques were held that resulted in joint statements on a few issues of international development and on how relations should proceed. The communique contained positive statements on international relations, the Great October Socialist Revolution, the unity and solidarity of Socialist countries and the Communist and workers parties, developments in Europe, for peace and cooperation in Asia, and on the importance of peaceful coexistence between the GDR and the FRG.

The Korean side praised the existence of the GDR as an important contribution to strengthening the forces of socialism in the world. The negotiations resulted in an agreement that the visit would contribute to deepening the friendship and cooperation between the GDR and the DPRK and would thereby strengthen the solidarity of socialist states.

Conclusions

1. Deliberate efforts shall be undertaken to bring to fruition the proposals Comrade Erich Honecker made on further developing relations between the Socialist Unity Party and the Korean Workers Party, the GDR and the DPRK.

For action: Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party, International Relations Department

Ministry of Foreign Affairs
State Planning Commission
Ministry of Foreign trade

2. A draft of the Agreement on Friendship and Cooperation between the GDR and the DPRK shall be prepared and provided to the Korean side in preparation for Comrade Kim Il Sung's visit to the GDR.

For action: Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party, International Relations Department

3. The Agreement on Developing Economic and Scientific/Technical Cooperation between the German Democratic Republic and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea is approved. (Attachment)

Council of Ministers shall determine necessary measures.

For action: Chairman, Council of Ministers

4. A draft for a long-term trade agreement for the period 1978 - 1984 shall be prepared and, once approved in the Presidium of the Council of Ministers, shall be provided to the Korean side.

For action: Ministry of Foreign Trade

State Planning Commission

Scheduled: March 1978

5. Comrade Minister Singhuber and a group of experts shall travel to Pyongyang to prepare and coordinate specific proposals for GDR involvement in developing raw materials in the DPRK that are important to the GDR.

For action: Chairman, Council of Ministers

Scheduled: January 1978

6. The rest of the goods and services required for assuring the scheduled start-up of the automation equipment plant in the DPRK in 1980 shall be realized for 1978 and 1979. A government representative shall be responsible for firm management and coordination and for assuring production.

For action: Minister of Heavy Machinery and System Construction

Minister of Electronics/Electrotechnology

Minister of Foreign Trade

7. Appropriate material on the situation and policies in the FRG, in particular attempts by the FRG to infiltrate the Quadripartite Agreement, shall be provided to the Korean side.

For action: Ministry of Foreign Affairs

8. The DPRK's Mansuda Ensemble shall be invited to the GDR as guest performers.

For action: Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Ministry of Culture

Scheduled: February 1978

9. The former official designation, "Korean People's Democratic Republic", shall be changed in accordance with Korean usage to "Korean Democratic People's Republic".

For action: Ministry of Foreign Affairs

10. Uniform transcription of Korean names and words shall be assured.

For action: Ministry of Secondary Education

Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Agreement

On the development of economic and scientific/technical cooperation between the government of the German Democratic Republic and the government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

The government of the German Democratic Republic and the government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, with the goal of comprehensive development of fraternal relations of friendship and cooperation between the two nations, in the spirit of proletarian internationalism and with the intent of further developing economic and scientific/technical cooperation in areas of mutual interest, have agreed as follows:

Article 1

Both sides shall enter into a long-term trade agreement for the period 1978 to 1984 with the goal of developing economic relations and expanding the exchange of goods.

Provided in this long-term trade agreement shall be the supply of goods that are traditionally traded by both sides and of new goods that are in demand on both sides.

The Democratic People's Republic of Korea shall increase the quantity of annual deliveries of sintered magnesite to the German Democratic Republic during the term of the above long-term trade agreement. The German Democratic Republic shall provide the Democratic People's Republic of Korea a proportionate amount of potash fertilizer annually.

Article 2

Both sides have agreed to develop stronger scientific/technical cooperation based on successes in science and technology achieved in recent years in both nations.

In this context, both sides agreed to examine the possibilities for long-term scientific/technical cooperation and to promote the development of mutual exchange of goods through suitable measures, such as the exchange of delegations in the fields of science and technology.

Both sides agreed to begin scientific/technical cooperation to their mutual interest in the fields of:

- methods of upgrading coal, including gasification of anthracite and brown coal;
- production of fertilizers, super phosphate, and sulfuric acid;
- production of synthetic and reclaimed fiber.

The German Democratic Republic is prepared to provide scientific/technical support in the following fields to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea by providing projects, technological and other documentation, by sending specialists and training personnel, by awarding production licenses and in other ways:

- production of synthetic rubber based on calcium carbide;
- methods of processing oil, petrochemistry methods, and rationalization of petrochemical facilities;
- preparing technical mining and technical engineering projects for developing copper deposits;
- production of tool machines;
- production of ceramic tiles for panels.

Article 3

Both sides believe that economic cooperation is in their mutual interest and should be further developed taking into account the national economic possibilities of both nations.

For this purpose, the German Democratic Republic shall supply industrial equipment and machines and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea shall supply metallurgic products, minerals, machines, and other products.

3.1 Both sides shall accelerate deliveries of equipment and technical services for the automation equipment plant based on the Agreement dated 5 February 1966 such that it is

possible for the plant to start up in the first half of 1980.

3.2 Both sides agreed that the German Democratic Republic shall provide the Democratic People's Republic of Korea long-term support in the mining and processing of raw materials such as copper, zinc, magnesite, and other ores, by providing technical documentation, projects, and equipment, and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea shall provide to the German Democratic Republic for a part of the value of the equipment products that are produced using the equipment delivered by the German Democratic Republic.

They agreed that the cooperation shall initially begin in expanding production of sintered magnesite in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and in exploiting copper deposits in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

Article 4

Both sides determined that the loan made available to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in the amount of 18 million rubles by the German Democratic Republic with the Agreements dated 5 February 1966 and 20 March 1972 has not been used.

Both sides agreed to apply this sum to the delivery of equipment and machines in the fields of metallurgy, chemistry, electronics and automation, light industry, and the food-stuffs industry from the German Democratic Republic to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. Experts from the two countries shall consult on and coordinate specific deliveries.

The Democratic People's Republic of Korea shall make payments on the loans in 10 equal annual payments, each beginning one year after the shipment of the last delivery for each item. The interest rate is 2 percent.

The Democratic People's Republic of Korea shall provide to the German Democratic Republic 35 percent of its annual payments as deliveries comprising equal portions of products from heavy metal metallurgy and black metallurgy.

The delivery of equipment shall be accomplished based on contracts that the respective foreign trade organizations shall enter into.

Article 5

Both sides agreed to delaying repayments of a total of 11.7 million rubles in loans provided by the German Democratic Republic to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in the Agreements dated 5 February 1966 and 4 November 1968 for the period 1977 up to and including 1979. In accordance with these Agreements, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea shall provide deliveries of electrolyte zinc, silver, and cadmium to the German Democratic Republic in the framework of the annual trade agreement.

The Democratic People's Republic of Korea shall repay all loans made to it that are to be repaid by the end of 1979, including the sum that was not repaid in previous years, beginning 1 January 1980 in equal payments over the course of 5 years.

Article 6

The foreign trade banks of the German Democratic Republic and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea shall agree separately how the payments related to this Agreement shall be regulated.

The foreign trade organizations of the two nations shall agree on the prices of goods delivered to both sides.

Article 7

Both sides shall authorize the appropriate organizations in their countries to agree on specific measures for realizing the tasks contained in the above articles to this Agreement.

The Advisory Committee for Economic and Scientific/Technical issues between the Government of the German Democratic Republic and the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea shall begin meeting soon in order to determine suitable measures for realizing this Agreement.

Article 8

With this Agreement, the agreement on supplying an office for metrology, as contained in "Agreement between the Ministry of Foreign Trade and Domestic German Trade of the German Democratic Republic and the Ministry of Foreign Trade of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea on the Supply of Complete Systems and Equipment", dated 5 February 1966, is hereby no longer in effect.

The "Agreement on Providing a Loan from the German Democratic Republic for Supplies and Services for Establishing a Facility for Processing Zinc Residue in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea," dated 20 March 1972, is hereby annulled.

This Agreement shall take effect upon signing.

Two copies of this Agreement were prepared on 11 December 1977 in Pyongyang, each copy written in German, Korean, and Russian, whereby the texts in German and Korean are equivalent in terms of validity. The Russian text shall take precedence should there be any differences in interpretation.

For the government of the German Democratic Republic
For the government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea

Chairman, Council of Ministers, German Democratic Republic

Chairman, Council of Ministers, Democratic People's Republic of Korea

DOCUMENT No. 7

Stenographic record of conversation between Erich Honecker and Kim Il Sung, 30 May 1984

[Source: SAPMO-BA, DY 30, 2460. Translated by Grace Leonard.]

Stenographic record

Official friendship visit to the GDR by the Party and State Delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea led by Kim Il Sung, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Korean Workers Party and President of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

First day of meetings: Wednesday, 30 May 1984

Start time: 9:30 a.m.

Erich Honecker: Dear Comrade Kim Il Sung! Dear Korean comrades who have accompanied Comrade Kim Il Sung here. Permit me to say as we officially begin our exchange of views that again we all welcome you to this friendship visit to the GDR in the name of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, the State Council, the Council of Ministers of the German Democratic Republic, and in the name of all of the people of the GDR.

At this moment we feel transported back in time and think of our trip to the People's Republic of Korea, the warm welcome that awaited us as we arrived there. I am not betraying any secrets when I stress how much we have looked forward to this opportunity to renew our acquaintance in the GDR. Our relations have developed very well since then and have reached a new level. We are entirely convinced that our exchange of views here in Berlin and the rest of your stay in the German Democratic Republic will enhance the friendship, cordiality, and assertive community between our two Parties, states, and peoples.

Again, a warm welcome, dear Comrade Kim Il Sung and dear Korean comrades and friends! Now, as we agreed, I would like to give you the floor.

Kim Il Sung: Thank you very much. First I would like to thank you, Comrade Erich Honecker, for these warm words. I am paying this visit in return for the visit seven years ago, in December 1977, when Comrade Erich Honecker visited our country. At that time you told me that we would sign a Friendship Pact in Berlin. I also hoped that we would be able to sign this pact one year later here in Berlin, but it was not to be. I could not visit that soon because of the situation that developed in our country. I ask your pardon, therefore, that I could not make this visit until somewhat later. I am very pleased that I am able to visit you here today.

When we arrived, you, esteemed Comrade Erich Honecker, and also the leading comrades of your Party and state leadership, greeted us warmly and the people of the German Democratic Republic made us feel very welcome,

despite the rain. I believe that signifies the feelings of friendship your people have for our people. The people of the GDR have proved in this manner that they stand solidly behind the Central Committee of your Party with you at the top. I believe that this is a great success for your Party.

I would like to take this opportunity on behalf of all of my comrades and on my own behalf to offer our sincere thanks for your warm reception and to pass on to you fraternal greetings from the Central Committee of our Party and our government to the Central Committee of the SED, the government, and the people of the German Democratic Republic. I am extremely pleased that we are meeting here today to conduct these talks.

I would like then first to address our country's situation and relations between our two countries. I would like to tell you about the situation in South Korea and in the countries that surround our country. I will take this opportunity to personally provide you information about the non-aligned movement and other issues.

So I would like to tell you about the situation in our country, especially the issues that came up in our country after your visit. Since then there have been exchanges of many high-level delegations, which has improved the exchange of information between our countries.

After your visit to our country, we held the VI Party Congress and had many events related to the festivities surrounding the 35th anniversary of the founding of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. You sent high-level delegations to this Party Congress and to the festivities. You will be familiar with the situation in our country through these delegations.

After your visit to our country, we held the VI Party Congress of our Party, as I already said. We took stock at the VI Party Congress. We were able to determine that we have successfully had three great revolutions. We had the ideological, technical, and cultural revolutions. We assessed this at the VI Party Congress and set out new goals.

We also set forth new goals in the area of the economy and put forth a new proposal for accomplishing the peaceful unification of our country. We discussed issues of the movement of non-aligned countries and issues of sovereignty for the whole world. During our stock-taking, we were able to assess that we have successfully implemented the political/ideological program.

It was also found that the entire population has rallied solidly around the Central Committee of the Soviet Union and, with the policies of the Party, is armed to build socialism even more successfully. This is also important because our country is divided and the other part is dominated by US imperialists. It is therefore very important for us to make sure that capitalism does not penetrate our ideology. I will summarize once more: it was very important to train the population in the spirit of patriotism and class ideology so that the entire population could successfully build socialism. In short, the entire population and all Party members are in a good ideological position. That is, the entire population and all Party members are prepared to reject any type of anti-com-

munist propaganda.

The struggle for the organizational life of the entire population was also bolstered. Party members must organize their Party life well; the workers must consolidate their unions politically and organizationally, and all of our youth work in their youth organization. The farmers are enhancing communal life in their villages.

We have obtained excellent results arming and training all of our people in politics. Sometimes it was also necessary to exercise mutual criticism during the training. This is how all of the political work was conducted successfully.

Unity and solidarity in the ideological realm between the people and the Party were consolidated by reinforcing the ideological work and by studying the ideology of communism. We enhanced the struggle for ideological training.

I'd like to address the economic situation. Ten perspective goals for the 80's to 1990 were identified at our VI Party Congress; these goals testify to the fact that we want the economic level of our country to approach the level of developed nations. The goals are: to produce 15 million tons of steel; to increase coal production to 120 million tons; to increase energy production to 12 billion kWh, cement production to 20 million tons, production of chemical fertilizers to 7 million tons, production of non-ferrous heavy metals to 1.5 million tons, and production of textiles to 1.5 billion meters. Furthermore, to catch 5 million tons of fish, to produce 15 million tons of grain, and to reclaim 300,000 ha [hectars] of marshland.

If we have achieved all of these prospective goals at the end of the 80's, then we can say that we have also nearly reached the level of the developed nations. In order to achieve these ambitious goals, the Central Committee first posed the task of reclaiming marshland from the sea. In our country, there is a very limited amount of usable land, we have very little of it, only 2 million ha. But if you don't count the area devoted to fruit orchards, there are only 1.5 million ha of usable land, because 200,000 mountainside ha must also be deducted. But we can produce 15 million tons of grain with these 1.5 million ha. We have already achieved grain production as high as 9.5 million tons, now that we are applying the methods of intensification in the countryside. Now it is important for us to reclaim these 300,000 ha of marshland, because with this land we can achieve an additional 3 million tons of grain production. This marshland is flat, and we can farm it mechanically—we have already begun.

But what is most important is that later we also have the requisite water resources for this new land. For this reason we have begun to build the barrage¹ at Nampo. When we have built this lock, then we can bring water from the Taedong, the great river that flows through Pyongyang, to the marshland. We have made it a goal to finish this lock by October of next year, and it is realistic. Naturally this is a major planned construction. The entire Party and all of the members of the army are engaged in bringing it to fruition. But when we have accomplished this task, then we can also achieve grain production of 15 million tons. This is why the first task is to resolve the issue of water supply. We have encapsulated

this in the slogan, "Rice is Communism!" All of our Party members are now engaged in the struggle to achieve these goals.

The second most important task we put forth is to achieve our goal for non-ferrous heavy metals. We have rich mineral resources: copper, lead, and zinc. We came up with the solution at the Central Committee Plenum in 1982. First we must achieve 1.5 million tons of non-ferrous heavy metals and then attack the rest. We made this resolution in August 1982. Within a year we unleashed the battle and for this reason we were able to reach 1.5 million tons. That is, we built a metallurgical plant with a capacity of 1.5 million tons. We accomplished this in less than a year. Including this mining, we can obtain an additional approximately 700,000 to 800,000 tons of ore. Next year we want to recover 200,000 tons of copper.

If we have largely achieved our goals in terms of non-ferrous heavy metals in the next year, we will also have solved the currency issue. While we are still in debt to West European countries, next year we will be able to pay it all off. We are not very deeply in debt to the West European countries. The total is about 700 to 800 million, and this is owed to France, Austria, Sweden, and Denmark. Not so much for the other West European countries. This year we will make substantial re-payments and next year we will have paid everything back. The world market price for one ton of zinc has risen to about 720 pounds. Once we have largely solved the currency issue, we will introduce the required facilities for metallurgy, mining, coal mining, and the electrical industry.

Altering our domestic structure will play a large role in steel production, for instance, building silicon plants. We are already producing some, but it does not satisfy the engineering industry. We must also produce stainless steel pipes. We need a plant for producing high voltage lines. If we bolster this industry, then we can increase steel production and better develop the engineering industry.

Naturally we have rich deposits of hard coal. There are 15 billion (?) tons of our prized brown coal. Thus far we have no experience in producing brown coal, because in the past we have only mined anthracite. Mining in Anju has already begun to yield this brown coal.

On the occasion of my visit to European socialist countries, I would also like to address cooperation with these nations and their assistance in exploiting our brown coal deposits. Our geographical position is a bit complicated because the region with the brown coal is immediately surrounded by the sea. We have already been able to set up a mining operation with a capacity of 7 million tons, but at least 30 to 40 million tons must be mined; this is within the realm of the possible. We are now in the process of acquiring the experience we need to mine this region. We are convinced that we can achieve the goals that we have set for ourselves if we obtain appropriate support from construction engineers from socialist countries.

In terms of the production of energy: we have good water resources since it rains a lot in our country. We will therefore build both hydroelectric plants and heating and

power stations. We have the potential to produce 70 billion kWh of current through hydroelectric power. We are building a hydroelectric plant with China on the Yalu River. Other mid-size and small hydroelectric plants will be built in the countryside, as well. We will have hydroelectric plants available to the degree that we resolve the coal-mining issue.

During my visit to the Soviet Union, I also made agreements with our Soviet comrades to build nuclear power plants. We are convinced that when we have accomplished this task, we will certainly be able to produce 100 billion kWh of energy. And once we have done this, developing agriculture is no longer a problem. Once we have solved the industry problem, nothing else will be an issue.

Naturally there are also problems in the area of the economy. This is foremost a lack of workers.

Because we are confronted with imperialism, many of our young people must go into the army. We must have 400,000 to 450,000 soldiers, because the South Korean army has 700,000 soldiers. Then there are also about 43,000 American soldiers stationed in South Korea. Although this is a great burden for us, we cannot reduce the strength of our army. We must resolve the labor problem using mechanization and automation, thus freeing up workers.

We ask for your support in resolving this problem, because we will resolve the labor issue if we automate at all in mechanical engineering and in industry. And if we have enough labor, we could create numerous mines and even strengthen the other industries. Other countries might have excess labor, but we don't. We are now considering how we can automate by trading with you and with your support, and we would also like to have cadre train with you in this field.

Now, these difficulties that are cropping up now are difficulties that can occur as development progresses.

Just as you are confronted with capitalism, we are also confronted with capitalism. We must therefore also show the South Koreans the superiority of socialism, just as you show the West Germans. It is also important to influence the entire South Korean population so that they want socialism and are in favor of unifying the country.

With respect to the cultural revolution, I told you about this, esteemed Comrade Erich Honecker, when you visited us. There are no major issues to clarify. We have introduced 11-year compulsory education. We have a total of 3.5 million children ranging in age from infants to high school age. Overall we have some 8.5 million being educated. Our current population is 17.7 million. That is, about half of the population is being educated at this time.

Naturally this is a great burden for us. But we have to take this upon ourselves in order to develop. All people must have a high degree of technical ability in order to build socialism and develop. If we accomplish these tasks, then we can train the people in the socialist sense. The issue is that each person strengthens his socialist lifestyle so that his neighbor can build socialism even better. People who are now less than 60 years of age have learned the lessons of middle school. We have set forth the solution that all people should reach

the level of high school graduate. Then we can completely resolve the issue of the national cadre.

We have not had less success in the area of the cultural revolution. When the country was liberated, we Koreans had only 12 high school graduates. Now there are some 1.2 million high school graduates. Training of the national cadre is the most important issue in Third World nations. We have resolved this issue.

As far as the economic situation is concerned, we must and we can achieve the perspective goals for the 80's in order to progress further. This is the situation. But we will have to work hard.

I would like to tell you briefly about the situation with South Korea. The situation with South Korea is very complicated and also very dangerous. Every year the American armies conduct a major military exercise. They conducted these exercises even prior to the Reagan era, but since Reagan took office this has grown. Last year 100,000 South Korean soldiers took part in this military exercise in addition to the American soldiers. We were a bit shocked that the Americans mobilized 100,000 South Koreans. We declared a state of emergency. This year the Americans mobilized more than 200,000 soldiers for this exercise. These exercises were "Team Spirit '83" and "Team Spirit '84".

The Americans stationed in Okinawa participated, as did those stationed in Hawaii. But many also came from the US. It was a major military exercise. But in contrast to last year, this year we did not declare a state of emergency. Our enemies threaten both us and the South Korean people with these exercises, and therefore there is this tension day in and day out on the demarcation line.

We have to take countermeasures every time the enemies conduct such military exercises, and this is a great hindrance for our production. Since the number of soldiers in our army is smaller than that of the South Korean army, we have to mobilize many workers in these cases. But when the workers are mobilized, one work shift is dropped for up to one and a half months per year. That is a great loss.

We proposed conducting tri-partite talks between us, the US, and South Korea this year in order to reduce tensions. The goal of these talks should be to replace the armistice with a peace treaty with the US. We proposed a non-aggression pact to South Korea. We hope that this will help to improve the tense situation, as well. And then the armies for both sides would be reduced and the Americans would withdraw from South Korea. Our opponent is using the pretext that we would attack South Korea, and says that this is why the Americans have to remain in South Korea. There is constant talk in the US House of Representatives that our military forces are stronger than those of South Korea—the purpose of this talk is to deceive the people of the world. In truth, it is not even possible for us to have more armed forces than our opponents. We have a population of 17 million, while South Korea has a population of 30 million. Just looking at these figures it is clear that it is impossible for us to be stronger militarily.

Just looking at the weapons potential, our opponent

gets all of its weapons from the US. And then there is the US army that is stationed in South Korea. And they even have nuclear weapons there. It is very plain that we are not militarily superior to them. But they use the pretext that we are stronger militarily in order to build up their weapons even more. And it would be impossible for us to attack them. This is all just a pretext for them to continue to occupy South Korea. South Korea is nothing more to the Americans than a colony and a military support point. The Americans never intend to leave South Korea. When Carter was in office, sometimes he said that there would be a partial withdrawal of American troops from South Korea. But Reagan has said that there should be even more American troops in South Korea. This is another reason we proposed tri-partite talks. We wanted to use the proposal to expose the American pretext. But this is precisely why the Americans have not agreed to our proposal yet. But their official statement is that they are against such tri-partite talks.

Their position has been that only two sides, that is, North and South Korea, should hold talks and negotiations. But in reality the South Korean authorities have no right to do so. In the past they opposed an armistice. They didn't want to sign it. In reality only we and the Americans are signatories. This is why it's completely clear that only the people who were signatories should hold the talks, but not those who opposed it. This means that when they say that both parts of Korea should hold talks, they will not replace the armistice with a peace treaty and they also oppose a statement of non-aggression. The commander of the South Korean Army is in reality an American. They are the unified military forces of the US and South Korea. This is why if talks are conducted with South Korea's president, it will never be possible for the armistice to be replaced with a peace treaty and for the soldiers on both sides to be reduced to a strength level of 100,000 to 200,000 troops. In reality our opponents want two Koreas and do not want to accept peaceful unification of the country.

The Americans now demand that if tri-partite talks are even to be conducted, the Chinese should also take part, so there would be four sides. The Chinese say they will not take part in such talks. The Chinese do not want to be drawn into the Korea issue. When Reagan was in China, he proposed conducting quadripartite negotiations, but China was opposed to this.

So the Korean situation looks like this. The struggle by the population of South Korea is currently intensifying. In the past the South Korean populace either feared the Americans or worshiped them. These two tendencies are in decline. The South Korean populace fought for democratization in the past. They did not fight for national sovereignty; they just demanded it. The demand for sovereignty would mean extricating itself from US domination. The young people and students of South Korea are currently waging an energetic battle for this. The Chun Doo Hwan regime is even worse than the Park Chung Hee regime. There are dogs that are somewhat belligerent and others that are downright vicious. This Chun Doo Hwan regime is like a vicious dog.

The US Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the armed forces in South Korea fought with Chun Doo Hwan against the Vietnamese during the Vietnam War. Chun Doo Hwan held major fundraisers for Reagan during the election when he was running for president.

When Reagan became president, he invited Chun Doo Hwan to further increase military forces in South Korea.

Once Chun Doo Hwan took power, the democratic parties in South Korea were dissolved under the pretext that they were our inventions. Some of the chairmen of the democratic parties were arrested, some were expelled. These representatives of democracy have thought about things since then and now say that there could be negotiations if they were still active as a party there. The entire population and even many Catholics in South Korea are unleashing a vigorous struggle against the Chun Doo Hwan regime. There is a rumor that the Americans are now considering replacing Chun Doo Hwan because the current trend in South Korea is to fight against Chun Doo Hwan.

In a word, there is little chance of reunification coming about as long as the Americans occupy South Korea. It is necessary to put forth proposals for peace over and over again in order to show the world that the US does not want this reunification. This is also necessary in order to encourage the South Korean people in their struggle. In the past we made a proposal for peaceful reunification, and, as I said, this year we proposed conducting tri-partite talks. So much for the situation in South Korea.

I would like to take this opportunity, esteemed Comrade Erich Honecker, to express to your Central Committee and your government our most sincere gratitude for your great understanding and active support for the fight to bring about the reunification of our country.

I would now like to turn to relations between our two Parties. Another reason we are visiting you is to consolidate friendly relations between the two Parties and to learn from the successes you have had in building a developed socialist society. At the same time, we have come to sign the Treaty of Friendship we spoke about in Pyongyang. Signing this treaty will be very encouraging, not only for socialist countries, non-aligned countries, and Third World nations, but also for all peace-loving peoples in the world. And this is very necessary in order to strengthen cooperation in the economic realm.

Our comrades have come at your invitation, at the invitation of the Central Committee and your government. It is both a great honor for us and a great joy that we are meeting here in Berlin. We have no differences of opinion with your Party and your government. It is necessary that we band together in order to reinforce the building of socialism and to assure peace in the entire world. I am in favor not only of signing the Treaty of Friendship, but also the long-term agreement on economic issues so that we can demonstrate socialism's superiority to capitalism.

The Central Committee and the government of our country actively support your people's struggle as the outposts

of socialism in the West. We actively support all of your proposals with regard to security in Europe and in the world. Our challenge is also that we obtain peace and strengthen the building of socialism. This is how we can assure peace in the entire world, because the only way we can continue to build socialism is under peaceful conditions.

With regard to relations between our two nations, I do not want to neglect mentioning that you also provided our people material and moral support during the three years of war in Korea. We are also very happy that you took in so many of our orphaned children and raised them as cadre. We are also grateful that you supported building up our country after the war ended, especially building up Hamhung. We are also grateful that you actively support us today on every issue.

I'd like once again to take this opportunity in the name of the Central Committee of our Party and in the name of all of the delegation members to express our sincere thanks for your active support for us in every area. I also believe that we will take the time on some other occasion to tell you about the issue of the movement of non-aligned nations and to speak with you about developments in countries in the region.

Erich Honecker: Thank you. If you permit, we will continue the talks after a short break and tell you about developments in the GDR and about problems we face in the further build-up of socialism, in realizing the resolutions of our X Party Congress.

In our country, the rent for one square meter of residential area is 0.80 to 1.20 M; in the Federal Republic of Germany it is 11.00 to 30.00 DM.

Comrade Kim Il Sung, I notice that we have exceeded the time we had allotted. I propose that we talk about the development of mutual relations at another time. We consider them positive, but think they can be expanded.

I have here the draft of an agreement between the governments of the Korean Democratic People's Republic and the German Democratic Republic on economic and scientific cooperation during the period up to 1990. I propose that our comrades get together and work out the final text—this would be Comrades Reichelt and Müller on our side. Then the Prime Ministers will sign it.

We have fulfilled the goals of the last long-term agreement. We have achieved a great increase, and we accept your proposals, also those on specialization and cooperation, which we take as the foundation for completing our Treaty of Friendship in the economic arena.

If you will permit, I would like to close now. We can continue our discussion after the afternoon break.

Kim Il Sung: Thank you very much. I also thank you in the name of my delegation for the detailed report. We wholly and completely support the measures you have undertaken to maintain peace in Europe and in the world.

In addition, you spoke about relations between the two German nations. That was an important and very interesting issue. What you said was precisely correct.

Erich Honecker: We will meet again, then, and will also be together all day tomorrow.

¹ Translator's note: German word used in source document can also mean lock or sluice.



DOCUMENT No. 8

Memorandum of conversation between Erich Honecker and Kim Il Sung, 31 May 1984.

[Source: SAPMO-BA, DY 30, 2460. Translated by Grace Leonard.]

Memorandum

[stamp:] Personal Classified Information

Central Committee 02 310

on the meeting between Erich Honecker and Kim Il Sung on 31 May 1984

E. Honecker used the meeting to address some issues that could not be addressed in greater detail during the official talks on 30 May 1984 due to time constraints.

He stated that the GDR is currently preoccupied with its 35th anniversary. The Party, which has 2.2 million members, is making thorough preparations for the 35th anniversary. The centerpiece is the ideological work, which has led to intense talks with practically every citizen of the GDR.

He said that, as Kim Il Sung could see for himself, the Party is bound to the masses, and there is a good trusting relationship between the Party and the masses. The alliance policy is very important, that is, cooperation with allied Parties, the role of organizations of the masses such as the Confederation of Free German Trade Unions, with 9 million members, the Free German Youth, with 2.3 million members, and the whole range of other organizations of the masses.

He said that the election results of 6 May 1984 could be considered the best in the history of the GDR, both in terms of the election itself and in terms of voter turnout, and attests to the successful policies of the Party and government in carrying out the resolutions of the X Party Congress.

He stated that the Socialist competition in honor of the 35th Anniversary of the GDR is very important. The workers have established as their goal for this to increase productivity by one percent above what is planned. Given the results thus far it can be expected that they will surpass this goal in the competition. Thus net industrial production in the first 5 months of 1984 increased by 7.9 percent. Productivity in the field of industrial ministries increased by 7 percent during the same period. This demonstrates the excellent initiative of the citizens of [line cut off].

He stated that the fact that 6 million citizens received new apartments between 1971 and 1983 alone was very positive for consolidating trust between the Party and the masses. Now the goal is to improve the residential conditions of an additional 4.3 million citizens between 1984 and 1990. Then the issue of apartments in the GDR as a social problem would be resolved in 1990. In addition, there are a number of other measures in the realm of social policy, e.g., the recent resolutions on improving material conditions for families with more than 3 children and the third increase in minimum pensions since 1971.

E. Honecker detailed the activities of organizations of the masses such as the Confederation of Free German Trade Unions, the Free German Youth, the Association of Gardeners and Animal Breeders, the reinvigorated Association for Mutual Farmers Assistance, the scientific institutes of the GDR, the academies and schools of higher education, the development of the general polytechnical school, the activities of artists unions, and much more.

All of this, he said, is going on in our country under conditions that are open to the world, as he had already expressed in 1977, that is, under the immediate observation of the Western adversary's electronic media. Naturally there are a few people who listen to these broadcasters and their daily lies, but it should not be overlooked that the vast majority of citizens of the GDR, one could even say, the people, stand fast and unalterably with the Party and government, with their republic.

E. Honecker then asked Kim Il Sung his assessment of the situation in China and of the current leadership of the Communist Party of China based on his own experience. For the USSR and also for the GDR and other socialist countries that do not have Party relations with China, China is a country about whose future course there are still many unresolved questions, for instance, as a result of the Reagan visit.

Kim Il Sung responded as follows. When Hu Yaobang visited our country in May, I also told him about my upcoming trip to the Soviet Union and the other Socialist countries. He welcomed it. I had not known Hu Yaobang before this. On the other hand, I have been friends with Deng Xiaoping for a long time. As you know, he was exiled three times during the Cultural Revolution. Deng Xiaoping paid me an unofficial visit for my 70th birthday in April 1982 to introduce Hu Yaobang to me as the new Secretary General of the Communist Party of China. He made a good impression on me from the beginning.

Hu Yaobang told me that he wants to improve governmental relations with the Soviet Union. He asked me to convey this to the leadership of the Soviet Union. Hu Yaobang assured me many times during our lengthy discussion that China is truly interested in improving relations with the Soviet Union. He confirmed this to me again this year. The leadership of the Communist Party of China is of one mind on this issue. He asked me to convey my thoughts on this to our Soviet comrades.

During his visit to the DPRK, he received news that Comrade Arkhipov's planned visit to the People's Republic

of China would be pushed back. Comrade Hu Yaobang told me that he had very much been looking forward to this visit. Our Chinese comrades also think highly of Comrade Arkhipov. He used to be an economic advisor in China. Comrade Hu Yaobang said that he very much regretted that Comrade Arkhipov's trip would be pushed back.



**Kim Il Sung and Erich Honecker,
29 May 1984**

Source: Bunesarchiv, Berlin

I told Comrade Chernenko about this during my meetings with him. I told our Soviet comrades my thoughts both in a personal meeting with Comrade Chernenko and in official negotiations—that the Chinese really want to improve relations with the Soviet Union. The Chinese do not want war. Overcoming the consequences of the Cultural Revolution in the economy and in the standard of living of the population requires a lot of time and effort. All resources must be devoted to this. The Chinese are not developing relations with the US and Japan with the goal of working against another country.

Given the complex world situation, I hope that the Soviet Union and China work things out. I believe that the development of relations with the US is not targeted against the Soviet Union. Mao Zedong and Zhou Enlai already told me that when they established relations with the US. They told us every time they met with Japan and the US. The only objective of these relations is to obtain developed technology and credit from Japan and the US. Deng Xiaoping is said to have stated in the US that the arms build-up in the US is good for peace. I don't know if that's so. This is the first time I have heard of Deng Xiaoping expressing a sentiment like that.

It is a fact that the Chinese have improved governmental relations with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. The number of delegations exchanged has grown, as well. All of this can help to reduce the mistrust between the Soviet Union and China. Naturally, I was not able to tell Comrade Chernenko that I think it is a mistake to push back Comrade Arkhipov's visit to China. I just told him that the Chinese regret it. The Presidium of the Central Committee of the Com-

munist Party of China has 5 members. Two of them—Wu Xueqian and Li Xiannian—used to be friends with Comrade Arkhipov. Today they are both powerful. Comrade Arkhipov could build trust in meetings with these two men.

Hu Yaobang told me the following: We sent the Deputy Prime Minister to Comrade Andropov's funeral. During the welcoming meeting, his escort told him that he could meet with anyone he wanted. As is customary with East Asians, he said that he would accommodate himself to whatever his host had arranged. Our Soviet comrades did not understand this correctly. There were meetings with just anyone. Only the Foreign Minister attended Brezhnev's burial. They were sending a message to the Soviet Union by sending the deputy prime minister. But this was not understood.

Kim Il Sung said that he believed that all socialist nations should work toward creating trust between the Soviet Union and China. No new mistrust must be permitted to arise. I have told our Soviet comrades that I believe that the goal of our Chinese comrades is to put Socialism in China in order. They don't want a conflict. I think it is important that China wants to open the gate to socialist nations in the interest of socialist modernization. We should not oppose that. Why should we leave the important Chinese market to the capitalists?

The old generation of leadership in China is dying out. We should show the new generation an opening. If we leave China to the capitalists, there is the risk that China will become a quasi-colony again. We should not close the door in China's face.

Because of our position—the length of our border with China, confrontation with the US and Japan—what we are most afraid of is that China will not stick with socialism. There are 1 billion people in China. We have to make sure that they follow the socialist path rather than some other path. We have to focus on drawing them toward us. In the past there were major anti-Soviet campaigns in China. This is not the case anymore. During the Cultural Revolution there were major propaganda actions against us on the Yalu. There were provocations in North Korea at the time of the Chinese/Soviet conflicts on the Ussuri in 1969. While I was recuperating in the country, I received a call from our Minister of State Security that Chinese troops were crossing the Tumen [River] onto our territory. I gave the order not to shoot, but to let them come ahead so that we could take them on our territory, if necessary. We sent a group of soldiers there. Then the Chinese withdrew. The Chinese have castigated the Soviet Union and even us as revisionists. It lasted about 5 years in our case, and we had to keep our peace because of our situation. We had to be patient.

China has new leadership now. They don't want any conflict with the Soviet Union. They want peaceful co-existence with the US, Japan, India, and even the Soviet Union. There are still no Party relations between the Soviet Union and China. We should all try to use our governmental relations to create an atmosphere that promotes the restoration of Party relations, even between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of China. I ask that

you, Comrade Honecker, recommend to our Soviet comrades that they send Comrade Arkhipov to China and furthermore that they begin exchanging delegations. I am convinced that China would never put herself on the side of the US against the Soviet Union. All socialist countries should develop economic ties to China, and should even invest in China. The Chinese wanted to speak to Comrade Arkhipov about opportunities to cooperate in modernizing the numerous plants built by the Soviet Union. I told Hu Yaobang that I would ask the Soviet Union about building a nuclear power plant. Hu Yaobang welcomed this, because it would be better than purchasing one from a capitalist country.

Regarding the incidents on the Chinese/Vietnamese border that you mentioned, which you do not approve of, which you regret, I have only the Chinese press accounts to go by. I know nothing of what actually happened. I consider it very regrettable, because these incidents help neither the Vietnamese nor the Chinese. They do damage to our common tasks, above all bringing the Chinese closer to us. All socialist countries should urge the two great powers to hold out their hands to one another.

Hu Yaobang has gathered a lot of new people around him. Hu Qili, who in the past was with the World Federation of Democratic Youth—he knows many people from the past, including you, Comrade Honecker. The current Foreign Minister was also involved in the youth organization in the past. There are many other people around Hu Yaobang who used to work in the youth organization. Hu Yaobang himself is still very healthy; he is smart, his theoretical knowledge is good, and he has also made a thorough study of Marxism. Deng Xiaoping works more from behind the scene, but he also believes that they have to develop relations with the Soviet Union. He is the only one of the old functionaries who is still there. I am his friend. In the past the Chinese castigated the Soviet Union as social imperialists. They don't do that any more.

I met Comrade Chernenko for the first time [line cut off] ... I knew him well. He has been to Korea three times. He sent me a personal letter immediately after he was elected. I promised him that I would come to the Soviet Union quickly so that I could travel to the GDR immediately afterwards. But that had to be postponed due to Comrade Andropov's illness. Since I have just gotten to know Comrade Chernenko, I did not know how far I could go with him during our talks. I ask you, Comrade Honecker, to discuss all of these issues with him when you meet. How good it would be for all of us if the Soviet Union and China would reconcile. Japanese journalists have frequently asked my opinion on Sino-Soviet relations. I always said that they are both socialist countries and they therefore belong together. Both the Soviet Union and China are our comrades-in-arms.

To E. Honecker's inquiry about the nature of the group of Koreans living in Japan, Kim Il Sung stated that this was a group formed by the DPRK. We support relations between this group and socialist countries, including the GDR.

Hu Yaobang, Kim Il Sung continued, had me briefed in great detail on his trip to Japan. I support normalization of

relations between China and Japan. There are those in Japan who aspire to reviving militarism and the alliance with the US. But Japan in general can have no interest in re-militarization for economic reasons. All of Japan's mass organizations oppose militarization. Much depends on which people are in power. I asked Hu Yaobang about his talks with Nakasone. He told me that Nakasone said that Japan will not become cannon fodder for the Americans. It can't dissociate itself from the US, but does not want to become a lackey of the US. We should all think about that. For the future it could be important whether Nakasone remains prime minister or whether Abe becomes prime minister. In China the Chinese have been courting Abe because they think he would be the better choice. We have to work with the Japanese in a way that ensures that militarism does not recur. I sometimes make harsh statements against Japanese militarism, but we have to work with them anyway. Above all we oppose the US/Japan/South Korea trilateral military alliance. The Japanese have promised the Chinese \$2 billion in credit. This is good for the Chinese economy.

I would like to address the socialist market, but today we have no more time.



DOCUMENT No. 9

Memorandum of Conversation between Erich Honecker and Kim Il Sung, 1 June 1984

[Source: SAPMO-BA, DY 30, 2460. Translated by Grace Leonard.]

[stamp:] Personal classified material

Central Committee 02 311

Memorandum

on the meeting between Erich Honecker and Kim Il Sung on 1 June 1984

E. Honecker began by expressing his gratitude for the lively exchange of views that took place during Kim Il Sung's visit. You were able to become more familiar with the policies of our Party and government, E. Honecker said, during your stay in Berlin, Wolkow, Frankfurt (Oder) and Eisenhüttenstadt, and during discussions with members of your delegation in the semi-conductor plant and in the Buna plant. And it was evident that the masses support these policies.

E. Honecker stated: I am happy about how well our views on the most important issues coincide. I was already convinced of this in 1977, at the time we agreed to enter into the Treaty on Friendship and Cooperation. Today we will sign this treaty. At the same time, both heads of state will sign the Agreement on Economic and Scientific Cooperation between our two nations. Naturally, all of this is extremely impor-

tant—it is an inspiration for our people, as you noted.

As you know, the development of the GDR is occurring based on a major division of labor in the framework of COMECON, cooperation with the other socialist countries. Seventy percent of our foreign trade goes to the socialist world, thirty percent to the non-socialist world. The great majority of our trade is based on the dynamic development of our industry. We have obligations that we must honor, both with respect to socialist countries, in particular based on cooperation and specialization, and in trade with the capitalist world, as well. It must be stated that trade with the capitalist world has suffered for the last 4 years, given the freeze on credit that the Reagan administration implemented with its allies. The same applies to deliveries of what they call “strategic goods.” Regardless of the complex conditions that arose for our balance of payments, we rely on ourselves, on the Soviet Union, and on the socialist community. You could say that our confidence in our own abilities is justified.

In the past few years the GDR has developed into a powerful industrial complex, into an industrialized nation, as they say in the West. It is now among the ten strongest industrialized nations in the world. We have made great progress in the fields of microelectronics, in refining our own raw materials. Organizing our industries into collective combines that respect the complete independence of the operations has proved worthwhile. The collective combines can react to demand with flexibility and endeavor to maintain and influence peak positions in critical fields.

We devote great attention to upgrading coal. Brown coal is the basis for gas production in the GDR. It is significant that coal dust is used in operations that used heating oil in the past, such as the cement industry. We are now in the process of converting from “D” locomotives to “E” locomotives.

In terms of bilateral relations between the GDR and the DPRK, E. Honecker stated that they are developing well. It is satisfying to see that economic and scientific/technical cooperation has made steady and dynamic progress since 1977. This positive development is manifested above all in the fact that sales of goods continue to increase. Based on the long-term trade agreement, sales will grow approximately 160 percent in 1984.

I would like to highlight the cooperation in the building of the automation equipment plant in Pyongyang, which began operating in 1983, and in the new construction of an anilon textile plant and the reconstruction of an existing textile plant, E. Honecker said. The GDR provided the equipment in the framework of government credits. Measures for scientific/technical cooperation are being realized between the two nations, in particular in the fields of chemistry, mining, and metallurgy. We believe that it would be useful to both countries if in the future we were to link scientific/technical cooperation even more strongly to focal points of economic cooperation.

We now think the time has come to prepare and reach agreement on measures for developing mutually advantageous economic and scientific/technical cooperation for the

post-1985 years and thus to create a stable foundation for our cooperation for the period up to 1990. Talks between economic delegations from both countries in March of this year already provided a number of good incentives. Initial measures were established at the last meeting of the advisory committee.

It would be useful to enter into an agreement on economic and scientific/technical cooperation between the GDR and DPRK for the period up to 1990. We are assuming that the long-term agreement from 1977 was worthwhile and our further cooperation can be formulated even more goal-intensively if we proceed in accordance with a plan we both agree on. For this reason, over the past few days we prepared and made available for discussion the draft of an agreement for the period up to 1990.

The economic efficiency of our cooperation should be further increased by our concentrating even more on fundamental work for consolidating the economic potential of both countries. We believe conditions are good for strengthening cooperation in the fields of mining, processing, and the supplying of raw materials, basic materials, and energy carriers. We are prepared to support the expansion and modernization of capacities in the DPRK’s extractive industry by providing machines and equipment and want to increase the products we receive from these capacities. We completely understand that your country does not want to provide only raw materials at the first processing stage, but to a certain extent would like to provide refined exports. We would also consider such a possibility.

Also in the field of processing industries, especially mechanical engineering and electrotechnology/electronics, we consider the conditions for further cooperation to be very good. We welcome the fact that the responsible minister has established contacts with us and leading comrades from collective combines and operations in both countries are working out proposals about what, to our mutual advantage, is to happen with our cooperation in the next few years. We are also willing and in a position to provide certain equipment for the textile industry, for production of agar and also other items if, in exchange, we can take goods that the GDR’s national economy requires.

We would like to propose that the central planning organs of our countries hold detailed consultations on realizing the central tasks for economic cooperation based on the foundation of the agreement signed [for the period] to 1990. They should come to agreement on the specific basis of cooperation as a condition for preparing a long-term trade agreement.

Our comrades in foreign trade have agreed to extend by one year the long-term trade agreement that is in effect until 1984, and to prepare a new long-term trade agreement for the period up to 1990. We would sincerely welcome this because it fits the rhythm of our planning.

I would particularly like to stress our intent, through even closer cooperation between our countries, to contribute to eliminating imports from Capitalist countries and to including concrete agreements in the long-term trade agree-

ment. We consider this to be exceptionally important, given the economic war that the US and other imperialist countries are waging with all resources against the nations of the socialist community.

Our Party and our state in the future will also continue to develop our mutually beneficial economic cooperation, with high-reliability, as an effective growth factor.

Kim Il Sung expressed his thanks for the overview that E. Honecker gave on developments in the GDR since 1977, and addressed two issues: the results of the visit to a few additional operations in the GDR and the relationship to the non-aligned countries.

It is very encouraging that we were able to agree on the delivery of a semi-conductor plant by your side, he said. Soon we will send specialists to agree on all of the specific issues, including joint ordering of certain parts in third countries. We already purchased a semi-conductor plant from Japan through unofficial channels. But it is incomplete. We were not aware of electronics development in the GDR. It was only as I was preparing for this visit that I learned that you have such a plant of your own. Our Central Committee approved the means for purchasing a semi-conductor plant a long time ago. But it could not come to pass because, for one thing, we did not know about your electronics. When I was just in the embassy, I criticized our comrades because they did not provide us correct information about GDR industry. For instance, we also did not know that you produce good synthetic rubber and herbicides. In the past we purchased all of these things from capitalist countries. That has to change.

In our country we have rich deposits of heavy metals: lead, zinc, etc. We have enough sintered magnesite for you to rely on us in this regard for a long time. There are good prospects for the supply of other heavy metals over the long-term, as well. I criticized our comrades in the embassy because of the lack of information. But I must say that in terms of management we did not provide our cadre sufficient guidance on the issue of fully exploring options for cooperating with the GDR and other socialist countries.

The agreement on long-term economic cooperation that our specialists have come up with and that we will sign today—I would like you to understand that we can add to it in many areas. We are not adequately familiar with the options for cooperation. Many options should be examined in greater detail by specialists in order for us to be able to expand the agreement.

We had been members of the movement of non-aligned nations since 1975; most recently we no longer belong to the movement, said Kim Il Sung. The movement set forth good solutions but is not in a position to resolve the basic issues. Above all it is not in a position to realize the requirement for a new economic order. The states that belong to it are politically independent, but they do not have independent national economies. This is why the danger of expanding neo-colonialism is growing. The US and Japan are again reaching toward the countries of the third world. The problems of the developing countries cannot be solved simply by

cooperation among themselves. Naturally something has to be done. Certainly mutual cooperation can achieve a few successes for agriculture and health care. But the countries cannot be industrialized by cooperation within the non-aligned pact. The best solution for them would be close ties between the socialist market and the market of the developing lands. We must all think carefully about this. We also oppose the efforts of capitalism in the Third World.

I believe there are two options for economic cooperation: 1. Expand the socialist market by adding individual developing nations. 2. Individual socialist nations can establish bilateral economic relations to individual developing nations. We can offer them specialists and technical documentation at lower prices than the capitalist countries will. In return the socialist nations can obtain cheaper raw materials from them. If we help them to assure their political independence through economic independence, they will succeed in ridding themselves of the pressure of the former colonial powers.

Above all it is important to develop this cooperation with the African nations. Nearly all of the heads of state of Africa—with the exception of Kenya and Morocco—have already visited our country. We know that you, Comrade Honecker, have visited a number of African nations and ascribe great importance to Africa's development. We have agricultural specialists in nearly all African countries. Our experience in Sudan indicates that just sending a small number of specialists can help them to double or triple agricultural production and thus to solve their main problem, the issue of food. If all of the socialist countries together initiate more dynamic activities with respect to the nations of Africa, we will be able to tear all of Africa away from imperialism and set many countries on the path to socialism.

The political forces and resulting avant-garde parties in these countries are very different. Ethiopia has obviously achieved the highest level of consolidation of a Marxist party. Despite these differences, however, we can use economic cooperation to strengthen the anti-imperialist forces in all of these countries. I am very pleased that we are of the same mind on this issue, as well.

Kim Il Sung asked Erich Honecker for his impression of non-aligned nations, in particular those with a socialist orientation, based on his visits to the non-socialist world. He stressed that the DPRK maintains relations with them all in order to support the path to further decolonialization and to prevent re-colonialization. E. Honecker specifically mentioned the critical situation in Latin America, US interference in the domestic affairs of Nicaragua, El Salvador, and other countries, the continuing threats against socialist Cuba, and the situation in Angola, Mozambique, and Ethiopia.

In conclusion, it was determined that it is necessary to continue to provide vigorous support to these countries in the struggle against imperialism, in particular US imperialism, but also imperialism of the FRG.

DOCUMENT No. 10**Report on conversation between Prof. Dr. Manfred Gerlach and Kim Il Sung, 26 May 1986**

[Source: SAPMO-BA, DY 30, 2460. Translated by Grace Leonard.]

To the members and candidates of the Politburo, EH [Erich Honecker], 26 May 86

Berlin, 26 May 1986

To Comrade Erich Honecker

Dear Comrade Honecker,

As you know, Manfred Gerlach was received by Kim Il Sung during the former's trip to the DPRK. During this meeting, Kim Il Sung made some statements that were specifically intended for you. I am sending you this excerpt from the report in the enclosure.

Sincerely,

[s]

Enclosure

J. Herrmann

II The meeting with Kim Il Sung

1. The meeting with Kim Il Sung lasted over an hour and was very friendly and open. Kim Il Sung spoke frequently, interrupting remarks by Prof. Dr. Gerlach (on statements about the XI Party Congress of the Socialist Unity Party, the GDR's peace and security policy, the USSR's peace program, the alliance policy of the Socialist Unity Party and issues of internal development in the GDR, the status of relations between the GDR and the DPRK, praising the policies and achievements of the DPRK) to express his thanks, to make assenting comments, or to make additional statements expressing his affirmation.

Kim Il Sung's comments can be categorized as follows:

- Emphatic, very sincere appreciation for his visit to the GDR in 1984. He said he will never forget the visit, the time he spent with Erich Honecker, "his best friend and comrade-in-arms", the extremely warm welcome the people of the GDR gave him. As soon as his train crossed the border and reached the first city, the entire population received him with jubilation, and his first impression was: This is truly a strong force that can withstand even its greatest foes.
- The expectation of a visit by Erich Honecker to the DPRK. After Erich Honecker's warm regards were conveyed to him, Kim Il Sung combined his thanks with a request that his own warm regards be conveyed. He said he was touched by these greetings and was very happy to re-

ceive them. He stated that he waited every day for news that Erich Honecker is coming to the DPRK. If he comes, he intends to receive him with extraordinary warmth and to personally show him the progress that has been made over the nearly 10 years since his last trip to the DPRK. He said he wants to discuss the international situation with him, the situation on the Korean peninsula and in Asia, and to talk about views on these topics.

He said he is very hopeful that Erich Honecker will visit and asks only that he not come in December during the cold season, as he did last time. He experienced such a warm reception in the GDR that if he wants to reciprocate the visit must take place in the warm season. He said Erich Honecker absolutely must come in order to encourage our people and the population of South Korea in their struggle. It is worthwhile to demonstrate before the entire world how both countries (even though they are divided) work together and diligently for socialism and peace. He has great personal respect for Erich Honecker, who has brought the entire population together in the GDR while Germany has been divided and who has built a developed socialist society. He greatly appreciates his accomplishments in achieving solidarity among Socialist countries, assuring world peace, the solidarity the people of the GDR have with the Korean people, and the material and moral support.

Relations between the GDR and DPRK

He said that since the Treaty of Friendship was signed in 1984, relations between our countries and peoples have grown much deeper. He stated that he is very happy that this is evident in all areas of politics, the economy, and culture. We are unanimous on all issues, there are no differences of opinion. Our task is to become even closer, as outposts of socialism in the east and west to fight against nuclear war, to assure world peace, and to continue to build socialism. Reagan is using every resource to prepare for nuclear war, but the peoples of the world oppose this and even his own allies waver. He said he is therefore convinced that we can assure peace and continue to build socialism even better if we wage this battle correctly. It is clear to us: this era of peace must be preserved. We must have better science and technology than the capitalist countries. The most important thing is to wage the battle so that socialism is completed.

He stated that in 1984 he became personally acquainted with the GDR's success in building socialism, and that after his visit in all the meetings of the Politburo and Central Committee he said in no uncertain terms that the people of the GDR—who are very disciplined, aggressive, and organized—will achieve victory. The outcome of the XI Party Congress of the Socialist Unity Party, the peace initiatives, and the new tasks for social/economic progress in the GDR typify very successful development in the GDR—developments he is well informed of, developments that are just as gratifying to him as the re-election of Erich Honecker as Secretary General. He requested that Erich Honecker be told that everything is going well in the DPRK. The Korean Workers Party continues

to wage the battle and wants to speed up development. Work is still ongoing in terms of successfully realizing the resolutions of the VI Party Congress and the 3rd Seven-Year Plan. He said that realizing the Nampo Plan opens up great economic opportunities, including resolving transport issues and reclaiming land. 300,000 hectares of land are to be reclaimed by 1990, so that in a few years it will be possible to have an annual grain harvest of 15 million tons.

Appreciation of alliance policies.

He said he is very pleased to have met the Chairman of a Party such as the LDPD that, together with and under the leadership of the Party of the Worker Class, and with Erich Honecker at the top, fights on a united front, marching toward socialism. We have the SPK and a Christian party. We want to combine these resources and build socialism together. He said he believes the GDR will also wage the battle for socialism successfully and effectively in its political/moral unity in the future as well.

The situation in South Korea.

In South Korea the people are now waging a good battle against the puppet regime and the US occupiers. It is not just students who are fighting, but broad elements of society. A wide united front is forming, and although it is not yet able to drive the US out of South Korea, it is still very important for developing consciousness and increasing vigilance among South Korea's populace.

He said the dictator is trembling, and Schultz and Weinberger have had to stiffen the regime's spine. But there is no injection that can save a man who is already dying. So, the situation is good. We continue to build socialism, the populace of South Korea continues its battle to rid itself of its dependence on the US.

At the conclusion of the meeting, in the name of the Korean people, Kim Il Sung conveyed warm greetings to the people of the GDR. He was visibly pleased with the gift from the LDPD delegation (oil painting by a Dresden painter of the view from the bastion of the mountains along the Elbe).



DOCUMENT No. 11

Report on the Visit by Erich Honecker to the DPRK, 18-21 October 1986

[Source: SAPMO-BA, DY 30, 2460. Translated by Grace Leonard.]

Report

On the official friendship visit by Comrade Erich Honecker, Secretary General of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party and Chairman of the State Council of the GDR, to

the People's Democratic Republic of Korea from 18 to 21 October 1986.

I.

The visit occurred at the invitation of Comrade Kim Il Sung, Secretary General of the Central Committee of the Korean Workers Party and President of the DPRK. Resolution no. 02 347 12/86 of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Social Unity Party of 8 July 1986 was fulfilled.

The official talks (Attachment 1) took place in a very friendly, open, and constructive atmosphere. They offered an opportunity for a detailed exchange of information and views on the international situation and policies, social development in the GDR and DPRK, and on the structure of bilateral relations.

In Pyongyang there were meetings between Comrade Günter Mittag and Comrade Yi Chong-ok, member of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Korean Workers Party and Vice Premier of the DPRK; between the Foreign ministers, Comrades Oskar Fischer and Kim Yong-nam, Member of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Korean Workers Party and Deputy Chairman of the Ministerial Council (Attachment 2); between Comrades Gerhard Beil and Choe Yong-gun, the Ministers of Foreign Trade; and between Comrades Günter Sieber and Hyon Chun-guk, member of the Central Committee and Director of the Department of International Relations of the Central Committee of the Korean Workers Party (Attachment 3).

Comrade Erich Honecker was warmly welcomed by 100,000 residents of Pyongyang and Nampo. He saw for himself the proof of the success the DPRK has enjoyed in building socialism and visited sights in Pyongyang, Mangyongdae, the heavy machinery construction collective combine in Taan, and the West Sea barrage and locks complex. There was a major presentation in Pyongyang, with more than 150,000 participants. This was followed by a major athletic exhibition by 50,000 athletes, which took the form of a political manifestation of the close and friendly relations between the two Parties, nations, and peoples.

Comrade Erich Honecker placed a wreath at the memorial grove of revolutionaries in Pyongyang.

II.

Comrade Erich Honecker explained the tasks that are to be undertaken in the GDR in accordance with the resolutions of the XI Party Congress in the qualitatively new segment of further structuring the developed socialist society and the foreign policy of the GDR. The Socialist Unity Party has become involved, at the right time, with the requirements for further developing productivity and socialist production. He stressed that the economic strategy has made it possible to permit intensification to become the critical foundation for the increase in performance and to ensure the required continuous economic growth, in particular by mastering key technologies.

Comrade Erich Honecker stressed that the Socialist Unity

Party will hold steady in the future its course of unifying economic and social policy as the main battlefield for successful development of the GDR. The results of the national elections on 8 June have affirmed the will of the workers to continue this policy with new initiatives.

The focus of Comrade Erich Honecker's remarks on foreign policy was a detailed assessment of the international situation, which has become extremely critical due to the policies of the most aggressive circles of US imperialism and their allies in NATO, and an explanation of the initiatives of the SED and GDR, which are intended to maintain peace and assure security, in concert with the agreed peace strategy of the USSR and other Warsaw Pact member countries. Comrade Erich Honecker said that it was not until now that it was worthwhile to take the opportunity and fight to decide the issue of war or peace, in favor of peace. This is why the GDR also supports the path Comrade Gorbachev laid out in Reykjavik to achieve that which was shown to be possible there. He made assurances, based on historical responsibility that war will never again issue from German soil, only peace, that the GDR will work with all forces of reason and realism and seek a constructive, results-oriented dialogue. In this context, he welcomed the foreign policy initiatives of the DPRK, especially efforts to create a nuclear-free peace zone on the Korean peninsula.

III.

Comrade Erich Honecker and Comrade Kim Il Sung praised the excellent state of fraternal relations between the two Parties, states, and peoples, which have reached a qualitatively new level since both leading representatives met and since the treaty on Friendship and Cooperation was signed in 1984. The further deepening of relations between the Socialist Unity Party of Germany and the Korean Workers Party, as well as the active exchange of delegations and experience, had a particularly stimulating effect overall.

Comrade Erich Honecker invited Comrade Kim Il Sung to visit the GDR. The invitation was accepted with great joy and sincere thanks.

Comrade Erich Honecker stressed that the successful development of economic relations between the GDR and the DPRK was in complete accord with the political interests of the Party and government. It could therefore be established at the XI Party Congress that a qualitatively new level of relations of friendship and comradely cooperation had been achieved with the DPRK.

The positive results obtained in economic cooperation and in trade, and the further conditions created for dynamic development of economic, scientific/technical, and trade relations between the two countries, were appraised as the successful realization of the Treaty on Friendship and Cooperation and the Agreement on the Development of Economic and Scientific/Technical Cooperation in the period up to 1990. Important industrial objectives in the DPRK, such as the automation equipment plant in Pyongyang, the textile plants in Kanggye, Hyesan, and Anju, were met with machines and equipment from the GDR and are important components of

the economy of the DPRK.

Comrade Kim Il Sung agreed with Comrade Erich Honecker's remarks on the link between strong socialism and peace. He stressed the need to draw more and more resources into the peace movement.

Comrade Kim Il Sung explained that the focus of the third seven-year-plan, which begins in 1987, is to resolve the food issue and to provide residential living space and adequate clothing.

This means expanding the amount of land cultivated for grain by 500,000 to 2 million hectares and guaranteeing comprehensive irrigation of the areas, creating 150,000 to 200,000 residential units annually, and, due to a lack of cotton, creating new production capacities for synthetic fibers from domestic raw materials (limestone, anthracite) from 50,000 tons to 150,000 tons annually as a foundation for a total of 1.5 billion meters of material.

It has turned out that only 8.5 to 9 million tons of steel are adequate for domestic demand, rather than the originally planned 15. Instead, the amount of aluminum produced from limestone and alumina must be increased. It is necessary to further raise the training level of the people to satisfy the new tasks.

Comrade Kim Il Sung mentioned important resolutions by the Central Committee of the Korean Workers Party that are meant to achieve the technical level of developed countries in a short period of time by accelerating the scientific/technical revolution.

In order to achieve the 10 planned development goals of the VI Party Congress, it will be necessary in particular to modernize available technology based on rapid development of mechanical engineering, electrotechnology, and automation technology, including in particular technology for finding and exploiting raw materials and fuels and other energy carriers, raising the technological level of production, scientific penetration into production methods and operational activities.

In this context, Comrade Kim Il Sung stressed the importance of cooperation with the GDR in implementing economic objectives and particularly providing scientific/technical know-how. This cooperation will become extremely important in the next few years. Comrade Kim Il Sung asked that the GDR review its ability to provide machines and equipment for the vinalon textile plant.

As to the situation in South Korea, Comrade Kim Il Sung stated that the anti-American mood has grown even more among the population, and in religious circles. But no rapid change in relations among the powers is to be expected.

The US rejected proposals made by the DPRK for reducing tensions on the Korean peninsula because it [would] lose its reason for remaining in South Korea if the initiatives were realized.

Comrade Kim Il Sung affirmed that the DPRK does not intend to attack South Korea, nor could it. More than 1,000 US nuclear warheads are stored in South Korea, ostensibly for defense, and it would take only two of them to destroy the DPRK. The DPRK supports the proposals made by Comrade

Gorbachev in Vladivostok and Reykjavik. Many problems could not be resolved with South Korea. Progress in relations between the Soviet Union and the US would also help to resolve the Korea problem.

Comrade Kim Il Sung welcomed Erich Honecker's upcoming visit to the People's Republic of China. He characterized the trip as good for Socialism and told him about views expressed to him by high-level Chinese politicians, who praised Comrade Honecker's work and who had great expectations for his visit.

Comrade Erich Honecker and Comrade Kim Il Sung stressed their complete agreement on the issues they addressed and determined that there were no differences in views between the two Parties.

Comrade Erich Honecker welcomed the DPRK's foreign policy initiatives, especially the proposal to convert the Korean peninsula into a nuclear-free peace zone and the international conference held in Pyongyang on this, as important contributions by the country to ensuring peace and security in Asia. He considered the withdrawal of 150,000 DPRK army troops from the front line at the demilitarized zone to be a most important step for decreasing tensions on the Korean peninsula. Comrade Erich Honecker supported the DPRK's demand that US troops withdraw from South Korea and that Korea be peacefully reunited.

Comrade Kim Il Sung repeatedly stressed the DPRK's determined resolution to work more closely with the USSR, the GDR, the other states in COMECON, and with the Warsaw Pact.

During his visit, Comrade Kim Il Sung openly and repeatedly spoke in favor of the comprehensive initiatives Comrade Gorbachev proposed for preventing a nuclear war, in favor of transforming the Asia/Pacific region to a peace zone, in favor of cooperation, and in favor of the proposed halt to the nuclear arms race and averting the danger of a nuclear inferno. He characterized the Soviet proposals as responsible and evidence of a peace-loving foreign policy. In this context, he advocated comradely solidarity and development of friendship and cooperation between socialist nations as an important pledge in the war against imperialism and for socialism.

In his meeting with Comrade Günter Mittag, Comrade Yi Chong-ok, Member of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Korean Workers Party and Vice Premier of the DPRK, expressed the conviction that the official friendship visit by the Secretary General of the Central Committee of the Social Unity Party and Chairman of the State Council of the GDR would result in a broad impetus for deepening and expanding economic relations.

The economic policies of the Korean Workers Party, which are aimed at qualitative factors of economic development and intensification, offer favorable conditions for developing economic cooperation with a highly industrialized nation such as the GDR. Both sides agreed to examine further objectives of economic cooperation. A statement on this between the Ministers of Foreign Trade, Gerhard Beil and Choe Jong-gun, was signed on 21 October 1986.

The Annual Statement on Mutual Imports and Exports between Comrade Gerhard Beil and Comrade Choe Jong-gun was signed on 20 October 1986. It provides for a 37.5 percent increase in foreign trade over 1986. This created the foreign trade policy basis for export and import tasks for above-average and dynamic development of exports and imports. Including objectives for economic cooperation for the first time in the annual statement for 1987 assured the supply of work and professional clothing to the GDR in the amount of 32 million M/VGM.

IV.

Summary assessment:

1. The trip to the DPRK was an impressive and powerful demonstration of the friendship and fraternity between the two Parties, states, and peoples. It promoted closer cooperation between the Socialist states and will stimulate confident cooperation at all levels for a long time.

The official friendship visit and the meetings with leading comrades from the DPRK significantly improved the conditions for coordinating policies, for intensification, and for further improving the sharing of experiences on all sides. At the same time new conditions were created for quantitative and qualitative improvement of relations in all areas, especially in the economic and scientific/technical realms.

The broad exchange of information and experience on policies of both countries while building socialism, on raising the standard of living of the populace, on performing political/ideological work, and, last but not least, on the activities of the Party, represents an increase in knowledge for building and strengthening socialism.

2. The first meeting with Comrade Kim Il Sung since his official 1984 friendship visit to the GDR pointed out additional opportunities to deliberately strengthen the process of rapprochement and of cooperation between the nations of the socialist community and the DPRK.

3. Comrade Erich Honecker's official friendship visit to the DPRK resonated strongly with the public in the DPRK and in the media.

Particularly stressed were:

- the trusting relationship of the two leading representatives;
- the great mutual understanding and constructive approach of both sides in managing relations;
- the effectiveness of past cooperation between the two Parties and nations.

V.

Conclusions:

1. Comrade Kim Il Sung will visit the GDR at some future time to be agreed upon.

For action: Comrade Oskar Fischer

Comrade Günter Sieber

2. Relations between the GDR's Chamber of Deputies and the DPRK's Supreme People's Assembly shall be taken to a higher level by exchanging views and experience.

For action: Comrade Horst Sindermann

3. The existing consultation mechanism with the Korean Workers Party and the DPRK shall be qualified and employed in a deliberate manner for mutual procedures for reconciling and further coordinating foreign policy activities.

For action: Comrade Hermann Axen

Comrade Oskar Fischer

4. The official visit by the Foreign Minister of the GDR to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea at a time to be agreed is approved.

For action: Comrade Oskar Fischer

5. Relations with the DPRK in the areas of economy, foreign trade, and science and technology shall be expanded and deepened based on the talks conducted and on existing agreements and treaties.

Foreign trade relations shall be expanded based on proposals made, the Governmental Agreement on the Exchange of Goods for 1986 - 1990, and the signed Annual Statement for 1987. The potential for supplying machines and equipment for a vinalon textile plant shall be examined.

For action: Comrade Günter Mittag

Comrade Gerhard Schörer

Comrade Gerhard Beil

6. The initiatives of the DPRK and its youth organization for conducting the XIII World Games of Youth and Students in Pyongyang are supported.

For action: Comrade Eberhard Aurich

7. Cultural/scientific relations to the DPRK shall be expanded. A cultural working plan shall be prepared for the years 1987 - 1990.

For action: Comrade Kurt Hager

Comrade Oskar Fischer

Comrade Hans-Joachim Hoffmann

Comrade Hans-Joachim Böhme

8. Concrete proposals for sending study delegations from the Party and appropriate ministries and high-ranking study delegations to the DPRK shall be presented to the Secretariat of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party for further developing bilateral relations in the realization of determinations made during the Erich Honecker's official friendship visit.

For action: Comrade Günter Sieber

Comrade Oskar Fischer

DOCUMENT No. 12

Report on a Trip to the DPRK by a Delegation from the GDR, 16 May 1988

[Source: SAPMO-BA, DY 30, 2205. Translated by Grace Leonard.]

To the members and candidates of the Politburo, EH [Erich Honecker]

16 May 88

SOCIALIST UNITY PARTY OF GERMANY

BERLIN DISTRICT

KURSTRASSE 36, BERLIN 1080

FIRST SECRETARY

To

Comrade Erich Honecker

Secretary General of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party

and Chairman of the State Council

of the GDR

Berlin, 16 May 1988

Dear Comrade Erich Honecker,

I am reporting on the trip by a delegation from the Berlin District of the Socialist Unity Party to the capitols of the People's Republic of China, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, and the People's Republic of Mongolia. The delegation was received with extraordinary warmth in Beijing, Pyongyang, and Ulan-Bator. We were afforded the greatest possible opportunities for work in each country.

The delegation leader and Comrade Erhard Krack, the lord mayor, were received by Secretaries General Zhao Ziyang, Kim Il Sung, and Jambyn Batmonh. Our comrades stressed their respect for the policies of the Socialist Unity Party, for the building work that has been accomplished in the GDR, and their great appreciation for the work of Comrade Erich Honecker, Secretary General of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party and Chairman of the State Council of the GDR. They expressed their personal and genuine solidarity with Comrade Honecker.

To augment my telegrams from the individual stations, I have enclosed the detailed records of remarks by Comrade Zhao Ziyang, Comrade Kim Il Sung, and Comrade Jambyn Batmonh.

In addition to the agreements with the Party leadership and municipalities on continuing to improve exchanges, agreements on city cooperation were reached with the capitols of Beijing and Ulan-Bator that the Secretaries General emphatically approved.

The most important of these framework agreements is the one with the city government of Beijing. I have enclosed it with proposals for a number of measures for fleshing out the framework agreement with respect to the 40th anniversary

sary of the People's Republic of China. I would be grateful for your ideas on this so that we can proceed with them in mind.

We will give Comrade Sieber the detailed reports about the delegation's work.

With Socialist greetings,

[s]

Enclosures

Günter Schabowski

Minutes

Of the meeting between Kim Il Sung, Secretary General of the Korean Workers Party, and Comrade Günter Schabowski in Pyongyang on 10 May 1988

At the beginning of the meeting Kim Il Sung asked specifically after Erich Honecker's health. He expressed his thanks for the Secretary General's regards as conveyed by Günter Schabowski and asked that his own warm regards be conveyed to his best friend and brother. He emphasized his deep friendship with Erich Honecker by saying that each of them was occupying a socialist outpost, one in the west, the other in the east. He said he still remembered the tremendous reception he experienced from the people of Berlin when he visited the GDR in 1984. The population thereby demonstrated its solid unity with the Party and also the force that grows out of the friendship of our two nations.

Comrade Kim Il Sung again gave his thanks for Erich Honecker's invitation for a delegation from the DPRK to attend the International Meeting for Nuclear Free Zones from 20 June to 22 June 1988 in Berlin. He characterized this initiative of Erich Honecker's as very important and said that the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Korean Workers Party had decided to send a delegation that would be led by a member of the Politburo and the Secretary of the Central Committee.

Kim Il Sung stressed how completely the foreign policies of the GDR and the DPRK were in agreement and emphasized that our parties also had the same views on objectives for building socialism.

There can be no other objectives if one truly wants to blaze the trail of socialism.

He said he follows Erich Honecker's speeches with great interest, and that these speeches coincide completely with his views.

Comrade Kim Il Sung stated that he is very satisfied with the cooperation between the GDR and the DPRK. The GDR actively supports the Korean people's struggle in all areas. Indirectly referencing the information Günter Schabowski asked for at an earlier meeting with Kang Hui-won, candidate for the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Korean Workers Party, about the prospects for contractual delivery of certain raw materials from the DPRK, Comrade Kim Il Sung said that he knew that the DPRK is not currently fulfilling its trade obligations as set forth in the agreements. He made

assurances that this will be made up and everything will proceed normally in the second half of 1988. Addressing the reasons for the backlogs – and according to him this was the first time he had discussed this with a foreign delegation—Kim Il Sung talked about major floods in 1986 and 1987, which the Koreans had not made publicly known internationally. All of the production facilities, railroad tracks, and roads were flooded in the valley where the sintered magnesite is found, production came to a standstill, and there was a great deal of destruction. A member of the Politburo and the Secretary of the Central Committee was dispatched to lead efforts on-site to repair the damage. A Deputy Chairman of the Council of Ministers has been working as the District Party Secretary for this period. The production workshops will begin full operations during the course of the first half of 1988 so that everything will be delivered that the DPRK has pledged to deliver.

The Party and the entire country is currently focusing great efforts on the construction plans for the 13th World Games of Youth and Students in Pyongyang in 1989. These are very difficult and also expensive preparations, because at the same time capital investments in operations must also continue. The build-up work in small cities has been suspended for the time being. It is primarily the army that is working at the construction sites in Pyongyang; it will accomplish much in the "200-day battle." Everything is being done to prepare well for the 13th world games and to make them a success.

Work is proceeding with the same initiative with which the service members of the army constructed the West Sea barrage. Now that the barrage has been operating for two years, the substantial efforts and costs invested have already been recouped.

Günter Schabowski thanked Kim Il Sung for the meeting, for the detailed description of the Korean Workers Party's current struggle to bring about the resolutions of the VI Party Congress, and the confident assurances that all of the obligations to the GDR with regard to deliveries would be fulfilled. He emphatically stressed that Comrade Erich Honecker had authorized him to provide assurances again that the GDR will observe all agreements that were made between him and Comrade Kim Il Sung. In this context, he described the resolution of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party to send a delegation of representatives of the GDR, to be led by Willi Stoph, to the 40th anniversary of the founding of the DPRK.

He said that the youth in the GDR are preparing for the 13th World Games in Pyongyang with the intent, alongside the side of the Korean youth, to make this occasion a great event for the youth of the world, a convincing demonstration of the strength of our socialist nations, and an active contribution to maintaining world peace. This was also reflected in the May demonstration by over 750,000 residents of Berlin, which was a powerful manifestation of the unity of Party and people.

Comrade Kim Il Sung again asked that his fraternal greetings be conveyed to Erich Honecker, and stressed that the

successes of the GDR, under the leadership of the Socialist Unity Party, are also always considered as mutual successes and our Parties and our peoples will conduct increasingly close cooperation.



DOCUMENT No. 13

Report on visit of GDR military delegation to DPRK, July 1988.

[Source: SAPMO-BA, DY 30, 2508. Translated by Grace Leonard.]

Report

On the visit by an official military delegation from the GDR to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in July 1988.

An official military delegation from the GDR, led by General of the Army Heinz Kessler, Minister of National Defense and member of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party, visited the Democratic People's Republic of Korea from 19 July to 23 July 1988. This visit followed an invitation from Vice Marshall O Chin U, Minister of the People's Army and member of the Presidium of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Workers' Party of Korea. The delegation included Colonel General Horst Brünner, Deputy Minister, Lieutenant General Manfred Grätz, and six other generals and officers of the National People's Army.

In Pyongyang the delegation laid a wreath in the memorial grove of fallen Korean revolutionaries and toured the house in Mangyongdae where Kim Il Sung was born, visited the Tower of the Juche Idea, the Victorious Fatherland Liberation War Museum, the Pioneer Palace, construction sites for the athletic center, and Kwangbok Street, and in Nampo the delegation visited the West Sea barrage complex.

The military facilities the delegation visited were the "Kim Il Sung" military political academy, one base for the West Sea fleet (on an island off the coast), and a training center for special reconnaissance forces. The visit to the military forces in the Kaesong area, the building complex for armistice negotiations in Panmunjom, and to special forces, which had been planned for 22 July (originally planned for 20 July), could not take place due to poor helicopter flying conditions (violent rainstorms).

The high point of the GDR military delegation's stay was a meeting with Kim Il Sung, Secretary General of the Central Committee of Workers' Party of Korea and President of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, on 21 July 1988.

At the beginning of the 70-minute visit, Kim Il Sung asked, "How is my brother and my best friend, Erich Honecker?" Heinz Kessler conveyed to him personal greetings from the Secretary General of the Central Committee of

the Socialist Unity Party, praised the manner in which relations between our two parties, nations, and peoples have developed since 1984 in accordance with the assessment of our Party and state leadership, and then had the opportunity to speak for about 40 minutes about the GDR's peace policy (Berlin Meeting for Nuclear-Free Zones in June, Meeting of the Political Advisory Committee of the Warsaw Pact in July), progress of economic and social policy in the Socialist Unity Party (especially with regard to the increase in productivity and the use of key technologies), and security and military policy (including the withdrawal of Soviet missiles from GDR territory ahead of schedule and exercise monitoring in accordance with the Stockholm document).

Kim Il Sung expressed his sincere gratitude for the detailed and informative briefing on the policies of the Socialist Unity Party and on the situation in the GDR. His exact words were, "I greatly appreciate the policies of the Socialist Unity Party, with Erich Honecker at its top, and its efforts to assure peace in the world." He said that the International Meeting for Nuclear Weapons-Free Zones was very important. He was also very grateful that the GDR's Party leadership and state leadership had determined that the delegation from the Democratic People's Republic of Korea had played such an important and vital role at this meeting in Berlin. He cited this as eloquent proof that their Party and our Party are fighting together for world peace.

He asserted that under the leadership of the Socialist Unity Party, with Erich Honecker at the top, we are building Socialism well, that they have great appreciation for this and laud it as a success. The fact that we have made such good progress with residential construction and electrotechnology/electronics is a good indication that they can learn much from the GDR.

He said that our two countries welcome the signing of the medium-range missile pact between the Soviet Union and the US. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea welcomes the far-reaching disarmament negotiations between the two superpowers and has high hopes for a positive outcome. However, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea is confronted with many nuclear weapons in South Korea that belong to the US. This is why the leadership of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has also already made numerous proposals for the withdrawal of US troops and their nuclear weapons, for ending the arms race, and for reducing the armed forces on the Korean peninsula in stages in order to transform it into a nuclear-free zone of peace.

He stated that the situation in Korea is still tense. The declaration by the South Korean leadership on 7 July 1988 is meant to split the country permanently. Over the past six months the puppets over there have not responded at all to the proposals the President made in his New Year's speech to work intensively for peace and to undertake negotiations for reconciliation between North and South Korea on the broadest possible social basis, to alleviate tensions, and to work on relations between them at a conference of all parties and social classes of the North and South, with a view toward unification.

The stance of the puppets led to mass protests by the young people in South Korea, who demanded that they be able to go to the North and that the young people from the North be able to come to the South.

He said that the proposals made by the South Korean leadership were nothing new. Negotiations by the Red Cross, scientists, and other contacts were broken off precisely because "Team Spirit" and other major exercises were being conducted in the South. Peaceful negotiations were impossible to reconcile with the fact that they were aiming cannons at North Korea and sharpening their swords.

He stated that now new parliaments are being elected in the North and South — as a first step their representatives could get together and hold talks, sometimes in Pyongyang, sometimes in Seoul, on a declaration of non-aggression.

Today at 11:00 a.m. a new letter will be presented to the South Korean side in Panmunjom. If they decline to accept it, its contents will be broadcast by radio starting at 5 p.m. It remains to be seen what the response to this will be.

He said the South Koreans might want to, but the US will certainly oppose it and will prevent them because such an agreement on non-aggression would make it impossible to continue to justify to the world their presence in the South. But then the Democratic People's Republic of Korea would be in a position to expose the statements made by the US and South Korea as mere empty words. Kim Il Sung requested that Erich Honecker be briefed about this situation and its implications.

During the second part of his remarks, the Secretary General addressed economic development in the country. He said that they are currently conducting a major campaign in the building of socialism. This has to do both with the construction of hydroelectric plants and many coal mines and with the building of major plants for vinalon, plastics, aluminum, and potassium fertilizers. "When we have completed this major campaign and have successfully satisfied the third Seven-Year Plan, then we will nearly have reached the level of developed nations."

In particular he praised the 200-day battle for the 40th anniversary of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, in which the goals were consistently exceeded. He cited as an example that the daily goal of 4 million kilowatt hours of current was exceeded yesterday with 4.3 million.

Only 3.5 to 3.6 million kilowatt hours were produced in the past. Important accomplishments were achieved in transportation, as well; it was possible to increase the daily perfor-

mance of rail transport from 300,000 tons to 330 to 350,000 tons. And if energy production and transportation lead the way, the entire national economy will develop well.

Finally, Kim Il Sung expressed his gratitude for the assistance the GDR provided to the Korean People's Army. He considered the visit by the military delegation and also the subsequent short vacation by the Minister to be an expression of the close ties between our two Parties and of the profound confidence the Socialist Unity Party has in the Workers' Party of Korea. He asked that his most sincere regards be passed on to his brother and friend, Erich Honecker, and to the people of the GDR, when we returned. The President then personally awarded General of the Army Heinz Kessler with the Order of the State Banner First Class and the other members of the delegation with further orders and medals of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

Subsequent to this visit, which took place in the President's residence at the foot of the Paektusan mountain, a center of the partisan battles against the Japanese, the delegation visited the highest mountain in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (2,744 meters), which is located immediately on the border with China. Minister O Chin U, who accompanied the delegation constantly except for two occasions, also made his way up the steep mountain paths despite problems stemming from a serious traffic accident in 1986.

A spirited meeting of the German/Korean Brotherhood in Arms with more than 6,000 members of the Korean armed forces took place on the afternoon of 22 July 1988 in the Cultural Palace of the Korean People's Army, one of the largest halls in the capitol (speeches by the two ministers enclosed as attachment).

At this point the completely open, comradely, even warm atmosphere that had characterized the entire visit by the military delegation was evident once again. The high esteem in which the GDR and National People's Army are held was apparent everywhere.

After the announcement, the document that we had prepared on the cooperation of the two Ministries of Defense in the coming years was signed.

In conclusion it can be stated that the goals of the Party and state leadership for the military delegation and the expectations linked to it were completely fulfilled.

The embassy of the GDR, the media, and its representatives abroad provided good support to the visit. Reporting in the Korean media was very detailed.

Inside North Korea: Selected Documents from Hungarian and Polish Archives

The following documents provided by Csaba Békés of the Cold War History Research Center in Budapest and Vojtech Mastny of the Parallel History Project on NATO and the Warsaw Pact supplement the analyses by Shen Zhi-hua, Bernd Schaefer and Balazs Szalontai. These records of Kim Il Sung's conversations and correspondence with his allies, and Hungarian diplomats' reports to Budapest from their embassy in Pyongyang, provide important insights into the evolution of North Korea's remarkable autonomy within the communist camp. The first three documents serve as a foil, illuminating by way of contrast just how sharply and rapidly relations between communist countries deteriorated following Khrushchev's denunciation of Stalin in 1956. In this new environment, Kim Il Sung moved quickly to protect himself from the threat posed by de-Stalinization, while at the same time ensuring the continued flow of economic aid from his fraternal allies. As the Sino-Soviet split intensified the dangers facing the North Korean leadership, Kim Il Sung withdrew further into self-protective idiosyncrasy, pressing but never exceeding the limits of his allies' forbearance.

DOCUMENT No. 1

Report, Legation of Hungary in North Korea to the Hungarian Foreign Ministry, 4 March 1953

*[Source: Hungarian National Archives [Hereafter MOL],
XIX-J-1-j-Korea-11/f-00828/1953 8.d. Translated by
József Litkei.]*

The Legation of the Hungarian People's Republic.
Top Secret.

Pyongyang 4 March 1953.

Subject: Delivery of Comrade Rákosi's verbal greeting and
gift to Comrade Kim Il Sung.

On 17 February, based on a previous appointment, I visited Comrade Kim Il Sung with the purpose of fulfilling the necessary visit upon my return from vacation and delivering Comrade Rákosi's verbal greeting, best wishes, and his previously-mentioned¹ gift to Comrade Kim Il Sung. Despite being occupied [with work], Comrade Kim Il Sung received me very quickly, on the third day after my request, at 12 p.m. at General Headquarters. He welcomed my arrival—as he usually does—with a cheerful and good-humored smile. Our conversation lasted for 108 minutes, and during this entire time he maintained his cheerfulness and good humor.

Comrade Kim Il Sung spoke in Korean, which was translated into Russian by Comrade Deputy Foreign Minister Yi Tong-gon, and he talked for so long that I had difficulty remembering everything word-for-word. I apologized for disturbing him and immediately explained that the reason for my visit was to deliver to Comrade Kim Il Sung and the entire Korean people Comrade Rákosi's verbal greeting and best wishes, in which he wishes the earliest possible victory over

the enemy. Please allow me, Comrade Kim Il Sung, to deliver Comrade Rákosi's modest but cordial gift as well.² Comrade Kim Il Sung first [shook my hand] with his usual laughter, which expressed his fullest and honest delight, then repeated the handshake in a serious and strong way and thanked [me] for Comrade Rákosi's greeting and gift. He immediately offered me a seat and also offered biscuits and apples, which were served quickly.

Comrade Kim Il Sung briefly inquired after our well-being. Surely we must be having some difficulties, he said, to which I responded that we are having difficulties only in the sense that we would like to work more than we have managed to do so far. Other than this, we cannot speak of difficulties, since the Korean government—under the leadership of Comrade Kim Il Sung—does everything possible to provide us with the appropriate and necessary undisturbed working conditions, with which we are fully satisfied.

Comrade Kim Il Sung then began [the conversation by] saying that the Eisenhower [government] is making a big noise which they think they can use to scare us, but we will not be scared by their noise, [since] our people have been forged and soldered together in this war. We are not alone. Chinese volunteers are fighting on our side, and, headed by the Soviet Union, all democratic countries—among them the Hungarian people—are giving us every support. Of course, he said, without this powerful assistance, we would be unable to continue successfully the fight against such an enemy as American imperialism. This is why we cannot give enough thanks for this help to the friendly countries, the Hungarian people, and Comrade Rákosi, who is so attentive and who took a position so resolutely to help the Korean people from the very first day of the war. We will never forget this, said Comrade Kim Il Sung.

Our hinterland is steady and we are stronger than ever before, and if the enemy dares to attack we will destroy them. Comrade Kim Il Sung repeated this with the following words:

“We will inflict a destructive blow upon the enemy.”

Following this, he listed some data concerning the assistance given by friendly China and Mongolia. They received 5,000,000 items of clothing and pairs of shoes from China. (One can see people everywhere wearing warm, blue Chinese clothes.) They also received a large amount of wheat from China.

From Mongolia, they [the Mongolians] intend to send 86,500 various animals again this year, among them 16,000 horses. This is extremely important, said Comrade Kim Il Sung, because until now the soldiers have been forced to carry various equipment on their backs and to haul military equipment [themselves], but this work can now be done by horses. With this, the situation of the soldiers is greatly improved. Comrade Deputy Foreign Minister Yi Tong-gon told us that on one occasion, Comrade Kim Il Sung expressed himself on this topic in front of a Mongolian delegation visiting in January in the following way: they are a new kind of volunteer.

The assistance provided by friendly countries is ever increasing—just as Hungary increased its support for this year by 15 percent—so we are becoming ever stronger, said Comrade Kim Il Sung. Of course, we are receiving the most assistance from the Soviet Union, it helps us with everything, he said. In addition to this great support, we also do everything possible in order to strengthen the front and the country on our own. The mining industry is meeting the state plan, despite the fact that they had to work under very difficult conditions. Of the required 65 million meters of cloth, we are producing 40 million meters—primarily white linen—by ourselves. We have an underground textile factory equipped with 1,500 spools. (At this point, Comrade Kim Il Sung asked me whether I have seen this factory). No. They will show it [to us]. In addition to this, we have two smaller textile factories, he said. (We saw one of them in Pyongyang in a narrow [air raid] shelter.) In our meat production, we expect 60,000 tons this year, he said.

At this point, he turned to the subject of the importance of cadres, and referred to Comrade Stalin’s well-known thesis that [the quality] of cadres determines everything. In connection with this, he spoke again of the help given by the friendly countries. Today we still have great deficiencies [in this field] and difficulties that result from it, but in a few years time we will have many well-experienced cadres, who are now studying in friendly countries. This help is also of immeasurable value for us, said Comrade Kim Il Sung.

Here he mentioned that because of the difficulties caused by last year’s drought [in Hungary], they had not planned to send any new orphans to Hungary this year, but since they received our official request and approval concerning this, they will send them [after all]. They are very pleased to accept this help from us. In connection with this, he mentioned that the Korean children are being treated very well in Hungary, they have great opportunities to study, and in every respect they are being taken care of in the best manner. Comrade Kim Il Sung thanked us for this as well. This very serious help gives great strength to our people, he said.

Later, he inquired about the work of our hospital and the well-being of our medical staff. We are surely having difficulties, aren’t we? Our hospital has very good and safe underground working places. Our doctors can work undisturbed. I said that the frequent shortages of electricity are causing some difficulties in their work, but we can manage that. There were greater difficulties in terms of providing the labor force necessary for the construction. At the moment, our hospital is located in four villages. It was decentralized in this way due to the conditions of earlier times. Recently, however, as prescribed by order of the Military Medical Command, hospitals must be even more decentralized (outside of the villages), so we began with the construction of free-standing buildings and sickrooms that are located below ground level. The construction of the hospital was begun by our own forces, which is making it go very slowly. So far we have managed to build only four smaller buildings for 60 patients, and the groundwork for some more buildings is underway. The other patients in the villages are exposed to the greatest danger.

Comrade Kim Il Sung told us that certain military units are now under reorganization, but this will soon end, and then he will immediately send assistance to accelerate the construction [work], because it is very important that the patients get out of the villages as soon as possible. Concerning our hospital, Comrade Kim Il Sung mentioned that our doctors are working very well and that our hospital has become very well known among the Korean people, and further added that [“]I have already promised to visit the Hungarian hospital named after Comrade Rákosi, but unfortunately I have not yet had time for it. From now on, however, the moment I have some [free] time, I will visit it.[”] I said that this would be our great pleasure, since Comrade Kim Il Sung’s visit will surely give a further impetus to the work of the hospital’s entire personnel.

Comrade Kim Il Sung then asked again whether we are having any further difficulties because of the bombing. With regard to the hospital we are not, I said. I see difficulties with respect to the work of the legation; we would like to work harder, but language problems on the one hand, and the war conditions on the other make our work more difficult. The staff of our legation has increased, [but] so have our tasks, I said. We find it very important to learn about the valuable experiences of the Korean people, who are bearing [the burdens of] a long war. Comrade Kim Il Sung reacted keenly to this, and listed several things, such as the fight of the heroic railroad workers and engine-drivers, the steadfast work of the peasantry to provide bread, and the heroic deeds of the partisans, etc. These are all providing [us with] important experiences, of which we have ample, he said. He also mentioned the story of the seventy heroic fishermen. While fishing, they were spotted by the crew of an enemy cruiser, which wanted to capture them. The fishermen did not surrender, and all of them jumped into the water and tried to swim to the seashore. Out of 70, only three drowned while the rest reached the shore.

I also mentioned that we are very interested in how the

different organs and organizations execute and organize their work under the difficult war conditions. I mentioned, for example, the work of the Peace Council, Trade Union, Democratic Women's Association, Youth Association, and, in the realm of culture, the work of the recently established Academy of Sciences. We would like to learn about their work, experiences, and the difficulties they face, in order to [know how we could] help them. We would like to provide the Academy of Sciences regularly with academic material, but we also would like to help in other fields. In order to do so, however, it is necessary to get in closer touch with them, in order to discuss with them from time to time what kinds of materials they need.

[Since] Comrade Kim Il Sung understands Russian quite well, he understood this, and said that this is a very good idea. Thereupon Comrade Deputy Foreign Minister Yi Tong-gon reported to Comrade Kim Il Sung that I have already submitted a number of questions to which we would like to receive answers. He [then] listed the questions, to which Comrade Kim Il Sung responded that this is very natural and experiences must be shared. He requested that we reciprocate by sharing with them all of our people's experiences building socialism, ["because after the war we will also be building"], said Comrade Kim Il Sung. In this respect as well, I said, we will do our best to help as much and as well we can.

At this point Comrade Kim Il Sung emphasized that he will provide all possible assistance to this work, and that they will organize the meetings I requested in order to establish the necessary connections.

Concerning the bombing, I said that we already have a very appropriate air-raid shelter and we can work very undisturbed. I have, however, a very modest remark related to the population. I do not know the entire territory of the country from this respect, but for example from the bombing of two villages in our small working area, I perceived that they were located too close to the railroad's unloading platform, and this is why they were hit so badly that they were almost entirely destroyed.

Comrade Kim Il Sung said that this is indeed true and immediately added that ["we already gave strict orders to the population to move out from the cities, other dangerous locations, and their immediate vicinity (like railroad stations and unloading locations) to the mountains, and the peasants should build their houses on their land, 150 to 200 meters from each other. With the coming of the winter this work has become more difficult, so the population has not yet been able to move from many dangerous places. Now, in the spring, this problem will be entirely solved,"] said Comrade Kim Il Sung.

The entire conversation was very friendly, and as I could see, Comrade Kim Il Sung also enjoyed it. He did not mind devoting time to it. I was prepared to leave earlier, in order not to take up the time of Comrade Kim Il Sung for such a long while, but he kept on raising new questions, from which I concluded that I could not leave after all. He was glad to have this conversation, and I was just as glad to listen to him.

In the following [remarks], Comrade Kim Il Sung told me that they are receiving a great amount of meat from friendly countries, but now they are also taking the course of developing their stock of domestic animals, although they also have to consider the climate here. They are primarily thinking of raising pigs and sheep, he said, because they have difficulties with respect to the fat provision as well. Corn also grows here, and this provides a great opportunity for good pig breeding. Moreover, I said, you could introduce cows of good breed, which is necessary not only with respect to the meat provision but also with respect to the very important milk provision. To this, Comrade Kim Il Sung took out his notebook and showed me the names of the Caucasian breed cows they have requested from the Soviet Union. Friendly countries are helping us with everything, he said. We are now summoning our ambassador's home, and through them we will also express our special thanks for all the effective assistance the friendly countries have been providing us, said Comrade Kim Il Sung.

When standing up, Comrade Kim Il Sung turned to me and said the following: I ask you to forward my thanks, gratefulness, and love to Comrade Rákosi, the Hungarian government, and the entire friendly Hungarian people for the unselfish and honest assistance that they have provided us, which we will never forget. Then he continued: Moreover, I would like to thank you for your tireless work, which you have been doing in the last two long years in order to help our people under the greatest ordeals and difficulties. With these words, Comrade Kim Il Sung offered his hand, but I asked him to allow me one more minute, first apologizing that I kept him for such a long time, then requesting to respond to the last words of Comrade Kim Il Sung.

My assistance, I believe, can hardly be termed even modest, but in the future I will make every effort to contribute even better work to support the struggle of the heroic Korean people, and to deepen the friendship between our peoples. Concerning our difficulties here, I do not regard them as difficulties, because as I have already said, I see and I am convinced that the Korean government under the leadership of Comrade Kim Il Sung is doing everything in order to provide the appropriate conditions necessary to our work. I could not feel better being here, I am proud that I can work together with this heroic people, and as far as I am concerned, I do not wish to leave the beloved Korean people until it finishes its victorious struggle against the enemy.

Concerning the gift, in Hungary the one who gives the gift usually says to wear and consume it in strength and health, and this is what I also wish now to Comrade Kim Il Sung.

Comrade Kim Il Sung shook my hand again with great fervor and expressed his thanks for the gift several times.

[In the following paragraphs, the Hungarian minister reports that a flat tire made it difficult to arrive at the meeting on time.]

signature

Minister Károly Pásztor

¹ TRANSLATOR'S NOTE: The document here uses the Hungarian expression "already known gift," but it is not clear what this refers to. It is most likely that the gift was either mentioned in a previous report or that the minister believes that those receiving this report already know about the gift.

² TRANSLATOR'S NOTE: Here, as throughout the document, the text turns from indirect speech to quasi-quotation.



DOCUMENT No. 2

Report, Legation of the Hungarian People's Republic in Beijing to the Foreign Ministry of Hungary, 15 January 1954.

[Source: MOL, XIX-J-1-j-Korea-11/f-00317/1954 9.d.
Translated by József Litkei.]

The Legation of the Hungarian People's Republic.
Beijing.

Top Secret.

4 copies prepared. 3 for FM, 1 for embassy.

Beijing, 15 January 1954.

Subject: Chinese opinion concerning the Korean question.

In the course of a conversation with Comrade Wu Xiuquan [Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs] on 2 January, he told me the following.

They think that it is very likely that the political conference can only be started after the beginning of the Berlin conference, but it is also possible that it can be started only after the Berlin conference is over. The beginning of the Berlin conference, its course, and [its] outcome will have a great impact on the entire international situation, and therefore on the Korean political conference as well.

The Chinese-Korean side is taking political advantage of the Americans' stonewalling tactics, revealing to the world what is the real meaning of [the Americans' policy], while they [the Chinese-Korean side] on the other hand are urging the resumption of the negotiations.

Another reason why the Americans are delaying the political conference is the question of prisoners of war, and [the Americans' attempts to] prevent a solution concerning the [ir] ideological education.¹ According to the Chinese government, the decisive factor in the question of prisoners of war is not the issue of the prisoners themselves, but the political aspect of the question. By preventing ideological education, the USA broke the armistice agreement.

In the eyes of international public opinion, this already

means a great defeat for [the US]. This further contributes to the violation of the agreement by the so-called UN Forces. If on 22 or 23 January, they execute the greatly-publicized liberation of the prisoners of war, which will entail penetrating into the neutral zone, they will again unmask themselves. At the same time, the Chinese-Korean side is strictly keeping the regulations of the armistice agreement.

It was interesting that although in December Indian General Thimayya, in the majority resolution (Indian, Czechoslovakian, Polish) concerning the prisoners' of war ideological education, condemned the UN's quibbling concerning ending the detention of the prisoners of war, on 23 January he represented the US position and took a stand for the release of the prisoners of war. The Chinese government, specifically Comrades Zhou Enlai and [Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs] Zhang Hanfu, informed the Indian government through Ambassador Raghavan that this declaration seemed to indicate that the Indian government would support the Americans' machinations which are trying to prevent resolution of the prisoners of war problem. According to the Chinese government, this does not correspond to India's neutral position. In this way, they exerted pressure on the Indian government, which a few days later resulted in Nehru making his well-known statement in which he declared that he supports prolonging the ideological education and ordered General Thimayya to withdraw his declaration and represent the position of the Indian government. In this way, it was achieved that despite all hesitations, India took a position concerning the prisoners of war issue that at least appeared to be neutral.

In my opinion, the reason for India's hesitation and contradictory statements is that it wants to take advantage of its neutral position vis-a-vis the US and to profit from publicly defending the Chinese-Korean position. It particularly needs this tactical advantage concerning the issues of Pakistan's armaments, the establishment of military bases, and the Kashmir question. At the moment, [India's] neutral statements favor the peace-camp.

signature

chargé d'affaires ad interim

¹ TRANSLATOR'S NOTE: The literal translation of the term used here and elsewhere in the document would be "explanatory work." This, however, would not give the proper meaning.

DOCUMENT No. 3

Report, Embassy of Hungary in North Korea to the Hungarian Foreign Ministry, 28 June 1955.

[Source: MOL, XIX-J-1-j-Korea-5/f-006944/1955 7.d.
Translated by József Litkei.]

The Embassy of the Hungarian People's Republic.
Top Secret.

00135/Top secret-1955

Pyongyang, 28 June 1955.
Prepared in 4 copies, 3 for the FM,
1 copy for the Embassy
Typed by Mrs. Sóváradi

Subject: Visit to Comrade Kim Il Sung.

On 24 June, I went to the foreign ministry for a pre-arranged meeting at 4:45 p.m., where Comrade Foreign Minister Nam Il was already expecting me. After a few welcoming words, we drove with Comrade Nam Il in his car to [meet] Comrade Kim Il Sung, arriving a few minutes before five. I took Comrade Golub with me to act as interpreter for the conversation. Comrade Kim Il Sung received us very warmly. His speech was translated by Comrade Nam Il into Russian. The conversation lasted for forty minutes.

At the very beginning of the conversation, I thanked Comrade Kim Il Sung for receiving me so quickly, despite his amount of work. After this, I immediately presented the reason for my visit. I told him that [I came] on behalf of our party's Central Committee in order to hand over materials dealing with the March CC [Central Committee] session of our party. These materials consist of resolutions that were passed and documents dealing with the inner life of our party. I think that Comrade Kim Il Sung and the CC of the Workers' Party can make use of these materials, since there are certain problems that are common to both parties. Comrade Kim Il Sung received the material gratefully. He responded that he and the members of the CC will carefully study them.

Following this, Comrade Kim Il Sung inquired about our experts and the employees of our embassy. I answered that we live here in Korea just as if we were at home; I myself almost feel like an old Pyongyang resident, since I have been living in Korea already for a year. Comrade Kim Il Sung expressed his thanks for the good work of our engineers, who are helping to plan the rebuilding of Pyongyang and are also participating in the actual construction work. I answered that it is very pleasant for us to hear that Comrade Kim Il Sung values our experts and their work so highly. Our experts do everything in order to do as good a job as possible—while of course there are nonetheless some shortcomings in this respect. The rebuilding of Pyongyang has otherwise greatly advanced in the course of the last year. Last year it was difficult to notice its urban character, but

now we can say that Pyongyang really has become a city. Comrade Kim Il Sung responded that this is only the beginning of the city's development, and that the city will only be built up to a great extent in three or four years time. Otherwise, they are having difficulties with the construction, and especially in providing the necessary cement. They lack a sufficient amount of cement, and so they need to import it from abroad. Recently they have partially repaired a cement factory. Due to the urgent need for cement, they were forced to put it into operation. The factory was producing for a while, but now its operations have stopped again. It should not have been put into operation in a half-finished condition. Well, we are inexperienced in this respect. But we have drawn the necessary lessons in order to avoid such events in the future. I responded that we are familiar with cement shortages. One of our technical delegations was here recently, and he was intensively engaged with this very issue.

Following this, Comrade Kim Il Sung told us that the country's party leaders and experts are young, with little experience. During the more than 30 years of Japanese rule, there was no education of Korean experts. The majority of the present experts began to study after the liberation, and they had hardly graduated when we had to appoint them to responsible professional or party positions. It is no wonder that mistakes in the work still occur. It makes our situation even more difficult that our country is ruined, divided into two, and the fact that Southern slogans are emphasizing that they want to launch a "military campaign against the North" is forcing us to strengthen our defense capabilities. Hungary is in a much better situation in this respect. I responded that this is indeed the case; Hungary has been free for ten years, and during this time we did not have to wage a war. Of course, we also have difficulties. We also must intensify raising our country's defense capacity and developing our heavy industry, since there are imperialist states in our neighborhood. The road of our development is not paved with smooth asphalt either.

After all this, Comrade Kim Il Sung said that last autumn the party took the necessary measures to overcome the difficulties caused by last year's bad harvest. When I asked about the prospects for this year's harvest, he answered jokingly that the weather is good now, it rains a lot, and they make use of God's help. I answered, also jokingly, that we don't really care much about God's help, but sometimes it comes in handy.

I asked Comrade Kim Il Sung if he might have the time to answer a question of mine. Comrade Kim Il Sung courteously gave a positive answer. Then I asked him what were those fractional actions that were discussed during the last meeting of the party's Central Committee. Based on the material we received, we could not understand whether this refers to an old and ongoing question or merely to isolated phenomena. Comrade Kim Il Sung explained that the subversive elements uncovered last year exerted some influence on some party members, such as the Minister of Postal Affairs, and other members too. These elements were not in direct contact with the elements from last year. They did not have

a separate organization. They criticized the party's policy and were unsatisfied with it. The same thing happened in the army. The person who continued this policy in the army was a general who has already admitted his mistake and made honest [self-] criticism, so he was relieved of his post and appointed to another position. The CC is now dealing with the case of the minister of postal affairs. He is being cultivated and educated. Of course, the party does everything to avoid this or similar things from happening in the future. They have organized things so that if something like this happens again, it can be immediately prevented. It is absolutely important to be vigilant. And we will be vigilant for any such action. The activities of those members who pursued a clique-policy in the past are being observed as well. At the moment, they are not yet excluded from the party, but this could also happen in the future.

I thanked Comrade Kim Il Sung for his reply and told him that we are very interested in the situation of the fraternal parties. Unfortunately, not very long ago, similar problems also occurred in our party. The materials we brought deal with this issue, among other things. Our party had to engage in a hard struggle, from which it emerged victorious.

Comrade Kim Il Sung repeated that of course there is no guarantee against such things happening in the party in the future, but that they did everything they could to prevent such incidents from occurring again.

Following this, Comrade Kim Il Sung inquired about Comrade Rákosi. I told him that [Comrade Rákosi] has been sick lately, and for this reason he was not able actively to participate in the work done before March. He feels much better now, and the doctors have allowed him a six-hour work-day, but he works more than that because he has so much to do.

Finally, I expressed my thanks to Comrade Kim Il Sung for receiving me at such short notice and wished him good health and success in his work. Comrade Kim Il Sung replied that whenever I have any problem, I should turn to him. He is ready to receive me at any time. It is possible that he will have some questions concerning the materials I brought him.

The conversation took place in a very cordial atmosphere.

Remarks:

1. It was very friendly of Comrade Kim Il Sung to receive me immediately after learning the reason [for my request].
2. Praising our engineers and experts was more than a formal act of courtesy.
3. The information received concerning the issue of sectarianism is important for us because it explains the nature of the phenomenon discussed at the last plenum.
4. Comrade Kim Il Sung is in very good condition, in an extremely good mood, and he is very friendly.

signature

Ambassador Pál Szarvas



DOCUMENT No. 4

Report, Embassy of Hungary in North Korea to Hungarian Foreign Ministry, 10 September 1956.

[Source: MOL, XIX-J-1-j-Korea-1/c-007230-1956 2.d.
Translated by József Litkei.]

The Embassy of the Hungarian People's Republic.

96/7/Top Secret. 1956. I/3.

Presenter: Lajos Karsai

Top Secret.

Pyongyang, 10 September 1956.

Subject: Visit to Comrade Kim Il Sung.

Since presenting my credentials (on 10 August), we have made five requests to the protocol department of the F[oreign] M[inistry] to be received by Comrade Kim Il Sung. Later I decided—and this decision was confirmed by the opinion of Soviet Ambassador Comrade Ivanov (See my report no. 96/8 top secret 1956)—not to make further requests.

I talked about this issue with the Comrade Soviet Ambassador on 20 August. After this, I indeed did not urge the above-mentioned visit, but on the evening of 2 August [sic.], at the reception organized at the Romanian embassy for the 12th anniversary of Romania's liberation—where Comrade Kim Il Sung was not present—Comrade Nam Il personally informed me that the next day, 24 August, Comrade Kim Il Sung would receive me at 12 p.m. At the same time, Comrade Nam Il asked me to be at his office at 11.50 a.m., because he would accompany me.

In my opinion, after the conversation with me, Comrade Ivanov raised the question to Comrade Nam Il whether Comrade Kim Il Sung had already received me, and if not, then why. That they can discuss such questions is the more likely since at every reception Comrade Ivanov talks only to Comrade Nam Il and vice-versa; moreover, their conversations can last a very long time. It happened several times that they arrived together in the same car to a reception. (For example, Comrade Nam Il and Ivanov arrived together in the same car to the reception we organized in honor of the "Járóka" ensemble. After the reception, they left separately in their own cars.)

But no matter how much the comrade Soviet ambassador did or did not help [us] (which is, of course, only an assumption), and moreover, no matter how definitely Comrade Nam Il stated the evening before that on the next day

Comrade Kim Il Sung would receive me, in reality he did not do so. On the appointed day, the morning of August 24, the FM [Foreign Ministry] protocol department informed me that due to his illness, Comrade Kim Il Sung was unable to receive me that day. I accepted this. In the evening, when I was at the dinner organized by Comrade Deputy Foreign Minister Yi Tong-gon, I expressed my regret that I had not yet been able to meet Comrade Kim Il Sung since presenting my credentials and [my sympathy] for his illness. I asked Comrade Yi Tong-gon to forward my best wishes to Comrade Kim Il Sung and to wish him a speedy recovery.

On 1 September, the FM protocol department informed me over the telephone that Comrade Kim Il Sung was ready to receive me at 12 p.m. that day. He asked me to be in front of the FM building at 11:50 a.m., but they could not yet tell me whether Comrade Nam Il or Comrade Yi Tong-gon would accompany me to the visit.

At the appointed time, I went first to the building of the FM accompanied by Comrade Karsai, where an official of the protocol department escorted me to Comrade Nam Il. Here Comrade Nam Il told me that the reason why Comrade Kim Il Sung has been unable to receive me was his illness and his being occupied with the work of preparing for the CC's August plenum. Comrade Nam Il also briefly mentioned that Comrade Kim Il Sung participated in the work of the CC Plenum despite his illness, and that unfortunately he is still sick, and he still does not feel entirely well. I immediately responded to this that if I had known this before, I would have suggested postponing the meeting to a later point of time when Comrade Kim Il Sung feels better, and I firmly requested not to disturb Comrade Kim Il Sung now. Comrade Nam Il responded that his illness was not so dangerous and in any event, this was a kind of official visit that did not need to last long—so there was nothing strange in my visiting him now, especially since he was waiting for me.

At 12 p.m. exactly, I appeared in Comrade Kim Il Sung's reception room in the Cabinet (Council) of Ministers building, where Comrade Kim Il Sung was indeed waiting for me.

Besides Comrade Kim Il Sung and myself, Comrade Nam Il and Comrade Karsai also participated in the conversation, the latter acting as interpreter on behalf of the embassy.

Comrade Kim Il Sung received me with apparent cordiality. He came up to the door that opened into the reception room to [greet] me, but the way he offered me a place to sit was interesting and for me somewhat unusual. The reception room, which was rather a hall, was a rectangular room. There were small tables along the two longer walls with comfortable leather armchairs behind them. The hall was approx. 5-6 meters wide, with an empty space in the middle covered with carpet. [Kim Il Sung] offered places to me, comrades Nam Il, and Karsai at one end of the hall, while Comrade Kim Il Sung took a seat alone at the other end of the hall. There was a distance of 2 to 3 meters between us, and this is how we conducted our conversation. It seems that this is the custom here.

[The following paragraphs deal with the conversation, which touched upon issues such as life in Pyongyang, the

problem of constructing a new building for the Hungarian embassy, and plans for developing Pyongyang. The conversation did not address political issues.]

When I left, Comrades Kim Il Sung and Nam Il escorted me to the door of the room.

signature

Ambassador Károly Práth



DOCUMENT No. 5

Report, Embassy of the Hungarian People's Republic in the DPRK to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Hungary, 19 November 1959.

*[Source: MOL, XIX-J-1-j-Korea-5/c-006836/1959 6.d.
Translated by József Litkei.]*

The Embassy of the Hungarian People's Republic.

Top Secret.

Pyongyang, 19 November 1959.

Subject. Conversation with Deputy Foreign Minister Yoo Ch'ang-sik on the Korean reaction to the CPSU Seventh Congress and some important questions concerning Korea's foreign and domestic policies.

Comrade Yoo Ch'ang-sik was recently appointed deputy foreign minister. He leads the work of the F[oreign] M[inistry]'s No. 1. Political Department, the Protocol Department, and the DCSO.¹ He is a young man aged approximately 35 to 38. During the Korean war, he fought on the front as a political officer. He was sent from the front to study in the Soviet Union. He graduated from the College for International Relations in Kiev. As a former war veteran and college student, he spent one month in Hungary in 1952 and participated for approx. one week in the building of Sztálinváros. Before his appointment as deputy foreign minister, he worked as the deputy head of the Party's CC International Department. He speaks Russian well. He gives the impression of being a talented, pleasant, and serious man.

[Translator's Note: In the following two paragraphs, the ambassador reports on the first part of their meeting, which dealt with the composition of the Korean delegation to be sent to the forthcoming Seventh Congress of the HSWP.]

Upon my inquiry, Comrade Yoo Ch'ang-sik briefly informed me about some important questions of Korean foreign and domestic political life.

The Sixth session of the DPRK's Second Supreme People's Assembly was convened upon the personal initiative of Comrade Kim Il Sung. It was Comrade Kim Il Sung's

initiative as well which placed the question of Korea's peaceful unification on the agenda. They are convinced that they did so at the most appropriate time. Today, tension is abating in the international situation. Peoples of the world everywhere honestly wish for peace. They [the Koreans] think that the socialist countries and all the peace-loving people of the world reacted positively to the Korean parliament's appeal. Their aim with their appeal to the parliaments of the world was to direct the world's attention to the Korean question during a favorable period of international relations like this, so that they could achieve the withdrawal of US troops from South Korea as soon as possible, start negotiations and economic and cultural relations between North and South Korea, and realize the peaceful unification of the country as soon as possible. In the name of his government, Comrade Yoo Ch'ang-sik expressed his thanks for the support that the Hungarian People's Republic offered so far in this issue and emphasized that they are counting on this support also in the future.

Talking about the domestic situation, Comrade Yoo Ch'ang-sik informed me that they will convene the Korean Workers' Party CC Plenum in the near future, which will be similar to the December 1956 plenum in its significance. In Korea, the December Plenum is considered to be a plenum of historic importance. In the words of Comrade Yoo Ch'ang-sik, this plenum gave the push to the emergence of the "Chollima" movement. It was the 1956 December plenum at which they again debated and closed the Ch'oe Ch'ang-ik and Pak Ch'ang-ok faction group affair. While at the August plenum of that year they uncovered this faction and excluded its leaders and several members from the party, they were on the other hand re-admitted to the party at the September plenum, where Comrade Mikoyan also participated. At the December plenum, these faction leaders were finally excluded from the leading organs of the party and government and were allegedly sent for the time being to factories in the countryside. Comrade Yoo Ch'ang-sik did not say anything concerning the latter. The main questions that the forthcoming party plenum will discuss are the question of the economic plan for the year 1960 and of developing the planting of trees into a popular movement.

One of the most important national economic tasks of the year 1960 is the mechanization of agriculture and bringing the technical revolution of agriculture to victory. In January of this year, at the first congress of producer cooperatives, Comrade Kim Il Sung set the task of accomplishing the mechanization of agriculture within one to two years. Comrade Yoo Ch'ang-sik emphasized that the DPRK will be able to achieve this, since it already has a developed industry that is able to produce tractors and other agricultural machines. In order to increase the production of agriculture, modernize animal husbandry, and deliver more and a greater variety of food products to the workers' table—all issues which were discussed by this year's February and June party plenums—they need more work and, first of all, more working hands. The DPRK's national economy, and especially agriculture, suffers from a great labor shortage. This shortage of labor

will be compensated for by [the use of] machines, which will be able to accomplish work of both greater quantity and a more perfect, higher quality than human hands. The mechanization of agriculture will concern primarily the provinces of South Hwanghae and South Pyongan. These provinces provide more than the half of the country's agricultural gross yield. If they manage to mechanize agriculture in these two provinces, then it can be said that the mechanization was basically completed in the whole country. It is not by accident that Comrade Kim Il Sung recently visited several cities, villages, agricultural machine factories, and machine [and tractor] stations in South Hwanghae province on 12, 13, and 14 November. Others with him were Pak Chong-ae vice chairman of the CC, the head of the Planning Office, the Minister of the Engineering Industry, the Minister of Transportation, the Minister of Agriculture, and the Minister of Trade.

According to the press, the total sowing area of grain in South Hwanghae province is 286 thousand chongbo. On 58 percent of this, work (plowing, sowing and threshing) is already done with machines. The province has 16 machine [and tractor] stations.

In the seat of the province, the city of Haeju, a new agricultural machine factory was put into operation this July. Besides this, there is already another engineering factory in Haeju. Comrade Kim Il Sung visited both factories on 12 November, and had conversations with the workers. Here, in the engineering factory in Haeju, he announced that the building of a factory of machine parts necessary for irrigation plants will be terminated and a food industrial plant will be built instead. The parts necessary for irrigation plants will be produced in the machine factory in Haeju. The province has at the present 900 tractors. Next year they will give one thousand tractors and more trucks to the province. In this way, they will be able to cultivate 80 to 85 percent of the province's sowing area with machines. Parallel with the progress of motorization, the total crop of grain in the province will be raised to 1 million tons within the next few years. The 17 November issue of the "Minju Choson" wrote that during his November visit to the countryside, Comrade Kim Il Sung criticized the work of the ministry of agriculture, since the latter does not devote enough care to promoting the cause of mechanizing agriculture.

Comrade Yoo Ch'ang-sik emphasized that the reason why the question of mechanizing agriculture became such a central issue is that the problem of irrigation has been basically solved. The extension of the system of irrigation plants was put on the agenda of the September 1958 plenum. Then, Comrade Kim Il Sung set the task of making 1 million chongbo of arable land irrigable in the next 3 to 4 years. By the end of the sixth month after the September plenum, they already achieved making 80 percent of the planned arable land—that is, 800 thousand chongbo—irrigable. This year, they completed all irrigation system constructions. Next year's plan does not schedule the building of further irrigation plants. Since in this way 1 million of arable land [sic.] will potentially become irrigated next year, they will increase the sowing area of wheat and corn as well.

Following this, Comrade Yoo Ch'ang-sik spoke on the issue of forestation. At the present, there are orchards in the DPRK on a territory of 70 thousand chongbo. The overwhelming majority of this consists of apple gardens. [During their occupation,] the Japanese destroyed a vast number of trees in Korea. The mountainsides were almost entirely devastated. The party plenum to be convened in the near future will make planting trees into a movement that embraces the entire population. They plan primarily to plant apple, sweet chestnut, and poplar trees, which can be well utilized in the national economy in a relatively short time, that is, within a maximum of ten years. Fruit-trees will provide fruits that can be utilized both in natural form and as canned food, thus increasing the foodstuff stocks. Poplar grows quickly and constitutes an important raw material in producing both paper and artificial textiles. These trees will be planted primarily on the slopes of mountains, hillsides, and along roads. Besides providing important raw materials for light industry within the next ten years, the propagation of these tree species will decorate the Korean soil and the Korean landscape.

Finally, Comrade Yoo Ch'ang-sik mentioned that since the enlarged session of the Party CC Presidium in August, the issue of widening the local people's committee's sphere of authority and the network of local small scale industry is very much in the forefront for the DPRK. At the same time, the issue of increasing the quality of production came even more to the forefront as well. Comrade Yoo Ch'ang-sik emphasized several times that all changes that occurred or are planned in every field of the national economy originate from the personal initiative of Comrade Kim Il Sung.

The Yugoslav question was also mentioned in the sense that I remarked that while the national economies of socialist countries develop and rise year by year, the economic development in the capitalist countries, and characteristically in Yugoslavia, has become stuck or is even falling back. In Yugoslavia, animal husbandry and consumption of meat is on the level of the year 1931. Comrade Yoo Ch'ang-sik's apt response was that here is the result of revisionism, which is a lesson for all communist parties and all people building socialism. Deviation from the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism leads to the deterioration of the standard of living of the working masses.

In my opinion, Comrade Yoo Ch'ang-sik made special preparations for this meeting, since at the dinner given in honor of Comrade Yi Tong-gon I informed him that parallel to the party congress we will have a ministerial conference in Hungary.

After thanking him for the information he gave me, I asked him to have more such useful conversations in the future.

The above conversation lasted for almost two hours.

signature

Ambassador Károly Práth

¹ TRANSLATOR'S NOTE: Diplomatic Corps Supply Office

DOCUMENT No. 6

Report, Embassy of the Hungarian People's Republic in the DPRK to the Foreign Ministry of Hungary, 20 May 1960.

[Source: MOL, XIX-J-1-j-Korea-5/b-004817/1960 4.d.
Translated by József Litkei.]

The Embassy of the Hungarian People's Republic.

Top Secret.

Pyongyang, 20 May 1960.

Subject. Conversation with Deputy Foreign Minister Yoo Ch'ang-sik on some questions concerning Korea's foreign and domestic policies.

Upon my request, on the nineteenth of this month I was received by Comrade Yoo Ch'ang-sik, Deputy Foreign Minister, whom I asked for information concerning the DPRK's relations with Africa¹. In his answer, Comrade Yoo told me that on the occasion of the Republic of Guinea's declaration of independence, an exchange of telegrams occurred between the two countries by which they mutually recognized each other, but did not realize any further relations in the fields of diplomacy and the economy. Except for this, they have no connection to Black Africa; in the recent past, there was only one military delegation visiting Conakry. Of course, they support to the utmost the struggle of the African peoples against imperialism and colonialism and are making efforts to unmask American imperialism and its Syngman Rhee-like satellites—especially in the Afro-Asian countries—in front of the greatest possible public and to isolate them. Concerning the Afro-Asian countries, the comrade deputy foreign minister mentioned that they have a trade representation in Cairo, and based on an agreement last year, they will open a trade representation endowed with the rights of a consulate in Baghdad. As is known, they have trade representations in India, Indonesia and Burma.

In answer to my question, Comrade Yoo briefly described the visit of the Algerian government delegation to Korea. The delegation, headed by Krim Belkasssem, arrived for a friendly visit and showed great interest concerning military questions. They spent a lot of time in the Museum of the Patriotic War, where they asked for detailed information, and then they also visited the Military Academy. Members of the delegation stated that the Korean people's fight against American imperialism inspires them too, and they gained a lot of experience during their visit. Concerning the latter, Comrade Yoo mentioned that this opinion is shared by the Koreans as well. He told me that the Algerians declared that "after driving out the French colonizers, the people of Algeria will act the same way the Koreans did."

Moving on to South Korea, the comrade deputy foreign minister expressed his view that the situation is unfolding, and this is setting new tasks for the DPRK. The possibility of unification is getting nearer; at the moment, their aim is to

establish correspondence and transportation connections. There are several parties being formed in South Korea, which is progress compared to the past situation and offers a possibility for uniting the progressive forces. The South Korean movement is deepening and intensifying, and it is increasingly acquiring the character of a class struggle. The task of the DPRK is to accelerate the building of socialism, so the Party is now devoting great attention to further developing the national economy. The most important task now is the intensification of mechanization, especially in agriculture (they need approx. 20,000 tractors), and to raise the workers' living standards. In the DPRK, for example, the average production is 17 meters of textile per person per year, but the army and industry use a significant share of this amount. They want to raise the average amount to 30 meters per person. Therefore, the government has recently passed a resolution concerning the development of the vinalon production. At the moment, they are having difficulties concerning machines.

At the end, the comrade deputy foreign minister expressed his thanks for the technical support provided by the Hungarian foreign ministry (cde. Bozi and Balogh), which he highly appreciated. Then he mentioned that recently the Hungarian periodical "Ország-Világ," in one of its Korean reports, evaluated the "Chollima" movement in a different way than the Korean position. "We do not have any objection to this, our embassy raised the issue. It is possible that a foreign visitor might not understand this [movement] a hundred percent as a Korean might," said the comrade foreign minister. In my response, I promised to look into the issue.

signature

Ambassador Károly Práth

¹ TRANSLATOR'S NOTE: The literal translation of the term used here would be "Black Africa," which refers to the non-Arab part of the continent, that is, Africa south of the Sahara.



DOCUMENT No. 7

Report, Embassy of the Hungarian People's Republic in the DPRK to the Foreign Ministry of Hungary, 1 March 1961.

*[Source: MOL, XIX-J-1-j-Korea-27/e-0027/1961 13.d.
Translated by József Litkei.]*

The Embassy of the Hungarian People's Republic.
Top Secret.

6/1961

Pyongyang, 1 March 1961.

Subject: Conversation with Soviet Ambassador Puzanov on the position of the Korean Workers' Party concerning the Moscow conference.

In the course of my conversation with Comrade Puzanov on the first of March (see my top-secret report No. 5), the position of the Korean comrades concerning the debate between the CPSU and CCP also arose. Comrade Puzanov told me that the issue was raised during the consultation between Comrade Khrushchev and Kim Il Sung in Moscow in June 1960, during which Comrade Kim Il Sung agreed entirely with the position of the CPSU. A few days later, at the Bucharest conference, Comrade Kim Ch'ang-man took a similar position. During the June consultations, Comrade Khrushchev did not engage in detail with the question, and only referred to several documents issued by the Chinese comrades, among them the well-known article "Long live Leninism!" by "Hongzhi" (By the way, Comrade Puzanov remarked that he is not sure whether Comrade Khrushchev was aware that Korean newspapers also published this article). Without being asked, Comrade Kim Il Sung mentioned that Korean newspapers had published this article on his personal advice, because the article sharply criticized revisionism. Comrade Puzanov assumed that on account of this latter factor [revisionism], the Korean comrades might possibly not have entirely comprehended the other messages of the article, or that they did not pay enough attention to them.

Over the course of time, the position of the Korean comrades has changed somewhat. In October, the November conference's Editorial Committee was working in Moscow. A Korean delegation, headed by Comrade Yi Hyo-sun, also participated [in this work]. Here, the Korean delegation, together with some other delegations (Vietnamese, etc.), sought to find a mediating solution or a compromise that could be accepted by both parties. Due to his illness (kidney stone), Comrade Kim Il Sung could not take part in the November conference; the speech of the Korean delegation [that would have been] headed by Comrade Kim Il was originally scheduled to come after the Chinese delegation, but the Korean comrades requested to give it earlier. So they actually did not address the questions under dispute, but [later], together with other delegations, [they] visited Comrade Khrushchev in order to convince him to make a compromise. He, however, held onto the only correct position and said that they should rather try to persuade the Chinese delegation. The delegation indeed visited the Chinese comrades. In Comrade Puzanov's view, the Korean editorials published after the Moscow "declaration" and "appeal," as well as the later December resolution of the Korean Workers' Party CC, correspond to the spirit of the Moscow declaration, although they omitted—for understandable reasons, remarked Comrade Puzanov—the issue of the cult of personality. He mentioned that contrary to other friendly states, the Korean comrades did not deal with the Moscow conference in detail. Before traveling to the January plenum in Moscow, Comrade Puzanov met Comrade Kim Il Sung. Comrade Kim Il Sung spoke very positively about the November conference and especially

about the steadfast and faithful behavior of the CPSU delegation headed by Comrade Khrushchev. Comrade Kim Il Sung remarked that continuing the debate between the CPSU and CCP would have caused commotion among the members of the Workers' Party. One has to understand, he said, that China is Korea's great neighbor, and that the Chinese people sacrificed their blood for the freedom of the Korean people. According to Comrade Puzanov, the Korean comrades are apparently happy that the issue is closed, and would not like to engage with it [further].

signature

Ambassador Károly Práth



DOCUMENT No. 8

Report, Embassy of the Hungarian People's Republic in the DPRK to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Hungary, 16 March 1961.

*[Source: MOL, XIX-J-1-j-Korea-5/ca-003645/1961 5.d.
Translated by József Litkei.]*

The Embassy of the Hungarian People's Republic.
Top Secret.

90/1961

Pyongyang, 16 March 1961.

Subject: Conversation with Soviet ambassador Puzanov on the Korean question and the forthcoming visit of Comrade Khrushchev to Korea.

During my conversation with Soviet ambassador Comrade Puzanov on 15 March, I asked his opinion concerning Comrade Khrushchev's visit to Korea, and whether he thinks that such a visit would be timely now. At the same time, I mentioned that a visit by Comrade Khrushchev would place Korea and the Korean question into the focus of international relations, and the Korean comrades, who are inclined to push their cause excessively into the foreground, could misunderstand this and perceive it as the justification of their position.

In his answer, Comrade Puzanov told me that the visit of Comrade Khrushchev was already timely in 1959, but at that time, during his [Khrushchev's] negotiation with Comrade Kim Il Sung in Beijing, they both came to the conclusion that due to the international situation of that time (immediately after Comrade Khrushchev's visit to the USA), this would not be advisable. Comrade Khrushchev would have visited Korea last October, but this was canceled solely due to the

lack of time: according to original plans, Comrade Khrushchev was scheduled to arrive back from New York at the end of September, but his trip to the US lasted longer, and after his return he was absorbed with preparing for the Moscow conference. The CPSU CC sent the KWP CC a very warm, comradely letter concerning the postponement of the visit to Korea, and upon receiving it, Comrade Kim Il Sung immediately told him (Puzanov) that he understood perfectly and also agreed with it from party-minded point of view.

During their visit to Moscow (in November 1960), the Korean party delegation visited Comrade Khrushchev, and Comrade Kim Il Sung inquired when [Khrushchev's] Korean visit could take place. In his answer, Comrade Khrushchev stated his great wish to come to Korea, but asked at the same time to examine this question at a later point in time, since due to the preparation for the Twenty-second Congress, he could not give a concrete answer at that moment.

According to Comrade Puzanov, there is no danger that the Korean comrades would present the Korean question as the central question of the international situation. He told me that during his Moscow visit in June 1960, Comrade Kim Il Sung gave Comrade Khrushchev an account of their policy towards South Korea. Comrade Khrushchev agreed with this [policy], and asked whether they [the Koreans] would want to elaborate a proposal of confederation as the Germans had done. Kim Il Sung answered positively, and the Korean comrades did the further work, and did it well in his [Puzanov's] opinion. It is apparent that the Korean comrades are now seeking to win public opinion in South Korea, and they have achieved some results in this respect. An increasing number of people support the proposals of the DPRK, and the anti-American mood is increasing as well. According to the opinion of Comrade Puzanov, the policy of the DPRK corresponds to the common policy of our camp regarding peaceful coexistence. Of course, the unification of the country requires a lot of further work, and this will not happen in the near future. The Soviet Union and other socialist countries have offered, and continue to offer, serious assistance to the DPRK in making its position known and accepted. The Korean comrades well know that without this assistance they cannot achieve results; international power relations have changed so much in our favor that the governments of capitalist countries cannot dismiss the opinion of the socialist camp. Comrade Puzanov mentioned that the Soviet foreign ministry recently instructed ambassadors working in neutral countries to inform the leaders of their host country of the position of the DPRK during their conversations with them [the host country]. This has achieved positive results in many places. The content of the DPRK government's "Memorandum," which was issued on the Korean question prior to the opening of the second half of the UN General Assembly's 15th session, was also delivered through the above-mentioned Soviet ambassadors to the governments of neutral states.

Comrade Puzanov did not rule out the possibility that, depending on how the South Korean situation evolves in the future, the DPRK might take a new position and make new

proposals, which we all will support.

I informed Comrade Puzanov of my conversation with Comrade Deputy Prime Minister Kim Tae-hui during which he told me that they will not protest against the simultaneous admission of the DPRK and South Korea into the Interparliamentary Union. Comrade Puzanov said that the DPRK had already practically acknowledged South Korea at the 1954 Geneva conference, even if this fact was later somewhat withheld by the DPRK, or rather, one could observe irresolution [in this regard]. So, for example, when publishing an earlier speech Comrade Zorin gave at the UN, Korean newspapers omitted that part which concerned the two states formed on the Korean peninsula. On another occasion, upon receiving in advance a Soviet government communique supporting the proposals of the DPRK, they requested replacing the expression "two states" by "two governments."

The conversation lasted for approximately three hours, with Comrade Fendler present as interpreter.

signature

Ambassador Károly Práth



DOCUMENT No. 9

Report, Embassy of the Hungarian People's Republic in the DPRK to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Hungary, 16 March 1961

[Source: MOL, XIX-J-1-j-Korea-5/bc-0030/1961 5.d.
Translated by József Litkei.]

The Embassy of the Hungarian People's Republic.

Top Secret.

Subject: Chinese policy toward the DPRK and behavior of the Chinese ambassador in Pyongyang.

Pyongyang, 16 March 1961.

During my visit to Comrade Kohousek on 15 March, I informed him of my conversation with the Chinese ambassador (see my top secret report no. 95). The Comrade Czechoslovakian ambassador fully agreed with me, and he found it highly incorrect that the Korean comrades organized a separate presentation for the government and another for the ambassadors.

In the course of the conversation, we both remarked upon the fact that Chinese ambassador doyen Qiao Xiaoguang has recently not been attending the programs organized for the D[iplomatic] C[orps] by the Korean comrades, under the excuse of being busy. In addition to other

[examples], he did not participate in the visit to the steel complex in Kaesong, nor did he attend the performance of the Cuban ballet ensemble or the cultural presentation of Comrade Han Sol-ya, etc. According to Comrade Kohousek, the Chinese ambassador might be dissatisfied because in the course of last year he failed to convince the Korean comrades to support the Chinese position. Comrade Kohousek stated that earlier (last summer) he was of the opinion that the Korean comrades are under Chinese influence; however, recently he had to change his position. It is true that earlier there were attempts by the Korean side to adopt Chinese methods: for example, according to his information, they planned to establish two people's communes, etc., but they soon realized the negative [effects] of this, and gave it up. The so-called "Chongsan-ri method" radically opposes the earlier Chinese position, and, at least recently, the Korean comrades are devoting great attention to maintaining the principle of material interest and socialist distribution.

The Chinese comrades exerted pressure in order to bring the KWP to their side in the debate between the CPSU and CCP last year. The invitation of Comrade Kim Il Sung to China last year (before his incognito visit to Moscow) also proves this. Comrade Kim Il Sung, however, informed Comrade Khrushchev of this [invitation].

Last October, on the occasion of the 10th year anniversary of the Chinese volunteers entering the war, a Chinese delegation headed by General He Long [vice-premier of the State Council] visited Korea and tried again to win Korea over to the Chinese side. Despite this, the Korean delegation did not support China at the November conference, although, together with other delegations, [they] sought to find a compromise solution. To sum up, the Chinese did not reach their goal, despite a further credit of 420 million rubles offered to the DPRK last autumn, so it is not impossible that this is the reason that the Chinese ambassador is so displeased.

In confirming this, Comrade Kohousek told me that although the Chinese side enjoys a position of equality with the Korean side in the armistice committee in Panmunjon, the speeches are always given by the head of the Korean delegation. A recent event, when the new heads of the Swedish and Swiss delegations paid an introductory visit to the heads of the Korean and Chinese delegations, was characteristic of this. The head of the Chinese delegation wanted to return these formal calls, but the Korean comrades did not consent to this, saying that they were not going to return them either. Similarly, a Chinese general came recently to Panmunjon to pay his usual yearly visit and was received by the heads of the Czechoslovak and Polish delegations. Contrary to previous custom, however, the head of the Korean delegation did not show up, nor did he meet the Chinese general later. The latter left pretty soon without any notice.

The same afternoon, I also talked to Soviet Ambassador Puzanov, and informed him as well of my conversation with the Chinese ambassador. Comrade Puzanov agreed with me, the more so since I was the one to inform him that the performance in question was organized for the DC (he was not present due to the Women's Day celebration at the Soviet

embassy). He agreed that, under the pretense of discussing various protocol questions, I visit the Chinese ambassador, who following this will have to summon the [other] ambassadors. Concerning the statement of the Chinese ambassador, according to which “some criticize the people’s communes, yet they have already been proven to work” (see my above-mentioned report), Comrade Puzanov briefly outlined the questions concerning the Chinese people’s communes, and told us that according to his personal opinion, the Chinese comrades have also already learned from the experiences of the past years, and there are signs that they put an end to the communes’ “egalitarianist” system of distribution and are giving more space to individual farms, etc. That the last plenum of the Chinese fraternal party put the blame for the condition of agriculture entirely on weather and natural disasters is the business of the Chinese, said Comrade Puzanov, although the way we communists become even stronger is exactly by openly admitting our mistakes. He told us that on the way back from the CPSU January Plenum, he came to Pyongyang via Beijing, and also informed Comrade Kim Il Sung about the work of the plenum. On this occasion, the issue of the grave economic situation in China was also raised. Comrade Kim Il Sung declared that they (the Koreans) can also feel the Chinese difficulties, since there are delays in the delivery of coking coal, etc., and foodstuffs are not being delivered to Korea either. According to Kim Il Sung, taking the Chinese situation into consideration, they do not want to hurry the Chinese deliveries. Concerning the people’s communes, Comrade Kim Il Sung said that he also follows the recent measures related to this with great attention, and he knows the articles published in the Chinese press, as well. In his opinion, “it is not the name, nor the form that is important, but the content,” and Comrade Puzanov, too, sees the essence of the issue in this.

Concerning this question, Comrade Puzanov made the final comment that Chinese Ambassador Qiao [Xiaoguang] “offended against his own party-consciousness” when he put the blame for their difficulties on the weather alone.

signature

Ambassador Károly Práth

DOCUMENT No. 10

Report, Embassy of the Hungarian People's Republic in the DPRK to the Foreign Ministry of Hungary, 17 May 1961.

[Source: MOL, XIX-J-1-j-Korea-27/a-0042/1961 13.d.
Translated by József Litkei.]

The Embassy of the Hungarian People's Republic.

Top Secret.

9/1961

Pyongyang, 17 May 1961.

Subject: Conversation with Soviet ambassador Puzanov on the cult of personality and the policy of the DPRK.

On 15 May, I made a farewell visit to Comrade Puzanov, the Soviet ambassador. During the friendly conversation, the topic of the May Day parade also came up. I mentioned to Comrade Puzanov that in my opinion the Korean comrades organized the parade well, the small number of Kim Il Sung portraits was striking, etc. (See my report No. __)

Comrade Puzanov agreed and pointed out that the slogans were chosen carefully as well; they did a good job of symbolizing the achievements and tasks of the DPRK, but he found the Kim Il Sung statue to be superfluous.

Concerning the above issue, the question of the “cult of personality” was also raised. Comrade Puzanov expressed his view that the question cannot be decided merely based on the number of portraits, etc. What one has to look at, he said, is how the Leninist norms of inner party life prevail. In his opinion, the Central Committee of the Korean Workers' Party holds regular meetings, and in its work often involves experts and functionaries from different fields.

During the last months, there were a number of nationwide¹ Korean professional meetings, in which leading comrades also took part. Comrade Puzanov also mentioned that Comrade Kim Il Sung and other leading comrades spend a lot of time in the countryside visiting factories and collectives, etc. The so-called Chongsan-ri method proved to be a good one.

Following this, when talking about the policy of the Workers' Party, Comrade Puzanov told me that the party leadership is mature, and that it has learned from past mistakes and is correcting them itself. He did not experience mistakes being “hushed up” by the party leadership. As an example, he mentioned the “great leap.” It is known that in 1958, Korean comrades adopted this slogan from the Chinese, and they wanted to double the plan target in 1959. The consequences were very negative, and a number of difficulties were caused in agriculture. The Korean party realized this, corrected the mistakes, and emphasized the necessity of the proportionate development of the national economy.

I request that this report be sent to leading comrades.

[To comrade foreign minister
Budapest]

signature

Ambassador Károly Práth

¹ TRANSLATOR'S NOTE: That is, with participation from both North and South Korea.



DOCUMENT No. 11

Letter to Wladyslaw Gomulka from Kim Il Sung, 3 February 1966

[Source: Modern Records Archives, Warsaw, KC PZPR 2263/175-233, pp. 209-233. Translated by Vojtech Mastny.]

To Comrade Wladyslaw Gomulka
First Secretary of the Central Committee
of the Polish Workers' Party

Dear Comrade,

I have received your letter of 31 December 1965, in which you asked me to support the proposal by the Central Committee of the Polish United Workers' Party for the earliest possible convocation of a conference of the communist and workers' parties of the countries of the Warsaw Treaty as well as the socialist countries of Asia, with the goal of discussing the coordination of assistance to the Democratic Republic of Vietnam in its war against US aggression.

In the present situation of an expanding war by American imperialists against the Vietnamese people, we consider it appropriate to convene a conference of the parties of the socialist countries and discuss there the ways of providing assistance and support for the fighting Vietnamese people as well as the coordination of common action. Because of the serious disagreements that exist within the communist movement, however, it would be difficult at this time to convene such a conference without a consensus among the interested fraternal parties and careful advance preparation.

If the conference were to be convened without adequate advance preparation it would not bring benefit to the struggle of the Vietnamese people nor would it enhance the cohesion of the socialist camp; on the contrary, it would cause further damage to the unity of the international communist movement.

The fraternal parties therefore must, above all, undertake sincere efforts to reconcile conflicting views and create conditions for convening the conference.

At the same time, with regard to assisting the Vietnamese people in its struggle, all parties of the socialist countries

and each one of them must first act in practice without waiting for the conference. The socialist countries must support even more actively the Vietnamese people in its heroic struggle against American imperialism and render it maximum assistance and moral support. At the same time, all socialist countries must develop their struggle against US imperialism from the position of principle.

It is necessary to use all possible opportunities to unmask the aggressive policy of American imperialism and gradually isolate it, not allowing any compromise with it.

At a time when the US imperialists are escalating their attacks on a socialist country—the Democratic Republic of Vietnam—and expanding the war, the socialist countries should not even hesitate to break all relations with American imperialism.

If all socialist countries indeed take such common steps, they would deal a powerful blow to American imperialism, thus giving real help to the Vietnamese people.

In the course of such action, the existing divergences among the fraternal parties could be gradually overcome and the conditions for convening the conference of the parties of socialist countries that you propose could be created.

We believe that under the present circumstances this is the right way of both demonstrating support for the struggle of the Vietnamese people and defending the unity of the socialist camp.

Our party will also in the future make every effort to strengthen the unity of our camp and the cohesion of the international communist movement.

Kim Il Sung
Chairman of the Central Committee of the Korean Workers Party

Pyongyang, 3 February 1966

Mongolia and the Cold War

CWHP and its Mongolian and international partners held a workshop on “Mongolia and the Cold War” in Ulaanbaatar in March 2004. The workshop, the first of its kind, meant to explore and promote access to the Mongolian archives, to provide a forum for discussion of Mongolia’s role in the Cold War based on newly available archival evidence, and to allow for the establishment of closer links between Mongolian and foreign scholars and archival experts. Discussion touched on Mongolian foreign policy during the Cold War; declassification issues and practices in Mongolia, US, and elsewhere; and consideration of future cooperation, activities, collaborative research, and publications.

The meeting was hosted by a group of Mongolian Cold War scholars established in partnership with CWHP in early 2003 and follows a spate of recent revelations from the Mongolian archives. (See March 2003 news announcement and CWHP Working Paper No 42, by Sergey Radchenko, accessible on the CWHP website (<http://cwhp.si.edu>); and the conference website (<http://serrad.by.ru/mongoliaworkshop.shtm>)

**Program:
Mongolia and the Cold War
International Workshop, Ulaanbaatar, March 19-20, 2004**

*Co-sponsored by the Cold War International History Project (CWIHP),
The George Washington Cold War Group (GWU),
The National Security Archive,
and the Parallel History Project on NATO and the Warsaw Pact (PHP)*

Thursday, March 18. Foreign participants arrive.

**Friday, March 19. Chinggis Khaan Hotel (Ulaanbaatar),
Meeting Hall.**

9:30 – 10:00 Welcome and introduction.

10:00 – 12:00 Panel 1: **Mongolia and its Neighbors I**

Chair: Munkh-Ochir K. Khirghis.

Ts. Batbayar, “Chinese-Mongolian Relations in the Cold War Context”

Sergey Radchenko, “Lin Biao Affair: Mongolian Evidence”

K. Demberel, “Looking East: Mongolia’s Special Relationship with North Korea”

12:30 – 13:30 Lunch. Chinggis Khaan Hotel.

13:45 – 15:45 Panel 2: **Mongolia’s and its Neighbors II**

Chair: Odd Arne Westad.

Yvette Chin, “Mongol-American Relations”

Munkh-Ochir D. Khirghis, “Defying the Soviet Line on Iran: Mongolian-Iranian Rapprochement in the 1970s”

Badamdash D. Marhy, “Chinese Workers and Mongolia’s Economic Difficulties”

16:00 – 18:00 Panel 3: **Mongolia’s internal politics and the Cold War**

Chair: D. Ulzibaatar

J. Boldbaatar, “Mongolian Party Politics: An Insider’s View”

Ts. Lookhuuz, “Our Moves Against Tsedenbal: 1956–1964”

Christopher Kaplonski, “Democratic Revolution in Mongolia: How It Happened”

J. Tugsjargal, “Soviet-Mongolian Relations during the Cold War: Materials from High-level Meetings”

Saturday, March 20. Chinggis Khaan Hotel, Meeting Hall.

10:00 – 12:00 Panel 1: **International Co-operation on Cold War Research**

Chair: Ts. Batbayar.

Malcolm Byrne

Jim Hershberg

Vojtech Mastny

Christian Ostermann

Odd Arne Westad

12:30 – 13:30 Lunch. Chinggis Khaan Hotel.

13:45 – 15:45 Panel 2: **Declassification and Archives**

Chair: Jim Hershberg

D. Ulzibaatar, “Mongolian archives: how declassification is coming along”

T. Nergui, “Foreign Ministry Archives of Mongolia: problems and opportunities”

Malcolm Byrne, “Cold War Research Using the U.S. Freedom of Information Act”

16:00 – 18:00 Panel 3: **Roundtable Discussion**

Chair: David Wolff

Monday, March 22. Foreign participants depart.

“You Have No Political Line of Your Own” Kim Il Sung and the Soviets, 1953-1964

By Balázs Szalontai

Recent publication of Russian and Chinese documents by Evgenii Bajanov, Chen Jian, Alexandre Y. Mansourov, Kathryn Weathersby, and other scholars has finally thrown light on many aspects of the North Korean/Soviet/Chinese alliance during the Korean War.¹ Less attention has been paid, however, to the relationship between North Korea and the Soviet Union under Khrushchev. Andrei N. Lankov has uncovered numerous Russian documents related to the important events of 1955-1956, but without access to a broader base of documents from Russia, the Khrushchev era of the DPRK/USSR alliance has remained largely obscure.² The documents presented below from the Hungarian National Archives help fill that gap. In general, Hungarian diplomats had more limited access to highly confidential information on North Korea than did their Soviet counterparts, receiving most of their information on Soviet-North Korean relations from the Soviet Embassy in Pyongyang. Nevertheless, thanks to the assistance of North Koreans who had been trained in Hungary and maintained contacts with the Hungarian Embassy after their return to the DPRK, Hungarian diplomats often matched the Soviets in acquiring information about North Korean domestic policies.

Peculiarities of the North Korean Regime and the Roots of Isolationism

As emphasized by Bruce Cumings, Brian Myers, and others, North Korea was by no means a typical “people’s democracy,” and its peculiarities influenced the character of Soviet-North Korean relations from 1945 on.³ For one thing, the relative backwardness of the North Korean economy either retarded the adoption of certain Soviet institutions or necessitated an inordinate dependency on Soviet expertise. For example, the limited financial resources of the North Korean state led it to establish unpaid security organs, whose members were present in every village.⁴ In 1953-1954 work cards and Stakhanovism were still unknown to most North Korean workers.⁵ The DPRK’s agricultural tax system seemed far less complex than its Hungarian counterpart, and the circulation of newspapers remained a fraction of that of their East European equivalents.⁶ Because of the deficiencies of the country’s motion picture industry, as late as 1957 some 60 per cent of the films shown in the cinemas were of Soviet origin, whereas the proportion of North Korean films did not exceed 10 per cent.⁷ Due to the paucity of North Korean authors, translated Soviet works constituted the largest share of the books published in 1955. By contrast, most of the plays staged in 1955 were classical Korean works like the *Tale of Ch’unhyang*.⁸ In 1956 North Korean higher education still lacked adequate textbooks, a problem the authorities proposed to solve by placing greater emphasis on teaching Rus-

sian so that students could use Soviet textbooks until Korean ones could be published.⁹ In primary and secondary education, on the other hand, Soviet and Communist influence gained ground at a much slower pace. In the mid-1950s the majority of teachers continued using the pedagogical methods of the pre-liberation era. The history of the Three Kingdoms was taught in a rather “romantic” style, and the teaching of Russian was less emphasized than in Hungary.¹⁰ The similarities and differences between Soviet and North Korean institutions did not, therefore, necessarily indicate political sympathy or aversion; in a number of cases they simply reflected the specific realities of North Korea.

From the very beginning, Hungarian diplomats were aware of the “special relationship” between Moscow and Pyongyang. On 30 April 1950 Hungarian Envoy Sándor Simics flatly told Kim Il Sung that Hungary could not afford to sell goods to the DPRK below world market prices. He also noted in his report that “they took a liking to the fact that the Soviet Union had given them long-term credit ... this is the generosity of the Soviet Union that overlooks everything they do. We cannot do it yet, for we are small and poor.”¹¹ This emphasis on Soviet generosity may have been an overstatement, but in the mid-1950s the character of Soviet-North Korean economic relations certainly differed from the common East European pattern. Like Albania, the DPRK received aid from the other Communist countries, whereas its export capacity remained quite negligible until the end of its Three-year Plan (1954-1956).¹² That Moscow assumed an obligation to such a small developing country greatly boosted the self-confidence of the North Korean leaders, who felt that the DPRK was entitled to preferential treatment.

Pyongyang took little interest in establishing contacts with Communist countries not capable of rendering concrete assistance. In 1954 its relations with Bulgaria and Albania were still at the ministerial, instead of ambassadorial level.¹³ Neither these two countries nor Romania carried on substantial trade with the DPRK in the mid-1950s.¹⁴ Pyongyang set up a Ministry of Foreign Trade as late as the last months of 1952, which demonstrated North Korea’s isolation within the “Soviet bloc.” Until that time, the DPRK had exchanged goods only with the USSR and China.¹⁵ To be sure, the disinterest often proved mutual, since the DPRK had little to offer the East European “people’s democracies.” Moreover, many North Korean leaders knew little about Europe or the “ways of the world” (see Document No. 1), which also inhibited the improvement of relations.

In the spring of 1950, as the DPRK prepared for its military campaign against the South, diplomats at the recently established Hungarian Legation found the North Korean Foreign Ministry anything but cooperative. “They received ev-

ery request completely uncomprehendingly, and whenever possible they dragged out its fulfillment until the requests became out of date,” Simics complained. On 21 August 1950 the Soviet Ambassador to Beijing frankly told his Hungarian counterpart that soldiers of the Korean People’s Army [KPA], infuriated by the US air raids that killed many civilians, often killed American POWs in defiance of repeated orders of the high command. The DPRK authorities prevented the Hungarians from acquiring photos of war-related events, even though the very same pictures were widely displayed in Pyongyang. Simics also stressed that the relationship between the North Koreans and the Soviet Embassy was “of a wholly different nature.”¹⁶

Throughout the 1950s the leaders of the Korean Workers’ Party [KWP], compelled to provide Soviet and Chinese diplomats with confidential information, apparently compensated by curtailing as much as possible the freedom of action of the East European embassies. China pursued a similar policy vis-à-vis the Soviet Union and its satellites. In 1951 Beijing forced the recall of Czechoslovak Ambassador Weisskopf and expelled a Polish diplomat, Lewandowski. In the mid-1950s the PRC did its best to increase its trade with the USSR and the Asian non-Communist countries, but cut back its exports to East Europe in order to retain more agricultural products for domestic consumption.¹⁷

Kim Il Sung’s tight control over North Korean society was one of the factors that enabled him to keep the “fraternal” Communist states at arm’s length. DPRK authorities, like their counterparts in China, limited their citizens’ contacts with foreign embassies to prevent the latter from recruiting clients, confidants, and informants. They also attempted to keep their intra-party affairs secret. As the purge of Communists of South Korean origin gathered momentum in November 1952, the Foreign Ministry emphatically told Hungarian diplomats not to visit anyone without prior approval from the ministry.¹⁸ (By and large, the North Vietnamese authorities did not resort to such measures until July 1963.¹⁹) Domestic despotism thus became a diplomatic tool.

In fact, North Korean despotism had few equals in Eastern Europe.²⁰ With the possible exception of Tito’s Yugoslavia, nowhere else did a leadership cult emerge as quickly as in North Korea. In 1946 the regime named the country’s sole university for Kim Il Sung, and in 1947 it established schools for the orphans of revolutionary martyrs in Man’gyongdae, Kim’s home village.²¹ By contrast, the Hungarian dictator Mátyás Rákosi, hardly an opponent of a personality cult, never took comparable measures. In Romania, the cult of Gheorge Gheorghiu-Dej bloomed only in 1952. In January 1946 the North Korean authorities merged the various youth leagues into a single organization, whereas similar events would take place in Hungary only three years later. The membership of the new organization was proportionally far greater than that of the Soviet Komsomol, and it had a unitary structure, while China and North Vietnam created two youth leagues, one for devout Communists and another for sympathizers.²² In 1946 only party members gained admission to Kim Il Sung University, and even the janitors employed there

had to possess a party card.²³

While these distinctive characteristics—dependence on foreign assistance, a particularly despotic political system, and an inclination for isolationism—all played a central role in the clashes between Kim Il Sung and the post-Stalin Soviet leadership, the unresolved issue of Korean unification complicated the situation even more. Unification plans had influenced North Korean domestic policies from the very beginning. For example, in contrast with its East European allies, the DPRK did not collectivize agriculture during Stalin’s lifetime. In 1952 Minister of Foreign Trade Chang Si-u plainly told the Hungarians that the government had decided to postpone collectivization until unification in order not to alienate potential South Korean supporters.²⁴ Also, unlike the pattern in most East European countries, the 1948 purge of O Ki-sop and other party leaders did not lead to show trials that might have produced a negative effect on South Korean public opinion. The policies of the East German and North Vietnamese regimes also included the temporary postponement of certain unpopular domestic measures in order to facilitate national unification.

Pyongyang Seeks to Control the Diplomatic Corps

While the North Korean regime apparently welcomed the eagerness of Stalin’s successors to put an end to the Korean War, the Kremlin’s decision to call off the campaign accusing the US of germ warfare may have angered Kim Il Sung.²⁵ The first signs of political liberalization in East Europe were certainly greeted warily in Pyongyang. The replacement of Rákosi in June 1953 shocked the North Korean leadership, as it quickly understood that Hungary was moving away from the Stalinist path.²⁶ In the last months of 1953 the Foreign Ministry systematically obstructed attempts by Hungarian diplomats to communicate with the DPRK’s Academy of Sciences (see Document No. 2). These measures may have been designed to isolate North Korean intellectuals, who were eager to establish contacts with European colleagues, from the new political ideas that had gained ground in Hungary under Communist Party leader Imre Nagy. Such restrictions may also have been aimed at keeping secret the details of the purges that continued throughout 1953. As one Hungarian diplomat put it, “the masses did not understand” why Yi Sung-yop and the other SKWP leaders had been arrested. In June the regime thought it necessary to launch a 40-day campaign in order to convince the population of the guilt of the accused.²⁷

The purges were discontinued in 1954, but the relationship between the regime and Hungarian diplomats failed to improve. On the contrary, the restrictions now affected every foreign legation, including the Soviet and Chinese Embassies. Hungarian Ambassador Pál Szarvas suspected that the policies were motivated by Pyongyang’s antipathy to de-Stalinization (see Documents No. 4 and 5). “They would like to curtail the operation and activity of the whole diplomatic corps,” Szarvas warned. In essence, Pyongyang downplayed the inter-party aspects of its relationship with other Communist regimes and instead placed great emphasis on state sov-

ereignty. "It is customary in Korea that they speak little about the party in the presence of foreigners," Szarvas noted in December 1954.²⁸ In contrast, on 25 November 1955 the North Vietnamese Deputy Premier Nguyn Duy Trinh willingly provided Hungarian diplomats with highly confidential information about the number of recently expelled party members and the social composition of the membership.²⁹

After the armistice was signed in July 1953, North Korean security organs gained the right to subject Chinese soldiers to identity checks.³⁰ Moreover, in the fall of 1954 the Foreign Ministry began to replace the embassies' Korean employees very frequently in order to prevent the latter from becoming loyal to their foreign employers. On 21 October 1954 Soviet Ambassador Suzdalev told Szarvas "one may raise the issue of ... the Korean employees in the Foreign M[inistry], but in any case they will reply that the replacement of the employees occurred for political reasons."³¹ The North Korean authorities knew that the diplomats were neither willing nor able to verify the unspecified charges the Foreign Ministry's Cadre Department brought against the dismissed employees. Little by little, the North Korean Lilliputians enmeshed the foreign Gullivers.

Nevertheless, the Soviet Embassy proved a hard nut to crack. So-called "Soviet Koreans" who disagreed with Kim Il Sung's policies frequently met Soviet diplomats without officials of the Foreign Ministry being present, and they provided the Soviets with precious information about the North Korean situation.³² Kim's subsequent campaign against the Soviet faction thus constituted, among other things, an attempt to deprive the Soviets of their allies and informants.

Discord over Unification Tactics

As early as 1954 Hungarian diplomats noted that their Soviet colleagues criticized certain North Korean actions related to unification. To be sure, Moscow agreed with Pyongyang that a general election under UN supervision would only benefit the Syngman Rhee in Seoul, regime, since the population of the ROK was twice that of the DPRK (see Document No. 3). Neither Kim Il Sung nor Rhee wished to dismantle his political system for the sake of national unification, and the Chinese also made it clear that a UN-supervised referendum would "give up North Korea to the Americans."³³ On 3 July 1954 DPRK Foreign Minister Nam Il told Szarvas that a South Korean attack on the DPRK was unlikely at that time—a view shared by Moscow and Beijing.³⁴ However, the North Koreans seem to have had higher hopes for the Geneva conference than did the Soviets and the Chinese. Whereas Suzdalev was pessimistic about the conference, Nam Il told Hungarian Envoy Extraordinary Károly Pásztor on 23 March that while the Americans helped Seoul to expand the ROK Army, they might withdraw their own troops from South Korea by 1956.³⁵ This conclusion was based on knowledge of the American intention to replace a part of its ground troops with South Korean divisions in order to reduce military expenditures. The reality, however, was that a complete troop withdrawal remained out of the question.³⁶

In the summer of 1954, war-torn North Korea offered

economic aid to the ROK, a proposal Suzdalev rightly described as irresponsible.³⁷ Pyongyang then concluded that it was pointless to make any approach to South Korea, and kept silent for months. While Suzdalev admitted that Rhee's inflexibility and hostility constituted a formidable obstacle, he disapproved of the passive attitude of the KWP leadership.³⁸ On 9 September Soviet diplomats told Szarvas that the Soviet Embassy considered the data Pyongyang published on the South Korean situation to be unreliable. Since the Soviets subscribed to several South Korean newspapers, they were able to verify the information provided by the North Koreans.³⁹ GDR Ambassador Richard Fischer also complained of the uncooperative attitude of the North Korean Foreign Ministry regarding unification matters. While he provided P'yongyang with many documents related to the issue of German unification, the North Koreans did not give him anything about South Korea and Japan in return.⁴⁰

Conflict over Economic Policies

North Korean economic policies were another source of tension between Pyongyang and Moscow. As early as November 1954 the Romanian Ambassador to Pyongyang questioned the advisability of rapid collectivization, which might alienate the South Korean peasantry and middle classes from the DPRK.⁴¹ "The [North and South Korean] populations are equally familiar with the South and North Korean economic situation, since the borders are not hermetically sealed," the new Soviet Ambassador Vasily Ivanovich Ivanov stated in July 1955. He also criticized North Korean propaganda that depicted the ROK as a living hell (see Document No. 8). Informal relations indeed existed between the two Koreas at that time. The North Koreans succeeded in establishing some contacts with the ROK through Japan. They also carried on a contraband trade with the South across the DMZ in order to obtain wolfram and other goods indispensable for the DPRK's electrical industry.⁴² Under the circumstances, the Soviets thought, Pyongyang should not have ignored the negative effect its domestic policies might produce on South Korean public opinion. Actually, Kim Il Sung's economic strategy did not overlook the question of unification. However, he wanted to overtake the South instead of adjusting to it, which led to further disagreements with the DPRK's patrons (see Document No. 10).

A major objective of post-1953 industrialization was the replacement of the regional specialization that had characterized economic development in Japanese-ruled Korea (the textile industry, for instance, was concentrated in the southern part of the country) with a self-sufficient industrial structure. Mining thus received less emphasis than machine-building, even though the Soviets understandably wanted to import raw materials such as non-ferrous metals rather than poor quality North Korean industrial products. The bulk of Soviet aid went to the chemical industry, non-ferrous metallurgical works, iron smelting, and power generation. It was the more developed East European countries that assisted Pyongyang in the construction of a few machine works.⁴³ (By contrast, the Soviets had favored the development of an engineering

industry in China from 1951 on.⁴⁴) When Poland undertook to construct a plant for repairing freight cars, the North Koreans asked Warsaw to build a factory large enough to meet the demands of a united Korea. Finally the Poles persuaded them to abandon the idea.⁴⁵ The Rhee regime also linked its economic policies with the goal of unification, albeit in a rather different way. Power production, for instance, got little emphasis on the grounds that there would eventually be supplies from the North.⁴⁶

Committee plenum, when the leadership finally admitted the gravity of the food crisis, Kim called upon party members not to copy mechanically the policies of other Communist countries, and purged Pak Il-u and two other party leaders.⁴⁹ He apparently played upon Korean nationalism to conceal the fact that he had to beat a temporary retreat. Since Kim's agricultural policies proved less successful than contemporary Soviet or Chinese ones, his domestic and foreign critics made comparisons unfavorable to the DPRK, proposing that

**While the Kremlin did not hesitate to unseat the local
“little Stalins” in Hungary and Bulgaria in 1956,
it acted otherwise in North Korea.**

Soviet-North Korean disagreements over economic issues culminated in an open conflict in mid-1955. Pyongyang responded to the poor rice harvest of 1954, which had been caused by adverse weather, by squeezing an even larger percentage of the crop from the peasants. The leadership also resolved to speed up collectivization and prohibited private trade in grain. North Korean authorities, as Soviet Counselor A. M. Petrov reported, often “took as much as 50 per cent of the poor crop [...] from the peasantry by brute force.” As a consequence, the DPRK faced a serious food crisis in the first half of 1955. The system of non-rationed food-supply ceased to function, and in certain regions there were deaths from starvation. Comparable CCP policies, by contrast, did not affect urban consumers to the same extent, since Chinese agriculture was in better condition at the outset of collectivization than was that of war-torn North Korea, which proved simply unable to bear the burden the government placed on it.⁴⁷ Soviet diplomats harshly criticized the regime's disastrous policies (see Documents No. 6 and 7).

Pyongyang had no option but to appeal to the USSR and China for emergency aid. In April and May, Moscow and Beijing sent 24,000 metric tons of flour and 130,000 metric tons of agricultural products respectively. In May and June, Kim Il Sung and Nam Il spent substantial time in Moscow, where they must have had some difficult moments during the negotiations with Soviet leaders. Kim finally had to bite the bullet and cancel some of the measures the Soviets held responsible for the economic crisis. During the summer the government increased investments in agriculture, cut the retail prices of certain goods, reduced workers' personal taxes, and, above all, rescinded the decrees that effectively prohibited private commerce (see Document No. 8). In December Pyongyang increased agricultural investments once more, and reduced the personal taxes of private merchants.⁴⁸

In contrast with the USSR and certain East European countries, these changes were not accompanied by political liberalization. On the contrary, Kim Il Sung offset the economic concessions he had to make to the Soviets by cracking down on his intra-party critics, who may have played an active role in the Soviet intervention. At the April Central

Pyongyang adopt more flexible methods on the basis of the experiences of these countries. Kim was determined to prevent any such development.

At a CC plenum held in December, Kim Il Sung launched an attack on the Soviet faction. The economic measures taken in December were probably intended to emphasize Kim's commitment to the “New Course” in order to prevent Soviet criticism of this purge. Since the economic crisis had provided a good opportunity for the Soviets to meddle in the internal affairs of the DPRK, Kim did not want to repeat that error. The Soviets, for their part, turned a blind eye to the purges, perhaps because they considered the Soviet Koreans useful informants and allies whenever Soviet and North Korean interests clashed, but did not want to rely on them in periods when Kim appeared cooperative.

Throughout the Soviet bloc, de-Stalinization in the long run favored “domestic Communists.” As early as 1957 every East European country except the GDR was ruled by a “domestic Communist” leader. The influence Soviet Koreans, therefore, went against the tide. During the 1955 confrontation Moscow was much more interested in economic issues than in political ones and therefore did not attempt to force on Kim Il Sung unwanted political reforms, whether it would have been able to do so or not. As a consequence, rehabilitation of the unjustly persecuted remained out of the question in the DPRK, while all East European regimes except the Albanians began to release at least some of their political prisoners in 1954-55. Ironically, Moscow's attitude contributed to the decline of Soviet influence in the DPRK, since fewer and fewer North Koreans were willing to take sides with such an unreliable patron against a dictator as formidable as Kim Il Sung. On the other hand, it was quite understandable that the new Soviet leaders preferred Kim to the Soviet Koreans, since continued favoring of “Muscovites” might breed nationalist resentment that could destabilize their satellites.

Thus, in 1955 both North Korea and the Soviet Union made certain concessions. Pyongyang re-examined its economic policies and made some tentative approaches to Yugoslavia, while Moscow equipped the North Korean Air Force with turbo-prop bombers and gave the Soviet-North Korean

airline to the DPRK.⁵⁰ Nevertheless, in contrast to Beijing and Hanoi, Pyongyang failed to establish any contact with Belgrade in the Khrushchev era.⁵¹ Moreover, the reconciliation between Moscow and Pyongyang was soon disrupted by the 20th Congress of the CPSU.

The August Plenum and its Consequences

Khrushchev's denunciation of Stalin at the 20th Party Congress in February 1956 certainly worried Kim Il Sung. Though some aspects of Kim's cult of personality were toned down in the following months, the North Korean press did not directly criticize the phenomenon as such.⁵² To the chagrin of Soviet Ambassador Ivanov, at the 3rd KWP Congress the leadership stuck to the policy of rapid industrialization and economic autarky, and barely laid any emphasis on the improvement of living standards.⁵³ The spirit of the 20th Party Congress had no substantial effect on North Korean domestic policies. By contrast, CCP leaders were much less reluctant to follow Khrushchev's example. By May 1956, the Chinese Foreign Ministry had become more willing to provide the Communist embassies with information. In June the PRC adopted a conciliatory policy toward Taiwan.⁵⁴ Security precautions aimed at protecting high-ranking officials were greatly relaxed.⁵⁵ Mao's 10-point program placed a substantial emphasis on improving peasants' living standards. The party encouraged the children of "bourgeois" families to apply for admission to the universities.⁵⁶ Whereas in December 1955 the CCP had characterized Confucius' teachings as thoroughly reactionary, four months later the Deputy Foreign Minister called him "a great thinker, politician, and philosopher."⁵⁷ From 1954-1956 those Soviet and East European diplomats who harshly criticized North Korean policies often praised the correctness of Chinese measures, indicating that in this period the Soviets considered the North Koreans less cooperative than the Chinese (see Documents No. 9 and 10).⁵⁸

By the end of 1955 the North Koreans had used up most of the bulk of Soviet aid and they had received Chinese aid.⁵⁹ In the summer of 1956 the KWP leadership concluded that the country would need aid at least until 1958, and consequently dispatched a delegation led by Kim Il Sung to the USSR and Eastern Europe. The North Koreans seem to have been aware that the Kremlin's disapproval of their economic policies, since Nam Il informed the Romanian Ambassador before the delegation departed that they would ask for consumer goods instead of technical assistance. The visit proved quite successful. The Soviets granted a further 300 million rubles in aid to the DPRK, and cancelled a debt of 570 million rubles.⁶⁰ Though the CPSU leaders may have criticized Kim's policies during the negotiations, in the end they decided to fulfill his request. While the Kremlin did not hesitate to unseat the local "little Stalins" in Hungary and Bulgaria in 1956, it acted otherwise in North Korea. The Soviets supported Kim Il Sung quite reluctantly, and repeatedly interfered in his policies, but they did not attempt to replace him. This crucial difference between Eastern Europe and the DPRK effectively sealed the fate of those KWP leaders who dared to criticize Kim at the famous August CC plenum.

The "conspiracy" of Pak Ch'ang-ok, Ch'oe Ch'ang-ik, and others, which culminated in their open attack on the dictator's policies on 30-31 August 1956, was a desperate attempt to turn the tide rather than a serious challenge to Kim's rule. As early as mid-1955 most ministerial posts of crucial importance were held by Kim loyalists like Pang Haks-e (Interior), Ch'oe Yong-gon (Defense), Nam Il (Foreign Affairs), Yi Chu-yon (Finance), Chong Il-yong (Metallurgical Industry), Chong Chun-t'aek (Chemical Industry), Yi Chong-ok (Light Industry), and Kim Il (Agriculture). Thus, Kim Il Sung's critics, despite their high party ranks, had already become marginalized to a considerable extent.⁶¹

The unprecedented cooperation between the Soviet and Yan'an Koreans may have been due to their realization of the gravity of the situation. Outnumbered in the Standing Committee and the CC, they had little chance to prevail over the dictator. They may also have made some tactical mistakes. Pak Ch'ang-ok allegedly wanted to read an 80-page speech describing the errors the leadership had committed. Ch'oe Ch'ang-ik characterized Japanese-trained intellectuals such as Chong Il-yong and the new intelligentsia created by the Communist regime as reactionaries and boors, respectively.⁶² Since Kim Il Sung had cultivated contacts with both groups in order to offset the expertise of the Soviet and Yan'an Koreans, Ch'oe had good reason to criticize them. By doing so, however, he became even more isolated. Kim's critics also pointed out that the government should have devoted greater care to the improvement of living standards. Kim skillfully countered this charge by enumerating the achievements of his recent visit to the Communist countries, and promising economic reforms. Already before the CC plenum, the regime had resolved to cut the price of some consumer goods, raise wages, and reduce agricultural taxes.⁶³ On 20 August Ivanov told Hungarian Ambassador Károly Práth that the cult of Kim Il Sung had recently decreased significantly.⁶⁴ Thus, the action of Pak Ch'ang-ok and Ch'oe Ch'ang-ik proved rather ill-timed.

Kim Il Sung promptly purged his challengers, but his repressive measures provoked a joint Soviet-Chinese intervention. Most probably, Moscow and Beijing interpreted the purge as a manifestation of North Korean nationalism and willfulness. According to the memoirs of Albanian Enver Hoxha, at that time Boris Ponomarev Head of the International Department of the CPSU Central Committee, told him "things are not going very well with the Koreans. They have become very stuck-up and ought to be brought down a peg or two."⁶⁵ In 1955 Kim had skillfully exploited the rivalry between the Soviet and Yan'an Koreans, and his purges did not affect the two groups simultaneously. By contrast, in August 1956 he clamped down on both factions, and this act of repression, which ran counter to the new trend in Soviet and Chinese policies, could not pass unnoticed. Following a visit by Anastas Mikoyan and Peng Dehuai, on 23 September the purged leaders were readmitted to the CC. The Soviets and the Chinese were content with restoring the status quo ante;⁶⁶ it was the purge, rather than Kim Il Sung's rule as such, that they disapproved of.

Beijing seems to have played a crucial role in the success of the diplomatic intervention. In April 1956 a group of Albanian party leaders criticized Hoxha in the same way Pak Ch'ang-ok and Ch'oe Ch'ang-ik would condemn Kim Il Sung's policies in August. Although Khrushchev sympathized with the dissidents, he proved unable to protect them from the wrath of Hoxha. When Khrushchev sent Mikhail Suslov and Petr Pospelov to Tirana to persuade Hoxha to rehabilitate Koci Xoxe, the most prominent victim of the Albanian show trials, the dictator flatly refused to do so.⁶⁷ Had Moscow not joined forces with Beijing, Kim similarly might have gotten away with the purge. Judging from the support the CCP leadership gave to the Kremlin, in the summer and early fall of 1956 Mao did not yet consider Soviet de-Stalinization a threat. In fact, Hoxha stresses in his memoirs that Mao attempted to convince him in September that Stalin had made mistakes towards both the CCP and Yugoslavia.⁶⁸

On 3 October Ivanov told Práth that the North Korean leaders had finally begun to re-examine their economic policies, but it was not easy to eliminate the various deficiencies. For instance, the leadership had insisted on producing bicycles, watches, and sewing machines, even though the DPRK could have imported such products as part of the aid it received. Korean-made consumer goods were of poor quality, yet their prices were unaffordably high.⁶⁹ Contrary to widely held assumptions, Ch'oe Ch'ang-ik, Pak Ch'ang-ok and the Soviets had proposed the importation, rather than the local production, of consumer goods. Kim Il Sung seems to have opposed this proposal partly on the grounds that the DPRK's serious foreign trade deficit necessitated the rapid resuscitation of the country's industrial capacity.⁷⁰

Pyongyang Regains the Initiative

The Hungarian revolution of October 1956 stunned the KWP leaders, who were at a loss to understand the causes of the uprising. South Korean reactions to the Hungarian events also contributed to Pyongyang's anxiety. Certain high-ranking officials of the ROK Ministry of Defense allegedly made preparations for a military intervention in case a similar revolt took place in the DPRK.⁷¹ Kim did not regard this potential threat lightly. Factory-building came to an abrupt halt as the regime reassigned workers to the construction of underground plants.⁷² Of the North Koreans studying in Hungary, at least one took the opportunity to emigrate to the West, whereupon the regime hurriedly summoned most of the students home. On the other hand, Kim also took advantage of the Hungarian crisis. He demonstrated his dependability—and thus countered Soviet criticism of his policies—by offering economic aid such as 10,000 metric tons of cement to the newly-installed regime of Janos Kádár as early as 12 November.⁷³

Since the Hungarian crisis temporarily discredited de-Stalinization, Mikoyan's intervention in September did not put North Korean intra-party conflicts to rest. On 14 February 1957 Kim Tu-bong, a venerable leader of the Yan'an faction who had sympathized with the conspirators in August 1956, made a speech that condemned Pak Ch'ang-ok and

Ch'oe Ch'ang-ik.⁷⁴ This event revealed that Kim Il Sung was again in control of North Korean domestic politics. In February, Moscow summoned most of its technical experts home, and handed over the equipment of a joint-stock company called Sovexportfilm to the North Koreans. The Soviets also renamed the advisers remaining in the DPRK as consultants to demonstrate that their proposals were not binding on the North Koreans, as well as to prevent the North Koreans from blaming every setback on the Soviet advisers.⁷⁵

However, Soviet-North Korean friction continued. In the summer of 1957 Pyongyang invited foreign teacher deputations to spend their holidays in the DPRK. Seven smaller Communist countries did send deputations, but the Soviets and the Chinese were conspicuously absent.⁷⁶ One may thus conclude that Pyongyang's conflict with Moscow and Beijing did not necessarily affect its relations with the other Communist regimes. While the Soviets did not call upon their satellites to condemn the KWP leadership, the North Koreans seem to have attempted to win the friendship of the smaller Communist countries. In 1957, Práth emphasized, that P'yongyang appeared much more cooperative than it had been in 1956. The ambassador had several long and amicable conversations with Kim Il Sung, the latter repeatedly asking Práth what he thought of North Korean domestic politics.⁷⁷

In the fall of 1957 Pyongyang and Moscow apparently reached a *modus vivendi*.⁷⁸ Kim Il Sung took advantage of the events that had taken place in the USSR in June 1957. Since Khrushchev had also resorted to a purge in order to get rid of his opponents, he could no longer accuse Kim of violating the principle of "collective leadership." The KWP leadership publicly approved of the replacement of the Molotov group, drawing a parallel between the activity of the latter and that of the North Korean 'factionalists.' A CC plenum held in October expelled Yi Sang-cho, a dissident Yan'an Korean, from the party. Having been DPRK Ambassador to the Soviet Union in 1956, he decided not to return home after the August plenum. Since he continued to criticize Kim Il Sung, Pyongyang demanded his extradition. The Soviets refused the demand, but they reportedly told Yi Sang-cho to keep silent. So Hui, another dissident Yan'an Korean, sought refuge in China, and Beijing similarly refused to hand him over to the North Korean authorities.⁷⁹ Later Lee joined So Hui in the PRC, and their case troubled Chinese-North Korean relations as late as the fall of 1958. When a Chinese delegation headed by Guo Moruo arrived in the DPRK on 30 September 1958, it was given a cold reception.⁸⁰ The CCP leadership seems to have made every effort to conciliate Kim Il Sung. When the North Korean leader visited the PRC at the end of 1958, the Chinese told him that the assistance the CCP had received from Kim's guerrillas in the 1930s was far greater than the help Beijing gave to the DPRK during the Korean War.⁸¹

Problems of Industrialization

In July 1957 the KWP leadership initiated a two-year-long party purge that broke the influence of the Soviet and Yan'an factions once and for all.⁸² Since it coincided with the

Ch'ollima movement, a campaign the regime launched in order to speed up economic development, repressive measures were often motivated by the leadership's desire to find scapegoats to blame for the economic problems. The foreign advisers working in the DPRK could not persuade the leadership to set reasonable production targets, and if they complained of any mismanagement or deficiency, the authorities clamped down on some hapless Korean engineer or official in order to demonstrate their willingness to listen to Soviet advice. In mid-1958 the Soviets pointed out that a number of machines sent by the "fraternal" countries stood idle, whereupon the leadership promptly replaced two deputy ministers in the Ministry of Engineering Industry.⁸³ At the same time, the slow pace of the construction of a machine-tool factory led to debates between the Hungarian specialists and the North Koreans. The Hungarians failed to deliver certain facilities in time, but they managed to put the blame for the delay on the Koreans by emphasizing that the Korean technicians had not received further vocational training in Hungary. In turn, the DPRK authorities launched an investigation, suspecting the Korean engineers of sabotage.⁸⁴

To be sure, the conflicts between North Koreans and foreign advisers were not provoked exclusively by the former. In December 1950 the Hungarian Embassy in Beijing reported that two members of the Hungarian medical team in Korea were notorious drunkards, while two others treated Koreans rudely and contemptuously.⁸⁵ The Hungarian technicians often failed to take the inexperience of the North Korean engineers and directors into consideration. The embassy repeatedly castigated them for their intolerant and arrogant attitude. In 1957 the DPRK authorities told a Hungarian specialist not to prolong his stay, for his Korean colleagues were not satisfied with him.⁸⁶

Hungarian professors highlighted the extraordinary diligence of their North Korean students.⁸⁷ Nevertheless, at the end of 1956 the DPRK recalled most of its students from the "fraternal" countries, even though they had not yet completed their studies. (By contrast, neither Beijing nor Hanoi resorted to similar measures at that time.⁸⁸) Since their experiences abroad made several students critical of North Korean conditions, in 1957-1958 many former students were neither allowed to correspond with foreigners nor appointed to positions worthy of their qualifications.⁸⁹ Those who could participate in production often lacked practical experience. Although the leadership did its best to prolong the stay of the foreign specialists, the shortage of skilled labor proved an insuperable obstacle. As Foreign Minister Chong Il-yong pointed out in 1958, nearly every iron-casting till that had been produced was faulty. However, the leadership, fully aware of the difficulties but preferring quantity to quality, pressed on with mass production.⁹⁰

The *Ch'ollima* campaign required enormous efforts of the hard-pressed population. North Korea already faced a labor shortage as early as 1946,⁹¹ and the war of 1950-53 diminished the population by a substantial percentage.⁹² Since men were mobilized for urban reconstruction, in the mid-1950s some 70 to 80 percent of the agricultural workforce was com-

posed of women and children.⁹³ "It is a common scene that a young girl of twelve to thirteen is operating sophisticated machines," a Hungarian diplomat noted.⁹⁴ The regime's solution to the labor shortage was the massive use of "voluntary work." In addition to the 8-hour workday, people had to do 4 to 5 hours of unpaid work every day, not counting political meetings. At the end of 1958 foreign advisers noted that workers and officials did their best to wriggle out of "voluntary work," though they did not dare to criticize it openly. Political meetings met with near-complete indifference.⁹⁵

On the other hand, cadres were extremely proud of the DPRK's economic achievements. Although in 1958 Kim Il Sung personally asked the diplomatic corps for economic assistance, party propaganda systematically downplayed the role the "fraternal" countries played in the modernization of the DPRK. Some high-ranking party officials boasted that North Korea would catch up with Czechoslovakia by 1960. Information about the achievements of the other "people's democracies" was withheld from the population, and whenever officials made comparisons, these proved quite unfavorable to Central and Eastern Europe.⁹⁶ Nationalism also influenced cultural policies. To the chagrin of the diplomatic corps, in 1957 hardly any foreign plays, operas, or musical compositions were performed in the DPRK. In 1958 Deputy Minister of Education and Culture, An Mak, a critic of narrow-minded nationalism, temporarily revitalized cultural life and established good contacts with the foreign diplomats. However, the Polish Ambassador heard with regret that he had been purged in January 1959.⁹⁷ Since North Korean referees blatantly favored Korean players, every visiting team left the DPRK discontented.⁹⁸

Khrushchev Affronts Kim Il Sung

In December 1959 a Soviet diplomat in Pyongyang, Yulin told a Hungarian colleague that "most of the mistakes noticeable in the DPRK are attributable to ... the exaggerated national pride of the *Korean people* [emphasis added]." This attitude, which reflected the arrogance of a superpower vis-a-vis a small country, served the Soviets poorly. Moreover, Soviet criticism of North Korean economic policies was often motivated by self-interest. In February 1959, during a conversation with Kim Il Sung, Khrushchev rightly pointed out that the targets of the DPRK's Five Year Plan were hardly realistic, but his emphasis on international economic cooperation also revealed that the Soviets intended to shape the course of North Korean economic development. Moscow wanted to supply Siberia with canned food, fruit, and vegetables imported from the DPRK (see Document No. 14). Indeed, the value of North Korean food exports increased sixteen-fold between 1956 and 1959, while that of imported food only tripled. Since the USSR and the East European countries had to import non-ferrous metals from the DPRK in order to meet the demand of their industries, the Soviets repeatedly told Pyongyang not to develop engineering at the expense of the mining industry. On the other hand, the critical comments the Soviets made about North Korean industrialization proved well-founded. For instance, the Seven Year

Plan Pyongyang launched in 1961 set the production of electric locomotives and steam turbines as an aim. North Korean technological standards hardly rendered that possible, since even the steel and firebrick the DPRK produced for export was of inferior quality. However uneconomical the non-series production of sophisticated machines was, the regime made import substitution a matter of principle.⁹⁹

Kim's concern about Pyongyang's international prestige explained both his eagerness to invite Khrushchev to

had been exhausting for the workers.¹⁰³ Following the June CC plenum, the North Korean media admitted that "the relationship between the government organs and the masses has worsened" in the recent period.¹⁰⁴ On 10 December Yi Chong-ok told the diplomatic corps that the regime's over-emphasis on industrialization and urban construction had deprived agriculture of labor, while the authorities proved incapable of providing the swollen urban population with food and flats. As a consequence, a "tense atmosphere" had

As early as August 1959 Hungarian diplomats noted that the North Korean leaders "may harbor an idea that the division of Korea was caused by the Soviet Union, and thus its unification also depends solely on it."

the DPRK and his anger about the cancellation of the visit. In February 1959 Khrushchev allegedly promised Kim that he would visit North Korea that fall. The North Koreans took it for granted that the promise would be fulfilled. Although Soviet Ambassador Puzanov repeatedly stated that he did not know when the visit would take place, the North Koreans busily prepared for it from June on. In October Khrushchev told Kim that he would not visit the DPRK after all. This left the KWP leaders with the awkward task of turning the celebration into a non-event. The Soviets did not make it easier for them. "They have only themselves to blame if they were offended by that, as they make their bed so they must lie on it, they must realize that in the present international situation Comrade Khrushchev's visit to Korea would further increase, rather than ease, the tension," Soviet diplomats told their Hungarian colleagues.¹⁰⁰

The cancellation of Khrushchev's visit occurred immediately after his visit to the United States. At first Pyongyang attempted to pass over the latter event in silence, but the Soviet Embassy forced the North Korean media to deal "appropriately" with the visit (see Document No. 14). On 12 September, three days before the Soviet leader left for the US, Pyongyang had sided with China with regard to the Sino-Indian border dispute. This may have been a veiled expression of Kim's dissatisfaction with Khrushchev's foreign policy, since as late as 31 August the DPRK Ambassador to Budapest emphasized that North Korea's relations with India were improving. He also stated that Pyongyang intended to carry on with this policy.¹⁰¹

Breezes of Reform in North Korea

In May 1959 the KWP leaders asked the Kremlin to postpone the repayment of the credit the DPRK had received from the USSR, declaring that they intended to improve the living standards of the population. The Soviets consented to a four-year postponement.¹⁰² On 8 May, Kim Il Sung informed a Hungarian party delegation that the leadership wanted to designate 1960 as a "buffer year," because the last three years

developed. The December CC plenum had resolved to re-examine the regime's economic policies. While in January the Hungarian diplomats had thought it likely that the government would eliminate the household plots of the peasantry by the end of 1959, now the leadership decided not to resort to such measures.¹⁰⁵

The Soviets welcomed these changes, but the DPRK's new economic course also included measures that did not please the "fraternal" countries. In 1959 the export of certain agricultural products was halted in order to retain them for domestic consumption, causing a foreign trade deficit. Pyongyang then drastically cut back its imports in order to restore the balance of trade. At the end of 1959 several East European trade delegations arrived in the DPRK. Though the North Koreans had originally intended to halve the volume of their foreign trade, they finally yielded to the East Europeans' pressure. While imports fell to a large extent in 1960, the overall reduction proved quite insignificant. The volume of agricultural exports decreased, while the importation of agricultural products and food increased.¹⁰⁶

Since the DPRK leadership considered the shortage of skilled labor very grave, it felt compelled to relax certain discriminatory rules. In April 1959 Kim Il Sung declared that the country should involve "useful elements" of the pre-1945 intelligentsia in the modernization of the country, rather than slight and alienate them.¹⁰⁷ From mid-1959 on, the authorities permitted Hungarian-trained North Koreans to contact the Hungarian Embassy, and many of them were given jobs worthy of their qualifications.¹⁰⁸ "Communist universities" were set up in order to teach technical skills to persons of South Korean origin, who had hitherto been discriminated against. The repatriation of Koreans from Japan in 1959-1960 was also motivated, among other things, by Kim's desire to recruit skilled labor (see Documents No. 15, 18, and 19).

Preparations for Unification

On 8 May 1959 Kim Il Sung told a Hungarian party delegation that by 1958 the DPRK had become "strong enough"

to receive the Koreans willing to leave Japan.¹⁰⁹ The rapid development of North Korean industry also made the KWP leaders think that Pyongyang would soon overtake Seoul in every respect. Indeed, in 1958 the South Korean economy entered a period of stagnation. US aid flows began to decline in 1958, and it looked as if the ROK would be unable to survive without the American economic life-belt.¹¹⁰ Moreover, Pyongyang had good reason to believe that the Rhee regime would soon crumble. In 1959 the leaders of the Democratic Party [DP], the main opposition party in the South, also felt that “power was lying just around the corner, waiting for them to pick it up.”¹¹¹

In October 1959 the head of the North Korean Foreign Ministry’s South Korean desk stated that the party leadership “considered the situation as ripe for the unification of the country.” On 10 December a high-ranking KPA officer told a Hungarian diplomat that Pyongyang would unite Korea in 1960, supposedly by military means (see Documents No. 12 and 13). On 4 February 1960 the North Korean diplomat Paek Chong-won told the Hungarian Foreign Ministry that the KWP CC was of the opinion that due to various factors, it was possible to unite Korea in the immediate future. Among other things, he called the Hungarians’ attention to the increasing tension between South Korea and Japan.¹¹² The establishment of “Communist universities” for southern-born cadres therefore did not serve solely educational and economic purposes; they were also an effective tool of Pyongyang’s *Südpolitik*. Apart from nationalist motives, the North Korean leadership’s interest in unification may also have been for economic reasons. In November 1959 Romanian Ambassador to Pyongyang Dimitru Olteanu told Práth that national unification was crucial for both North and South Korea. Northern industrial products, because of their inferior quality, were not suitable for export; thus the North badly needed the industrially underdeveloped South as a captive market.¹¹³

Pyongyang’s unification plans became another source of conflict between the DPRK and the USSR in 1959–1960. As early as August 1959 Hungarian diplomats noted that the North Korean leaders “may harbor an idea that the division of Korea was caused by the Soviet Union, and thus its unification also depends solely on it.” “When will North and South Korea unite?” Yi Chu-yon asked Soviet Chargé d’Affaires Pelishenko on 20 August. Caught off guard, Pelishenko gave an evasive answer (see Document No. 11). Pyongyang, in all probability, felt that the Soviets were not concerned about Korean unification. The post-Stalin CPSU leadership indeed preferred maintaining the status quo in Korea to a risky confrontation. Competition with the US induced the Kremlin to give North Korea economic and military support, but the Soviets were content to protect the “socialist achievements” of the DPRK (see Document No. 3). Washington, similarly did its best to prevent Rhee from provoking a new war between North and South.¹¹⁴

Khrushchev’s preoccupation with the German question implied a comparatively neglectful approach to Far Eastern problems.¹¹⁵ In essence, he required North Korea to support

his policies with regard to Germany, but he refused to commit himself to the cause of Korean unification (see Document No. 17). The declarations of the international Communist conferences held in Moscow in 1957 and 1960 highlighted the “special situation” of the GDR. The East German leadership, like that of the DPRK, considered itself entitled to preferential treatment in terms of economic relations and other issues.¹¹⁶ This led to a conflict of interests between Berlin and Pyongyang. On 14 January 1960 GDR Ambassador Kurt Schneidewind told Práth that an East German government delegation headed by Heinrich Rau would soon arrive in the DPRK in order to “make the leading Korean comrades understand that today the main threat to peace is not in the Far East but ... in West Germany.” That is, the DPRK should not press for a quick solution of the Korean problem.¹¹⁷ (In the fall of 1959 Pyongyang had declared that the Korean question was the most important issue in the world.¹¹⁸) Since Khrushchev did not hesitate to resort to ultimatums and threats in order to solve the German question, one may conclude that in 1959–1960 the different priorities of Soviet and North Korean foreign policy played a more important role in Soviet–DPRK friction than the conflict between Soviet “peaceful co-existence” and North Korean belligerence.

Pyongyang and the South Korean Revolution

The South Korean April Revolution that toppled the Rhee regime had a profound effect on North Korean policies. On 21 April 1960, two days after the so-called “4/19 Revolt,” the DPRK diplomat Kim T’ae-hwa told the Hungarian Foreign Ministry that the KWP leadership did not consider South Korea to be ripe for an armed uprising, since neither the army nor the police supported the demonstrators. Nonetheless, the protests might lead to the downfall of Rhee, for “even the Americans are displeased with his brutal rule.” Kim also anticipated Chang Myon’s rise to prominence.¹¹⁹ Pyongyang’s analysis of the South Korean situation proved remarkably objective and accurate, if somewhat tarnished by ideological views. Certain officials of the Foreign Ministry seem to have formed an accurate view of the southern media. Describing the participants in the April Revolution, Paek Chong-won frankly stated that both workers and peasants had kept aloof from the demonstrations (see Documents No. 16 and 28). On 5 July Paek predicted that the DP would win the coming South Korean elections, though he did not expect far-reaching political changes from it.¹²⁰

KWP leaders adopted a cautious policy with regard to the South Korean events. Although they sympathized with certain “progressive” southern parties, they did not provide public support to any of them in order not to compromise the favored party.¹²¹ In June Kim Il Sung paid a visit to Khrushchev and on the latter’s advice proposed a confederation of the DPRK and the ROK. Although Chang Myon’s government proved unresponsive, Kim did not give up. In November he reiterated his proposal. The northern leaders spoke about the South in a very moderate tone, calling it by its official name. They seem to have been ready for a temporary “peaceful co-existence” with Seoul in case unification

was delayed. On 26 August the DPRK Ambassador to Budapest declared that if a third state proposed the simultaneous admission of the DPRK and the ROK to the UN, Pyongyang would not object (see Documents No. 20, 22, and 23). On 5 April 1961, Paek Chong-won stated that the DPRK would agree to the admission of both Koreas to the Inter-Parliamentary Union, and as late as 15 June he still stressed that North Korea would eventually become a member of the UN.¹²²

Pyongyang's acceptance of the admission of both Koreas to international organizations shows that the aforesaid proposals were not merely propaganda exercises. Since Beijing and Hanoi consistently rejected any similar suggestions concerning Taipei and Saigon, respectively, the idea of simultaneous admission should not be taken lightly. Moreover, North Korean domestic policies also seem to have been influenced by the prospect of cooperation with Seoul. Pyongyang took various steps to reassure southern public opinion. In March 1961 the DPRK Ambassador to Prague stated that it was high time to improve the quality of North Korean consumer goods, for if the South Koreans visited the North, these products would hardly make a good impression on them.¹²³ Following the April Revolution, the leadership repeatedly called upon cadres not to resort to oppressive measures. Forced resettlement from the capital came to a temporary halt. Still, real de-Stalinization remained out of the question, since Kim Il Sung regarded the overwhelming majority of the population as potential suspects (see Documents No. 21 and 25). The accelerated recruitment of southern-born cadres, whose future task was to deal with local administration in the South, indicated that Pyongyang's ultimate aim was the establishment of a Communist regime in South Korea.

The DPRK and the Sino-Soviet Rift

The April Revolution coincided with the first open Sino-Soviet clashes, and influenced the DPRK's reaction to the latter. Since the new leaders in Seoul repudiated Rhee's commitment to military unification, the prospect of a rapprochement between North and South temporarily convinced Kim Il Sung of the usefulness of Soviet diplomatic methods, and he eagerly adopted Khrushchev's confederation plan. On the other hand, Beijing probably considered Kim's acceptance of the admission of both Koreas to the UN a dangerous precedent. On 1 July 1960 the Czechoslovak Ambassador told Práth that Pyongyang had recently moved a bit closer to the Soviet standpoint, while Chinese influence in the DPRK was decreasing (see Document No. 17). Nonetheless, Kim's attempts to make a good impression on South Korean public opinion were not always welcomed in Moscow. Aware of being regarded in the ROK as Soviet puppets, the KWP leaders reinforced nationalist propaganda. Following the April Revolution, North Korean music broadcasts seldom included foreign compositions.¹²⁴ Pyongyang did its best to hide the fact that it had received aid from the "fraternal" countries. Nationalist propaganda and the condemnation of "flunkeyism" also served as a means to isolate the North

Korean population from the effects of the Sino-Soviet rift. Following the withdrawal of Soviet advisers from the PRC, the regime took measures to prevent its citizens from visiting the foreign embassies (see Document No. 23).¹²⁵

Although Kim Il Sung was hardly fond of Khrushchev, he had good reason not to give Beijing his full support. In October 1960 a Chinese delegation headed by He Long tried to win Pyongyang over to China's cause, but the attempt ended in failure. In fact, in early 1961 a certain tension appeared in Sino-North Korean relations. The KWP leaders were clearly aware of the PRC's economic difficulties (see Document No. 24). In 1960 Pyongyang purchased 300,000 metric tons of grain from the USSR, whereas China proved incapable of exporting grain to the DPRK.¹²⁶ Due to the famine caused by the Great Leap Forward, by September 1961 some 30,000 Koreans had fled Manchuria, seeking refuge in the DPRK.¹²⁷ On 5 February 1961 a section head of the North Korean Foreign Ministry told a Hungarian diplomat that while in North Korea the correct policies of the KWP had more or less solved the problems of agriculture, this was not the case in South Korea and China.¹²⁸

In fact, Kim Il Sung had little inclination to look up to the CCP leaders. "These Chinese are too sluggish. If I had only one division, I could destroy the Central [Nationalist] Army right now," Kim had commented regarding the CCP's efforts in 1946.¹²⁹ In August 1957 Kim told Práth that the DPRK's rice crop was 300 kilograms per capita, while in the PRC it never exceeded 200 kilograms per capita.¹³⁰ From 1958 on, Pyongyang began to downplay the military and economic assistance it had received from China since 1950.¹³¹ Although the North Korean and Chinese regimes had much in common, their policies were often nonetheless dissimilar. In 1954-1955 KWP cadres emphasized that there was no need to launch an anti-"kulak" campaign. By contrast, in 1955 Beijing declared that the struggle against "kulaks" was of great importance.¹³² Moreover, Kim's actions sometimes preceded, rather than imitated, comparable measures by the CCP. In labor-short North Korea the peacetime mobilization of officials for physical work began in 1953-1954. Beijing introduced a similar policy as late as 1957.¹³³ Early in 1955, as the regime's control over artists loosened a bit, many North Korean painters returned to the traditional Korean style of painting. In the PRC the similarly temporary "rehabilitation" of traditional Chinese painting took place only in mid-1956.¹³⁴ Although the Great Leap Forward had certainly influenced the *Ch'ollima* movement, Kim began to re-examine his economic policies in 1959, while Mao pressed on until December 1960.¹³⁵

Nevertheless, the CCP leaders proved more tolerant of North Korean nationalism than did their Soviet counterparts. In the wake of Park Chung-hee's coup, Pyongyang signed treaties of mutual friendship and cooperation with both Moscow and Beijing. In June 1961 Soviet Premier Alexei Kosygin visited the DPRK. He assured Kim Il Sung of the full support of the USSR, but criticized certain North Korean economic policies. Having inspected several factories, Kosygin, ever the technocrat, told Kim that the North Koreans should not have wasted time trying to invent everything themselves,

since in some cases the adoption of foreign patents would have been more economical.¹³⁶ By contrast, at the 4th KWP Congress in September, Deng Xiaoping explicitly appealed to Korean nationalism. "The Chinese leaders must learn from the Korean leaders," he declared, calling Koreans a "mighty people of 30 million." This certainly pleased Pyongyang. Deng's words were often quoted in intra-party propaganda.¹³⁷

Confrontation with Seoul and Moscow

Much to the Soviets' surprise, on 16 May 1961 Deputy Foreign Minister Kim T'ae-hui told the foreign ambassadors

assumed an interstate character. On 3 December all Soviet diplomats were recalled from Tirana. Henceforth Kim took the Soviet attack on Stalinism personally. As he put it at a CC plenum held in March 1962, "we must prepare for the contingency that the Soviet Union will cast us aside in the same way as it did Albania." (see Documents No. 27 and 30).¹⁴⁶

On 10 December Radio Pyongyang ceased to broadcast the Korean language programs of Radio Moscow. The post office withheld those copies of *Pravda* and *Kommunist* that dealt with the issue of Stalinism.¹⁴⁷ The diplomatic corps was told that from 1 January 1962 on, foreigners were forbidden

Since Krushchev did not hesitate to resort to ultimatums and threats in order to solve the German question, one may conclude that in 1959-60 the different priorities of Soviet and North Korean foreign policy played a more important role in Soviet-DPRK friction than the conflict between Soviet "peaceful co-existence and North Korean belligerence.

that Park's coup was a favorable development.¹³⁸ As did certain US observers, some KWP leaders considered Park, who had been arrested by the Rhee regime for his role in a 1948 rebellion, to be a leftist. Park's initial policies apparently confirmed this view.¹³⁹ Pyongyang, prepared for all emergencies, put the KPA on alert, but considered the South Korean situation rather unstable. On 15 June Paek Chong-won highlighted Park's conflict with Chang Do-young, calling it a clash of pro-Japanese and pro-US officers.¹⁴⁰ In September Pyongyang asked the Hungarian press not to criticize the southern leaders too harshly.¹⁴¹ As recently disclosed South Korean sources attest, at that time secret talks took place between the two regimes. Since these meetings proved fruitless, Kim Il Sung lost his patience. On October 2 Yu Chang-sik stated that because Park had cracked down on the southern proponents of unification, Kim dropped the matter of DPRK-ROK cooperation.¹⁴² Following Park's visit to the US, the northern media began to attack him by name.¹⁴³

Having failed to establish contacts with Seoul, Kim lost his interest in the "peaceful co-existence" proposed by Khrushchev. The 22nd CPSU Congress, with its renewed emphasis on de-Stalinization, also alarmed him. Still, at first Pyongyang seems to have tried to avoid an open confrontation with Moscow. During the Soviet-DPRK "month of friendship" (15 October-15 November), both sides stressed the importance of cooperation, and the North Koreans spoke about their economic problems with remarkable frankness.¹⁴⁴ Although at the end of October a few Albanian students arrived in the DPRK, North Korean students were told not to put questions to them about the Soviet-Albanian dispute.¹⁴⁵ On 27 November Kim Il Sung forbade party members to discuss Stalinism and the "Albanian question." However, the inter-party conflict between Khrushchev and Hoxha soon

to visit the three southernmost provinces without special permission.¹⁴⁸ In January Pyongyang flatly refused to sell copper and salt to the GDR, though the latter badly needed these materials.¹⁴⁹ From February on, intra-party lectures criticized Soviet policies and the COMECON. A wave of repression swept the party and state apparatus, and the half-hearted "thaw" of 1960-1961 came to an end. In fact, Kim Il Sung had good reason to worry about the effect Soviet de-Stalinization might produce on North Korean public opinion, for in the early 1960s dissenting voices were by no means non-existent among the intelligentsia and the masses (see Documents No. 27, 30, and 36). By contrast, the CCP leadership did not halt the process of political and economic "corrections," including the rehabilitation of "rightists," after the 22nd Congress.¹⁵⁰ While Soviet-Chinese relations began to improve in February, Soviet-DPRK friction continued until May.¹⁵¹

Kim Il Sung did not adopt a defensive posture vis-a-vis Seoul following his conflict with Moscow. On the contrary, he behaved as if he had finally been given a free hand. In March a high-ranking DPRK official told a GDR diplomat that Pyongyang would liberate the South by military means, for "we cannot wait until the population of South Korea starves to death!" (see Document No. 26). The belligerent statements of Kim Il and other KWP leaders startled certain East European diplomats, who had their doubts about the allegedly aggressive intentions of the US.¹⁵² In April the slogan *chonmin mujanghwa* (arming the entire population) appeared in many places.¹⁵³ In mid-1962 the employment of soldiers on construction projects more or less came to an end, indicating that the KPA was permanently put on alert.¹⁵⁴ At a secret meeting held on 19 June the leadership resolved to develop the defense industry. Kim seems to have tried not to place too heavy a burden on the population, since the other focal

point of the 1963 plan was agriculture, rather than heavy industry (see Document No. 30). While these steps gave the lie to the peaceful proposals the DPRK made in June 1962, it should be pointed out that in 1960-61 Kim's approaches to Seoul had not been accompanied by similar measures.¹⁵⁵

Early in 1962, Sino-North Korean cooperation intensified remarkably, as Beijing supported Pyongyang's militancy towards Seoul.¹⁵⁶ In April a Chinese delegation led by Peng Zhen arrived in the DPRK.¹⁵⁷ Since Sino-Soviet relations were improving at that time, Peng may have asked Pyongyang to be less hostile to Moscow. In August Khrushchev made an attempt to conciliate Kim, who welcomed the initiative (see Documents No. 29 and 30). On 17 October Kim told Soviet Ambassador Moskovsky that he did not intend to take sides in the Sino-Soviet conflict. He also emphasized that the KPA needed modern Soviet arms. Of the 500,000 troops, 300,000 were constantly in the trenches. The DPRK's defense expenditures, Kim said, were proportionately the highest in the whole Communist camp.¹⁵⁸

From the Cuban Missile Crisis to Khrushchev's fall, Soviet-DPRK relations steadily worsened, while Sino-North Korean contacts grew stronger. On 23 October, one day after the outbreak of the Caribbean crisis, Kim declared that no Communist country had the right to impose its will on others. He probably meant that the Kremlin had subordinated Havana's interests to its own, exposing Cuba to a potential nuclear attack.¹⁵⁹ In November Khrushchev was depicted as an appeaser at a meeting in the DPRK Foreign Ministry.¹⁶⁰ Military buildup accelerated, while industrialization slowed down. In December a CC plenum designated 1963 as another "buffer year."¹⁶¹ By contrast, in 1965-1970 P'yongyang, in an attempt to compete with South Korea's rapid economic growth, tried to develop the military and civilian sectors of the economy simultaneously. The KWP leaders seem to have underestimated the danger of nuclear war, which worried Moscow, particularly when Pak Kum-ch'ol stated that a South Korean attack was unlikely for the time being (see Documents No. 31 and 37).

In 1963-1964 Soviet-North Korean relations reached their lowest point. Harsh debates took place between the Soviet diplomats and the KWP leaders. The latter's actions often amounted to outright provocations (see Documents No. 35, 39, and 40). The authorities systematically harassed the Soviet and East European embassies, tapping their telephones and delaying their mail. While the Chinese diplomats were provided with vegetables and meat, their Soviet or Hungarian counterparts were not.¹⁶² In Moskovsky's view, the KWP's intra-party propaganda outdid even the Chinese in reviling Khrushchev.¹⁶³ In turn, a Soviet diplomat called Kim Il Sung's "brain trust," which included Hwang Chang-yop, a "political Gestapo."¹⁶⁴ Pyongyang launched a campaign against mixed marriages, compelling Koreans to divorce their European spouses (see Document No. 33). The GDR Ambassador described the speech of a party cadre, who had called such marriages a "crime against the Korean race," as "Goebbelsian."¹⁶⁵ Ordinary citizens, with the exception of some children, seem not to have shared the cadres' hostility

to Europeans, but they were prevented from contacting the latter.¹⁶⁶ Although several North Koreans asked the Soviet Embassy for political asylum, the Soviets, who were rightly afraid of Pyongyang's agent provocateur tactics, refused to help.¹⁶⁷

Searching for scapegoats, Khrushchev and Moskovsky declared that Puzanov, Counsellor Kryukov, and other diplomats had not noticed Kim's hostility in time. This accusation was not completely justified, for Kryukov had become *persona non grata* in the DPRK because of his critical remarks. Khrushchev also seems to have misinterpreted Kim's motives. "You have no political line of your own, it is the Chinese policy that the leaders of the KWP imitate and carry out," Moskovsky told Yi Chu-yon in June 1964. Ironically, it was Puzanov, a person known for his Stalinist views, who understood that the KWP leaders, though they temporarily sided with the PRC against Moscow, did not trust Beijing either. Kim Il Sung may have preferred the smaller, nationalist, and usually hard-line Communist states, such as Romania, Albania, Cuba, and the DRV, to the Asian colossus, for the former posed no threat to the DPRK (see Documents No. 32, 35, and 39).¹⁶⁸ On the other hand, cooperation with these countries yielded rather meager results to both sides. Apart from chrome ore, Albania had little to offer the DPRK, while the latter could not extend credit to Tirana.¹⁶⁹ Of the 4,000 metric tons of steel North Korea exported to the DRV in 1963, Hanoi took merely 700 metric tons, since its quality was very poor.¹⁷⁰ During the Cuban crisis, Pyongyang organized meetings in order to condemn the US. Much to the surprise of the Cuban Ambassador, the speeches dealt mainly with the DPRK's economic achievements. Kim Ch'ang-man, however, told the ambassador, "the Cuban people do not know how intensely we are supporting Cuba."¹⁷¹

Conclusions

From the new sources discussed here, we may conclude that in the 1953-1959 period Soviet-DPRK relations were based on a certain mutuality, rather than subordination. The Kremlin was still capable of intervening in North Korean domestic policies, but Kim Il Sung skillfully countered these steps by appearing to play along while gradually depriving the Soviets of their Korean allies and informants. Pro-Soviet gestures, such as Kim's approval of the 1956 Soviet intervention in Hungary, and of the 1957 purges, often served as justification of Kim's own policies. Moreover, Kim usually tried to conceal the anti-Soviet nature of his actions. Whenever the DPRK authorities prevented people from visiting the embassies or dismissed the latter's Korean employees, they referred to "security reasons," i.e. the American threat. In 1959 Kim Il Sung replaced Foreign Minister Nam Il, one of the few Soviet Korean leaders who had survived the purges of 1955-1958, but he was careful enough to tell Andrei Kirilenko CPSU Central Committee Secretary that Nam Il might be promoted to Premier a bit later.¹⁷²

From 1959 on, however, the nature of the Soviet-DPRK relationship began to change. By that time Kim had broken the influence of the Soviet and Yan'an factions, thus pre-

venting the Kremlin from playing off his fellow Politburo members against him. In addition, the Soviet aid program had come to an end. Kim continued to press Moscow for economic and military assistance, but he was less and less willing to offer anything in return. In 1961 Pyongyang failed to meet its foreign trade obligations to Moscow, whereupon the North Koreans asked the Soviets to cancel their debt. As they put it, "Your country is rich, you can afford that."¹⁷³ This attitude was combined with a feeling of superiority. As early as 1960 some KWP cadres made statements such as "It won't be long before the Europeans come here to learn from us."¹⁷⁴ While in the pre-1959 period the DPRK took little interest in establishing contacts with developing countries, from the 1960s on it strove for a dominant role in the Third World. When the authorities showed factories built with foreign assistance to African or Latin American guests, they described them as achievements of North Korea's self-reliant development.¹⁷⁵

Despite the regime's extreme despotism and "national solipsism," Kim's policies did not lack an element of pragmatism.¹⁷⁶ In 1963-1964 the DPRK, while condemning "flunkeyism" and "modern revisionism," laid increasing stress on economic cooperation with Japan.¹⁷⁷ Kim also consented to the systematic translation of articles published in Soviet, Japanese, and US scientific journals.¹⁷⁸ In certain cases the KWP leaders even proved more rational than Khrushchev. Pak Song-ch'ol's frank analysis of the problems of North Korean agriculture stood in sharp contrast to the utopian educational scheme concocted by the Soviet leader (see Document No. 34). Due to this underlying pragmatism, Kim proved able to let bygones be bygones, and in 1965 readily accepted Moscow's offer of reconciliation. The Soviets also tried to avoid a complete rupture with the DPRK. In November 1964 Kosygin told Kim Il that the Soviet media had consistently refrained from criticizing the KWP by name.¹⁷⁹ In essence, the Soviets were compelled to put a good face on Kim's domestic and foreign policies in order not to push North Korea toward China. While Khrushchev eventually declined to make that sacrifice, his successors did not.

Balazs Szalontai completed a Ph.D. in History in 2003 from Central European University in Budapest. His dissertation, "The Failure of De-Stalinization in North Korea, 1953-1964: The DPRK in a Comparative Perspective," draws on the extensive records available in the Hungarian National Archives to place North Korean history in the context of the development of other small states within the communist camp, particularly North Vietnam and Albania. His publications include: "The Dynamic of Repression: The Global Impact of the Stalinist Model."

NOTES

¹ See, among others, K. Weathersby, "To Attack, or Not to Attack? Stalin, Kim Il Sung, and the Prelude to War," *Cold War International History Project Bulletin* 5 (Spring 1995); Evgeni Bajanov, "Assessing the Politics of the Korean War, 1949-51," Chen Jian, *China's Road to the Korean War: The Making of Sino-American Confrontation*; Alexandre Y. Mansourov, "Stalin, Mao, Kim, and China's Decision to Enter the Korean War, Sept. 16-Oct. 15, 1950: New Evidence from the Russian Archives," Kathryn Weathersby, "New Russian Documents on the Korean War," *CWIHP Bulletin* 6-7 (Winter 1995/1996); Milton Leitenberg, "New Russian Evidence on the Korean War Biological Warfare Allegations: Background and Analysis," Kathryn Weathersby, "Deceiving the Deceivers: Moscow, Beijing, Pyongyang, and the Allegations of Bacteriological Weapons Use in Korea," *CWIHP Bulletin* 11 (Winter 1998).

² Andrei N. Lankov, "Kim Il Sung's Campaign against the Soviet Faction in Late 1955 and the Birth of *Chuch'e*," *Korean Studies* 23 (1999), pp. 43-67.; A.N. Lankov, "The Demise of Non-Communist Parties in North Korea (1945-1960)," *Journal of Cold War Studies* 3:1 (2001), pp. 103-125.

³ Bruce Cumings, *The Origins of the Korean War II: The Roaring of the Cataract 1947-1950* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990), pp. 291-376.; Brian Myers, *Han Sorya and North Korean Literature. The Failure of Socialist Realism in the DPRK* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994), pp. 49., 53-66., 78., 99-107., 138-141.; Sung Chul Yang, *The North and South Korean Political Systems. A Comparative Analysis* (Boulder-Seoul: Westview Press, Inc.-Seoul Press, 1994), pp. 367-368. On the other hand, a number of other scholars consider the North Korean regime, at least in the 1945-1956 period, a Soviet satellite not different from the East European dictatorships, and describe it as an imitation of Soviet Stalinism. See, among others, Robert A. Scalapino and Chong-sik Lee, *Communism in Korea I-II* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972); Okonogi Masao, "North Korean Communism: In Search of Its Prototype," in *Korean Studies: New Pacific Currents*. Ed. by Dae-Sook Suh (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1994), pp. 177-206; Adrian Buzo, *The Guerrilla Dynasty. Politics and Leadership in North Korea* (London-New York: I.B. Tauris Publishers, 1999).

⁴ Hungarian Legation to the DPRK, Report, 19 April 1953, XIX-J-1-k [Administrative Documents] Korea 1945-1964 [henceforth KA], 4. doboz, 5/cg, 04629/1/1953.

⁵ Hungarian Legation Documents] Korea 1945-1964 [henceforth KTS], 10. doboz, 24/b, 001132/1955; Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 14 September 1953, KA, 11. doboz, 24/b, 011219/1953.

⁶ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 19 April 1956, KA, 8. doboz, 15/b, 025/25/11-6/1956; Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 4 November 1954, KA, 11. doboz, 22/a, 010968/1954.

⁷ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 21 May 1957, KA, 9. doboz, 18/f, 002756/1957.

⁸ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Annual Report, 1 March 1956, KTS, 4. doboz, 5/a, 003133/1956.

⁹ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, 14 April 1956, KA, 9. doboz, 18/g, 025/25/4-5/1956.

¹⁰ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 8 December 1954, KA, 9. doboz, 18/g, 001140/1955; Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 28 June 1955, 025/25/3-28/1955, June 28, 1955.

¹¹ Hungarian Legation to the DPRK, Report, 5 May 1950, KTS, 7. doboz, 5/f, 00895/1950.

¹² Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 23 December

1955, KTS, 10. doboz, 24/b, 00608/1956; Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 8 August 1954, KA, 11. doboz, 25/b, 09479/1954.

¹³ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 13 September 1954, KA, 6. doboz, 11/h, 09481/1954.

¹⁴ Hungarian Legation to the DPRK, Report, 23 December 1956, KTS, 10. doboz, 24/b, 00608/1956; Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 21 April 1956, KTS, 11. doboz, 25/b, 004441/1956.

¹⁵ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 8 August 1954, KA, 11. doboz, 25/b, 09479/1954.

¹⁶ Hungarian Legation to the PRC, Report, 23 August 1950, XIX-J-1-j [Top Secret Documents] Kina 1945-1964 [henceforth CTS], 10. doboz, 5/f, 001503/1950; Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 20 December 1950, KA, 4. doboz, 5/e, 01075/1951.

¹⁷ Hungarian Embassy to the PRC, Report, 29 January 1951, CTS, 5. doboz, 5/a, 028286/1951; Hungarian Embassy to the PRC, Report, 8 April 1952, CTS, 5. doboz, 5/a, 00875/1952; Hungarian Embassy to the PRC, Report, 18 March 1955, CTS, 5. doboz, 5/a, 003989/1955; Hungarian Embassy to the PRC, Report, 21 January 1955, CTS, 10. doboz, 5/f, 003995/1955.

¹⁸ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 25 November 1952, KA, 4. doboz, 5/e, 013952/1952.

¹⁹ Hungarian Legation to the DRV, Report, 16 August 1963, XIX-J-1-j [Top Secret Documents] Vietnam 1945-1964 [henceforth VTS], 3. doboz, 5/a, 006368/1963.

²⁰ On the other hand, the North Korean land reform of 1945-1946 proved less violent than the ones carried out by the Chinese and North Vietnamese Communist regimes. See Bruce Cumings, *The Origins of the Korean War: Liberation and the Emergence of Separate Regimes 1945-1947* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981), pp. 414-417.

²¹ Hungarian Legation to the DPRK, Report, 27 October 1951, KA, 9. doboz, 18/g, 01939/1952.

²² Hungarian Legation to the DPRK, Report, 7 October 1953, KA, 6. doboz, 12/a, 011216/1953; Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 29 November 1956, KA, 6. doboz, 12/a, 1/25-5/1957; Hungarian Embassy to the PRC, Report, 8 April 1952, CTS, 5. doboz, 5/a, 00875/1952; Hungarian Embassy to the DRV, Report, 21 July 1955, VTS, 4. doboz, 5/c, 007961/1955.

²³ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 18 June 1953, KA, 10. doboz, 18/i, 001404/1953. On the 1945-1950 period, see Charles K. Armstrong, "Surveillance and Punishment in Postliberation North Korea," *Positions: East Asia Cultures Critique* Vol. 3 (Winter 1995), No. 3, pp. 695-722; Jeon Hyun Soo, *Sotsialno-ekonomicheskie preobrazovaniia v Severnoi Koree v usloviakh sovetskoi voennoi administratsii 1945-1948* (Moscow: Drevo Zhizni, 1997); Erik van Ree, *Socialism in One Zone. Stalin's Policy in Korea, 1945-1947* (Oxford: Berg Publishers Limited, 1989).

²⁴ Hungarian Legation to the DPRK, Report, 19 July 1952, KTS, 3. doboz, 4/bc, 001024/2/1952.

²⁵ Kathryn Weathersby, "Deceiving the Deceivers," p. 180.

²⁶ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 5 August 1953, KA, 1. doboz, 1/b, 02199/2/1953.

²⁷ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 15 April 1954, KTS, 4. doboz, 5/a, 00866/1954.

²⁸ Hungarian Legation to the DPRK, Report, 6 December 1954, KTS, 12. doboz, 27/a, 001131/1955.

²⁹ Hungarian Embassy to the DRV, Report, 28 November 1955, VTS, 9. doboz, 27/d, 00426/1956.

³⁰ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 23 December 1953, KA, 5. doboz, 5/f, 01202/1954; Hungarian Embassy to the

DPRK, Report, 16 July 1954, KTS, 6. doboz, 5/cb, 001201/1954.

³¹ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 29 September 1954, KA, 4. doboz, 5/e, 010941/1954; Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 7 October 1954, KA, 4. doboz, 5/e, 010929/1954; Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 23 October 1954, KTS, 7. doboz, 5/f, 001567/1954.

³² Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 13 April 1955, KTS, 7. doboz, 5/f, 006054/1955. The term 'Soviet Korean' refers to Soviet citizens of Korean background who were dispatched to North Korea in 1945-1947 to help Kim Il Sung in the establishment of a Communist regime. The most influential members of the so-called 'Soviet faction' were Ho Ka-i, Pak Ch'ang-ok, Nam Il, Pak Chong-ae, and Pang Hak-se. While some of them opposed Kim's policies in the mid-1950s, others took sides with him against Moscow. Those Korean Communists who had fought against the Japanese under CCP leadership in Yan'an constituted the 'Yan'an faction,' and its leaders were Mu Chong, Kim Tu-bong, Ch'oe Chang-ik, Pak Il-u, and Kim Ch'ang-man. This group was also divided between Kim Il Sung's supporters and opponents.

³³ Hungarian Legation to the PRC, Report, 18 May 1954, CTS, 9. doboz, 5/e, 00731/5/1954.

³⁴ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 12 July 1954, KA, 4. doboz, 5/e, 08071/1954.

³⁵ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 24 March 1954, KTS, 6. doboz, 5/e, 00738/1/1954.

³⁶ On post-1953 US military policies in Korea, see Taik-young Hamm, *Arming the Two Koreas. State, Capital and Military Power* (London-New York: Routledge, 1999), pp. 67-69.

³⁷ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 6 November 1954, KA, 4. doboz, 5/ba, 09427/1/1954.

³⁸ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 4 November 1954, KA, 4. doboz, 5/ca, 010976/1954.

³⁹ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 11 September 1954, KA, 5. doboz, 5/f, 09446/1954.

⁴⁰ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 15 November 1954, KTS, 7. doboz, 5/f, 001117/1955.

⁴¹ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 2 December 1954, KTS, 7. doboz, 5/f, 001117/1/1955.

⁴² Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 1 September 1954, KA, 4. doboz, 5/ba, 09427/1954.

⁴³ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 10 June 1956, KTS, 12. doboz, 25/j, 005594/1956; Hungarian Board of Trade, Study, October 1959, KA, 3. doboz, 5/a, 001/114/2/1959. On the aid programs of the Communist countries, see Károly Fendler, "Economic Assistance and Loans from Socialist Countries to North Korea in the Postwar Years 1953-1963," *Asien* No. 42 (January 1992), pp. 39-51.

⁴⁴ Hungarian Embassy to the PRC, Report, 30 November 1951, CTS, 10. doboz, 5/f, 00313/1952; Hungarian Embassy to the PRC, Report, 8 June 1953, 001275/1953.

⁴⁵ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 28 October 1958, KTS, 7. doboz, 5/f, 006456/1958.

⁴⁶ Anne O. Krueger, *The Developmental Role of the Foreign Sector and Aid* (Cambridge [Mass.]-London: Harvard University Press, 1982), p. 79.

⁴⁷ Hungarian Embassy to the PRC, Report, 2 November 1954, XIX-J-1-k [Administrative Documents] Kina 1945-1964 [henceforth CA], 6. doboz, 5/c, 05236/1/1954. See also Dali L. Yang, *Calamity and Reform in China. State, Rural Society, and Institutional Change Since the Great Leap Famine* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1996), pp. 23-29.

⁴⁸ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, August 1955, KTS, 4. doboz, 5/a, 006044/3/1955; Hungarian Embassy to the

DPRK, Report, 17 August 1955, KTS, 5. doboz, 5/ca, 008014/1955; Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 24 August 1955, KTS, 10. doboz, 24/b, 008016/1955; Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 23 December 1955, KTS, 10. doboz, 24/b, 00608/1956.

⁴⁹ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 6 May 1955, KTS, 12. doboz, 27/a, 006063/1955.

⁵⁰ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 19 October 1955, KTS, 4. doboz, 5/a, 006044/1955; Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 31 August 1955, KTS, 10. doboz, 24/b, 008020/1/1955.

⁵¹ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 7 February 1960, KTS, 5. doboz, 5/bc, 001668/1960; Hungarian Embassy to the DRV, Report, 8 February 1956, VTS, 2. doboz, 5/a, 003065/1956; Hungarian Embassy to the DRV, Report, 9 September 1957, VTS, 3. doboz, 5/b, 004730/1957.

⁵² Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 19 April 1956, KTS, 12. doboz, 27/a, 004436/1956.

⁵³ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 5 October 1956, KTS, 7. doboz, 5/f, 20440/1/1956; Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 4 June 1956, KTS, 12. doboz, 27/a, 003127/1956.

⁵⁴ Hungarian Embassy to the PRC, Report, 9 May 1956, CTS, 6. doboz, 5/b, 005760/1956; Hungarian Embassy to the PRC, Report, 24 May 1956, CTS, 7. doboz, 5/c, 005813/1956; Hungarian Embassy to the PRC, Report, 16 August 1956, CTS, 13. doboz, 11/f, 006693/1956. On Chinese reactions to the 20th Congress, Zhang Shu Guang and Chen Jian, "The Emerging Disputes Between Beijing and Moscow: Ten Newly Available Chinese Documents, 1956-1958," *CWIHP Bulletin* 6-7 (Winter 1995/1996).

⁵⁵ Hungarian Embassy to the PRC, Report, 17 July 1956, CA, 17. doboz, 22/a, 006713/1956.

⁵⁶ Hungarian Embassy to the PRC, Report, 8 June 1956, CTS, 7. doboz, 5/bc, 005769/1956.

⁵⁷ Hungarian Embassy to the PRC, Report, 23 May 1956, CTS, 9. doboz, 5/e, 005774/1956.

⁵⁸ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 24 May 1955, KTS, 7. doboz, 5/f, 006053/1955; Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 1 July 1955, KA, 12. doboz, 28/c, 008024/1955.

⁵⁹ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 23 December 1955, KTS, 10. doboz, 24/b, 00608/1956.

⁶⁰ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Annual Report, 28 May 1957, KTS, 4. doboz, 5/a, 002749/1957; Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 17 September 1956, KTS, 7. doboz, 5/f, 007219/1956; Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 10 June 1956, KTS, 12. doboz, 25/j, 005594/1956.

⁶¹ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Annual Report, 26 February 1955, KTS, 4. doboz, 5/a, 004076/1955.

⁶² Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 18 September 1956, KTS, 7. doboz, 5/f, 007232/1956; Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 31 October 1956, KTS, 12. doboz, 27/a, 003128/1/1956.

⁶³ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Annual Report, 28 May 1957, KTS, 4. doboz, 5/a, 002749/1957; Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 31 October 1956, KTS, 12. doboz, 27/a, 003128/1956.

⁶⁴ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 12 September 1956, KTS, 2. doboz, 1/c, 007233/2/1956.

⁶⁵ *The Artful Albanian: Memoirs of Enver Hoxha*. Ed. by Jon Halliday (London: Chatto & Windus Ltd., 1986), pp. 177-184.

⁶⁶ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 31 October 1956, KTS, 12. doboz, 27/a, 003128/1/1956; Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 28 November 1960, KTS, 13. doboz, 27/a, 002481/1961.

⁶⁷ Anton Logoreci, *The Albanians: Europe's Forgotten Survivors*

(London: Victor Gollancz Ltd., 1977), pp. 119-123.; Nicholas C. Pano, *The People's Republic of Albania* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1968), pp. 117-119.

⁶⁸ *The Artful Albanian*, pp. 177-184.

⁶⁹ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 5 October 1956, KTS, 7. doboz, 5/f, 20440/1/1956.

⁷⁰ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 13 April 1955, KTS, 7. doboz, 5/f, 006054/1955; Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 23 December 1955, 10. doboz, 24/b, 00608/1956; Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 17 October 1961, KA, 1. doboz, 1/c, 1/25/46-1/1961.

⁷¹ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Annual Report, 28 May 1957, KTS, 4. doboz, 5/a, 002749/1957.

⁷² Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 17 January 1958, KTS, 3. doboz, 4/bc, 00264/1/1958.

⁷³ Hungarian Foreign Ministry, Protocole Department, Memorandum, 26 February 1960, KA, 1. doboz, 4/a, 163/1960; Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Annual Report, 7 March 1958, KTS, 4. doboz, 5/a, 002247/1/1958.

⁷⁴ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 19 March 1957, KTS, 5. doboz, 5/ca, 001812/1957; Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 28 November 1960, KTS, 13. doboz, 27/a, 002481/1961.

⁷⁵ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 20 March 1957, KTS, 12. doboz, 25/j, 001805.

⁷⁶ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Reports, 16 September 1957 and 10 October 1957, KA, 9. doboz, 18/g, 004743/1/1957.

⁷⁷ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Annual Report, 7 March 1958, KTS, 4. doboz, 5/a, 002247/1/1958.

⁷⁸ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 18 October 1957, KTS, 7. doboz, 5/f, 00257/1958; Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 10 October 1957, KA, 9. doboz, 18/g, 004743/1/1957.

⁷⁹ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Annual Report, 7 March 1958, KTS, 4. doboz, 5/a, 002247/1/1958; Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 24 October 1957, KTS, 12. doboz, 27/a, 00262/1958; Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 23 October 1958, KTS, 12. doboz, 27/a, 006458/1958.

⁸⁰ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 7 November 1958, KTS, 8. doboz, 5/i, 006450/1958.

⁸¹ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 29 December 1958, KTS, 5. doboz, 5/bc, 00111/1/1959.

⁸² Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 4 October 1957, KTS, 3. doboz, 4/bc, 003870/2/1957.

⁸³ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 3 September 1958, KTS, 3. doboz, 4/bc, 00264/3/1958.

⁸⁴ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 27 June 1958, KTS, 11. doboz, 24/b, 004375/1958.

⁸⁵ Hungarian Embassy to the PRC, Report, 12 December 1950, CA, 20. doboz, 28/c, 00138/1951.

⁸⁶ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 13 January 1957, KA, 9. doboz, 18/g, 001044/1/1957.

⁸⁷ Hungarian Ministry of Education, Memorandum, 13 August 1954, KA, 8. doboz, 17/d, 025/25/2-72/1954.

⁸⁸ Hungarian Foreign Ministry, Memorandum, 22 October 1959, KTS, 10. doboz, 17/d, 006235/1959.

⁸⁹ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 3 June 1960, KTS 2. doboz, 1/b, 004819/1960; Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 14 March 1957, KTS, 6. doboz, 5/e, 001806/1957; Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 18 July 1958, KTS, 11. doboz, 24/b, 004885/1958; Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, 26 February 1958, KA, 9. doboz, 18/b, 002245/1958.

⁹⁰ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 24 September 1958, KTS, 11. doboz, 24/b, 004885/1/1958.

- ⁹¹ Bruce Cumings, *The Origins of the Korean War II*, p. 336.
- ⁹² Nicholas Eberstadt and Judith Banister, *The Population of North Korea* (Berkeley: University of California, 1992), p. 32.
- ⁹³ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 10 May 1955, KA, 11. doboz, 22/a, 006049/1955.
- ⁹⁴ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 9 February 1955, KA, 6. doboz, 12/a, 004063/1955.
- ⁹⁵ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Annual Report, 24 February 1959, KTS, 4. doboz, 5/a, 002242/1959; Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 4 June 1959, KTS, 11. doboz, 24/b, 004529/1959.
- ⁹⁶ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Annual Report, 24 February 1959, KTS, 4. doboz, 5/a, 002242/1959; Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 8 December 1960, KTS, 5. doboz, 001/RT/1961.
- ⁹⁷ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Annual Report, 24 February 1959, KTS, 4. doboz, 5/a, 002242/1959; Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 24 January 1959, KTS, 7. doboz, 5/f, 001702/1959. On North Korean cultural nationalism, see Leonid Petrov, „North Korean Historiography in Crisis (1956-1967).” Research Paper. Proceedings of the Second Biennial Conference of Korean Studies Association of Australasia (Melbourne, 24-25 September 2001), pp. 374-383.
- ⁹⁸ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 18 May 1959, KA, 8. doboz, 15/i, 004532/1959.
- ⁹⁹ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Study, June 1962, KTS, 11. doboz, 24/b, 007195/1962.
- ¹⁰⁰ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 7 October 1959, KTS, 5. doboz, 5/bc, 006028/1959.
- ¹⁰¹ Hungarian Foreign Ministry, Memorandum, 2 September 1959, KA, 1. doboz, 4/a, 683/1959.
- ¹⁰² Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 30 July 1959, KTS, 10. doboz, 23/b, 005420/1959.
- ¹⁰³ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 14 May 1959, KA, 3. doboz, 4/bc, (no reference number)/1959.
- ¹⁰⁴ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 17 August 1959, KTS, 5. doboz, 5/c, 005421/1959.
- ¹⁰⁵ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 30 January 1959, KA, 11. doboz, 22/a, 001706/1959; Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 15 December 1959, KTS, 11. doboz, 24/b, 001710/1960.
- ¹⁰⁶ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 13 November 1959, KTS, 7. doboz, 5/f, 006837/1959; Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Study, June 1962, KTS, 11. doboz, 24/b, 007195/1962.
- ¹⁰⁷ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 18 May 1959, KTS, 7. doboz, 5/f, 004528/1959.
- ¹⁰⁸ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 3 June 1960, KTS, 2. doboz, 1/b, 004819/1960.
- ¹⁰⁹ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 14 May 1959, KA, 3. doboz, 4/bc, (no reference number)/1959.
- ¹¹⁰ Krueger, *The Developmental Role of the Foreign Sector and Aid*, pp. 41-42., 80-81.
- ¹¹¹ Quee-Young Kim, *The Fall of Syngman Rhee* (Berkeley: University of California, 1983), p. 24.
- ¹¹² Hungarian Foreign Ministry, Memorandum, 6 February 1960, KTS, 3. doboz, 4/af, 002103/1960.
- ¹¹³ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 13 November 1959, KTS, 7. doboz, 5/f, 006837/1959.
- ¹¹⁴ See Pyo-Wook Han, *The Problem of Korean Unification. A Study of the Unification Policy of the Republic of Korea 1948-1960* (Seoul: The Research Center for Peace and Unification of Korea, 1987), pp. 148-150., 155-156.
- ¹¹⁵ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 12 December 1961, KTS, 5. doboz, 5/f, 002278/1961.
- ¹¹⁶ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 5 February 1962, KTS, 11. doboz, 25/b, 002290/1962.
- ¹¹⁷ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 16 January 1960, KTS, 7. doboz, 5/f, 001712/1960.
- ¹¹⁸ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 2 July 1960, KTS, 8. doboz, 5/f, 0029/RT/1960.
- ¹¹⁹ Hungarian Foreign Ministry, Memorandum, 22 April 1960, KTS, 3. doboz, 4/af, 003577/1960.
- ¹²⁰ Hungarian Foreign Ministry, Memorandum, 12 July 1960, KTS, 3. doboz, 4/af, 005061/1/1960.
- ¹²¹ Hungarian Foreign Ministry, Memorandum, 12 July 1960, KTS, 3. doboz, 4/af, 005061/1/1960. On the South Korean unification debates and the reception of northern proposals, see Hak-Joon Kim, *The Unification Policy of South and North Korea. A Comparative Study* (Seoul: Seoul National University Press, 1977), pp. 176-189.
- ¹²² Hungarian Foreign Ministry, Memorandum, 5 April 1961, KTS, 3. doboz, 4/af, 003159/2/1961; Hungarian Foreign Ministry, Memorandum, 17 June 1961, KTS, 3. doboz, 4/af, 003159/6/1961.
- ¹²³ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 16 March 1961, KTS, 10. doboz, 25/b, 003640/1961.
- ¹²⁴ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 1 July 1961, KA, 9. doboz, 18/b, 004517/1/1961.
- ¹²⁵ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 28 November 1960, KTS, 13. doboz, 27/a, 002481/1961.
- ¹²⁶ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, 24 December 1960, KTS, 6. doboz, 5/e, 002505/1961.
- ¹²⁷ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 28 April 1962, KTS, 13. doboz, 30/d, 004853/1962; Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 2 October 1961, CTS, 9. doboz, 5/cc, 0074/RT/1961.
- ¹²⁸ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 6 February 1961, KTS, 6. doboz, 5/e, 002489/1961.
- ¹²⁹ Sergei N. Goncharov, John W. Lewis, and Xue Litai, *Uncertain Partners. Stalin, Mao, and the Korean War* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1993), pp. 132-134. On Sino-North Korean relations, see Chae-Jin Lee, *China and Korea. Dynamic Relations* (Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, 1996).
- ¹³⁰ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 6 August 1957, KTS, 3. doboz, 4/bc, 003870/1957.
- ¹³¹ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 7 November 1958, 8. doboz, 5/i, 006450/1958.
- ¹³² Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 14 May 1955, KTS, 12. doboz, 27/a, 006047/1955; Hungarian Embassy to the PRC, Report, 14 April 1955, CA, 18. doboz, 22/d, 004719/1955.
- ¹³³ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 16 May 1955, KTS, 5. doboz, 5/c, 006050/1955; Hungarian Embassy to the PRC, Report, 13 December 1957, CTS, 8. doboz, 5/c, 00196/1/1958.
- ¹³⁴ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 31 January 1955, KA, 9. doboz, 18/e, 025/25/1-31/1955; Hungarian Embassy to the PRC, Report, 7 June 1956, CA, 12. doboz, 18/b, 005790/1956.
- ¹³⁵ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 10 November 1958, KTS, Report, 11. doboz, 24/b, 006463/1958; Hungarian Embassy to the PRC, Report, 5 December 1960, CTS, 9. doboz, 5/ca, 0066/RT/1961.
- ¹³⁶ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 26 June 1961, KTS, 5. doboz, 5/bc, 005780/1961.
- ¹³⁷ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 5 July 1962, KTS, 7. doboz, 5/b, 006413/1962; Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 6 May 1962, KTS, 8. doboz, 5/i, 004856/1962.
- ¹³⁸ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 20 May 1961,

KTS, 8. doboz, 5/f, 0041/RT/1961.

¹³⁹ On Park's coup and its reception in the U.S., see Mark L. Clifford, *Troubled Tiger. Businessmen, Bureaucrats, and Generals in South Korea* (Armonk-London: M.E. Sharpe, 1994), pp. 36-39.

¹⁴⁰ Hungarian Foreign Ministry, Memorandum, 17 June 1961, KTS, 3. doboz, 4/af, 003159/6/1961; Hungarian Foreign Ministry, Memorandum, 22 June 1961, KTS, 3. doboz, 4/af, 003159/7/1961.

¹⁴¹ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 24 September 1961, KA, 8. doboz, 15/b, 1/25/34-1/1961.

¹⁴² Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 17 October 1961, KA, 1. doboz, 1/c, 1/25/46-1/1961.

¹⁴³ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 15 November 1961, KA, 8. doboz, 15/b, 3/25/3-1/1962.

¹⁴⁴ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 21 November 1961, KA, 11. doboz, 21/c, 1127/1961.

¹⁴⁵ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 1 November 1961, KTS, 10. doboz, 17/d, 008662/1961.

¹⁴⁶ The slogan 'Arms in the one hand and a hammer and sickle in the other!', which cropped up in December 1962, was adopted from the Albanians. Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, January 1963, KTS, 13. doboz, 27/a, 00380/1963.

¹⁴⁷ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 5 February 1962, KTS, 13. doboz, 27/a, 002307/1962.

¹⁴⁸ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 20 January 1962, KTS, 8. doboz, 5/g, 002299/1962.

¹⁴⁹ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 5 February 1962, KTS, 11. doboz, 25/b, 002290/1962.

¹⁵⁰ Hungarian Embassy to the PRC, Report, 25 January 1962, CTS, 8. doboz, 5/c, 002045/1962; Hungarian Embassy to the PRC, Report, 15 January 1962, CTS, 17. doboz, 27/a, 002068/1962.

¹⁵¹ Hungarian Embassy to the PRC, Report, 30 May 1962, CTS, 6. doboz, 5/b, 002053/1/1962; Hungarian Embassy to the PRC, Report, 9 April 1962, CA, 18. doboz, 22/a, 004123/1962.

¹⁵² Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 6 April 1962, KTS, 5. doboz, 5/b, 004106/1962; Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 7 April 1962, KTS, 5. doboz, 5/b, 004105/1962.

¹⁵³ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 29 April 1962, KTS, 8. doboz, 5/f, 004855/1/1962.

¹⁵⁴ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 7 January 1963, KTS, 11. doboz, 24/b, 00385/1963.

¹⁵⁵ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 23 June 1962, KTS, 9. doboz, 11/f, 006076/1962.

¹⁵⁶ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 5 July 1962, KTS, 7. doboz, 5/b, 006413/1962; Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 5 February 1962, KTS, 13. doboz, 27/a, 002307/1962.

¹⁵⁷ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 6 May 1962, KTS, 8. doboz, 5/i, 004856/1962.

¹⁵⁸ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 27 October

1962, KTS, 5. doboz, 5/bc, 0081/RT/1962.

¹⁵⁹ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 2 November 1962, KTS, 5. doboz, 5/bc, 004105/1/1/1962.

¹⁶⁰ Hungarian Foreign Ministry, Memorandum, November 1962, KTS, 5. doboz, 5/bc, 0085/RT/1962.

¹⁶¹ Hungarian Foreign Ministry, Report, 25 January 1964, KTS, 11. doboz, 24/b, 001400/1/1964.

¹⁶² Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 11 May 1963, KTS, 8. doboz, 5/g, 004161/1/1963; Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 23 September 1963, KTS, 8. doboz, 5/g, 006728/1963.

¹⁶³ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 1 February 1963, KTS, 5. doboz, 5/bc, 0012/RT/1963.

¹⁶⁴ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 7 January 1963, KTS, 13. doboz, 27/a, 00398/1963.

¹⁶⁵ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 22 June 1963, KTS, 13. doboz, 30/b, 005273/1963.

¹⁶⁶ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 18 May 1959, KTS, 7. doboz, 5/f, 004528/1959; Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 18 October 1964, KTS, 5. doboz, 5/bc, 004087/1/1964.

¹⁶⁷ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 15 May 1964, KTS, 7. doboz, 5/f, 004090/1964.

¹⁶⁸ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 23 June 1962, KTS, 8. doboz, 5/f, 006081/1962; Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 8 May 1963, KTS, 11. doboz, 24/b, 0022/RT/1963.

¹⁶⁹ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 8 May 1961, KTS, 5. doboz, 5/bc, 004516/1961.

¹⁷⁰ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Study, June 1964, KTS, 11. doboz, 24/b, 001400/3/1964.

¹⁷¹ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 10 November 1962, KTS, 8. doboz, 5/f, 008695/1962.

¹⁷² Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 29 October 1959, KTS, 4. doboz, 5/a, 006840/1959.

¹⁷³ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 19 January 1962, KTS, 5. doboz, 5/bc, 002255/1962.

¹⁷⁴ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 9 June 1960, KTS, 5. doboz, 5/ca, 004823/1960.

¹⁷⁵ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 23 May 1964, KTS, 10. doboz, 17/d, 004091/1964.

¹⁷⁶ The term 'national solipsism' was coined by Bruce Cumings. See *Origins of the Korean War II*, pp. 305-316.

¹⁷⁷ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 17 January 1964, KTS, 5. doboz, 5/bc, 001770/1964.

¹⁷⁸ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 28 July 1964, KA, 10. doboz, 18/g, 004878/1964.

¹⁷⁹ Hungarian Embassy to the DPRK, Report, 8 December 1964, KTS, 5. doboz, 5/bc, 006558/1964.

DOCUMENT No. 1**Report, Hungarian Foreign Ministry to the Embassy of Hungary in North Korea, 6 May 1950**

[Source: Hungarian National Archives (Hereafter MOL), XIX-J-1-j Korea, 3. doboz, 4/bc, 00529/1950. Translated by Balazs Szalontai.]

For the information of the Ambassador I should like to relate our experiences with the members of the Korean government delegation that was in Budapest on the occasion of the celebrations of 4 April.

Yi Pong-nam [emphasis in the original], Minister of Health, the head of the delegation [...]

Pak Tong-ch'o [emphasis in the original], Deputy Foreign Minister, the deputy head of the delegation, alternate member of the Korean Workers' Party Political Bureau [...]

At first, the Korean delegation was very reticent [...]. The fact that most of them had never been abroad, and only a few of them spoke any foreign languages, contributed to that. In contrast with the other Far Eastern delegation, the Chinese, one could not find out which program they liked and which program they liked less. One never could judge their mood by their behavior.

In addition, they made approaches to other delegations very rarely. For the most part, they just introduced themselves to each arriving delegation, but they did not attempt to get in touch with them later. Relatively speaking, it was the Chinese delegation that they met most frequently. As their visit was drawing to its end, they began to relax a bit, and in the course of some programs they were already in a quite good mood.

Nevertheless, their behavior differed from the behavior of the other Far Eastern delegation till the very last, for they kept a certain detachment and reticence all the time.

[...]

By order of the Minister

Irén Rózsa

Deputy Assistant Under-Secretary

**DOCUMENT No. 2****Report, Embassy of Hungary in North Korea to the Hungarian Foreign Ministry, 22 December 1953**

[Source: MOL, XIX-J-1-k Korea, 9. doboz, 18/g, 00303/1954. Translated by Balazs Szalontai.]

On 21 December 1953 I visited the secretariat of the Academy of Sciences. I asked for this meeting long ago, but the

[DPRK] Foreign Ministry of this place did not give its permission. Now and then I met the members of the Academy in passing. They always invited me, and on occasion they even asked me for a meeting over the phone. Thus, the Foreign Ministry has created an impossible situation [...]. It should have ascertained long ago whether the delegation from the Academy, which was to visit the Soviet Union, intended to visit us [Hungary] or not. By order of the Center, we invited this delegation as recently as half a year ago, completely in conformity with the rules, through a verbal note. The invitation had been a great pleasure for the scientists, but because the delegation did not leave [for the Soviet Union], we had to wait. Due to the absence of contacts, we were not able to learn when this delegation would leave; it left in the middle of December. In giving reasons for not permitting the meeting, the Foreign Ministry came up with the argument that at present the scientific cadres were working in the countryside. During a conversation I remarked that I had seen these cadres in Pyongyang, whereupon they replied that these cadres may have been at home, but the secretary of the Academy had left for the Soviet Union [...]

On 21 December [...] I was suddenly invited to the Academy through the F[oreign] M[inistry]. I met the Deputy Secretary-General, *Comrade Yi Chu-won* [emphasis in the original]. This meeting came in handy, for the exchange of agricultural experience should have been discussed with the Academy here long ago. On the grounds of a conversation in September, the Academy here has already sent samples of seed grain and silkworm. While at home [in Hungary], I reached an agreement with Comrade Osztrovszki about how we would give fruit stocks [...] in return. We will be too late to help before long, which [...] will endanger the excellent relationship we had established with the Academy of Sciences here during the war.

The meeting took place in the following manner [...] the head of the chemical branch [...] spoke of *the difficulties they had in the chemical field* [emphasis in the original]. True, by now they receive scientific journals from the Soviet Union and from us, but they have not gotten any Western scientific journals since 1945. During the war, they were isolated even from Soviet scientific literature [...]. He asked me to send them copies of the following journals, or similar chemical journals, should there be the slightest chance of it [...]

- 1) *Chemical Abstracts* (USA)
- 2) *Industrial and Engineering Chemistry* [...]
- 3) *Journal of [the] American Chemical Society*
- 4) *Polymer Science*
- 5) *Modern Plastics*.

- 1) *Berichte [der] deutschen chemischen Gesellschaft* (West German)
- 2) *Angewandte Chemie*
- 3) *Zeitschrift für physikalische Chemie* [...]
- 4) *Kunststoffe*.

[...]

As for the silkworm samples: they handed them over to the Foreign Ministry here three months ago. Eggs were also attached (they have spoiled due to the storage). In my view, the Foreign Ministry here has kept them in storage for more than 2 months, although it could have handed them over to us almost any day [...] the Korean comrades need our help badly [...] This is why *the policy pursued by the Foreign Ministry here is so incomprehensible* [emphasis in the original]. I dare say that the isolation of the Embassy is greater than in the West, those who would like to visit us are subjected to an identity check and taken to task. If we ask for an appointment, they refuse it. For instance, I was repeatedly invited to the Academy [...] In return, we wanted to ask them to dinner. The F[oreign] M[inistry] turned down our proposal, coming up with the ridiculous argument that they [the scientists] did not reside here. This is ridiculous, for at present the Academy is in our vicinity, so to say, and if they were thinking about it, they would surely know that we can easily check that, even unintentionally. Around 1st December they asked me whether I wanted to meet the painters and the artists this year [...] *They have created an impossible situation* [emphasis in the original]. I think the Center should lodge a protest with the [North Korean] *Embassy here* [emphasis in the original], or authorize the head of the Embassy here *to have talks in order to put an end to this impossible situation* [emphasis in the original]. Thus, the situation would improve, at least temporarily, as it improved after Comrade Pásztor paid a visit to Kim Il Sung and raised the issue of these difficulties.

Zsigmond Csuka
Chargé d'Affaires ad interim



DOCUMENT No. 3

Report, Embassy of Hungary in North Korea to the Hungarian Foreign Ministry, 12 March 1954

[Source: MOL, XIX-J-1-j Korea, 7. doboz, 5/f, 00741/1954. Translated by Balazs Szalontai.]

On 10 March [...] I paid a visit to Comrade Soviet Ambassador Suzdalev. [...] I asked him what we could expect with respect to solving the Korean question. Comrade Suzdalev then immediately asked me what my opinion was. As was also well-known from the statements of Comrade Molotov, I said, in principle our position on this issue—and we were wholly in favor of it—was that if both sides sincerely wished to achieve unity, it would be possible to find a way. One indeed can, and should, carry out the unification of both Germany and Korea, but the Berlin conference—although it yielded some very considerable results in other respects—

indicated that as regards the Korean question, we cannot expect considerable results from the Geneva conference either, as Berlin failed to yield a result with respect to the German question. We cannot expect [a result], because the leaders of both sides, both here and in Germany, are diametrically opposed to each other, the enemy is terrified of the consequences of rapprochement, and for the time being, is unwilling to make any compromise [...] Comrade Suzdalev [...] embarked on the following long and interesting exposition: Germany and Korea are two separate questions. Practically, though, both countries are divided in the same way. Still, concerning the conditions of their unification, one must take into consideration, apart from the aforesaid difficulties (the attitude of the enemy), some additional problems with regard to solving the Korean question, [i.e.] factors that are not to our advantage, and we must thoroughly prepare for them. Namely, the distribution of Korea's population is too uneven. Some 8 million people live in the North, whereas there are 20 million people in the South. One must also take into account, to an even greater extent, the results we can expect from a possible referendum. On this point he again asked me what my opinion was of it. We might expect results concerning the masses' efforts to unite their country, I said, but otherwise I was not convinced of [the positive results of the referendum]. Quite so, [Suzdalev said]. While in Berlin the enemy rejected our fair proposals which set that as an aim, in the Korean question it is they who can safely propose that, say, a general referendum should be held. Of course, this is not likely to take place. As a result of the elections, a National Assembly of such a composition might be established where all the proposals of our minority deputies would be rejected. Moreover, they might even be expelled from the National Assembly. On the other hand, if no elections were held, they [the South Koreans] would surely refer to the distribution of the population in establishing a unified government. If the central organ that would be fully entrusted with the guidance of the foreign and domestic policies of united Korea was created in accordance with this principle, this would also raise various difficulties for us. Namely, we obviously cannot sacrifice anything of the socialist achievements we have hitherto gained in the course of development, as the enemy is also unwilling to make concessions. [...] The Geneva conference does not look promising as regards the Korean question. One must prepare for it by thorough and very careful work. I could imagine a solution, Comrade Suzdalev said, that would include the unification of Korea and the establishment of a unified government to be fully entrusted with the guidance of Korea's foreign and domestic policies, but North Korea would exist as a dominion within united Korea, her socialist achievements [...] guaranteed by the Great Powers. He did not dwell on the issue of the dominion.

In my view, Comrade Suzdalev's exposition is extremely interesting. Namely, if it could be achieved that the present conditions—and for North Korea, even the possibility of further development—would be guaranteed in some form on both sides, then the leaders of the two opposing parts of the country may move toward rapprochement more

easily. It is doubtful, however, whether one could speak of a united Korea in such a case, and whether the unified Korean government could pursue coherent foreign and domestic policies, for, apart from the difficulties arising from the reconciliation of principles and interests, the opinion of the government of the dominion would be also a factor to be reckoned with.

[...]

Károly Pásztor
Envoy Extraordinary



DOCUMENT No. 4

Report, Embassy of Hungary in North Korea to the Hungarian Foreign Ministry, 18 December 1954

[Source: MOL, XIX-J-1-j Korea, 2. doboz, 2/b, 001118/1/1955. Translated by Balazs Szalontai.]

[...] the F[oreign] M[inistry] here quite mechanically turns a deaf ear to [the Hungarian proposal to] maintain a direct relationship with the [North Korean] party [...] the Korean comrades—I mean the comrades in the party—are a bit afraid of maintaining relations with the members of the foreign diplomatic corps. They are afraid and reserved. This is also noticeable on the occasion of receptions. [...] the leaders of the Korean Workers' Party show a certain reluctance to adopt the experiences of the parties of the fraternal countries. I think these problems would arise in the course of such a conversation. In my view, they would like to avoid responding to the problems, and for this reason they prefer not to maintain relations, although in my judgement, the time has already come to adopt a different point of view on a few questions, particularly on the issue of the methods of the party leadership. What I have in mind is primarily the issue of personality cult and [...] the methods of agitation and education. In my opinion, by now, one year after the armistice, the situation has become ripe for making changes at least on these issues, similarly to the other fraternal countries. In any case, the coming events will prove the necessity of the aforementioned.

Pál Szarvas
Ambassador

DOCUMENT No. 5

Report, Embassy of Hungary in North Korea to the Hungarian Foreign Ministry, 26 February 1955

[Source: MOL, XIX-J-1-j Korea, 4. doboz, 5/a, 004076/1955. Translated by Balazs Szalontai.]

[...] Our Embassy has not managed to extend its contacts during 1954. [...] recently the Korean organs and the [North Korean] F[oreign] M[inistry] do not give us the assistance that is necessary for the normal pursuance of our activities here. As indicated in earlier reports as well, they are unwilling to establish contact between us and the party. Recently the F[oreign] M[inistry] sends its representative to each meeting, who participates in the conversation from beginning to end. These [measures] make the issue more difficult. They frequently keep delaying meetings and certain programs for weeks instead of organizing them. The ones that are more important for us are arranged only after a long time, while the less important ones are organized rather quickly. As a rule [the North Korean Foreign Ministry] wants to ensure that we do not maintain any personal contacts with the state organs of greater importance but [...] submit questions, to which they reply in weeks, not infrequently in months, in writing and, of course, in Korean. For our part we dared to raise these measures with the Korean Foreign Ministry only very cautiously, because we can see that they would like to curtail the operation and activity of the whole diplomatic corps and keep its operation under rather strict control. We discussed this issue with the Embassies of the other fraternal countries, and we have come to that conclusion. A change in this issue can be accomplished only through rather persistent efforts going into small details. One must also add to the whole question the fact that in the highest Korean state organs, there is a certain incomprehensible secret-mongering aimed at covering up mistakes and difficulties, not just toward the diplomatic corps but toward the Korean people too. Of course, this manifests itself much more sharply toward the diplomatic corps. This cannot be changed solely through the Foreign Ministry, as it is connected with the development of the Korean party and its ideological level, and, last but not least, with the issue of frankness. The latter, though it has improved tremendously since liberation, has not yet managed to completely overcome the effects of the Japanese oppression that lasted for several decades.

[...]

Pál Szarvas
Ambassador

DOCUMENT No. 6**Report, Embassy of Hungary in North Korea to the Hungarian Foreign Ministry, 13 April 1955**

[Source: MOL, XIX-J-1-j Korea, 7. doboz, 5/f, 006054/1955. Translated by Balazs Szalontai.]

On 12 April [...] I paid a visit to Soviet Counsellor A.M. Petrov. [...] I told him that I dealt with issues of internal politics, and since there were some issues I did not see clearly, I asked for his advice. These issues were the following: the absence of criticism and self-criticism in Korea, the unchanged personality cult, and secret-mongering. [...] In his view—he emphasized that this was his personal opinion—*criticism was directed primarily downwards, there was barely any criticism directed upwards* [emphasis in the original]. They speak about it, but they do not practice it, or rather it seems that it is only Comrade Kim Il-sung who practices it. The criticism that is heard is not public but exclusive. [...] In his view, it is a serious error that *Comrade Kim Il Sung is surrounded by bootlickers and careerists* [emphasis in the original]. They exploit, and rely on, the successes of reconstruction, which undoubtedly exist. Whatever is said by the leader, they accept without any dispute. Thus, the mistakes are not revealed openly, only in private and belatedly. No one has ever been held responsible for them.

The personality cult has not changed at all, and it is a primary and decisive factor in every mistake [emphasis in the original]. They do not even speak about this question.

In many respects their plans are not realistic but exaggerated [emphasis in the original]. For instance, the grain crop target for 1955 was 4 million metric tons, which was almost double as much as the 1954 crop had been. They wanted to achieve it without any particular investment. When they were reminded of that, they gradually lowered the plan target, and now it is 2.7 million, which is more or less realistic.

An even greater mistake was made in the appraisal of the 1954 crop. On the basis of embellished and false reports, the crop was estimated at 3 million metric tons. [...] In effect, as they recently admitted, the crop had been just 2.3 million metric tons. Nevertheless, it is possible that this figure is not correct either. As a consequence, in many places they took as much as 50 percent of the poor crop, instead of the 23 to 27 percent tax in kind enacted by law, from the peasantry by brute force. Thus, the peasantry was left with barely any grain reserve. Moreover, plan targets for compulsory deliveries, set on the basis of the high estimates, were also exaggerated. Private grain trade came to an end, only state organs took over grain at very low state prices. As a consequence of all this, public feeling rapidly deteriorated. In the countryside, *one could already hear strongly dissenting voices* [emphasis in the original] among the peasantry. Hostile elements took advantage of the public feeling, and intrigued. In addition, a number of suicides occurred. Following this, the situation was discussed in private in February, and a number of measures were taken. Grain was purchased from China and

the Soviet Union. (As far as we know, they purchased 200 thousand metric tons [of grain].) Compulsory deliveries were halted at once. A part of the delivered grain was given back to the peasantry as a loan. A decision was taken about the establishment of new machine-tractor stations. These measures eased the problem, but they have not fundamentally changed the situation.

The pace of cooperativization is also far too rapid [emphasis in the original]. In just one year, 30 percent of the peasantry joined [cooperatives]. [...] In a few cases they admitted that force had been used in the organization [of cooperatives] (probably there were many more such cases).

The plenum of 1-4 April was also held in private, the reports and debates were not published.[...]

Then Comrade Petrov spoke about the undeniable success of reconstruction. The unfavorable side of the latter is *the extremely low standard of living* [emphasis in the original]. The average monthly wage of a factory worker of undistinguished performance is 1500 won, whereas a meter of linen costs 300 won, and a necktie 3 to 500 won. *They [the workers] get nothing else on ration but rice* [emphasis in the original], only a very narrow stratum gets anything else. *They expect foreign countries to give them everything* [emphasis in the original]. In place of a part of the equipment to be sent within the framework of the one billion ruble aid program, the Soviet Union offered to *give them consumer goods. The government of the DPRK rejected that, and insisted on sending equipment* [emphasis in the original]. Nor do they utilize the local sources of raw materials and the secondary products of heavy industry to produce consumer goods.

[...]

There is also a very great shortage of leading cadres and technical experts. Nevertheless, a new generation is certainly emerging [emphasis in the original].

[...]

Dr. László Keresztes

Chargé d'Affaires ad interim

**DOCUMENT No. 7****Report, Embassy of Hungary in North Korea to the Hungarian Foreign Ministry, 10 May 1955**

[Source: MOL, XIX-J-1-j Korea, 5. doboz, 5/c, 006048/1955. Translated by Balazs Szalontai.]

The food-supply situation got worse in April. Though [...] the government has taken certain measures, [...] it could not fundamentally change the situation.

Due to the excessive forced deliveries, stocks of provisions were rapidly running out in the villages. At the same time, rice has completely disappeared from the free market. It

is only the employees of the state sector and state offices, and the members of their families, who are given rice. It is impossible to get rice in the villages. In the north-eastern province [North Hamgyong], where the situation is the gravest, the government has distributed some 100 thousand tons of rice, but this is not enough. A lot of people go to the towns to work, but many of the aged and the women head for the south where the situation is somewhat better. In the course of wandering, several of the latter become weakened to such an extent that they literally starve to death. For instance, some 20 dying or dead individuals of this kind have been taken to the Hungarian hospital in Sariwon since early April, of whom the autopsy diagnosed death from starvation as the cause of death. Most of these were such wanderers, but 1 or 2 Sariwon residents were also to be found among them, mainly among the dependents and the aged.

While the urban working population receives the minimal ration, those working in the non-state sector (e.g. street vendors) and large families (the rice rations of the relatives barely meet their daily needs) are also in a difficult situation. As a consequence, the number of beggars, particularly of children, has increased rapidly. [...] At the same time, the number of robberies and criminal acts also increased substantially, and public security got worse.

[...] the rural population tries to supplement its food by gathering various kinds of grass, onions and wild plants. The situation of the rural population is particularly grave in the north-eastern provinces.

In addition to the rice shortage, an increasing shortage of other foodstuffs is observable. Due to difficulties in foddering, the arrival of meat in the cities is decreasing more and more. [...] Of the smaller restaurants, many have closed down, because they could not supply their customers with food. Vodka has disappeared from the shops almost completely.

The authorities do not reveal the situation, and this spoils the atmosphere even further, serving as a basis for exaggerated rumors which can be heard. The 26th April copy of *Nodong* [Sinmun], which had written about the difficulties, was withdrawn.

At present, in early May, a certain improvement is to be expected. The Soviet Union and China are increasing their grain shipments, and by the middle of May, they had transported some 60,000 tons of grain. This enables the government to ensure that the urban population gets the basic food-supply. At the same time, the ripening of various vegetables and onions alleviates the situation in the villages. In the middle of June, barley and certain cereal crops are harvested here too, which will also alleviate the situation. However, a fundamental change in the situation can be made only after the October rice harvest.

[...]

Dr. László Keresztes
Chargé d'Affaires ad interim

DOCUMENT No. 8

Report, Embassy of Hungary in North Korea to the Hungarian Foreign Ministry, 17 August 1955

[Source: MOL, XIX-J-1-j Korea, 10. doboz, 24/b, 008020/1955. Translated by Balazs Szalontai.]

On 29 July 1955, at 4:30 p.m., I returned the visit of Soviet Ambassador Vasily Ivanovich Ivanov, with whom I had made an appointment. I took Comrade Golub with me as a translator. During the conversation we discussed the following main subjects:

...] Comrade Ivanov mentioned that on 30th July, the inaugural ceremony to mark the opening of the Soviet Red Cross Hospital would take place in the eastern part of Pyongyang, and he invited me to it. I expressed my thanks for his thoughtfulness, and told him I had already received an invitation. Comrade Ambassador said that the hospital in question had been built with Soviet assistance, and its facilities had also been sent to the Korean comrades in the framework of Soviet aid. The hospital has 400 beds and a clinic, the latter also being suitable for the treatment of patients. I told him we had expected the new Hungarian medical team to arrive today, but the plane had not arrived because of the bad weather. Comrade Soviet Ambassador asked for information about the Hungarian hospital. I told him that our hospital was in Sariwon. I invited Comrade Ivanov to take a later trip to Sariwon to inspect the Hungarian hospital. He was glad to accept the invitation.

We then had a conversation about the changes that had taken place in the international situation. I told him that the recent four-power conference in Geneva had been of great importance. If the Soviet Union's proposal for disarmament were accepted, it would lead to an improvement in the workers' material and cultural conditions in every country. Hungary also spends a substantial part of its budget expenditures for defense purposes. Comrade Ivanov confirmed what I had said.

In connection with this, he asked me about my opinion of the economic situation in South Korea, with special regard to the material conditions of the South Korean population. I told him that according to the information available to us, the conditions of the population of South Korea were bad. This is based on the fact that in South Korea, the number of unemployed exceeds two million. A number of people are starving. Various kinds of taxes are imposed on the population, particularly on the peasants who have to deliver a large part of their produce to meet their delivery obligation. The state purchases their crops at a cheap rate. Comrade Ivanov immediately asked me from where we had got these pieces of information. I told him that [we had received them] partly from local [North Korean] sources of information and the South Korean press reports, and partly from the neutral commission overseeing the armistice. Unfortunately, it is very difficult to get information from the latter. Comrade Ivanov then said that South Korea received large quantities of artificial

fertilizer and many consumer goods from the USA, which improved the conditions of the population to a certain extent. In addition, they harvest twice a year, and this also improves the economic situation. Of course, the material conditions are not improving for the entire population, but the situation of certain strata, particularly of the urban population, is bearable. In reply to this I told him that the USA sends a lot of raw materials and agricultural products from South Korea to Japan so as to support Japan, a country deficient in raw materials. The USA purchases these goods from South Korea at very cheap prices.

Comrade Ivanov asked me whether I was of the opinion that the Korean comrades did not devote great care to the improvement of the population's material conditions. I said that in the last half year, the situation had somewhat improved in this respect, but not sufficiently. Comrade Ambassador then told me that the Korean comrades had made serious mistakes. He asked me *how it had been possible that the diplomatic corps did not discuss these issues with the Korean comrades. Had they kept an eye on these issues, the Korean comrades would not have made a series of mistakes* [emphasis in the original], e.g. the abolition of free market, the grain procurement, and so on. He visited the city's shops and markets in recent days, and saw that as a result of the correct resolution recently passed, which allowed private capital to take some initiative, conditions in commerce and the supply of goods improved, and, consequently, the price of certain products decreased. In reply to this I told him that the members of the diplomatic corps had discussed these issues with each other, but they failed to raise the subject collectively in the presence of the competent Korean authorities, because the Korean comrades were very sensitive due to the mistakes they had made, and they would not have interpreted the comments in the most appropriate way.

Comrade Ivanov said that the DPRK should have devoted very great care to the improvement of the population's material conditions. The [North and South Korean] populations are equally familiar with the South and North Korean economic situation, since the borders are not hermetically sealed. North Korea should have an attraction to South Koreans in order to demonstrate the superiority of the people's democratic system over the capitalist one. Otherwise, the Korean comrades devote all their energies to the development of heavy industry, although the Soviet Union could provide assistance to Korea by supplying consumer goods as well.

In my reply I also confirmed Comrade Ivanov's opinion. I told him that the Korean comrades had asked for equipment for heavy industry and factories from us too, although we also could have given them equipment for light industry and other products which would have enabled them to improve the population's material conditions in the near future. I mentioned that the Korean comrades had asked us for, among other things, a scale-making factory. Jokingly, I said that they should have had something to be weighed first, and scales only after that. On the other hand, we have already seen examples of this question. I reminded Comrade Ivanov of the

events that had taken place in the years past in the German Democratic Republic, where the population's unsatisfactory material conditions also played a role in the outbreak of various provocations.

Comrade Ivanov confirmed what I had said, then apologized for raising such serious issues on the occasion of my visit, but, he went on to say that he had had to do so because he had not yet gotten to know adequately the situation here. On the other hand, I was the only person he intended to tell about the questions raised and about his opinion. He will not discuss these with the other Comrade Ambassadors in such a way; he emphasized he intended to discuss them with the doyen of the diplomatic corps. In his opinion, the mistakes made by the Korean comrades should be raised in the presence of the top leaders, and in certain issues, the opinion of the whole diplomatic corps should be made known so as to ensure that the [Korean] comrades do not consider these comments as lecturing and ordering but notice the sincere helpfulness that inspired them. Our attitude will facilitate their [the Soviets'] situation if they take sides or give advice to the Korean comrades. The conversation, which lasted for some 75 minutes, took place in a sincere, friendly atmosphere.

Comment:

1.) As I have already reported by telegram, the raising of the questions was surprising and unusual. Hitherto, we have not experienced similarly sharp statements on the part of the Soviet comrades, at least not in this way. I am convinced that they have already criticized these issues very intensely, but they have not expressed their views in the presence of the diplomats of the fraternal countries. Still, this also had its antecedents, because Counsellor Petrov had already criticized issues of domestic politics quite sharply, and, in fact, that time we were of the opinion that his criticism was a bit too sharp.

On the basis of all this, one can conclude that the Soviet comrades consider the situation rather difficult, they anticipate the events [i.e. the problems that may result from the policies of the North Korean leadership], and they are doing their best to persuade the Korean comrades of the mistakes they have made, and it seems that they want to make use of the assistance of the diplomatic corps to achieve this purpose, in expectation that the Korean comrades may recognize their errors more easily if they are reminded of the latter by several [embassies]. I would like to make an additional remark about the whole question, namely, that the issue is quite delicate. One can touch it only very cautiously. One must think twice before raising questions like this so as to find the appropriate way. I must remind the comrades that I discussed these issues with Nam Il. Speaking with him, I raised economic issues as if I had asked for information, having not been to Korea for a long time. He stated that the situation was rather good, and although there had been some difficulties, "no one has starved to death yet in Korea," which, unfortunately, was not true. It was true, though, that when he made the statement mentioned above, the worst was already over and some improvement had set in. He did not speak about the errors committed, just about how they wanted to

establish a grain basis in 2 to 3 years. In my view, the last plenum of the [Korean] Workers' Party dealt with these issues quite sharply. It specified the mistakes, and it also took steps along the state line in order to correct these excessive measures. There are difficulties in carrying out [the new instructions]. The composition of the state apparatus, the executive organs and the provincial party and state organs is extremely weak, they cannot cope with the tasks. The executive organs are quite bureaucratic and inflexible. Lately, a rather intense struggle goes on in order to change that, in the press and other fields. Hitherto, this has not yielded yet any visible results. Comrade Kim Il Sung spoke to me too about the cadres' lack of professional and political skills when he mentioned that "they are young and inexperienced". For our part, we have already stated several times that the Korean comrades wanted to solve the agricultural problem too quickly. Otherwise, this is confirmed by the experiences of the past winter when there were rather serious difficulties, and the latter were undoubtedly related to the quick pace of the reorganization of agriculture (it was too quick, 25 percent of the peasant farms joined cooperatives in a year). It is only now that they begin to intensely organize Machine-Tractor Stations. The cooperatives hitherto organized are still just slightly more productive than individual peasant farms. They do not exactly give more to the state [than the individual peasant farms]. Their work is easier. For the time being, the state cannot give them anything but a minor support. Therefore, it would be appropriate to strengthen the existent cooperatives for a time, and expand their network only later. In my judgment, this issue is one of the most pressing problems of agriculture. It coincides with the difficulties of [food] supply and deliveries, and, last but not least, the living standards of the population.

2.) The issues raised by Comrade Ivanov are clear and comprehensible. It was unusual that he asked us to make occasional attempts at convincing the Korean comrades of the mistakes in certain issues, and, if possible, to prevent them [the mistakes]. Of course, this is a very difficult and delicate problem.

It must be emphasized again that the Korean comrades deal with their own issues in an extremely reserved way. There are few opportunities for a completely sincere discussion of domestic issues. In my view, Comrade Ivanov also sees it, and this is why he thinks that it may be possible to discuss the individual questions appropriately if we approach them collectively and from several different directions.

On the basis of all this one can conclude that the internal problems are somewhat greater than what we have hitherto seen or thought. I am clear about the fact that the Soviet comrades consider the issue serious and they actively deal with it.

I also draw another conclusion from the conversation, namely, that the reason for Comrade Suzdalev's dismissal was probably that his activity in this field was considered insufficient. It must be noted, though, that he was sick a number of times and he spent a long time out of Korea. This also contributed to the situation.

3.) I want to state that for the time being, I do not intend to take any initiative toward the diplomatic corps or the Korean comrades along the line described above. In my judgment, it is the Soviet comrades who have the say in this matter. I intend to take sides only if this is explicitly requested by the Korean comrades. I think this is sensible.

Pál Szarvas
Ambassador



DOCUMENT No. 9

Report, Embassy of Hungary in North Korea to the Hungarian Foreign Ministry, 26 October 1955

[Source: MOL, XIX-J-1-j Korea, 7. doboz, 5/f, 009565/4/1955. Translated by Balazs Szalontai.]

On 10 October [...] I paid a visit to Comrade German Ambassador Richard Fischer [...]. Comrade Fischer spoke about the situation here, he told me that the situation here was completely different from that in China. When he arrived in Pyongyang last year and paid an introductory visit to Comrade Kim Il Sung, Comrade Kim Il Sung told him that he [Kim Il Sung] viewed him not as an ambassador but as a friend who came to help. Unfortunately, he has not experienced that everywhere, because the Korean comrades, whatever comes up, say yes to everything, including tasks which they certainly know they cannot carry out. In his opinion, friends could safely speak among themselves about the difficulties and shortcomings which naturally exist after such a destructive war. In his view, China is much ahead [of North Korea] also in this respect, people are much more frank and open there. Although there were backward conditions and a long dual oppression [in China] too, the Chinese leaders are wonderful, and the people follow them with complete confidence and enthusiasm. [...]

József Füredi
Chargé d'Affaires ad interim



DOCUMENT No. 10

Report, Embassy of Hungary in North Korea to the Hungarian Foreign Ministry, 28 December 1956

[Source: MOL, XIX-J-1-j Korea, 7. doboz, 5/f, 001016/2/1957. Translated by Balazs Szalontai.]

On 27th December this year, [...] Comrade Füredi invited Macuch, the Counsellor of the Czechoslovak Embassy, to

coffee. [...] Comrade Macuch dwelt upon the Korean situation, and described all the main shortcomings that had been noticeable in the development of the DPRK's economy and that still existed in many places. [...] for instance, he related how senselessly industry had been developed in the DPRK; in his view, what was most characteristic of this was that the Hungarians and the Czechoslovaks were building plants of completely similar type and capacity in Kaesong and Huich'on respectively, even though the DPRK's demand for the machines produced there could be abundantly met by just one such factory. In his view, the Korean leaders are thinking of long-range plans for exporting machines to the South-east Asian countries. In his view, this plan will continue to lack any real basis for a long time. They have built many factories where they cannot provide the workforce, the skilled workers, the engineers, etc. There are also frequent disruptions in the supply of raw materials because they have neglected the development of the mining industry [...]. Although the 3rd Congress of the Korean Workers' Party had already dealt with these mistakes, they set such guidelines for industrial development that they could not prevent [the repetition of] the earlier mistakes. Later, the CC plenums held in August and December finally modified the earlier plans, and instead of new industrial projects, they resolved to enlarge already existing ones and improve their technical standards. In addition, they are laying more and more emphasis on improvement of living standards, for there are still serious problems in this field.

As far as he knew, Comrade Macuch said that in South Korea the population's living standards were higher, which was made possible by the fact that the substantial aid given by the USA provided employment for the industrial workers in certain branches of light industry, and by the fact that they did not invest as much in industry as was the case in the war-torn DPRK. In his view, peasants also live better in South Korea, for there is more and better land at their disposal, and they use much more artificial fertilizer—800,000 metric tons in 1955, as opposed to the DPRK's 125, 000 metric tons—of course, this does not mean that the South Korean population lives well, it merely lives relatively better than the population of the DPRK.

[...] Comrade Macuch said that the Americans were doing their best to curtail the influence and authority of the N[eutral] C[ontrol] C[ommission]. Various disturbances and provocations are constantly occurring in the border zone; for instance, recently Rheeist provocateurs came over to a border village, killed the chairman of the cooperative, and kidnapped several youths. In Comrade Macuch's view, it is not right that the press of the DPRK does not deal concretely and publicly with these and similar cases but always writes merely about the "Syngman Rhee clique," the "gang," the "traitors" etc. (To our knowledge, the press did write about that border incident; Comrade Macuch was misinformed in this case.) In his opinion, this formulation is not right, for the South Korean population also keeps an eye on it, and the latest elections also showed that more than half the popula-

tion supported Syngman Rhee. It would be more sensible if the attitude of the government of the People's Republic of China toward Jiang Jieshi and other leaders active on the island of Taiwan became a lesson for the DPRK. Recently, the following policy is being pursued there: they [the GMD leaders] are called upon to return home [...]. In our opinion, the DPRK cannot completely follow the Chinese example in this field, for the greater part of the population [lives] in South Korea, and conditions are entirely different.[...]

Károly Práth
Ambassador



DOCUMENT No. 11
Report, Embassy of Hungary in North Korea to the Hungarian Foreign Ministry, 10 September 1959

[Source: MOL, XIX-J-1-j Korea, 7. doboz, 5/f, 006029/1959. Translated by Balazs Szalontai.]

[...] at the cocktail party I gave on 20 August this year, the highest ranking Korean guest was Comrade Deputy Premier Yi Chu-yon. [...] As we were having a friendly conversation about generalities, Comrade Yi Chu-yon suddenly put the following question to Comrade [Soviet Chargé d'Affaires] Pelishenko: "In Comrade Pelishenko's opinion, when will North and South Korea unite?"

[...]

The question obviously also took Comrade Pelishenko by surprise. Nonetheless, he briefly gave the following answer: He is convinced that the peaceful unification of Korea will take place in a historically short time. He repeatedly emphasized in a historically short time, and by that he meant that it would not unite today, tomorrow, next year or in a few years but rather in the course of the worldwide triumph of the socialist idea. The existence of the socialist world system led by the Soviet Union, the rapid expansion of popular movements of [national] liberation in Southeast Asia, Africa and the Latin American states, and the unprecedented anti-war mood and desire for peace of the world's peoples were all facts which made possible the worldwide triumph of the socialist idea in a historically short time, Comrade Pelishenko stressed.

In our opinion, the Korean leaders may harbor the idea that the division of Korea was caused by the Soviet Union, and, thus, its unification also depends solely on it. Comrade Pelishenko certainly became aware of that. This is why he emphasized that Korea would unite in a historically short time—thus, he practically referred to the fact that the history of the division of Korea had been related to the objective historical events that happened in the last stage of World War II.

The dialogue described above consisted of just one question and one reply. Comrade Yi Chu-yon tacitly acknowledged what had been said by Comrade Pelishenko.

Károly Práth
Ambassador



DOCUMENT No. 12

Information Report Sent by Károly Fendler to Minister of Foreign Affairs Endre Sík, "Conversation with Comrade Kim, Interpreter of the Korean Embassy", 30 October 1959

[Source: MOL, XIX-J-1-j Korea, 3. doboz, 4/af, 006373/1959. Translated by Balazs Szalontai.]

To Minister Endre Sík, D. Min. Károly Szarka.

On the evening of the 28th [...] I met Comrade Kim, the interpreter of the Korean Embassy with whom I have long had friendly relations. During the conversation, Comrade Kim mentioned the following:

[...] The head of the IVth Political Department [of the North Korean Foreign Ministry] told them that the Central Committee of the Korean Workers' Party "considered the situation as ripe for the unification of the country." [emphasis in the original] In reply to my question Comrade Kim said that they "are considering accomplishing it in the '60s", then called my attention to the increasing discontent in South Korea, which had been further aggravated recently by extremely great damage from a typhoon. In what follows he said that this very assessment had induced the Korean comrades to convoke the Supreme People's Assembly, the latter having passed the resolution and letter already known to us. For the time being the Embassy is fully occupied in working up the documents of the session, their Center [the Foreign Ministry] charged them with making it known as widely and actively as possible [...], to such an extent that even the staff of the commercial branch agency is carrying out tasks related to it. [...]

Károly Fendler
official in charge of Korea

DOCUMENT No. 13

Report, Embassy of Hungary in North Korea to the Hungarian Foreign Ministry, 16 December 1959

[Source: MOL, XIX-J-1-j Korea, 7. doboz, 5/f, 001711/1/1960. Translated by Balazs Szalontai.]

On 10 December the [East] German Ambassador had a dinner party on the occasion of his departure. [...] I had a conversation with the Korean head of the Korean-Chinese Armistice Commission. I asked him whether the international détente was perceptible in Panmunjom too. He told me that it was not, because the Americans dropped perhaps an even larger number of agents behind North Korean lines than they had done before. The general expounded that they would soon put an end to the provocations of the Americans, because they "would unite Korea next year." Then he spoke of the unity and correct policies of the Korean Workers' Party as if it were the guarantee of the unification of the country. The general was obviously in a state of intoxication. Interestingly, the Polish member of the Neutral [Nations Supervisory] Commission was of the opinion that at present, the Americans were "silent" in Panmunjom.

[...]

Gábor Dobozi
Chargé d'Affaires ad interim



DOCUMENT No. 14

Report, Embassy of Hungary in North Korea to the Hungarian Foreign Ministry, 16 December 1959

[Source: MOL, XIX-J-1-j Korea, 11. doboz, 24/b, 001660/1960. Translated by Balazs Szalontai.]

[...] on 16 December I paid a visit to [Soviet] Comrade Yulin. During the conversation, several issues came up, on which I give the following information:

Comrade Yulin told me that the December plenum of the [Korean] Workers' Party had placed very healthy proposals on the agenda, and it also appeared to the Soviet Ambassador that this plenum had actually begun to correct the errors committed in the last years. He agreed with me that the most important resolution had been one that dealt with the rapid development of mining. In his opinion, mining should have been developed earlier, because that would have largely solved the problems which have cropped up in the supply of raw materials and in foreign trade. With regard to that, the issue of North Korea's foreign trade problems came up. Comrade Yulin mentioned that it caused very great difficulties in Soviet-Korean relations that the Korean comrades could not

send goods in return for [the goods they got from the Soviet Union], although the Soviet Union asked Korea for goods which every country gladly exported (e.g. vegetables, fruits, canned food). He made mention of the fact that supplying Siberia with vegetables presented a very great problem to them [the Soviets], and they wished to import a large part of the needed goods from Korea. He told me that as regards the trade agreement for 1959, the Soviets had already met their obligations one hundred percent, whereas the Koreans had only met 56 percent of their obligations.

In the opinion of Yulin, most of the mistakes noticeable in the DPRK are attributable to one thing, namely, the exaggerated national pride of the Korean people. The mistakes made in the economic field also derive from that, for the Korean comrades are loath to adopt the experiences of other countries. They do not ask for advice, and they go their own way. He told me that after the 21st Congress [of the CPSU], Khrushchev had had a long discussion with Kim Il Sung in Moscow. Kim Il Sung set forth the data of their first Five-Year Plan and the targets of the coming years. Comrade Khrushchev did not agree with this plan, and made clear that these plans were not realistic, because they lacked an economic base. One could not base such a huge plan solely on the dynamism and enthusiasm of the workers, Comrade Khrushchev said. He censured the Korean comrades for taking no account of the possibility of cooperation with the other fraternal countries, and for wanting to produce everything by themselves. It was particularly inappropriate, Comrade Khrushchev said, that the DPRK wanted to make preparations for the large-scale production of tractors and trucks. At that time, Comrade Khrushchev's opinion was disregarded and Kim Il Sung maintained that they were able to fulfill the plan. Khrushchev told him that they [the Soviets] also wished to fulfill their Seven-Year Plan in five years, but if that was not possible, one had to acknowledge it. Kim Il Sung explained the production of tractors and trucks by saying that their agriculture was badly off, it was urgent to equip it with tractors and trucks, but, due to their very limited export potential, they were not able to import the latter.

Comrade Yulin told me that they had noticed several times that if the Korean comrades borrowed some experience from the fraternal countries, they were loath to speak about it. He cited as an example that the resolution on the reorganization of local industries had been patterned after a Chinese one, and when the Soviet comrades made mention of that, they [the North Koreans] declared that "this is not a Chinese experience, we carry it out on the basis of our own ideas."

On 1 October this year, Khrushchev again met Kim Il Sung on the occasion of the Chinese national holiday. Following the December plenum, it appears to them [the Soviets] that the talks were not unsuccessful, and certain changes are indeed noticeable. On this point Comrade Yulin mentioned that the Soviet government, though it had been aware of the inappropriate economic policy [of the North Korean leadership], decided to help the DPRK with everything. They follow the principle that if they [the North Koreans] want to solve the problems by themselves, they should realize the

mistakes on the basis of their own experiences. In what follows he told me that the Korean comrades did not inform them either about the measures they intended to take. [Similarly to the Hungarians,] they [the Soviets] also learn of their resolutions and plans only after these have become accomplished facts. Recently, all they could do was subsequently warn the Korean comrades that the elimination of boards in the ministries had not been appropriate. They still regard it as inappropriate, and they do not consider the explanation given by the Korean comrades acceptable, for the work of the boards was taken over by the ministries' party committees. The Korean comrades argue that the party committees include the ministers, deputy ministers, assistant under-secretaries and departmental heads, and, thus, they do not need to discuss the same task in two places [...].

Comrade Yulin regarded the extension of the powers of the provincial, city, and district party committees as the curtailment of professional one-man management. [...]

Comrade Yulin informed me that at the December plenum, Comrade Kim Il Sung had also dealt with the work of the Korean press and the self-conceit of party members. Comrade Kim Il Sung sharply criticized the press for often attaching great importance to issues of lesser importance, writing articles [about such issues] for days on end, and thus misleading public opinion. He also subjected the self-conceit of party members to sharp criticism. He emphasized that it was a very important task to accustom party members to modesty.

With regard to the press, Comrade Yulin also told me that they had a lot of difficulties, because the Korean press did not deal much with Soviet issues. They often prefer "their own little events" to great international events. For instance, while the world's press devoted whole pages to the reports that dealt with Comrade Khrushchev's visit to America, the Korean press published nothing, or just very short news [...], about it. It was only the intervention of the Embassy that ensured that subsequently the Korean press dealt appropriately with the visit. [...] I told him that we had also experienced similar phenomena; for instance, the Korean press hardly wrote anything about the 8th Congress [of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party] in the first days.

We also spoke about the Koreans returning from Japan. Yulin told me that until now, the Korean Red Cross and the Soviet shipping company had made agreements for three ships. They will bring home approx. 3,000 Koreans [...] the South Korean government did its best to prevent their repatriation. [...] from 13 December on, a state of emergency was declared in South Korea, and the navy was put on alert in case there would not be any other way to prevent the arrival of the repatriates' ships in North Korea. The captain of the first ship declared before sailing that if the ship were attacked, they would regard that as an attack on the flag of the Red Cross and also as an attack on the Soviet flag. According to the *Seoul T'ongyang* news agency, on 14 December the American commander of the UN troops stationed in South Korea gave an order that prohibited the UN soldiers stationed in South Korea from participating in any action directed against the repatriates. He also instructed the South Korean Minister

of Defence to take similar measures with regard to the South Korean army.

[...]

Gábor Dobozi
Chargé d'Affaires ad interim



DOCUMENT No. 15

Report, Embassy of Hungary in North Korea to the Hungarian Foreign Ministry, 10 May 1960

[Source: MOL, XIX-J-1-j Korea, 5. doboz, 5/ca, 004238/1960. Translated by Balazs Szalontai.]

The large-scale return of Korean citizens from Japan goes on. [...]

Of the repatriates, those fit for work found jobs without exception. A large number of young people enrolled at colleges and universities. [...]

The technical experts who have returned from Japan are held in high esteem. Their wage-level substantially exceeds that of the other skilled workers and engineers, and in several plants they earn wages that are higher than those of the factory manager. It is beyond doubt that in many cases, the standard of their craftsmanship is higher than that of the skilled workers trained in Korea [...]. It is questionable, however, whether this difference is proportionate to the difference between the wages.

Those who have returned from Japan usually enjoy great privileges over other Koreans. Almost every repatriate was given a comfortable flat in a new building. They do not pay for the flat or the electricity. In the first months they get food and heating for free. In order to improve their food-supply, the competent authorities adopted a resolution about the establishment of special goods departments, where only repatriates can shop, in several stores in Pyongyang [...]. These departments are better supplied with goods than the other departments of the stores. To the knowledge of the Czech and Romanian comrades, prices are also lower in these departments. The privileges described above also include the fact that in the cities, the repatriates do not pay fares on public transportation.

When we discussed the aforementioned with the Soviet, Czech, Romanian, and Mongolian comrades, they unanimously declared that they refused to believe that the privileged status [of the repatriates] made a good impression on the Korean workers. Sooner or later, they will raise the question whether it is justified to favor the repatriates in terms of supply and wages to such a large extent. [...] such voices are already heard.

The Korean workers particularly often say that if so many people return home, they also include a number of people

who are not motivated by patriotism and the wish to work but by "other aims." [...] The Workers' Party stated over and over that it was possible that some subversive elements sneaked in, but "one must not look askance at every repatriate" because of a few people. [...]

Károly Práth
Ambassador



DOCUMENT No. 16

Information Report Sent by Lajos Karsai to Minister of Foreign Affairs Endre Sík, "Visit of Korean Provisional Chargé d'Affaires Paek Chong-won," 27 June 1960

[Source: MOL, XIX-J-1-j Korea, 3. doboz, 4/af, 005061/1960. Translated by Balazs Szalontai.]

To Minister Endre Sík,
1st D. Minister János Péter,
D. Minister Károly Szarka,
Assistant Under-Secretary Márta Kolozs,
Departmental Head János Radványi,
Departmental Head Péter Várkonyi.

On 23 June of this year [...] I sent for Comrade Paek Chong-won, the DPRK's Provisional Chargé d'Affaires in Budapest.

[...]

With regard to the *South Korean* [emphasis in the original] situation, Com. Paik Chong-won made the following evaluation:

The leading elements of the South Korean mass demonstration of April were composed of students and the urban petty bourgeoisie. In essence, the workers and peasants did not voice their opinion. The slogans were just political ones. The main thrust of popular wrath was directed against Syngman Rhee, and Syngman Rhee indeed fled from it.

The reasons for the non-appearance of the workers and peasants in April were the following:

- 1.) There is no Marxist-Leninist party in South Korea. The working class lacks a vanguard, either in a legal or an illegal form. The revolutionary guiding force is missing.
- 2.) The South Korean working class does not constitute an organized force, partly because of the absence of the party, and partly because of its divided character. In South Korea, industrial enterprises employing no more than 20-30 workers make up 95 percent of all... industrial enterprises.
- 3.) The peasantry is also divided. At present there are 2.2

million peasant families registered in South Korea, and 70.5 per cent of them own no more than 1.5 chongbo (approx. 1 Hungarian acre) per family. In South Korea, the oppression of the peasantry takes place primarily in an indirect way, that is, through the landlords. Therefore, the main thrust of peasant discontent is directed against the landlords instead of the government. [...]

Since 1 May, a qualitative change has taken place in the South Korean mass protests. According to the news, workers' strikes have become increasingly frequent. Their main demands are the observance of the eight-hour workday and rising wages. All kinds of parties are mushrooming, and they are demanding new parliamentary elections in addition to the new presidential election. The masses (now even the workers and the peasants) are pressing for punitive measures against Rheeist officials. A mass movement to take the Rheeist murderers to task is in the making in South Korea. Its initiators are the relatives of the slaughtered. [...] The movement started in Koch'ang district.

So far the Korean Workers' Party and the government of the DPRK have not supported any of the South Korean parties, they are just following their activity with close attention. [...] The transitional government, though it is barely different from that of Syngman Rhee in its composition and aims, no longer emphasizes the military unification of the country; it prefers unification through so-called "free elections" under UN supervision. "As is well-known, the government of the DPRK cannot agree with the idea of [holding] all-Korean elections under the aegis of the UN while it is in essence at war with the UN," Com. Paek Chong-won emphasized. Then he went on to say the following:

Now more and more people in South Korea are pressing for the establishment of postal, travel, economic, and cultural contacts between the South and the North. This mainly results from the fact that since the April events, more and more people in South Korea are listening to the North Korean broadcasts directed toward South Korea.

South Korean parliamentary elections are due to be held this July. Of the 233 seats in parliament, Syngman Rhee's Liberal Party has hitherto occupied 150 seats. In April, 110 Liberal deputies resigned their seats in the wake of the events.

The recently formed South Korean Renovation Party has begun to voice remarkable slogans:

- 1.) Free parliamentary elections!
- 2.) Rheeists—individuals who occupied important central or provincial posts under Syngman Rhee, i.e. police and military officers, officials, etc.—must not stand for election!
- 3.) Exchange of mail must be established between South and North Korea without delay!
- 4.) Negotiations must be started on the peaceful unification of the country!
- 5.) A joint South-North commission entrusted with entering into negotiations must be established!

- 6.) All Rheeist hirelings must be relieved of their posts! [...]

Lajos Karsai



DOCUMENT No. 17

Report, Embassy of Hungary in North Korea to the Hungarian Foreign Ministry, 2 July 1960

[Source: MOL, XIX-J-1-j Korea, 8. doboz, 5/f, 0029/RT/1960. Translated by József Litkei.]

On the morning of 1 July, Czechoslovak Ambassador Kohousek invited me for a friendly conversation during which we exchanged views on several issues concerning the DPRK's foreign and domestic policies and the general line of policy of the fraternal countries in the Far East.

On my part, I informed the Comrade Ambassador of the DPRK's Seven-year Plan and certain economic issues related to the June visit of Comrade Kim Il Sung in Moscow (see my other related reports). Concerning the latter issue, the Ambassador confidentially told me that according to the information received from Soviet Ambassador Puzanov, Comrade Khrushchev is going to visit Korea around 8-10 September. Concerning the Seven-year Plan, he referred to Comrade Kim Il Sung and informed me that the objectives of that plan will naturally be

higher than that of the five year plan in order to achieve greater effect among the South Korean masses.

During the informal and friendly conversation that lasted for several hours, the Ambassador expressed the following:

Lately, there has been a certain palpable hidden difference between the views of the Chinese and the Soviet comrades, especially concerning the interpretation of the slogan of peaceful coexistence and the issue of people's communes. To his knowledge, in the past the CC of the Chinese Communist Party had already pointed out some excesses and deficiencies in relation to the organization of communes. Despite this—according to the information he received—



Kim Il Sung

Source: National Archives

there has been no change in the question of the communes and, for example, the principle of egalitarianism still prevails in the system of distribution practiced in the communes. According to the opinion of Comrade Kohousek, the idea of peaceful coexistence is somewhat unpopular among the people's democracies of the Far East, and this idea indeed has a real basis. After all, this principle means peaceful coexistence with US imperialism, which for any Chinese, Korean or Vietnamese is at least difficult to understand, given that for them the US represents their fiercest national enemy, which they are not willing to tolerate in either Taiwan or South Korea, etc. (I would like to mention that to our knowledge, when the Korean party education comes to dealing with the material of the 20th and 21st [CPSU] Congress, the question of the two systems' peaceful coexistence is, so to say, hardly dealt with.) In addition to this, both China and Korea are so much occupied with their "own" international issues (Taiwan and South Korea, respectively), that it is difficult and awkward for them to accept the German question as the central problem of international life. In order to demonstrate this, Comrade Kohousek referred to the behavior of the Chinese at the June session of the Supreme Council of the World Federation of Trade Unions in Beijing and to the articles published in China for the 90th anniversary of Lenin's birth. He [Kohousek] also mentioned that in the speech of the Chinese Ambassador doyen in P'yongyang, given on the occasion of the New Year's reception, he did not even mention the slogan of peaceful coexistence and—contrary to custom—did not send his draft speech in advance to the ambassadors.

This [attitude] in the DPRK was evident at several occasions during the last year, most strikingly in the appeal of the DPRK's Supreme People's Assembly last autumn and in the letter addressing the parliaments of the world, in which they presented the Korean question as the most burning international problem. In the last months, according to the opinion of Comrade Kohousek, the Korean comrades became more reserved concerning this issue.

According to his observations, China's influence in the DPRK has increased significantly during the last year—especially after Comrade Khrushchev's visit to Korea was again canceled. (In the course of the conversation, Comrade Kohousek disapprovingly alluded several times to the Chinese Ambassador to P'yongyang, who uses his position as doyen to his own benefit in a very skillful way, and tries his best to please the Korean comrades.)

Comrade Kohousek nevertheless emphasized that in spite of China's great influence in Korea, the Korean comrades have never tried to copy the Chinese experiences. He referred to the example of communes, which, according to his knowledge, were the subjects of experiments but in the end the idea of their introduction to Korea was firmly rejected. Moreover, recently the Korean comrades have emphatically urged that the income distribution in agriculture be based on the quantity and quality of the work performed.

Concerning other political issues, it is undeniable that the Korean comrades are committing some mistakes along the way. We both agreed, for example, that the evaluations

made during the South Korean events had some weak sides (see my report No. 77). Despite this, the practical steps taken by the Workers' Party and the government were correct. The pursuit of autarky is still strong. Comrade Kohousek pointed out that in his view the Chinese influence is decreasing (understanding by this the above-mentioned political issues), and the Korean comrades stress more often and with more emphasis the *peaceful* [emphasis in the original] unification of the country, and there are signs that they no longer seek to place the Korean question at the forefront of international relations.

I informed Comrade Kohousek of my conversation with Deputy Foreign Minister Yu Chang-sik concerning the visit of Kim Il Sung in Moscow (see my report No. 90). In the opinion of the Comrade Ambassador, it was not without reason for Comrade Yu Chang-sik to emphasize the complete agreement of views between the Soviet and Korean parties, since in his [Kohousek's] opinion the main focus of the negotiations was after all not so much on economic but political questions, and the deputy foreign minister presumably alluded to this. According to the Czechoslovak Deputy Foreign Minister, it cannot be ruled out that Kim Il Sung also visited China prior to his visit to Moscow, but he does not have any data concerning this. He stressed, however, that in his views the Moscow talks meant a turning point in the political and party life of the DPRK. The agreement of views emphasized by the Foreign Minister¹ means that in domestic and foreign political questions, the DPRK completely shares the position of the Soviet Union.

Károly Práth
Ambassador

¹ TRANSLATOR'S NOTE: [sic.] probably Deputy Foreign Minister.



DOCUMENT No. 18

Report, Embassy of Hungary in North Korea to the Hungarian Foreign Ministry, 21 July 1960

[Source: MOL, XIX-J-1-k Korea, 11. doboz, 27/a, 1/25/34-1/1960. Translated by Balazs Szalontai.]

Under a resolution that the [Korean] Workers' Party CC passed more than a year ago, a few "Communist universities" were established experimentally in the 1959/60 academic year. According to the CC resolution, the main purpose of the Communist universities is the further education of the workers in general and the accomplishment of the further theoretical education of the cadres of South Korean origin in particular. Students who have graduated from Communist universities have the same rights as students who have graduated

from other universities. In the last resort, it is the provincial party committees and the provincial People's Committees that propose university applicants for admission. In addition to party members, non-members worthy of it are also admitted. Classes are attended in the evenings after working hours. The four-week holiday is due to these students in the same way as to the other evening students.

In the last few weeks the party CC discussed the experiences gained in the previous academic year, and it found that the Communist universities established experimentally last year had done good work, and it became possible to increase the number of such universities. The CC decided to establish 20 such universities in the 1960/61 academic year in provincial centers and larger industrial centers.

[...]

In addition to raising technological standards, the main purpose of the universities is to gather together people of South Korean origin, and to select those cadres who will be suitable for leading the party and the democratic organs in South Korea after unification. The primary aim [of the leadership] is that from each South Korean settlement, there should be one or two students who have long been living in the North, at the universities. [...] Following the graduation of the present class, it will be ensured that after the unification of the country, in all the centers, cities and larger villages of South Korea the party committees and People's Committees will be headed by cadres born there.

These cadres will be politically firm and loyal to the Korean Workers' Party. They will be more or less familiar with industry and the planned economy as well, because at the university they study such subjects too. At the same time they, having been born there, will also know local conditions, which will be of invaluable importance in the first period after unification. [...]

Károly Práth
Ambassador



DOCUMENT No. 19

Report, Embassy of Hungary in North Korea to the Hungarian Foreign Ministry, 1 August 1960

[Source: MOL, XIX-J-1-j Korea, 5. doboz, 5/ca, 004238/1/1960. Translated by Balazs Szalontai.]

In recent days, the 30th group of repatriates has arrived from Japan, and with them, a total of as many as 31,000 Koreans have already returned home. The repatriates—as I already related in my previous report—get jobs and can work right after they have settled down. Nevertheless, their adaptation to life here is not smooth. For one thing, their circumstances of life were better in Japan [than in the DPRK], and

they are not completely satisfied with the conditions here. According to what the repatriates say, there were more opportunities for entertainment in Japan. Initially, the [North Korean] way of life, which is fundamentally different from what they got accustomed to under capitalism, is certainly foreign to them. They have not heard about concepts like voluntary work, meetings, and pledges up to now. As a consequence, they are loath to participate in them. When the official working time is over, they try to go home immediately in order to change their clothes and seek opportunities for entertainment.

They also have difficulty complying with work discipline. [...] The government and the party ensure them a privileged position. [...] a substantial part of the repatriates have considerable professional skills. In addition to industrial experts, I primarily mean those professional skills which have existed only in a very rudimentary stage in the DPRK, e.g. ladies' hairdressing, gentlemen's and ladies' tailors, shoemakers, and so on.

Apart from formalities, the Korean workers do not like the repatriates very much. They have several reasons for that: 1) A great number of people have been removed from their flats so as to provide adequate flats for the repatriates; 2) In the factories, they get strikingly high wages; 3) They occupy a privileged position in food-supply; 4) Work discipline is less binding on them (at least they are not taken to task in the same way as others); 5) In respect of clothing and way of life, they are different from the local people.

[...]

Károly Práth
Ambassador



DOCUMENT No. 20

Information Report Sent by Frigyes Puja to Minister of Foreign Affairs Endre Sik, "Visit of Korean Ambassador Yi Tong-gon," 30 August 1960

[Source: MOL, XIX-J-1-j Korea, 3. doboz, 4/af, 0032/4/1960. Translated by Balazs Szalontai.]

To Minister Sik, First Deputy Min. Péter, Deputy Minister Szarka, Acting
Departmental Head Széphelyi, Assistant Under-Secretary Kolozs, Chef de
Protocol Radványi, Departmental Head P. Várkonyi.

On 26 August, the Korean Ambassador in Budapest paid me a visit. The purpose of his visit was to inform me about the speech of Comrade Kim Il Sung and tell us their wishes concerning the UN session [...].

Concerning the UN session: the Korean comrades would

like one of the people's democracies to propose a draft resolution during the discussion of the Korean question, laying stress upon the withdrawal of American troops from South Korea.

In the draft resolution, it would be appropriate also to demand the dissolution of the so-called "Korean Development Commission" of the UN.

The Ambassador said the Korean comrades did not press for their admission to the UN, but if a third state proposed the admission of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea together with South Korea, they would have no objections to it.

[...]

Frigyes Puja



DOCUMENT No. 21

Report, Embassy of Hungary in North Korea to the Hungarian Foreign Ministry, 11 October 1960

[Source: MOL, XIX-J-1-j Korea, 13. doboz, 27/a, 007686/1960. Translated by Balazs Szalontai.]

[...] this spring, the Korean Workers' Party CC passed a resolution on the more intense implementation of the principle of the "policy of the mass line" in party work. The party organs also discussed the resolution.

The party resolution in question makes it clear that the party should not become isolated but must take into consideration the interests of the vast working masses to the highest degree, maintain a permanently close relationship with them, etc. [...]

According to the information we received, the resolution analyzes the internal political situation of the country, qualifying it as complicated. The complicated nature of the situation is rooted in the 40-year Japanese rule, the subsequent division of the country, and the war of 1950-53.

In this [...] complicated internal situation, political work is impeded by further factors, namely:

- 1.) Almost all North Korean families have relatives living in the South, and in a number of cases, relatives who fled to the South;
- 2.) under the temporary American-South Korean occupation, many people—albeit under coercion—collaborated with the occupiers in various ways;
- 3.) a partial part of the former prisoners of war also constitutes a problem;
- 4.) there are still some petty bourgeois remnants in the DPRK, although not in a significant number.

Taking the aforementioned into consideration, in political work one must give evidence of great patience and caution, the method of re-education must be applied. In order to improve public feeling, the earlier policy of relocating people from P'yongyang came to an end. In cadre work, workers must be judged on the basis of the work they perform instead of on the basis of their origin. In accordance with the latter principle, in recent months—as far as we know—several non-party men or persons of class-alien origin (members of former noble and landowner families) were given leading professional positions, and increased attention is turned to the appreciation of those representatives of the old bourgeois intelligentsia who are excellent in their profession.

With regard to the implementation of the policy of the "mass line" in party work, in September a theoretical conference for party education leaders of various ranks was held at the Korean party college.

Károly Fendler
Chargé d'Affaires ad interim



DOCUMENT No. 22

Report, Embassy of Hungary in North Korea to the Hungarian Foreign Ministry, 30 November 1960

[Source: MOL, XIX-J-1-j Korea, 5. doboz, 5/ca, 005476/1/1960. Translated by Balazs Szalontai.]

On 30 November Comrade Deputy Foreign Minister Kim T'ae-hui gave the Ambassadors accredited in P'yongyang the proposals the 8th session of the DPRK's Supreme National Assembly had made with regard to the unification of Korea (the report of Comrade Ch'oe Yong-gon, the letter addressed to the National Assembly of the Republic of Korea, etc.). With regard to that, the Comrade Deputy Minister pointed out that these proposals meant the further concretization of the ones Comrade Kim Il Sung had mentioned in his speech of 15 August, and at the same time they specified the North Korean people's tasks concerning unification. [...] They intend to carry out unification by their own efforts, through general elections. Since the UN lent its flag to US aggression, it is at war with the DPRK, and thus it cannot be an "observer" of the Korean elections, etc.

In what follows, Comrade Kim T'ae-hui briefly outlined the proposals concerning the confederation and the establishment of a committee for economic cooperation, and with regard to the program aimed at assisting South Korea he pointed out the primary importance of the peasant question and land reform, for 70 percent of the South Korean population was composed of peasants. The DPRK's proposal concerning carrying out the South Korean land reform (purchase by the state, distribution for free) is different from the land

reform carried out in the DPRK, but, if one takes the circumstances into consideration, it is a Marxist-Leninist answer to the question. [...] The ruling circles of the USA have not adopted an official policy yet, they try to deal with the South Korean situation somehow indirectly. In these circles, a certain anxiety is noticeable, they do not completely trust the Chang Myon government, and, among others, the USA openly declared that if the South Korean authorities wished to negotiate with the representatives of the North in Panmunjom, this would require the previous consent of the "UN High Command." In South Korea, the proposals [of the DPRK] are already widely known and discussed among the intelligentsia, the students, and the youth. Characteristically, a great number of South Korean correspondents came to the 29 November session of the Panmunjom Armistice Commission, and 50 percent of them made statements in favor of the DPRK's proposals, while the others represented the official standpoint [...]. The South Korean National Assembly was also obliged to discuss the issue of economic and cultural contacts, then the Cabinet also dealt with it. While Chang Myon called [the proposals] "propaganda" in his statement, Foreign Minister Chong Il-hyong supported the idea of [accepting] electric power [from the DPRK] as long as no political strings were attached, though later he took back his word.

[...]

The tone of the [Supreme] National Assembly's session is typical of [the present attitude of] the DPRK. Both the reporter [Ch'oe Yong-gon] and the speakers spoke about the South Korean leaders in a very moderate tone, the various attributes they had hitherto used were largely absent, and they began to speak officially about the "Republic of Korea" instead of "South Korea" (it even appeared in newspapers). Of course, as the Korean comrades correctly pointed out, the primary obstacle in the way of the peaceful unification of the country is the presence of the US troops. [...] it is not likely, however, that one can achieve their withdrawal solely through domestic (Korean) channels; the given international situation, and its development, will play an important role in it.

Károly Práth
Ambassador



DOCUMENT No. 23

Report, Embassy of Hungary in North Korea to the Hungarian Foreign Ministry, 8 December 1960

[Source: MOL, XIX-J-1-j Korea, 5. doboz, 5/ca, 001/RT/1961. Translation by József Litkei.]

On 7 December, Czechoslovak Ambassador Comrade Kohousek invited me for dinner, together with Comrade Soviet Ambassador Puzanov. In the course of the friendly

conversation, I mentioned that the conduct of the Korean DCSO¹ is somewhat strange and incomprehensible to me, since they have been systematically taking away my best Korean employees on various pretexts. The behavior of the guards charged with guarding the embassies is also very strange, since—despite the emphatic statements of the Foreign Ministry—they constantly stop the Korean comrades visiting the Embassy, and check their identities. We do not take similar measures at the Korean embassy in Budapest; moreover, we do our best to offer them an ever-increasing space for movement and [possibilities to maintain] connections.

Concerning this question, Comrade Kohousek told us that his embassy is experiencing similar [behavior] from the Korean side, and remarked that according to his impression, some of the Korean employees working at the embassy are security people, who follow with great attention the work of the embassies and the Koreans visiting the embassy, and at the same time keep an eye on the other Korean employees as well. When Korean authorities have the impression that one or another of the Korean employees is working well, and that his work is promoting the work of the embassy, then he is removed from the embassy, usually on the baseless pretext of "political unreliability." At this point, Comrade Puzanov interjected that why then do they send "politically unreliable [people]"?!—Comrade Kohousek also pointed out that the Korean side—both official authorities and some of the embassy employees—is trying to restrict the connections between the individual embassies and the Korean comrades who studied in their countries, out of the fear that they [the embassies] can receive some kind of "information" from them [the Korean comrades]. The situation, however, is that these comrades cannot subscribe to foreign specialist literature, and this is why they are always inquiring at the embassies.

In my response, I emphasized that I have no need for the Hungarian-trained Korean comrades to act as "informants" since I have been in the DPRK long enough to be able to form my own opinion on its individual issues and its situation. Comrade Puzanov agreed with this and then said that so far he had no problems with the Koreans working at the Soviet Embassy, and when it comes to signing the collective contract, he determines in advance each employee's sphere of work. Concerning the problems related to free entry at the embassies, since he has also already heard similar complaints from the Bulgarian Ambassador, he had the issue investigated in relation to the Soviet Embassy, and they did not experience similar phenomena (I would like to remark that there is a permanent Soviet janitor service at the gate, so it is not possible for the [Korean] guard to stop visitors). According to Comrade Puzanov, Korean leading comrades do not assume that the embassies would use visitors for the purpose of getting information, such a [notion] can only possibly originate from some kind of lower subordinate. If he [Comrade Puzanov] wants to know about something, then he turns to the Central Committee or to the Foreign M[inistry], and it happened more than once that Comrade Kim Il Sung himself offered materials that were possibly necessary for

the work of the embassy. Concerning the conduct of the Korean DCSO and the guards, he strongly stressed that one has to call individual cases to the attention of the competent Korean authorities immediately [after such incidents happen], warning them “what, do you want brotherly reciprocity?!” If something similar would happen to me here, said Comrade Puzanov, then I would ensure that it be reciprocated in Moscow. I interjected that in our work we should not look for what possibly separates us but what unites us, and we must endeavor to strengthen cooperation and friendship. Comrade Puzanov also agreed with this by saying that these are after all minor issues, but they can also express the mutual relationship between two countries. No one in Moscow hinders entry to the Korean or [other] friendly embassies. After this, he firmly stated that concerning his own embassy, he has no information according to which certain Korean employees are engaged in “intelligence” activity. If he would experience anything like this, then he would immediately protest to the Korean authorities, noting that he would be obliged to report this to his government and party. He works as the ambassador of a socialist country in another socialist country, and the Soviet Union does not conduct such activity toward friendly states.

Following this, the conversation turned to the November session of the DPRK Supreme People’s Assembly (due to his Moscow visit, Comrade Puzanov was not present [at this session]). Together with Comrade Kohousek, we found it to be inadequate that when the speakers of the People’s Assembly [discussed] such an important event as the completion of the Five-year Plan, they only devoted a brief half-sentence to the huge assistance provided by the socialist camp, and, above all, the Soviet Union, without which the execution of this plan would have been impossible. I reminded Comrade Puzanov that approx. two years ago, Comrade Kim Il Sung personally requested of the ambassadors that the socialist countries assist in the realization of the Five-year Plan. Comrade Kohousek expressed his opinion that Korean comrades would have had a really good opportunity, on the basis of proletarian internationalism, to point out what the support of the Soviet Union, and more generally the socialist camp, can mean for the development of a previously backward and colonial country, especially from the point of view of the recently liberated Afro-Asian countries. It would have been especially important and appropriate to contrast this assistance and the [resulting] achievements with the American aid provided to South Korea. Comrade Puzanov said that the Soviet Union does not need constant expressions of gratitude for its help, but the Korean comrades are displaying too “modest” behavior concerning the assistance, and they try to hush it up. According to him, the core of the issue is not whether or not they speak of the assistance received from socialist countries, but *how they educate the people* [emphasis in the original]! This is the most important factor, he said. He emphasized that they do not know what the Korean comrades think concerning this issue, he had not yet raised the question with them. It could be that they wish to emphasize to South Korea the independence of the DPRK

in all respects, or that they have some other ideas. Comrade Kohousek remarked that any bourgeois economist can easily calculate that the DPRK was unable to reach its achievements on its own, and it is similarly unable to provide the economic aid it recently offered to South Korea from its own resources. In his opinion, the Korean comrades will achieve just the opposite with this, and their proposals can be more easily labeled “Communist propaganda.”

Comrade Puzanov declared that due to his absence, he does not yet know in detail the numbers related to the questions discussed by the [Supreme] People’s Assembly. He spoke with great appreciation concerning the Korean proposals for the unification of the country. He told us that during Comrade Kim Il Sung’s incognito visit to Moscow this June, Comrade Khrushchev briefly asked Comrade Kim Il Sung his opinion concerning a confederation proposal similar to the one on Germany. Comrade Kim Il Sung immediately agreed with the idea, but the Soviet side did not push the issue any further, and the Korean comrades elaborated proposals, that were, in his opinion, very concretely and flexibly aimed at creating state federation entirely independently: free elections, [unification through] either state federation or, for the time being, only a Committee of Economic Cooperation, etc. For his part, he regards the proposals as very thorough and correct. Concerning how realistic the offered economic aid is, he declared that he will examine the material, but he believes that South Korea will reject it anyway. Concerning South Korea, Comrade Kohousek stated that although a popular movement overthrew Syngman Rhee, it [the movement] is basically unable to advance further; moreover, anti-Communist attitudes are also manifesting themselves, especially among the so-called progressive forces of South Korea. In Comrade Puzanov’s view, time will decide the question; in any event, the movement seems to be developing anti-Americanism. This, however, has its limits, since the intellectual and other circles see clearly that there are only American products in South Korea, and a potential anti-American movement could lead to the termination of American supplies, while the South Korean economy is unable to fulfill the country’s needs from its own resources. For this reason, they are unwilling to risk ending American assistance. It is unquestionable, however, that the DPRK proposals are putting the leading circles of the US and South Korea in a difficult situation.

Concerning the South Korean response to the DPRK’s proposals, Comrade Kohousek told us that in accordance with the information received from the head of the Czechoslovak observer committee in Panmunjom, there is some visible change on the Western side. As is known, American authorities already previously made the free movement of the Czechoslovak and Polish observers in South Korea impossible. Now opinions are being voiced that this should be made possible again. Some suggest that in addition to Poland, Czechoslovakia, Switzerland, and Sweden, the neutral observation committee should be enlarged by two new states, possibly with India and Argentina. At the same time, the committee could contribute to developing relations between the two parts of the country. According to the

Czechoslovak Ambassador, the first impression is that the enlargement of the committee is not advantageous for us, since at the moment the voting ratio is 2 to 2, while [after the enlargement] this would be 2 to 4, to our disadvantage. In Comrade Puzanov's view, this also does not make any sense, since the activity of the committee is anyway reduced. Promoting relations between the two parts of the country would mean a change in the function of the neutral committee; this, however, would first of all require the consent of the Koreans themselves. Comrade Kohousek further mentioned that the head of the Swiss delegation invited the Czechoslovak general to visit Seoul, which the latter accepted only under the condition that he can go in an official status. The Swiss agreed to this, but the visit has been suspended for various reasons.

We evaluated the above-mentioned diverse Western initiatives as attempts by the USA to find a way to counterbalance the effects of the DPRK's very effective proposals.

Károly Práth
Ambassador

¹ TRANSLATOR'S NOTE: Diplomatic Corps Supply Office



DOCUMENT No. 24

Report, Embassy of Hungary in North Korea to the Hungarian Foreign Ministry, 16 March 1961

[Source: MOL, XIX-J-1-j Korea, 5. doboz, 5/bc, 0030/RT/1961. Translation by József Litkei.]

During my visit to Comrade Kohousek on 15 March, I informed him of my conversation with the Chinese Ambassador (see my top secret report no. 95). The Comrade Czechoslovak Ambassador fully agreed with me, and he found it highly incorrect that the Korean comrades organized a separate presentation for the government and another for the ambassadors.

In the course of the conversation, we both remarked upon the fact that Chinese Ambassador doyen Qiao Xiaoguang has recently not been attending the programs organized for the D[iplomatic] C[orps] by the Korean comrades, under the pretext of being busy. In addition to other [examples], he did not participate in the visit to the steel complex in Kaesong, nor did he attend the performance of the Cuban ballet ensemble or the cultural presentation of Comrade Han Sol-ya, etc. According to Comrade Kohousek, the Chinese Ambassador might be dissatisfied because in the course of last year he failed to convince the Korean comrades to support the Chinese position. Comrade Kohousek stated that earlier (last summer) he was of the opinion that the Korean comrades were under Chinese influence; how-

ever, recently he had to change his position. It is true that earlier there were attempts by the Korean side to adopt Chinese methods: for example, according to his information, they planned to establish two people's communes, etc., but they soon realized the negative [effects] of this, and gave it up. The so-called "Chongsan-ri method" radically opposes the earlier Chinese position, and, at least recently, the Korean comrades have been devoting much attention to maintaining the principle of material interest and socialist distribution.

The Chinese comrades exerted pressure in order to bring the KWP to their side in the debate between the CPSU and CCP last year. The invitation of Comrade Kim Il Sung to China last year (before his incognito visit to Moscow) also proves this. Comrade Kim Il Sung, however, informed Comrade Khrushchev of this [invitation].

Last October, on the occasion of the 10th anniversary of the Chinese volunteers entering the war, a Chinese delegation headed by Marshal He Long visited Korea and tried again to win Korea over to the Chinese side. Despite this, the Korean delegation did not support China at the November conference, although, together with other delegations, it sought to find a compromise solution. To sum up, the Chinese did not reach their goal, despite a further credit of 420 million rubles offered to the DPRK last autumn, so it is not impossible that this is the reason the Chinese Ambassador is so displeased.

In confirming this, Comrade Kohousek told me that although the Chinese side enjoys a position of equality with the Korean side in the armistice committee in Panmunjom, the speeches are always given by the head of the Korean delegation. A recent event, when the new heads of the Swedish and Swiss delegations paid an introductory visit to the heads of the Korean and Chinese delegations, was characteristic of this. The head of the Chinese delegation wanted to return these formal calls, but the Korean comrades did not consent to this, saying that they were not going to return either of them. Similarly, a Chinese general came recently to Panmunjom to pay his usual yearly visit and was received by the heads of the Czechoslovak and Polish delegations. Contrary to previous custom, however, the head of the Korean delegation did not show up, nor did he meet the Chinese general later. The latter left pretty soon without any notice.

The same afternoon, I also talked to Soviet Ambassador Puzanov, and informed him as well of my conversation with the Chinese Ambassador. Comrade Puzanov agreed with me, the more so since I was the one to inform him that the performance in question was organized for the DC (he was not present due to the Women's Day celebration at the Soviet Embassy). He agreed that, under the pretense of discussing various protocol questions, I would visit the Chinese Ambassador, who following this will have to summon the [other] ambassadors. Concerning the statement of the Chinese Ambassador, according to which "some criticize the people's communes, yet they have already been proven to work" (see my above-mentioned report), Comrade Puzanov briefly outlined the questions concerning the Chinese people's communes, and told us that according to his personal opinion,

the Chinese comrades have also already learned from the experiences of the past years, and there are signs that they put an end to the communes' "egalitarianist" system of distribution and are giving more space to individual farms, etc. That the last plenum of the Chinese fraternal party put the blame for the condition of agriculture entirely on weather and natural disasters is the business of the Chinese, said Comrade Puzanov, although the way we communists become even stronger is exactly by openly admitting our mistakes. He told us that on the way back from the January CPSU Plenum, he came to Pyongyang via Beijing, and also informed Comrade Kim Il Sung about the work of the plenum. On this occasion, the issue of the grave economic situation in China was also raised. Comrade Kim Il Sung declared that they (the Koreans) can also feel the Chinese difficulties, since there are delays in the delivery of coking coal, etc., and foodstuffs are not being delivered to Korea either. According to Kim Il Sung, taking the Chinese situation into consideration, they do not want to hurry the Chinese deliveries. Concerning the people's communes, Comrade Kim Il Sung said that he also follows the recent measures related to this with great attention, and he knows the articles published in the Chinese press, as well. In his opinion, "it is not the name, nor the form that is important, but the content," and Comrade Puzanov, too, sees the essence of the issue in this.

Concerning this question, Comrade Puzanov made the final comment that Chinese Ambassador Qiao committed an "offense against his own party-consciousness" when he put the blame for their difficulties on the weather alone.

Károly Práth
Ambassador



DOCUMENT No. 25

Report, Embassy of Hungary in North Korea to the Hungarian Foreign Ministry, 8 June 1961

[Source: MOL, XIX-J-1-j Korea, 13. doboz, 27/e, 003643/1/1961. Translated by Balazs Szalontai.]

According to information we received from an acquaintance of ours who is a party member working in a ministry, on 27 March Comrade Kim Il Sung delivered a lecture at the party center on some issues regarding proletarian dictatorship in Korea. His speech was recorded, and it is studied together with the Red Letter and collectively listened to by party and state cadres down to the middle level.

Kim Il Sung called attention to the country's complicated situation in cadre policy. Only about 0.5 percent (!) of the population has no relatives who live in the South, were collaborators of the Japanese or the Americans, or are elements of class-alien origin, etc. Nonetheless, the party lead-

ership is firm and experienced [...]. He condemned dictatorial methods in party and mass work, citing Ho Ka-i as an example of someone who was unmasked during the liquidation of factions and who, as the secretary of the CC, had disciplined 500 thousand party members out of 700 thousand in the course of the [1950-1951] retreat (later he committed suicide). He emphasized that the primary task of the Communists was to provide well-being for the popular masses, and they had to do their work primarily through re-education. In spite of its complicated composition, the 99.5 percent of the population cannot be considered as enemies, for in this case the Ch'ollima movement, etc. would be out of the question. The enemy wishes that the Communists make mistakes, that there are dissensions in their ranks, and that the relationship between Communists and non-members becomes tense. For instance, during the short period of occupation the Americans did their best to establish as many [anti-Communist] organizations as possible so as to provoke the Communists into forming suspicions about as many people as possible and [creating] sharp tensions within the population [...] after their [the Americans'] retreat. One must see that, and we must not bring grist to the enemy's mill through our actions.

In what follows Com. Kim Il Sung pointed out that in the DPRK, the [sharp] edge of proletarian dictatorship was directed against the former collaborators of the Japanese and the Americans, the former landlords, capitalists, and kulaks, then he proceeded to analyze these categories.

Those who occupied various minor administrative posts, were members of the civil defense, etc., before liberation cannot be reckoned among the collaborators of the Japanese.

It must be taken into consideration that almost every Korean over 30 was compelled to work [under the Japanese] so as to make a living, and neither they nor their children can be qualified as "bad people" for that. It is the former high-ranking officials, provincial etc. functionaries, confidential clerks, factory owners, police leaders, etc. who are considered friends of the Japanese.

Nor is the dictatorship directed against all religious people, only against the priests who collaborated with the USA. Religion is essentially a superstition, and the same holds true of Christianity, but the latter, due to its foreign origin, always remained foreign to the Korean people.

Superstitions of Korean origin must be weeded out through education. Comrade Kim Il Sung cited as an example that his grandmother had also prayed for him while he was still fighting with the partisans. Kang Ryong-uk (Kim Il-Sung's uncle, now the chairman of the Democratic Party and the vice-chairman of the presidium of the Supreme People's Assembly) also was a good priest, he prayed a lot, but his children protest against being called "priest's children".

After liberation, the landlords opposed land reform, and the kulaks stood up against collectivization; therefore, proletarian dictatorship is directed against them as well. However, Kim Il Sung declared emphatically that proletarian dictatorship had never been directed against the middle strata of peasantry, then advised the leaders not to underestimate the masses, no matter how complicated the cadre situation was.

He dealt separately with the issue of those who had been collaborators under the temporary occupation. The great majority of them were forced to do some service for the occupying troops, for the most part they did it unintentionally. He remarked that they wished Koreans had not served in the South Korean puppet army either, but one had to reckon with these circumstances as well. Several former collaborators later held their own bravely in the [Korean] People's Army and in peacetime work. One must also take into consideration that the landlords, etc. often did not participate in person in the various actions but forced others to carry them out, and they themselves attempted to remain in the background. Similarly, one must draw a distinction between those who fled to the South and the members of their families who remained here.

The aforesaid could not mean the weakening of class struggle, Kim Il Sung said, the latter went on, but it was directed only against the objects of proletarian dictatorship.

With regard to intra-party re-education, he pointed out that one had to look after those who had made mistakes, they had to be judged, or rehabilitated later, on the basis of their work. Within the party, the struggle may take two shapes: purge or re-education. Comrade Kim Il Sung considers the latter as the more appropriate and progressive, even in those cases when some people kept their class background, etc., secret from the party but held their own in work. In conclusion, he emphasized that "if we were incapable of carrying out re-education work within the party, how could we re-educate and transform the masses?", and "if we do not complete this work in the North, we will not be able to obtain results in the South either".

According to our informant, the aforementioned issues are studied primarily in the party organs of the offices, in enterprise and factory party organizations they constitute a lesser problem. [...]

Károly Práth
Ambassador



DOCUMENT No. 26

Report, Embassy of Hungary in North Korea to the Hungarian Foreign Ministry, 29 March 1962

[Source: MOL, XIX-J-1-j Korea, 8. doboz, 5/f, 004108/1962. Translated by Balazs Szalontai.]

On 29 March, Com. Reuter, the press attaché of the German Embassy, paid a visit to Com. Fendler, and informed him about the conversation that had recently taken place between Com. Provisional Chargé d'Affaires Stark and Com. Pak, head of the F[oreign] M[inistry]'s First Department.

For the latter's information, Com. Stark handed the copy of the memorandum written by the GDR government on the German question to Com. Pak. In the course of the conversa-

tion, Com. Pak dwelt at length upon the fact that the Korean situation greatly differed from that of Germany, [because] *in Korea, as opposed to Germany, there did not exist two states but only one, and the armistice demarcation line could not be considered a border* [emphasis in the original]. (Com. Reuter emphasized that the conversation had been initiated by the departmental head.)

Concerning the *peaceful coexistence* [emphasis in the original] of the two Germanys, Com. Pak remarked that in Korea, other methods were needed, "we cannot wait until the population of South Korea starves to death!" With regard to that, he also mentioned that economic competition was not the best method, and "class struggle is inseparable from war."

In the course of the conversation, the quotations from Lenin that had been published in *Nodong Sinmun* several times, and the issue of revisionism cropped up. Com. Pak stated that due to the great distance [between the two countries], Yugoslav revisionism had not affected Korea, and that time they (Korea) were occupied in fighting dogmatism. Now the situation has changed, because "the revisionist danger is close to us, the wind of revisionism is blowing toward us from all the four cardinal points, from South Korea, Japan, and another direction".

[...]

József Kovács
Ambassador



DOCUMENT No. 27

Report, Embassy of Hungary in North Korea to the Hungarian Foreign Ministry, 5 April 1962

[Source: MOL, XIX-J-1-j Korea, 13. doboz, 27/a, 0025/RT/1962. Translated by Balazs Szalontai.]

[...]

The Central Committee of the Korean Workers' Party discussed the 22nd Congress of the CPSU on 27 November, and on the evidence of Kim Il Sung's speech, which was also published in the newspapers (probably in an abridged version), they considered the issue (the cult of personality, the Albanian question, and so on) as practically closed, although, in our view, public opinion was greatly interested in it. The so-called "Tae'an instructions" of Kim Il-sung, and the reorganization of industrial management (which has not yet been completed), occurred after the November plenum, then the members of the Political Committee visited the most important industrial plants in order to guide the reorganization. According to very confidential information we received at the end of December (from a party worker in Hamhung), Com. Kim Ch'ang-man—a member of the Political Committee and the vice-chairman of the CC, who otherwise deals primarily

with ideological work—visited the Hamhung artificial fertilizer factory in connection with the “Taeang reorganization”. Before an invited audience of Hamhung city and provincial party leaders, Kim Ch’ang-man declared that the leaders of the CPSU had adopted a revisionist point of view regarding peaceful co-existence, proletarian dictatorship, and so on. According to our informant, he did not approve the openly anti-Soviet outbursts of the Albanian leaders, but emphasized that in the debate, “the CPSU is not right in every respect either.” [...]

To our knowledge, in February and March similar lectures were delivered in the party organizations of the capital and of the more important provincial centers. In some places they spoke about the revisionist threat just in general, whereas in other places they made concrete references to the leaders of the CPSU. At the end of February, the issue of the revisionist threat suddenly appeared in the press as well [...].

With regard to the food shortage, statements like “we have no apple, because we must export everything” are made, although they failed to ship even the minimal quantity the USSR had contracted in 1961, and the USSR canceled the arrears.

Although at the plenum held at the end of November Kim Il Sung declared that the cult of personality and the Albanian question must not be discussed in the Korean Workers’ Party and in Korea, the relevant statements of the 22nd Congress, albeit not always in their entirety, became quite widely known. It was obvious that the aforesaid objections were essentially attributable to the issue of the personality cult. From the end of January on, a certain tension was already noticeable; in the last two months, quite substantial (and, in a number of cases, sudden) replacements took place in the ranks of the middle-level (party and state) functionaries, which affected low-level employees as well. [...] a number of people have been transferred to the countryside, or simply sent to the mines. Surveillance of foreigners has been greatly tightened up, they are often shadowed, and those Koreans who have contacts with the Embassies here are particularly watched. [...] in early February, everywhere in the capital meetings were held in the institutions, enterprises, etc., in order to warn workers against having contacts with foreigners; they were told that no one was permitted to visit any Embassy without the previous consent of higher organs, and such a visitor would be obliged to give an account of his visit. At several universities and colleges, students were warned against corresponding with foreign (fraternal) countries. Korean subscribers, even in institutions, receive *Pravda* and other Soviet publications very incompletely, and in several places the local party organs got them to cancel their subscription “voluntarily.” Several of our acquaintances were also “exiled” for their contacts with foreigners[...].

At the very beginning of March, Com. Kulaevsky [*Pravda*’s correspondent in North Korea] and Com. Fendler had interesting talks with [...] a Soviet Korean who repatriated in 1946, and on the basis of his chance remarks, [we learned that] he will travel to Tashkent on the way back from his holiday in order to “visit his relatives”, and he may not

even return home. These circumstances presumably “loosened his tongue” to a certain extent.) Com. Kim depicted the internal situation of the DPRK in the following manner:

In the wake of the 22nd Congress of the CPSU, a rather tense situation has developed in Korea. The objections to the line of the CPSU are rooted in the personality cult.[...] He remarked that the slogan *charyok kaengsaeng*—“regeneration through one’s own efforts”—is also of Chinese origin, and—in his personal opinion—the *juche* slogan has little to do with “the application of the principles of Marxism-Leninism to the Korean reality,” it is in essence a manifestation of subjectivism. There is also an intense distrust of Koreans of Soviet origin. (This is also confirmed by other sources.) Finally, Com. Kim stated that the Korean internal situation was rather delicate (*shchekotlivy*), a great number of people were thinking about the effects of the 22nd Congress[...], but “they have shut everybody (including the F[oreign] M[inistry]) up,” and this is why people kept silent.

According to the informant of ours who is employed at the party committee of Hamhung, “political control” has been tightened up with an iron hand in the last months. Local party organizations must regularly prepare reports about the mood of the population, and in these reports they must constantly watch what the masses know about the aforesaid problematic issues (the Albanian question, etc.). Of those Koreans who had visited foreign countries or lived in the Soviet Union, the names of the “more suspicious” ones were recorded. Simultaneously with the political tension, he said, there were also difficulties in the economy, particularly in industry and the supply of goods. The so-called “Taeang reorganization” is going on, but it is dubious whether it facilitates solving the basic economic issues[...]. Living standards have declined, the prices of several textile products were raised, and [...] maize, barley, etc. is substituted for 30 to 50 percent of the rice ration. With reference to that, anonymous letters were sent to the Central Committee, and the issue was also discussed at the exclusive meetings of the party action committees. Women are complaining more and more often that there is nothing to buy. There is a general weariness among the people due to the rapid pace and rush which has been going on for years and which now became even more intense because of the introduction of compulsory physical work (one day per week). In March, the institutions and offices in Pyongyang switched over to a 5 day work week; employees perform physical work on the sixth day of the week, and, in addition to the daily political programs which last for two hours, there is compulsory collective political study on Sunday mornings. For instance, the F[oreign] M[inistry] does not operate on Saturdays.

[...]

József Kovács
Ambassador

DOCUMENT No. 28**Report, Embassy of Hungary in North Korea to the Hungarian Foreign Ministry, 28 May 1962**

[Source: MOL, XIX-J-1-k Korea, 8. doboz, 15/b, 005805/1962. Translated by Balazs Szalontai.]

At the Czechoslovak reception on 9 May, Comrade Fendler, while having a conversation with Comrade Cho Byong-hui, the Deputy Head of the Press Department, asked him for information about the character of the major South Korean newspapers and news agencies [...]. Comrade Chong, an employee of the Press Department, received Comrade Fendler on 24 May, and informed him in detail (enclosed please find the evaluation of each newspaper).

[...] At the reception on 9 May, Comrade Cho Byong-hui referred to the fact that certain South Korean newspapers, while beginning their articles with appreciation of the policies and [...] efforts of the government, cautiously pointed out that "there are still some shortcomings." The tone of the provincial newspapers is more dissenting than that of the metropolitan press, because in the countryside, particularly in the southernmost provinces, economic conditions are worse (the uprising of April 1960 also started in Masan), and the national feeling of the intelligentsia is also stronger in the countryside. Nonetheless, articles containing veiled criticism pass the censor time after time, considering the isolation of Park Chung-hee, which is substantial enough in any case, and international public opinion.

The conversation took place in a friendly atmosphere, and finally Comrade Chong, on his own initiative, stressed that they would be ready to inform the Embassy at any time, and referred appreciatively to the relationship between the Korean Embassy in Budapest and the Press Department of the Hungarian Foreign Ministry.

[...]

József Kovács
Ambassador

*Appendix 1**Characterization of major South Korean newspapers:**1) Han'guk Ilbo [...]*

The newspaper is owned by a stock company representing capitalist commercial interests, and it is solidly funded. It frequently publishes reviews, summaries, and long editorials. This newspaper was of an oppositional character as early as under Syngman Rhee, and at present it also criticizes the military government and the USA, though not consistently. Its circulation once exceeded one hundred thousand, but it has somewhat decreased since the coup.[...]

2) Kukje Sinmun [...]

It is published in Pusan, one of the largest seaports in

South Korea, owned by a stock company, and firmly funded; in terms of size and influence, it is equivalent to the metropolitan newspapers, and its circulation is one of the widest. [...]

Its editorial staff is very talented [...]. Under Chang Myon's government, this newspaper was the one that demanded the unification of the country most actively, and at present it is also the strongest critic of the "military government," it published several anti-US articles. It set forth, by and large, Comrade Kim Il Sung's proposals of 15 August 1960 (confederation), and valued them highly.

3) Ryongnam Ilbo [...]

A newspaper of oppositional attitude, it was founded in October 1946 in the city of Taegu. It published news, which revealed the policies of the "military government" and the present South Korean situation, and it recently called upon the other newspapers not to humble themselves before the government. It happened several times that it rated the guerrilla struggles of the 1930s highly, and demanded the peaceful unification [of the country] on the basis of revolutionary traditions. Its negative side is that it disseminates "Yankee culture" in the same way as the other newspapers do.

4) Pusan Ilbo [...]

A Japanese newspaper before liberation, it was refashioned in 1946. Originally a mouthpiece of the Pusan commercial circles, it has gradually turned to politics. It is a many-sided and interesting newspaper, and in recent times it has published oppositional news more than once. Its finances are low.

5) Tonga Ilbo [...]

One of the oldest newspapers in Seoul, its first issue appeared on 1 April 1920. Under Japanese rule, then under Syngman Rhee, it was repressed several times; it was banned during World War II. Owned by a stock company, it is firmly funded, and its circulation is around 150 thousand.

It was a mouthpiece of the former Democratic Party and the landowners, and as such, it attacked the former Liberal Party of Syngman Rhee, it was a competitor of *Seoul Sinmun*. Its critical tone has become faint since the military coup, it expresses the interests of the landowners, and it deals with the inflow of foreign capital from this angle.

6) Kyonghyang Sinmun

A Catholic newspaper in Seoul, it was founded in the autumn of 1946 with moderate funds. It criticized Syngman Rhee, for which it was once suppressed. Under Chang Myon, it was a mouthpiece of the government, at present it has an anti-Communist disposition. Park Chung-hee aspires to make it, together with *Seoul Sinmun*, a government newspaper.

7) Choson Ilbo [...]

Founded in 1920, it is a newspaper with meager funds and a narrow circulation. Under Syngman Rhee, it had been neutral as a rule, in recent times it has cautiously criticized

the “military government” time after time.

It had been the official newspaper of the Japanese Government-General, then of the regime of Syngman Rhee, and for this reason its editorial office was set on fire by the people in April 1960. The newspaper of Park Chung-hee in recent times, it is firmly funded, but its influence is insignificant. It is a reactionary newspaper, but it is afraid of public feeling. [...] It appears in 100 thousand copies. [...]



DOCUMENT No. 29

Report, Embassy of Hungary in North Korea to the Hungarian Foreign Ministry, 27 August 1962

[Source: MOL, XIX-J-1-j Korea, 5. doboz, 5/bc, 0066/1962. Translated by Balazs Szalontai.]

Comrade V.P. Moskovsky, the new Soviet Ambassador, paid me an introductory visit on 22 August, which I returned 2 days later. The subject of our two conversations was, above all, the development of Soviet-Korean relations [...].

Before his departure for Korea, he was received by Comrade Khrushchev who gave him important guidelines concerning [Soviet] policies toward the KWP and the DPRK.

Comrade Khrushchev explained that, in his view, they had made a mistake when they applied *mechanically* [emphasis in the original] the criticism of Stalin’s personality cult to the Korean Workers’ Party. It was a well-known characteristic of Stalin’s working method that he did not travel to the provinces, he visited neither factories nor co-ops, he ran the country locking himself up in the center, so he had no contact with the masses. For instance, at the time of the [Great] Patriotic War, he never visited the front to inquire into the situation on the spot, he always directed the military operations exclusively from the center.

This cannot be said of Kim Il Sung. The person in question regularly tours the country, inquires into the work of the factories and co-ops, and, thus, he has quite extensive contacts with the workers and the peasantry. Kim Il Sung has certain new conceptions, and these may be illuminating for us as well. For instance, he holds a CC meeting on the spot in the countryside if that facilitates better understanding of the question of the day. (Such a case was the CC session dealing with the development of fruit production held on 7 April 1961 in the district of Pukch’ong.) For instance, said Comrade Khrushchev, one can approve of the resolution passed by the CC last November on the reorganization of industrial management, disregarding a few errors. The district directorates established for agricultural management also must be considered as positive.

It is also known, said Comrade Khrushchev, that in the policy of the KWP and the DPRK, one can usually observe a vacillation between the Soviet Union and China. If we do not

strive to improve Soviet-Korean relations, these will obviously become weaker, and at the same time the Chinese connection will get stronger, we will make that possible for them, we will even push them directly toward China. Comrade Khrushchev instructed Comrade Moskovsky to do his best to improve relations between the CPSU CC and the KWP CC, and between the two governments.

At the same time, Comrade Khrushchev sent a message to Kim Il Sung through the Ambassador, in which he wanted to communicate that the CPSU CC and the Soviet government considered that Soviet-Korean relations were making good progress, they [the Soviets] were satisfied with it, and they saw no obstacle to the further improvement of relations, indeed they strove for it.

When Comrade Moskovsky delivered Comrade Khrushchev’s message to Kim Il Sung, the latter cheered up and likewise stated that they were also satisfied with the development of relations between their respective countries, and he agreed with Comrade Khrushchev that they had to intensify their relations even further.

[...] Comrade Moskovsky told me the story of the proposal for a Korean visit by a Soviet party and government delegation headed by Comrade Khrushchev. [...] When they [the Soviets] made this proposal, Kim Il Sung had not yet fully recovered from his nephrectomy. But it had been more than probable, said the Soviet Ambassador, that it was not because of his illness that they [the Koreans] kept delaying the answer, but because Comrade Khrushchev’s visit to the Far East would have put China in an awkward position. Therefore, he went on, the reply was presumably delayed because they asked the Chinese about the issue. After 10 days of waiting, the Soviet comrades withdrew their proposal with the explanation that Comrade Khrushchev was about to make a tour in order to observe the defense system in the northern part of the country, and, thus, he would not have time to visit Korea this year. When the Ambassador paid Kim Il Sung an introductory visit, the latter apologized to him, saying that he had been ill that time and the Central Committee could not come to a decision quickly on this issue. At the same time he assured Comrade Moskovsky that since the physicians had already given him permission to work 4 hours per day and he did work, he would receive the visit of Comrade Khrushchev with pleasure this year or any time next year, whenever the Soviet government considered that appropriate.

In Comrade Moskovsky’s view, Comrade Khrushchev’s visit to Korea will take place in all probability in the coming year.

In the opinion of the new Ambassador, recently a certain improvement has become noticeable in Soviet-Korean relations. The staff of the Embassy and the military attaché are received by the Korean functionaries more promptly than before, and they are even allowed to inspect certain issues concerning the M[inistry] of D[efense] and the M[inistry] of I[nternal Affairs]. As mentioned above, Kim Il Sung received the message of Comrade Khrushchev with pleasure, he agreed with the idea of improving relations between the two countries. The Korean leaders also favorably received the Soviet

supplies intended to serve the DPRK's defense needs, including submarines and facilities strengthening the defense of P'yongyang. Since his arrival (on 9th August) he has already met Kim Il Sung two times, the latter is very friendly to him, and he hopes he will also succeed in establishing a good personal relationship with him.

Of his predecessor, Comrade Puzanov, he said that during his five-year stay here, he [Puzanov] had had a very good relationship with Kim Il Sung for more than 3 years. However, for approximately 9 months before his departure no opportunity to meet the Prime Minister had been given to him, and Comrade Puzanov's farewell visit to Kim Il Sung lasted merely 10 minutes. They [the Soviets] themselves do not know it either, but presumably something was not right between his predecessor and Kim Il Sung. It was the impression of the organs at home that the good relationship established earlier between them had deteriorated, particularly in the last year.

József Kovács
Ambassador



DOCUMENT No. 30

Report, Embassy of Hungary in North Korea to the Hungarian Foreign Ministry, August 1962

[Source: MOL, XIX-J-1-j Korea, 11. doboz, 24/b, 002304/1/RT/1962. Translated by Balázs Szalontai.]

At the end of July I had a long heart-to-heart talk with a close Korean friend of mine [...].

The Korean comrade told me that in his opinion, the primary reason for the current economic problems of Korea was bad economic planning [...]. In the course of drawing up national plans for each branch of industry, they naturally take the capacity of the individual enterprises and factories as their starting-point. Preparation of the plans takes place, by and large, in the following manner: the competent employees of the central organs visit the enterprise or factory in question, and the latter's director informs them about its capacity and potentialities. The comrades coming "from above" usually find that insufficient, and they generally turn to the workers in the matter of the next year's plan. With an adequate political arrangement, one can always find some so-called "huray" men, who assume production obligations that are well over what can be fulfilled [...]. The plan for the factory is made on the basis of these pledges, and the director, if he happens to protest, will be branded a "backward-looking" man, which often leads to his qualification as politically unreliable and to his dismissal. Of course, a plan drawn up in this way cannot be fulfilled either by the enterprise or the branch of industry, and this also affects the other branches, since the same unrealistic plan targets are given as index numbers

for the related industries as well.

The phenomenon described above is observable not only on lower levels but also on the highest level. My informant told me that recently, Comrade Deputy Premier Chong Chun-t'aek, the chairman of the National Planning Office, and several of his high-ranking subordinates, paid a visit to Comrade Kim Il Sung, and they frankly revealed the situation of the vynalon factory.

In accordance with the 1962 plan, the factory should produce 10 thousand tons of vynalon, but due to various technological and other difficulties, so far it has produced a mere 5 or 6 tons per day. According to my informant, Comrade Kim Il Sung received this information with exasperation, he literally chased Chong Chun-t'aek and the others out from his office. Several high-ranking employees of the National Planning Office were soon dismissed and expelled from the party.

The Korean comrade told me that although Comrade Kim Il Sung had good organizational skills, his general theoretical and economic learning was very scanty, he usually liked to do his work in a "military" way. My informant explained this as follows: Kim Il Sung compares every issue to a front-line battle, that is, we always face some enemy to be defeated (in the case of production, nature is the enemy). For this reason, Comrade Kim Il Sung cannot study certain economic issues concretely and closely, he regards the embellished reports as true. He [the informant] cited as an example that whenever it was announced to him [Kim Il Sung] that they wished to overfulfill the plan targets of the given factory or branch by so many percentages in the following plan period, he always took this approvingly and contentedly. As I already mentioned, it is very frequent that the plans lack a real basis, but this comes to light only along the way, which again ends in the replacement of the professional leaders.

"Unfortunately," my informant said, "certain members of the Political Committee take advantage of this weakness of Kim Il Sung, and they regularly mislead him." The Korean comrade cited Comrade Deputy Premier Yi Chong-ok, the chairman of the Committee of Heavy Industry, as an example [...]. He also remarked that in the opinion of Kim Il Sung and the Party Center, the issue of political guidance was of single and exclusive importance in solving any problem, that is, this slogan resulted in a disregard of professional considerations, and often in a disdain for the latter. Of course, this does not promote solving the issue of technical cadres, which is difficult in any case. The rise of careerists and people of that ilk, and the thrusting of the few technical experts into the background and their designation as politically unreliable on fictitious charges, is a common occurrence. At the same time, the Party Center and the central organs constantly send various teams of inspectors to each area or factory; there are often 5 or 6 different control teams in a place, who disturb the work there with their activity, undermine the authority of the local leaders, and so on.

The various and constant political campaigns do not promote work in all cases.

In what follows, the Korean comrade told me that on 19th June, a secret meeting had been held at the Party Center, and its subject was the preparation of the 1963 economic plan. Comrade Kim Il Sung also attended the meeting and made a speech. To the knowledge of my informant, the two focal points of the next year's plan are the development of agriculture and the development of the defense industry. The Korean comrades pay increased attention to the development of defense capabilities, they will begin the construction of a very large defense factory in the city of Kanggye, near the Korean-Chinese border, in the immediate future. In higher circles, the extension of the 7 Year Plan (1961-67) by one year, through the omission of the year of 1963 from the period of the 7-year plan [...], is taken into consideration. A decision has not yet been made, but according to my informant, the issue is not likely to be published at all. In his opinion, the omission of the coming year would lead to a "transition" year comparable to the year of 1960 [...].

According to my Korean friend, the six months' report that was recently published by the Office of Statistics reflects not just an embellished situation but a falsified one, since [...] the six main targets of this year's plan are unreal, and there is no guarantee at all of their fulfillment.

At the end of June, Comrade Kulaevsky, TASS's correspondent in Pyongyang, also informed me of what he had heard of the background of the slogan *charyok kaengsaeng*, i.e. thriving unaided. As is well-known, this slogan, which covers a highly autarkic and nationalist tendency, was set by Comrade Kim Il Sung at the plenum of the Korean Workers' Party CC last December, and since then it has become the cornerstone of Korean domestic and economic policies and ideological work. According to the information Comrade Kulaevsky got from a Korean party worker, the slogan is in fact nothing else but the reaction of the Korean party leadership to the XXIIInd Congress, the self-defense of the regime of personality cult. According to what we have heard, at the March CC plenum Comrade Kim Il Sung, while explaining the slogan, allegedly declared that "we must prepare for the contingency that the Soviet Union will cast us aside in the same way as happened to Albania."

This information is confirmed by other sources and by the fact that the Korean press published only a short piece of news about the last COMECON session that had been held in Moscow, and it did not publish the document on the basic principles of international division of labor. Otherwise, the press and party education do not study the issues of international division of labor; according to certain pieces of information we received, this issue is often branded a "revisionist" one.

Comment: Autarkic tendencies had been felt in the economy of the DPRK even earlier, but in 1960—presumably due to the "transition year"—some subsidence in this field and a more or less realistic attitude were observable. The Korean comrades distanced themselves from the various mistakes the Chinese comrades had made in economic policy, and they even gave their opinion of them [the mistakes] within the party, [informing functionaries] to middle-level cadres

inclusive. In the second half of last year, particularly since the December plenum, autarkic tendencies have again been felt to a great extent.

Regarding the relationship [of the DPRK] with China, one cannot say that their standpoint is identical in every respect, although Korean-Chinese relations have greatly intensified in the last year and a half. According to the Korean friend of mine whom I mentioned in the early parts of my memorandum, there is an undeniable identity of Korean and Chinese views in the line of foreign policy, which manifests itself primarily in that both regard the anti-imperialist struggle and the colonial-national [*sic*] liberation movement as the most important task of our time. At the same time, my friend also remarked that in the field of economic policy, the Koreans still did not adopt, for instance, Chinese agricultural policy, etc., and they had other reservations as well. Another Korean acquaintance of mine [...] recently [...] suddenly remarked: "Do not think that we follow the Chinese line in every respect."

For the time being, the Korean comrades—approx. since May—outwardly intensely emphasize the unity of the socialist camp and the friendship of its peoples, on the surface they make an effort to maintain a balance between the USSR and China (see the first anniversaries of the Treaties of Cooperation), and the F[oreign] M[inistry] behaves in a friendly manner towards the D[iplomatic] C[orps] in Pyongyang; as opposed to the past, programs are frequently organized; etc. It's just possible that it is the result of the visit of Peng Zhen (in April and May), who may have warned the Korean comrades for "tactical" reasons.

Károly Fendler



DOCUMENT No. 31

Report, Embassy of Hungary in North Korea to the Hungarian Foreign Ministry, 15 February 1963

[Source: MOL, XIX-J-1-j Korea, 6. doboz, 5/d, 0011/RT/1963. Translated by Balazs Szalontai.]

The December session of the KWP Central Committee passed a resolution to reinforce the defense of the country. According to the resolution, a strong defense system must be established in the whole country, the population must be armed, and the country must be kept in a state of mobilization.

From what I hear, at present large-scale work is going on throughout the country, in the mountains not only entrenchments but also air-raid shelters for the population are being built. As the Soviet Ambassador informed me, in a conversation between him and Kim Il Sung the latter explained that the geographical conditions of the country (mountainous terrain) gave a certain advantage to them in case of an atomic

war, for the mountains warded off the explosions to a substantial extent, and to wreak large-scale destruction in the country, many such bombs would be needed. The construction of these air-raid shelters is presumably related to this theory.

The Czechoslovak Ambassador informed me that the Koreans propagated a theory that cited the South Vietnamese events as an example. In that country, there is essentially a war against the Diemist authority and the American imperialist troops, and, as is well-known, the partisan units have succeeded in winning over more and more territory from the influence of the Diemist puppet government. In spite of this, the Americans make no attempt to use atomic bombs. Does anything support the assumption that the Americans would act otherwise in case of a South Korean war, then? It is obvious that there is nothing to support it.

Comrade Czechoslovak Ambassador Moravec also told me that at the dinner party Deputy Foreign Minister Kim T'ae-hui had had [...], Major General Ch'ang Chong-hwan, the Korean representative of the Panmunjom Armistice Commission, approached in him after dinner, and put the following question to him: "What would you do if some day the enemy took one of the two rooms of your flat?" "Whatever happens, I would resort to methods which did not run the risk of destroying the whole building or the whole city [...]" Comrade Moravec replied. Thereupon [Major] General Ch'ang threw a cigarette-box, which he had held in his hand, on the table, and left him standing. It was also Comrade Moravec who informed me that recently, the percentage of rice in the rations of Pyongyang residents had been reduced (hitherto approx. 50 percent of the ration had been given in rice). It was supplemented by maize and potato (80 decagram of rice = 2.5 kg of potato). Presumably they kept back rice so as to reserve it, the Czechoslovak Ambassador remarked.

At the same time, several articles were published in *Nodong Sinmun* and other Korean newspapers about the American imperialist theory of "local" and "special" wars, and the role of Asia in the strategic plans of the US military. [...]

I had a conversation with Comrade Soviet Ambassador Moskovsky about these issues. He told me the following: Recently he paid a visit to CC Vice-Chairman Pak Kum-ch'ol, to whom he forwarded a telegram from the competent Soviet authorities that invited several persons for a vacation in the Soviet Union. During his visit he asked Pak Kum-ch'ol what his opinion was of [...] the fact that Park Chung-hee and the South Korean military leaders recently had a talk with Meloy, the commander of the "UN troops," about the defense of South Korea. In the view of the CC Vice-Chairman, for the time being no adventurist military preparations were to be expected because of the following two reasons: 1) The transfer of power to civilian authorities was going on, that is, they were putting other clothes on the Fascist dictatorship, and they were busy with that. 2) The South Korean economic situation was difficult, and it was inconceivable under the circumstances that they would make serious preparations in order to pursue adventurist aims.

The CC Vice-Chairman also expounded their viewpoint concerning South Korea. After Syngman Rhee had been driven away, when Chang Myon was in power, but even as late as the beginning of last year, their view on the South Korean situation was that a successful opposition to the Fascist dictatorship, led by the students and the intelligentsia, was possible. By now it has become obvious that there is no chance of it, and Park Chung-hee has even succeeded in improving the country's economic situation to a certain extent. In these circumstances one cannot negotiate with the Fascist dictatorship on peaceful unification, and the process of the country's unification drags on.[...]

As regards the resolution of the CC, Comrade Moskovsky also thinks that arming the population and keeping it in a state of mobilization is a rather unusual measure in peacetime. The economic situation of both North Korea and China is quite difficult, they have a lot of problems. Under the circumstances a military action is hardly to be expected from them. Or on the contrary? "Would their economic difficulties possibly plunge them into some adventure?," Comrade Moskovsky asked. It is not easy to say yes or no to such questions. The first sentence of the resolution of the December plenum begins as follows: The development of the international situation is favorable to the Korean revolution. However, the remaining part of the resolution tries to refute that, while Pak Kum-ch'ol said they were not threatened by any southern adventurist provocation. If they look upon the situation in that light, [...] why are these unusual defense measures needed?

As is well-known, last year the Korean leaders had specially asked the Soviet government to have the issue of the withdrawal of American troops from South Korea put on the agenda of the 17th UN session, the Soviet Ambassador went on. But when the session opened, the government of the DPRK declared that the UN was not competent to deal with the Korean question. Unfortunately, the fact was that we often heard contradictory opinions here, Comrade Moskovsky said.

I agree with Comrade Moskovsky that the policy of the Korean leaders is not an unvarying and consistent one. Otherwise, these contradictory statements serve the aim that they [the North Koreans] can justify [their actions] in any event.

József Kovács
(Ambassador)

DOCUMENT No. 32**Report, Embassy of Hungary in North Korea to the Hungarian Foreign Ministry, 26 August 1963**

[Source: MOL, XIX-J-1-j Korea, 5. doboz, 5/bc, 0034/RT/1963. Translated by Balazs Szalontai.]

During the visit I paid to the Soviet Ambassador on 24 August, I was informed of the following:

A few days after Comrade Moskovsky returned from holiday, Romanian Ambassador M. Bodnăra° called on him and informed him about the following issues, which are of some interest.

To begin with, the Romanian Ambassador emphasized how impatiently he had been waiting for his [Moskovsky's] return, because he wanted to inform Comrade Moskovsky of the events that had taken place in his absence before he [Bodnăra°] would go on holiday (he will leave for Bucharest on 28th August). For in the last one and a half months, Bodnăras was received twice by Kim Il Sung, and they discussed the widening of Romanian-Korean relations and issues of party politics.

At the first meeting Kim Il Sung, giving [Bodnăra°] a very warm welcome, asked the Ambassador to ensure that the Korean government delegation, which had left for Romania in order to discuss economic issues, be received at an appropriately high level. Among the members of the delegation there were two high-ranking party functionaries, Kim Il Sung said; thus, it would be possible even for leading Romanian party functionaries to negotiate with the delegation. Bodnăras promised to convey all this to the higher organs.

The second meeting took place at Kim Il Sung's invitation, and it lasted for not less than four hours. Among others, Kim Il Sung told Bodnăra° that the relations between their countries were developing in a pleasing way, and they [the North Koreans] were seriously determined to widen these relations even further, in a multilateral form. They intended to increase the volume of trade between the two countries approx. *ten times* [emphasis in the original] as early as next year or the year after that. Romania has a developed manufacturing industry, and they (the Koreans) have also developed that branch of industry. In Kim Il Sung's view, a close cooperation should be established between the engineering industries of the two countries. It would be necessary for them primarily for two reasons: First, with Romanian assistance they could get new machines produced in the Soviet Union and the European socialist countries. Second, it is to be expected that as a consequence of the disagreements between the CPSU and the CCP, the Soviet Union will reduce the amount of machinery exported to the DPRK. In case of such cooperation, the Romanian comrades would make good the losses they may suffer as a result of these reductions.

Kim Il Sung also said that Soviet geologists had been searching for oil in the DPRK for a rather long time, but, unfortunately, they did not find oil. They [the North Koreans] are of the opinion that the Soviet geologists intention-

ally searched for oil in places where indeed no oil was to be found, and, thus, it was not accidental that the large-scale search for oil ended unsuccessfully. Now they ask for Romanian geologists for this purpose, and he assures the Romanian Ambassador that the Romanian geologists arriving here will get every possible assistance from the Korean authorities. Hopefully, their efforts will be more successful than those of the Soviet geologists.

In Kim Il Sung's view, at present Comrade Gheorghiu-Dej is the sole party and state leader in Europe that he (Kim Il Sung) can negotiate with as an equal partner. Therefore, he holds him and the other leaders of the Romanian party in great esteem.

Ambassador Bodnăra° told Comrade Moskovsky that in the course of their conversation, Kim Il Sung had criticized the Chinese leaders for the extremist tone they used in attacking the CPSU. As noted by the Romanian Ambassador, Kim Il Sung did not agree with the line of the CPSU either. The worsening of relations between the KWP and the CPSU began as early as 1956, with Mikoyan's visit to Korea. Mikoyan's role in the intra-party factional struggles had a negative impact on their relations with the Soviet leaders. Nevertheless, they had the factionalist Ch'oe Ch'ang-ik sentenced and executed; they may have acted otherwise if they had had the present perspective, Kim Il Sung said. In the opinion of Romanian Ambassador Bodnăras, Kim Il Sung is a clever man, he pursues a sensible foreign and domestic policy, and he personally agrees with this policy.

Then the Romanian Ambassador explained to Comrade Moskovsky the standpoint of their party. They disapprove of the policies of the Chinese leaders, but they do not follow the CPSU as closely as the Czechoslovaks do. Under the guidance of the Romanian Workers' Party, they also build socialism in Romania, for there is no other way and it cannot be otherwise, but they want to do it in their own special way. Making use of the advantages of their country, in a certain sense they want to reach socialism according to their own ideas.

Finally, Bodnăra° emphasized to Comrade Moskovsky that he still had a lot to say, but because of the lack of time, he could not go on now. He came to an agreement with Comrade Moskovsky to meet with him again on 27 August, when he would speak more about his negotiations with Kim Il Sung.

In the opinion of Comrade Moskovsky, it is perfectly plain that Bodnăra° never participated in the party movement, his familiarity with Marxist-Leninist theoretical issues is extremely weak, [the following part of the sentence crossed out in the original document] but he is a good hunter and angler. Comrade Moskovsky is of the opinion that one should look after the Romanian Ambassador. We must attempt to speak with him several times so as to steer him in the right direction.

József Kovács
(Ambassador)

DOCUMENT No. 33**Report, Embassy of Hungary in North Korea to the Hungarian Foreign Ministry, 2 October 1963**

[Source: MOL, XIX-J-1-j Korea, 13. doboz, 30/b, 005273/1/1963. Translated by Balazs Szalontai.]

As I already reported, the Korean organs frequently adopt an incomprehensible position on the question of so-called mixed marriages (expulsion of Korean husbands from the capital, restrictions on the movement of their wives, who are citizens of the Soviet Union or other fraternal countries, and so on). Recently the Soviet comrades experienced an even more offensive attitude on the part of the Koreans, about which Comrade Moskovsky told me the following:

Before the holiday of 9 September, one of the Soviet women, accompanied by two children, presented herself at the Soviet Embassy, her clothes torn and her body covered with bruises. The following had happened to her: two months earlier she had asked for permission to travel to Pyongyang from the countryside, for she wanted to leave for the Soviet Union for good. The provincial organs refused to fulfill her request. At first they refused her request without offering an explanation, then, before the holiday, they let the Soviet woman know that at the moment any travel to the capital was prohibited, neither Koreans nor foreigners were allowed to enter the capital during the preparations for the holiday of 9 September. However, the Soviet woman, a mother of two, was compelled to travel [to Pyongyang] due to her financial situation; therefore, she took a train to the centre [Pyongyang] in defiance of the prohibition. Following that, the provincial police took her to task on the train, and after a short argument, they began to beat her. The woman lost consciousness because of the strong blows, to the extent that she had to be brought round with water. After she had regained consciousness, the persons assaulting her left, and the people travelling on the train took care of her two children. She arrived in Pyongyang under such circumstances. The Soviet Embassy took her statements down, and a medical report was written about the woman's injuries.

Another case: recently two Soviet women applying for repatriation came to them. These two women had been prevented from travelling to Pyongyang for four months, while they [the North Korean authorities] made countless attempts to talk them into renouncing their Soviet citizenship and not returning to the Soviet Union, [alleging that] there was starvation in that country, the situation was extremely bleak and it was going from bad to worse, and now there was a relapse into capitalism in the Soviet Union; they cast such aspersions on the Soviet Union. "You should understand," the police explained to them, "that the situation will soon get much better here, Korea will unite in a short time, it will become a united and rich country, and the rapid improvement of living standards is to be expected." "Do not forget," the competent authorities went on, "that Korea is defended by [...] China, which is at present the strongest state in the world."

In recent months it happened four times, Comrade Moskovsky said, that Korean students asking for political asylum presented themselves at the Soviet Embassy. The Soviet comrades regularly order these "asylum-seekers" out of the Embassy, and in one case they even had to ask for the help of the police to this end. [...] the police later informed the Embassy that the student in question was insane and a mental hospital kept a record of him. In order to avoid the repetition of the cases described above, Comrade Moskovsky lodged an official protest with the competent Korean authorities. He emphasized that these [cases] were nothing a but provocations committed against the Embassy [...]. To this very day, he has not received a reply to his protest.

József Kovács
Ambassador

**DOCUMENT No. 34****Report, Embassy of Hungary in North Korea to the Hungarian Foreign Ministry, 30 December 1963**

[Source: MOL, XIX-J-1-j Korea, 10. doboz, 22/d, 0014/1963. Translated by Balazs Szalontai.]

On 29 December I met Comrade Moskovsky, who informed me of the following facts concerning his conversation with Pak Song-ch'ol.

The Korean government requested approval of its new ambassador to Moscow. Intentionally, they did not react to the request for two weeks, which made the Korean leaders rather nervous. Recently they finally replied [to the Koreans], and he met the Foreign Minister on this occasion. At the same time, Comrade Moskovsky took the opportunity to inform the minister about the December plenum of the CPSU CC. At first the minister made an attempt to evade this, but he failed.

The Soviet ambassador gave a short summary of Comrade Khrushchev's speech, and spoke about the great enthusiasm the report had elicited from the six thousand participants of the plenum. Pak Song-ch'ol then asked whether the Soviet government planned a raise in salaries or a cut in prices. Comrade Moskovsky informed him about what had been said by Comrade Khrushchev, who expounded in his closing speech that the leading comrades and CC members had discussed how to increase the living standards of the Soviet workers. Three alternatives cropped up. First, to raise the salaries. Second, to cut the prices. There is also a third solution, and although it is still just a plan, more and more CC members are favorably inclined towards it. For the point is that instead of the above two measures, the state would provide board and lodging for all children. In accordance with this plan, all urban and rural children up to the 8th grade of primary school would live in day nurseries, kindergartens

and day-care centres, and all related expenses, clothing included, would be met by the state. Of course, the parents, if they wished, would be allowed to take their children home every evening or on Sundays. This great action of the state would have several advantages; among others, the parents would be freed from all financial burden and partly from the responsibility for the rearing of their children. Another advantage would be that the education of children in state institutions and by trained pedagogues would rear a new generation, the man of Communism. All this took the Foreign Minister by surprise, he was obviously astonished and practically did not know what to reply.

Comrade Moskovsky then put a question to him about the achievements of 1963 and their plans concerning the next year. The minister informed Comrade Moskovsky that agricultural production was approximately on the same level as it had been last year. Industry generally fulfilled its plan, but they have a lot of problems. The backwardness of the Korean villages is a particularly burning question for the time being. While the urban workers get inexpensive flats, heating, lighting and clothing from the state, and enjoy what is provided by the theatres, cinemas, and other cultural institutions, all this is absent in the villages. The Korean peasants work from daybreak until nightfall, they have to pay for everything given to the cooperatives. In addition, the villages pay taxes for the work done by the machine-tractor stations. They pay for the equipment necessary for the cooperatives, they pay taxes for the water needed for irrigation, and they also have a number of other financial obligations to the state. The Korean villages are underdeveloped, there are no community centers or any similar institutions at their disposal. *At that time they adopted foreign experiences in the socialist development of Korean agriculture. They have come to the conclusion that this policy did not work in their country, it must be changed* [emphasis in the original]. A substantial part of the cooperatives, particularly the cooperatives in the highlands, got into debt to the state. As a consequence of such a great difference between cities and villages, the peasants flee the villages, everybody wants to go to the cities, which is, of course, an intolerable situation, because, for one thing, they do not intend to swell the urban population, and secondly, the food for the country's population must be produced, one cannot feed the people on coal and iron. Practice also proved that resettlement from the cities does not work either. The more disciplined part of the people, the party members maybe remain [in the villages], but the resettled non-members return clandestinely to the cities. As a consequence of all these facts, the party and government leaders came to the conclusion that the villages had to be fundamentally reorganized and the rural policies hitherto pursued had to be changed. They are considering that the same system which exists in the cities must be established in the villages too. Cultural institutions and state-owned houses have to be built, in other words, all the advantages enjoyed by the urban workers must be extended to the villages too. According to their conceptions, in the new villages, whose establishment is planned, a system of house-rents and all the

advantages provided by the state will be introduced for the peasantry too, similarly to the urban workers. They are aware that such a transformation of the villages requires huge investments. The issue of reducing industrial investments was brought up. The question was raised whether it was necessary for them to achieve the planned production of 2.5 million tons of steel and 500 million metres of textiles per year. Instead, it would be more sensible to limit steel production to 1 million tons and textile production to 300 million metres, and to invest the full amount of money saved this way in the villages. They will not set a limit to the exploitation of raw materials, they intend to develop it further, because these raw materials are exported too. Of course, the realization of all this is not just a financial problem. They know from experience that the Korean peasants are accustomed to their small, primitive houses. They were reared and raised there, and they do not want to move into new, modern houses. Of course, this is a subjective factor, but they have to take it into consideration in the plan aimed at the transformation of the villages, the minister said.

József Kovács
(Ambassador)



DOCUMENT No. 35

Report, Embassy of Hungary in North Korea to the Hungarian Foreign Ministry, 11 January 1964

[Source: MOL, XIX-J-1-j Korea, 5. doboz, 5/bc, 0015/RT/1964. Translated by Balazs Szalontai.]

On 10 January 1964 I invited Comrades Soviet Ambassador Moskovsky and Romanian Ambassador Bodnăra°, and their wives, to dinner. During the conversation that followed dinner, Comrade Moskovsky told me the following facts about Soviet problems which had arisen in years past in connection with the interpretation of the Korean political situation and perspectives.

The development of the Korean situation, and the fact that the Korean Workers' Party took sides with the Chinese party, took the Soviet comrades to some extent by surprise, because, among others, their former Ambassador, Puzanov (he was in Pyongyang between 1957 and 1962), failed to indicate, or underestimated, the tendencies and phenomena of Korean-Chinese rapprochement, which undoubtedly developed more and more as early as that time. Puzanov also took a negative view of the anxieties that were aroused by this development.

Comrade Moskovsky told me that after his arrival (in August 1962), on the basis of his conversations with the various Korean leaders, and his other impressions, etc., he had been obliged to form an idea [of the North Korean situation] that was entirely different from what he had been pre-

pared for, or what several high-ranking diplomats of the Soviet Embassy wanted to ram down his throat. With regard to that, Comrade Moskovsky blamed several employees of the Soviet Foreign Ministry and the Soviet Embassy (he mentioned former Counsellor Kryukov and current First Secretary Titarenko by name), who were assigned to Korea as many as two or three times, “got accustomed” to the 1954–1956 situation, and were incapable of comprehending the change that had taken place in the political situation [...]. Comrade Moskovsky emphasized that, as a consequence, a struggle had been waged at the Embassy with regard to the interpretation of the Korean situation. During the introductory and other visits he paid to the Korean leaders, here and there—in spite of the apparently friendly tone—various allusions, etc., were made by the Koreans. However, when he (Comrade Moskovsky) expressed concern about this at the Embassy, Kryukov and others did not attach importance to it, they attempted to jump down his throat (“Kim Il Sung is our man, I am on very good terms with him, we were hunting together,” “the minister was lying in a state of drunkenness under my billiard-table,” etc.). True enough, some of the diplomats in question have modified their standpoint in the meantime, among others Comrade Puzanov [...] signed a document, in which he had “enumerated but not proved and interpreted” a few phenomena. However, he was forced to do so by the party secretary and some other diplomats of the Embassy, who threatened him with taking him to task along the party line, and declared that if he did not sign it, they themselves would send it to Moscow!

Nonetheless, no substantial change took place after Comrade Moskovsky had sized up the situation. Moreover, when he, in his quarterly political report, was obliged to describe the problems related to the Korean political situation, it was the same employees, who had returned home but continued to deal with Korea, who evaluated his reports at the Foreign Ministry. They forwarded his reports with comments like “the Ambassador overstates the matter,” etc. This situation had developed so far that in the summer of 1963, on the occasion of his vacation, “I was compelled to appeal to the top man [Khrushchev]. I told him that either the Foreign [Ministry] should be sorted out, or I should be recalled and reinstated in my former position!,” Comrade Moskovsky said (previously he, as Deputy Premier of the RSFSR, had dealt with cultural and ideological issues). That settled matters, and the December 1963 plenum of the CPSU CC also proved him right.

In addition to the development of the chemical industry, the December plenum also dealt with questions of the inter-party debate, and it was Comrades Ponomarev, Ilyichev, and Andropov who gave an account of the latter. In his concluding remarks, Comrade Khrushchev also referred to these issues in more detail. The standpoint of the Korean Workers’ Party was also made known in these speeches, and Com. Puzanov’s responsibility [for misinterpreting it] became obvious. In the intermissions of the plenum, Comrade Moskovsky said, several CC members, particularly the Ambassadors, had surrounded Puzanov (at present he is

Ambassador in Belgrade), besieging him with their questions (“you [ty] always reported that you hunted, were on vacation, and drank with Kim Il Sung, and that everything was fine!”, etc.), and finally Puzanov did his best to spend the intermissions in the toilet!

Comrade Moskovsky told me that the six thousand participants of the plenum had reacted with deep indignation and a loud outburst to a piece of information given in the concluding remarks of Comrade Khrushchev: at that time, the Soviet government managed to [...] get Eisenhower to eliminate the humiliating fingerprinting that had been applied to Soviet citizens who entered [the United States], then recently Kim Il Sung introduced it with regard to the Soviet specialists! The Korean organs demanded fingerprints from the Soviet technical experts who worked at the construction of the radio station, the experimental nuclear reactor, and the weaving mill (!) which were built with Soviet assistance and co-operation, and they made them fill out a form of 72 questions, in which they had to describe their circle of relatives and friends in detail, with addresses! A Korean “colleague” told one of the technical experts that “if we cannot get you for some reason, we will get your relatives; this is why it [the questionnaire] is needed!”

[...]

József Kovács
(Ambassador)



DOCUMENT No. 36

Report, Embassy of Hungary in North Korea to the Hungarian Foreign Ministry, 11 January 1964

[Source: MOL, XIX-J-1-j Korea, 11. doboz, 24/b, 001767/1964. Translated by Balázs Szalontai.]

On 10 January I invited Comrades Soviet Ambassador Moskovsky and Romanian Ambassador Bodnăra^o to dinner. Comrade Moskovsky told me the following about the problems of the thermal station being built with Soviet assistance in Pyongyang.

On the basis of the reports of the Soviet technical experts involved in the construction [of the power station], last summer he [Moskovsky] was compelled to visit Comrade Kim Il and call his attention to the absence of safety equipment and the neglect of safety regulations at the construction of the thermal power station. Serious accidents were a common occurrence at the construction site, and all the warnings of the Soviet experts were in vain. On the Koreans’ part these issues were dealt with in an irresponsible and thoughtless way.

Kim Il received the information with thanks, and promised that he would submit the issue to the Council of Minis

ters. To Comrade Moskovsky's knowledge, this actually took place, but it has yielded very little practical results. Last December, 11 fatal accidents occurred at the site. Among others, five Korean workers fell down simultaneously from a height of 27 metres. Of them, three died instantly, while one got caught on a hook by the rib and, having not been taken off for a long time, bled to death. The fifth one got caught on a hook by the clothes, and he had been hanging there for hours until they took him off, but he became mentally unbalanced in his alarm.

In late December, Deputy Premier Nam Il, accompanied by the chairman of the city party committee, the ministers concerned, etc., visited the construction site. He informed the construction's Korean management about the personal instruction of Kim Il Sung: they were to put into operation the first section of the thermal power station by March 1964! Comrade Moskovsky told me that approx. 20 percent of the construction of this first section had been completed in one and a half years, and now they [the leadership] wanted to have the remaining part of the work completed in three months! No one dared to oppose the instruction, both the local and the ministerial leaders promised everything to Nam Il. After the meeting [...] [a North Korean engineer] went up to one of the Soviet comrades and stated: "Have you seen this comedy? Everybody knows it cannot be done, but no one dared to tell the truth!"—Comrade Moskovsky said that 1500 soldiers dressed in pufaika and 1500 workers dressed in linen suits (!) were working at the construction site. In the morning a 40-minute open-air political meeting is held, but during this time they are frozen so much that following the meeting, everybody runs to warm himself, and they begin working as late as around 11 o'clock.

Otherwise, the Korean press investigated issues of industrial safety several times in the last few months.

József Kovács
(Ambassador)



DOCUMENT No. 37

Report, Embassy of Hungary in North Korea to the Hungarian Foreign Ministry, 10 March 1964

[Source: MOL, XIX-J-1-j Korea, 5. doboz, 5/bc, 003819/RT/1964. Translated by Balazs Szalontai.]

As was also disclosed in the Soviet press, in early February Comrade Khrushchev received the Korean Ambassador, who was about to leave Moscow. Comrade Moskovsky said the following about the meeting:

Comrade Khrushchev asked the Ambassador about last year's harvest in Korea and their achievements in the field of

raising rice yields. Without thinking, the Ambassador stated that last year they had harvested on average 50 quintals of rice per hectare (whereas it is known that at the 1963 CC plenum, Kim Il Sung spoke about a rice harvest of 3.6 metric tons [per hectare]). Thereupon Comrade Khrushchev noted that in Kazakhstan, they [the Soviets] also had a kolkhoz where 55 quintals of rice per hectare had been harvested, and they achieved 45 quintals in the Ukraine. Otherwise, in the Soviet Union there was a law that stipulated that if a kolkhoz overfulfilled its plan in rice production, it could dispose freely of the grain produced in excess of the planned amount, it could make use of it as it wished.

The Soviet people followed with great attention the South Vietnamese people, who fought for their freedom and waged a war against the American troops and the army of the US-satellite South Vietnamese government, Comrade Khrushchev said. Why is there such a great silence in South Korea at the same time? Do the South Korean people perhaps expect democratic steps from the government, or have they already gotten tired of the struggle? Is the dictatorship of Park Chung-hee perhaps so severe that the masses are incapable of putting up any resistance?

The Ambassador told Comrade Khrushchev that at present, there were 6 million unemployed peasants in South Korea. Nonetheless, the organization of a resistance movement meets with difficulties, because there is no revolutionary party, or any leaders capable of organizing such a party, in the country.

Comrade Khrushchev: But Kim Il Sung told us there was a strong resistance movement in South Korea. Otherwise, it is precisely the difficult economic situation that makes the organization of such a movement possible.

Ambassador: The American imperialists station large troop contingents in South Korea, and these are equipped with modern armaments, they even possess atomic weapons. Evidently they frighten the people in this way.

Comrade Khrushchev: To begin with, there are no atomic weapons in South Korea. At that time, the Americans took atomic weapons to West Germany. Secondly, let us suppose that there were such weapons in the country [South Korea], this still would not account for why there is not any resistance movement. Atomic weapons are unusable in direct fighting, because the explosions and the subsequent radioactive pollution would cause damage to one's own troops as well. For that very reason, both the Soviet Union and America have phased out atomic weapons as a service. As you can see, you are misinformed about the equipment of the American troops stationed in South Korea. Now it is the missiles installed outside of the enemy countries that are the most suitable for carrying atomic and hydrogen bombs, these are developed by the Americans and the Soviet Union too. I can assure you, Comrade Khrushchev went on, that if the North attacked South Korea again, it is more than probable that the Americans would put into action nuclear weapons too. The Ambassador did not object to the term "attacked again".

Concerning the rest of the conversation, Comrade

Moskovsky said just that the Soviet Prime Minister had commented on the fact that it has recently happened frequently that anti-Soviet writings and articles were published in the Korean press, and the Soviet people rightly found that injurious. He asked the Ambassador about the reason for that. In the Soviet Union, no anti-Korean material is published in the newspapers and magazines. Of course, the Ambassador could not give any concrete answer to that.

József Kovács
(Ambassador)



DOCUMENT No. 38

Report, Embassy of Hungary in North Korea to the Hungarian Foreign Ministry, 1 June 1964

[Source: MOL, XIX-J-1-j Korea, 13. doboz, 27/a, 004092/1964. Translated by Balazs Szalontai.]

[...] A particularly conspicuous characteristic of the country's internal situation [emphasis in the original] is a general mistrust and suspicion, and an increasing "tension." As I already indicated, the February plenum of the KWP CC discussed—on the basis of a report prepared by its Vice-Chairman, Pak Kum-ch'ol—the question of "working with various strata of the population." The press did not set forth the report or the resolution, but recently we chanced upon a secret party publication that outlined the issue discussed at the plenum. To our surprise (and to the amazement of the Soviet comrades), by the term "various strata of the population" they essentially mean the "untrustworthy" strata and elements. It is clear from the brochure that the plenum pointed out the following: in the DPRK, "the composition of the population is rather complicated," and, therefore, "the work to be done with the various strata of the population is an important factor in the *organizational policy* [emphasis in the original] of our party." (Pak Kum-ch'ol deals with organizational issues.) Although the report emphasizes the importance of educational and re-educational work, and of the method of persuasion, there is no doubt that it is, after all, a task of an organizational, rather than of a canvassing, nature. (According to unsubstantiated information, organized relocation on a large scale—carried out under the pretext of "reducing the population of the capital"—is to be expected.) It has come to light that in the 20th year of people's power, 10-12 years after the war, a substantial part of the population is categorized according to the following guidelines:

- 1) The remaining family members of those who fled to the South in the course of the war;
- 2) the former members of the counter-revolutionary detachments organized during the temporary occupation [of

the DPRK], and their families;

- 3) former [North Korean] prisoners-of-war, small and medium merchants, former clergymen, and their family members;
- 4) those who moved from South Korea to the North, old intellectuals and their family members, and those who returned home from Japan.

The divided character of the country indeed justifies certain measures. Nevertheless, the suspicion toward the former prisoners-of-war and those who had voluntarily joined the People's Army during the temporary liberation of South Korea [...] is incomprehensible. Although the report emphasizes that all these strata must be involved in the construction of socialism, it also points out that "they must be kept under surveillance in everyday life," "one must keep an eye ... particularly on their children," [...].

József Kovács
(Ambassador)



DOCUMENT No. 39

Report, Embassy of Hungary in North Korea to the Hungarian Foreign Ministry, 29 June 1964

[Source: MOL, XIX-J-1-j Korea, 5. doboz, 5/bc, 004558/RT/1964. Translated by Balazs Szalontai.]

On 26 June of this year Yi Chu-yon, an alternate member of the KWP PC and Deputy Prime Minister, received Comrade Moskovsky, and the Soviet Ambassador briefly informed us about the following issues that were brought up in the course of the conversation, which are of some interest.

"We are in the middle of the year," Yi Chu-yon began to speak, "and it appears to me that it would be appropriate to discuss next year's exchange of goods. For one thing, the Soviet foreign trade organ has not given 2000 metric tons of cotton to Korea in the current year, and instead of 200 thousand tons of magnesite clinker, they were willing to take a mere 60 thousand tons. Of the offered 80 thousand tons of barite, only 20 thousand tons were recorded in the minutes. They had considerably reduced the purchase of Korean chinaware, then they did not buy machine-tools either from the DPRK. Such measures mean that the Soviet Union has extended the interparty disagreements to the state line."

"Up to the present," the Soviet Ambassador replied, "the Soviet party and state leaders have not mentioned anywhere that there were any disagreements between the CPSU and the KWP; thus, nothing was to be extended to the state line. You are the first to inform me about the existence of such a disagreement, you [the North Koreans] are speaking of it; thus, it is also you who extend it to the state line."

The Korean government, Yi Chu-yon went on, had de-

veloped the production of magnesite clinker essentially at the disposal of the Soviet Union, and now the Soviets caused great difficulties for them [the North Koreans] by not purchasing it; they had been compelled to halt production in several mines.

Comrade Moskovsky reacted to that in the following manner: the Soviet Union never asked the government of the DPRK to develop the production of magnesite clinker; otherwise, he (the Soviet Ambassador) knew very well that production had not been halted in any of the magnesite mines [...] it was rather obvious that she [the Soviet Union] purchased goods they could really make use of. The Soviet organs would not take over magnesite sand in the future either.

As was well-known, they did not purchase Korean machine-tools, because the latter's quality was inferior to that of the Soviet machines, and the Soviet Union had no need of museum pieces.

As Ambassador to Pyongyang, Yi Chu-yon went on, he [Moskovsky] could see with his own eyes that they [the North Koreans] did not live well, food was scarce, clothes were in short supply, they worked hard, they made strenuous efforts, they even sacrificed their free time to develop the country and increase the living standards of the people. They wanted to become civilized people, they wanted to reach communism together with the socialist countries.

Unfortunately, Comrade Moskovsky replied, he did not know the situation of this place, for the Korean organs did not allow him to contact the people, they kept him away from the population. Nor had he, the Ambassador of the Soviet Union, any contact with the members of the Korean government; for instance, Kim Il Sung received even Japanese prostitutes, but he had not been willing to meet him [Moskovsky] for more than a year. They [the North Koreans] indeed worked hard, he could see that; the people were subjected to the torment of spending 8 hours at work and 4 hours at meetings every day. They [the Soviet diplomats] got information about the host country almost exclusively from the press. He also saw that *Nodong Sinmun*, the party's central newspaper, had been hurling abuse at the Soviet Union for a year under such terms as "certain people" and "certain countries".

Yi Chu-yon then presented the affair in such a way as though the Soviet Union and the Comecon countries (he listed them by name) had not been willing to purchase anything but non-ferrous metals from Korea; thus, they wanted to force the DPRK to remain a producer of raw materials and agricultural goods. Certain people lined their pockets through the trade with Korea.

Comrade Moskovsky repudiated this statement by saying that it was solely the inferior quality of Korean manufactured goods and other industrial products that prevented them from being purchased in larger quantities. Exchange of goods with Korea amounted to a mere 1.8 percent of the Soviet Union's foreign trade. "Do you not think," Comrade Moskovsky asked, "that the statement [accusing] the Soviet Union of lining her pockets through this trade sounds ridiculous in the light of such an insignificant percentage?"

The Deputy Premier brought up the issue of the payment by installments of the loans the Soviets had granted [to the DPRK]. (This amount would run to approx. 12 million rubles next year, then it would rise by 5-10 million in the coming years.) The Korean government could provide the payment of the next installments only through the export of magnesite clinker and milled barite. If the Soviet Union did not accept these materials, it would deal a heavy blow to the economy of the DPRK. This would obviously prove that the Soviet leaders extended the disagreements to the state line. The Korean Workers' Party had its own political line, and it intended to proceed along this line. (Comrade Moskovsky asked Yi Chu-yon to send the Koreans present out of the room, and when the latter fulfilled the request, Comrade Moskovsky also sent out the employee of the commercial branch agency who had accompanied him.) They continued the conversation with two interpreters present.

"Now let's talk with each other as Communists," Comrade Moskovsky began to speak. "First of all, you have no political line of your own, it is the Chinese policy that the leaders of the KWP imitate and carry out. We have been observing speeches about the alleged [...] attempts at the exploitation of Korea for approximately a year. Would it not be more appropriate if the high-ranking economic leaders, say, Deputy Premiers, of the Soviet Union and the DPRK came together to discuss and clarify the alleged grievances and the problems you perceive in our economic relations?"

Thereupon, Yi Chu-yon declared that the time had not yet come for such a negotiation.

"It seems that you are afraid of such a discussion, and at present the Chinese would not allow you to meet the representative of the Soviet Union," the Soviet Ambassador replied. Comrade Moskovsky then handed over the copy of the letter the Soviet government had sent to China with regard to the 1965 meeting of African and Asian Premiers. He asked Yi Chu-yon whether the latter wanted him to set forth orally the content of the letter. The person in question declined, then added that it must have been full of aspersions.

The leaders of the CPSU and the Soviet government, Comrade Moskovsky remarked, did not cast aspersions on anyone but substantiated their message by realistic arguments based on the principles of Marxism-Leninism. Casting aspersions was solely a habit of the weak who could not bring up convincing arguments.

With this, the three-hour debate came to an end.

József Kovács
(Ambassador)

DOCUMENT No. 40**Report, Embassy of Hungary in North Korea to the Hungarian Foreign Ministry, 1 October 1964**

[Source: MOL, XIX-J-1-j Korea, 5. doboz, 5/bc, 005971/1964. Translated by Balázs Szalontai.]

On 24 August, the Provisional Chargé d'Affaires of the Soviet Embassy, Comrade Pimenov, told Comrade Fendler that recently problems had recently arisen in Soviet-Korean cooperation for lumber. In accordance with the five-year agreement signed in 1957, the DPRK lumbers free of charge, with its own workforce, in the Amur region. In 1961, during Kim Il Sung's visit to Moscow, the agreement was extended, at the request of the Korean side, for another 10 years. The DPRK has hitherto lumbered approx. 2 million cubic meters of wood, and at present there are still approx. five thousand Koreans working in the forests around Khabarovsk. In the last months the Korean workers and their leaders have been behaving more and more provocatively, they are violating the rules aimed at the protection of forests, and the articles of the intergovernmental agreement, etc. The competent Korean authority is intentionally raising difficulties in the work with the local Soviet organs, and finally the head of the Korean enterprise made an ultimatumlike statement, according to which they would cancel the agreement unless the Soviet side fulfilled a good many demands of theirs. At the same time, they are taking advantage of the relaxed rules of border crossing to ship large quantities of vodka, apple, salt, Japanese goods, transistor appliances, etc., from the DPRK for the workers, and the Korean workers are carrying on a speculative trade with the local population by selling these goods. This had assumed such proportions that the local organs were obliged to report it to Moscow. On 17 August the Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister sent for the Ambassador of the DPRK, and gave him a verbal warning; at the same time, he reminded him that since it was an intergovernmental agree-

ment they were talking about, the government of the DPRK should officially confirm the statement of the aforementioned managing director, and in this case, if the DPRK wanted to cancel the agreement, the Soviet side would not make difficulties over that. Deputy Minister Kim Yong-nam also sent for Comrade Pimenov about the issue, and he blamed the Soviet organs for the difficulties.

On 8 September Comrade Pimenov also informed Comrade Fendler about the fact that three days ago Deputy Minister Kim Yong-nam had again sent for the Soviet Chargé d'Affaires, and handed him the letter of the Korean government, in which they proposed the cancellation of the agreement, laying the blame on the Soviet side.

Following that, Comrade Moskovsky told me that recently he had met Deputy Minister Kim Yong-nam. The Deputy Minister raised the issue of the cancellation of the Khabarovsk lumbering agreement [...].

Thereupon the Soviet Ambassador replied the following: [...] Unfortunately, the competent Korean authorities took unfair advantage of the helpfulness of the Soviet Union.

For one thing, recently the Korean lumberers have been exploiting the forests really ruinously, they are cutting down even the saplings, and, as a consequence, it will take a long time to reforest the area.

Secondly, the Korean organs took advantage of the relaxed rules of border crossing [...] to smuggle in Chinese anti-Soviet propaganda material, and they also involved the employees of the Korean Consulate in Nakhodka in that. [...]

Finally, Comrade Moskovsky emphasized to the Deputy Minister that if this activity continued, the Soviet organs would be obliged to close the Korean Consulate in Nakhodka and arrest certain persons so as to put an end to these unfriendly, destructive activities against the Soviet people.

József Kovács
(Ambassador)

Disclosure of True History after Fifty Years: The First Collection of Russian Archival Materials on the Korean War (Chinese Edition) Published

26 July 2003 was to be the fiftieth anniversary of the signing of the Korean War armistice agreement. The war impacted the whole world, and, consequently, for a half-century since its conclusion politicians, military experts, diplomats, and historians in many countries have published memoirs and monographs to remember, to comment on, to chronicle, and to debate the event. This has resulted in abundant achievements of scholarly research. Nevertheless the most valuable and revealing histories of the war have been written only since the 1990s. The obvious reason is that the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China, two key participants of the war, long kept their relevant historical records behind the "iron curtain." Not until more than a decade ago did the Russian and Chinese archives begin to declassify some of these records, which allowed the hitherto well-kept secrets to enter the public domain.

To mark the fiftieth anniversary of the Korean War armistice agreement, the Modern History Institute of Academia Sinica in Taiwan published a documentary collection, *Chaoxian Zhanzheng: Eguo Dang'anguan de Jiemi Wenjian* (The Korean War: Declassified Documents from the Russian Archives). These archival materials are principally from the Presidential Archives and the Foreign Policy Archives of the Russian Federation, the Russian Center for the Preservation and Study of Documents of Recent History, Storage Center for Contemporary Documentation, and the Central Archives of the Russian Defense Ministry. The collection includes correspondences and meeting minutes between Soviet, PRC, and North Korean leaders and government branches, meeting minutes, resolutions, reports and briefings of the Soviet Communist Party and government apparatuses, and telegrams and letters between the Soviet embassies in the PRC and North Korea and relevant government agencies at home. In total the collection publishes more than seven hundred documents, including 554 principal pieces plus appendixes. In addition, the publication is enhanced with biographies, a chronology, and an introductory essay, "The Soviet Union and the Korea War." The two-volume set consists of more than eight hundred thousand Chinese characters.

The compiler of the documentary collection is Shen Zhihua, an independent scholar based in the PRC. Since the early 1990s when Mr. Shen switched from the arena of business to the field of scholarship, he has undertaken study of Soviet Union history and Cold War history with tremendous enthusiasm. In the past decade, he organized and sponsored researchers to travel to Russia and the United States, and collected some 15,000 pieces of Russian archival materials. Under the aegis of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, Mr. Shen led a project group that translated and compiled more than 8,000 Russian documents. In August 2002 these documents were published by Shehui Kexue Wenxian Chubanshe (Beijing) in thirty-four volumes, under the title, *Sulian Lishi Dang'an Xuanbian* (Selected Compilation of Soviet Historical Archives). But, because the Korean War has remained an extremely sensitive topic in the PRC, this 2002 publication, even in the form of "internal publication," could not include any document on the subject. Some of the Russian documents on the Korean War have been released in various publications in Russian, English, and Korean languages, but not in Chinese. To give Chinese researchers access to these valuable historical records, the Institute of Modern History of Academia Sinica decided to publish all these in one collection.

As of today, only a small number of Russian documents on the Korean War have been published in their entirety through scholarly articles in Russia. South Korean press released some two hundred Russian documents on the Korea War, which were a gift from Russian president Boris Yeltsin to Korean president Kim Young-sam. But these were edited and were not the originals. In the United States altogether about two hundred documents were translated and published in professional journals at different times. These have been widely used by English-speaking scholars. The Chinese version of Russian archives to be published in Taipei therefore is the first documentary collection devoted to the subject of the Korean War. Its content is more focused and complete than any other previous publications in any language. It is hoped that its publication will help advance the study of the Korean War and the Cold War in Asia in the Chinese-speaking world.

For further information, contact Shen Zhihua: e-mail: shenzhih@public.bta.net.cn; TEL: (86-10-89232236, 68150750; FAX: 86-120-89232237