

Panel V

The Two Koreas and the United Nations

Chair: *Sun Jounyung*

Provocateurs: *James Hershberg, Hong Seukryule*

SUN: I present to you a chronology of some of the events which had taken place during the designated period, which are interrelated in one way or another. The Nixon Doctrine in 1969, which was followed by the withdrawal of 20,000 U.S. troops from South Korea, and then the PRC's—China's—return to the United Nations in October 1971 and the assumption of the position as one of the five permanent members of the Security Council. In February 1973, the South Korean government formally announced its abandonment of the Hallstein Doctrine. And then in June 1973, President Park Chung Hee announced the so-called June 23 Declaration, whereby South Korea proclaimed that it would seek diplomatic relationship with states having different political ideologies and/or social orientations, and also a willingness to have both Koreas enter the United Nations as separate entities. And of course, the next day Kim Il Sung rejected South Korea's offer to enter the United Nations as separate entities, because that would, from North Korea's perspective, perpetuate the division of the Korean Peninsula.

And there's one event which is very meaningful: the offensive made by North Korea on multilateral fronts rather than on bilateral fronts. That is to say, late in 1973, North Korea applied for membership in the UN specialized agency, the WHO [World Health Organization], but the South Korean government was not prepared for such a sudden offensive coming from North Korea, so the South Korean government was convinced that the monopoly of South Korea's membership in specialized agencies would continue even though the challenges from North Korea came. But without knowing the rules of procedure at the time, at the

final stage, the USSR proposed a secret vote, so South Korea was caught off-guard, and then the admission of North Korea to the WHO was realized. That was really a serious blow and a shock to the South Korean government, which did not know that North Korea would come forward on the multilateral organization front.

Furthermore, if I am to be brief, in 1975 so many things happened at the same time or consecutively: the U.S. was pulling out from Vietnam, the collapse of South Vietnam took place in the Spring of 1975, then North Korea was admitted to the Non-Aligned Movement at the Coordinating Committee of the Non-Aligned Movement in the wake of the fall of South Vietnam, and then North Korea moved forward and became a full member of the Non-Aligned Movement, while South Korea was defeated in at the Lima, Peru meeting. And for the first time in the history of the United Nations, two resolutions, respectively, representing South Korea's position and North Korea's position, two resolutions were adopted at the United Nations. Of course this was an anomaly and at the same time represented the change of the situation in favor of North Korea in the wake of the fall of South Vietnam and the admission of North Korea to the Non-Aligned Movement.

So I will stop here and I would like to invite Professor Hershberg to be the first provocateur.

HERSHBERG: My assignment is to be a provocateur on issues relating to the United Nations and the Korean question. I also want to use the United Nations issue as sort of a stand-in for the international system and the international context in which this Korean story takes place and to raise also a couple of broader issues for the participants who were focused very much on the Korean subject. This is a very emblematic representative example of something that pops up repeatedly throughout the Cold War, and now in teaching and writing of Cold War history, of a regional dispute or crisis that takes place in the context of broader Cold War issues. And it's obviously a mistake to simply attribute what happens in a regional context to the East-West relationship, or in this case, to triangular relationships, but also it is myopic simply to focus on regional dynamics while not examining its interrelationship with the Cold War and broader international affairs dynamics. Yet it is a sort of vacuous truism to say they're both important. The challenge is to

understand the relative weight and the interaction between these different levels of understanding, these different narratives of history. And so moving to the United Nations, as a sort of a stand-in for the broader Cold War and triangular relationship context of this story, I would be very interested if some of those who were deeply involved in the Korean story would comment on how much weight Cold War historians should give to the Korean dynamic as compared to the broader international affairs context. Is this a development in terms of the Korean-Korean dialogue and some of the other shifts in that relationship that would have taken place anyway regardless of some of the more dramatic breakthroughs in terms of the Sino-American opening and the emergence of the more full-blown U.S.-Soviet détente? Or did these take place more or less solely in the context and as a result of the Sino-American shock in the summer of 1971, and closely related to developments on that broader sphere?

Also, I think the most fascinating story or moment in this United Nations story is President Park's new approach of June 23, 1973, reversing decades of policy and supporting the idea of joint membership for North and South Korea. There's another source that I just want to point out to you, anyone who was in Washington or in the United States would remember that the entire country was obsessed with something very different which probably accounts for how little general attention was played to this. This was the same week that John Dean began testifying before the Irving Committee on the Watergate Affair and the country was entirely riveted. However, Alexander Butterfield did not reveal the existence of the White House tapes until two weeks later, July 14, 1973, to be specific. So it would be very easy to check the very detailed outlines of the White House tapes to see to what extent there was any discussion in the White House of President Park's very dramatic policy shift. Those tapes should exist. Whether they penetrated Richard Nixon or Henry Kissinger's consciousness if they were discussed would be very interesting.

Now, of course, this brings to a broader issue the question of the Park initiative and why it failed. When I teach Cold War History classes I tell my students who weren't lucky enough to have lived through the Cold War like many of us were that if they wanted to feel what the Cold War felt like there are only two places left to do really it; one is Korea and one is Cuba. Those confrontations, of course, were

not resolved during the détente period, but both have fascinating stories largely hidden of attempts to normalize those disputes or at least U.S. relations, both with Cuba and North Korea. And of course that would have been the effect to some extent of North Korea accepting that initiative. And one thing that would be fascinating to explore further is to get more Soviet and Chinese sources to see, did they automatically back Kim Il Sung's rejection of Park's initiative? I mean within ten hours the documents show Kim rejected that, talked only about North Korea joining the United Nations as part of a united Korea. Implicitly he confessed error because eighteen years later of course the two Koreas did join the United Nations at the end of the Cold War.

Was this a matter of disagreement? Was this a matter of discussion? Of course it's hard to tell what was going on inside the black box of Pyongyang, but there is a record of the Soviets and to some extent the Chinese not being thrilled with everything that Kim Il Sung was pushing. It would be fascinating to see if that was the case. And there's another interesting context to raise, which is the story of divided nations during the Cold War and UN membership. Now of course Park's initiative takes place in the context of the German-German agreement for the two Germanys to enter the UN and that is fascinating to compare. But also sort of a footnote to the Vietnam War is that in 1957 the Soviet Union proposed simultaneous entry into the UN for both South and North Vietnam, and Hanoi was absolutely furious at this and the Soviets had to back pedal and drop the proposal. Did they learn a lesson? Did they not even question this? In other words should this be regarded in the Soviet bloc as a missed opportunity for North Korea to gain the international legitimacy, in some respects, that it craves to this day, and has said as indicated is its main objective?

That brings another provocation to all of the participants, especially the Koreans; what did the United Nations mean at this point? When the story starts, the U.S. view in 1970-1971 is that the Korean issue isn't even something that they want to come up in the UN. They talk of it as the "Oh hell, not again" subject in the UN. They view it as not anything that is relevant. In fact, during this period obviously the United Nations Command and UNCURK [UN Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea] fade away.

O'DONOHUE: The United Nations Command has not faded.

HERSHBERG: Well, to some extent; it is recognized as being less and less relevant compared to the bilateral alliance and obviously the Korean War memories are fading. To what extent does the UN membership really matter? Is it a symbolic issue? Is this a serious background or just a peripheral issue especially to the Korean participants?

Finally, to the Koreans it would be fascinating to know more about Park's initiative in June 1973. Did he take it because he was confident that the North Koreans would reject this? In one conversation with Marshall Green I believe he indicates that Kim will probably reject this but that is not a true expression of how he feels. Was this taken, in other words, for tactical reasons in order to justify the more hardline policies of Seoul or was it taken for genuine strategic reasons believing that this would be a good way to move forward in the context of the changed regional and international setting? In other words, how should we understand Park's flexibility—genuine or tactical in this respect?

I think I'll leave it here for some issues both to understand what is happening in Seoul but also especially for Ambassador Mitov, was this something that was truly a consensus on the communist side? No one wanted to be more soft line than Kim. Or was this something that was actively disagreed with but it was felt that there was no alternative but to go along with Kim's hardline rejection of this idea about joint dual membership? Thank you.

HONG: My question is directed to the veteran diplomats from the U.S. and centers on the importance the U.S. placed on the discussions that were held in the UN regarding the entry of South Korea along with North Korea. Leading up to 1973, on an almost annual basis, Korean issues were dealt with and discussed on the UN floor; however, it does not seem as if there was any particular year in which Korean issues surfaced as being important. Although not dealt with at length, I don't think Korea had been a trivial issue either on the UN floor. For example, in 1972, it seemed that the U.S. was reluctant to discuss the Korean issues in the UN.



LEE HURAK AND PAK SEONGCHEOL

Documents show that in 1972 [Chinese Premier] Zhou Enlai had insisted strongly that Korean issues be dealt with in the UN and in response Kissinger indicated that the U.S. had an upcoming presidential election in November of 1972. So looking into the mind of Kissinger, perhaps he felt that discussing Korean issues in the UN could somehow have some sort of an influence on the presidential election in the U.S. Having said that, my question would be how much importance did Korean issues really hold if this was to be discussed in the UN?

The second question relates to the June 23 Declaration in Korea. In the June 23 Declaration, the South Korean government had suggested that there would be a simultaneous entry of the Koreas into the UN. What was the response from the international community at the time? Now the decision by the South Korean government to even suggest that the South and North Korea together enter the UN was a very difficult decision, because even as late as in the 60s anyone who had suggested anything close to it would be sent to prison. But I personally don't think that the simultaneous entry of South and North Korea into the UN was received all that warmly by the international community.

And looking at the voting records of the UN, as Ambassador Sun had indicated, in 1974, the records show that both for and against North Korea seems to come out fifty-fifty. And even as late as 1975 there was a resolution in support of North Korea which had passed the UN. So in light of what had taken place I think that perhaps it was not received all that warmly by the international community when simultaneous entry had been suggested.

SUN: One thing we have to bear in mind in discussing the United Nations issue for that period is that since Korea was not a member of the United Nations, the United States was inevitably playing the leading role.

HERSHBERG: Just very briefly precisely on this issue I think arguably the most important document on the U.S. position is a document from August 24, 1973, a memorandum from Henry Kissinger to the Secretary of State, who would be himself a few weeks later:⁷ "Regarding the simultaneous admission of both Korea to U.N. membership we should try to persuade South Korea to press its campaign less vigorously in order to avoid stimulating the opposition to make greater efforts in support of a hostile resolution on the UNC [United Nations Command] and

U.S. Forces in the ROK. The U.S. should be prepared to give modest support to the ROK's efforts to secure simultaneous admission in order (a) to support our Korean ally, (b) to avail ourselves of the tactical leverage this issue can provide against possible opposition efforts to press for a hostile resolution on the UNC and U.S. Forces in the ROK." The point being, I don't think there was any serious domestic political component, even though the 1972 election was of course the most overriding thing, but the Korean issue was not on the public radar scope during this period.

LEE: I think one of the important things that we should bear in mind in discussing the issue of dual admission by the two Koreas into the United Nations, as proposed by the June 23 Declaration, was that this June 23 Declaration enunciated by South Korea was rather a defensive and reactive exercise. It's not a proactive and it's not an offensive exercise. I think that is one thing which we should give consideration to.

O'DONOHUE: I think in this whole period, in the UN context, the United States and Korea were seen as receiving less support. There were several aspects to it; one was the détente in the sense of you should have both sides in, and so each year we were both expending more energy for a result that was in a sense defense of the status quo. We even had at one point the term "non-automaticity," which was the effort to get the item off the agenda. These were, I think fair to say, all tactical. And as Mr. Lee said at the time, I don't remember us seeing the president's announcement as profound, but rather a development as the South realized it should show more flexibility. I think the Kissinger memo is really a tactical one, then; how do you manage this issue in which we saw eroding support for our position? So from my perspective, and Don [Picard] or Ward [Thompson] might have different views, it was an annual exercise taking immense energy for a result that at best lasted twelve months and you were back there again. And President Park's gesture was one that took the South Korean side to a position that was far more defensible rather than a breakthrough.

LEE: One other point, this was the time when Non-Aligned Movement was in full swing and the Non-Aligned Movement was more under the control and influence of China. The United States was rather very limited in influencing the Non-Aligned Movement, so much so that the Non-Aligned Movement nations accounted for quite a number of votes, because of which the Republic of Korea had to find a situation more in its favor when the debate in the UN took place.

O'DONOHUE: And we were finding our traditional lives less enthusiastic, more ready to move towards recognizing both. So in this period I think our whole approach was a tactical one. The concerns Secretary Kissinger expressed related to a concern that there would be a concerted effort to highlight the U.S. forces in Korea, which we didn't want, and the UN command at the same time we were ready to bring UNCURK to its end. But as I said in that period, this was heavily a tactical-related to how do you get the votes, what makes sense, can we get the issue off the agenda so we don't have to do these things.

THOMPSON: I want to pick up on what Ambassador O'Donohue said but from a slightly different direction. First of all, I recall Dr. Lee's comment about perceptions. I'm no historian, but my impression is that diplomats deal very largely in perceptions. If you look through the documents our reporting is of not so much the facts, but of people's and nation's perceptions of the facts. I contributed to quite a lot of these voluminous papers and others during my career, but I had a different experience when I went to work for the Intelligence and Research Bureau, which Mr. Picard also worked for at some point. We were taught in writing a specific document for the Secretary of State and the President to start with a conclusion, whereas most of your work is you build-up to the conclusion. So we start with the conclusion. If I could analyze this situation, the conclusion that we wanted to reach was that the treaty relationship between the United States and South Korea was firm, unassailable, unalterable, because our objective, our goal was security as was that of the government of South Korea. However, I think the government of South Korea had some doubts, even about how long the United States would remain, because there was quite often mention of great powers shifting their in-

terests and perhaps marginalizing this whole area, so I can understand that there was some concern.

So we look at the different aspects that you build out from when you come to this core value, which Ambassador O'Donohue mentioned, the presence of U.S. forces, not necessarily connected to the treaty relationship, but very, very important from the point of view of the government of the ROK. And then the United Nations Command; building out the armistice relationship, the machinery, the operational control of Korean forces, which is important in a lot of respects that we don't have to go into right here, and then the special relationship that Korea had with the United Nations, which included in many ways the legitimacy of the Republic of Korea. And finally you get out far enough to come to the Korean question in the United Nations. All of this was to a certain extent dispensable because basically we're talking about the assurance of security which could be realized with the treaty relationship and everything else is adjustable. But as Ambassador O'Donohue said, these other factors were very, very important, and so we were putting a lot of resources into the Korean question trying not to upset these outer bastions if you will, so that we could preserve the UN command even though you concede from the documents that we quite often were talking about adjustments to the United Nations Command. We would prefer and I'm sure Dr. Kissinger would have preferred not to have to get to those questions because that would cause a lot of confusion.

And in my time at the embassy, I worked very closely with the working-level of the Foreign Ministry in assessing the relationships of every country that had a bearing on this question, doing vote tally, coming up with strategy and tactics for how to keep a certain country from changing its position away from supporting the ROK to supporting the DPRK and so forth. It was wearisome that it was a lot of investment for a very small return. Nonetheless, it was important. We certainly supported the Korean effort in this and there are, as Dr. Hershberg said, a lot of documents that aren't there, and I would expect in the future there would be more documents available especially perhaps reflecting the new Secretary of State's position, Dr. Kissinger, who did have a personal interest in this particular question and that's not really reflected here.

HERSHBERG: If I could just follow-up on that and for other Americans, was there another Kissinger back channel that is not reflected in the documents to Seoul? Or was he content to leave this to the State Department, even William Rogers' State Department, to handle the issue until he became Secretary of State?

O'DONOHUE: No. My impression is that this was solely a tactical issue of how do we get out of it.

HERSHBERG: I just mean more broadly, was there another channel?

O'DONOHUE: No. When I say "no," the answer is—I am actually fairly sure on this one—he was responding to what the Department of State was proposing rather than coming out with an edict. I may be wrong on that, but that's my impression.

LEE: You know this was a time when the U.S.-ROK relationship was to a certain extent, it was pretty flawed by the intervention of the U.S. Congress because of the uneasiness which looked quite prevalent in South Korea. South Korea tried to secure some kind of avenue through to the United States Congress and so much so that it somehow influenced the overall context of the U.S.-ROK relationship and that had, if I am correct to remember, some spillover influence over the context of the UN diplomacy as well. I may be wrong, but and in addition to that, let me add to that the kind of observation I think I remember I had at that time. During the early years of the 1970s, I maintained some relationship with the State Department's INR [Bureau of Intelligence and Research], and the overall impression I had was the INR was not necessarily that much in favor of and in support of South Korea vis-à-vis North Korea. There was a mood that I felt that INR was very sympathetic, most sympathetic with North Korea. One example, there was a North Korean flag hung on top of the door leading to the... [Laughter] Do you remember that? You had the North Korea flag hung above the door. [Laughter].

PICARD: This is really provocative. You are the real provocateur.

LEE: That sounded provocative.

PICARD: That was pretty provocative. Absolutely not. Nobody would be surprised to hear me say that, but I am saying it from a pretty clear recollection, from my time at least in INR which I guess was in '71-72, some point in '72. First of all I should say that INR was not terribly influential in the whole development of the U.S. policy and certainly even to a young officer going from INR working on Korean Affairs to the Office of Korean Affairs in the Regional Bureau it was like night and day. So no, the main observation I would offer of North Korea from the INR perspective in those days was that we were very puzzled about what was going on there. We could tell a little bit about the economic developments, but not very much about the political developments and whatever we knew or the best of at least what we knew came from you [the South Koreans].

THOMPSON: Well, that having been said, I think, Donovan, you're selling yourself a little short. I call attention to a document that he wrote in December 1971. I thought it was very perceptive and pointed out that the North-South, South-North context was a double-edged sword in effect for both sides as we've heard from Dr. Lee and the other speakers.

In terms of the North Korean flag [laughter], I think what American analysts try to do is get inside the heads of the people that we are studying, the nations that we are studying, and I can say that if you had visited me when I was a Marine Corp intelligence officer at war with Vietnam you would have found a Viet Cong flag on my wall because, I think it was the famous Chinese strategist who said, "You've really got to know the enemy", and we were very proud of being able to do that. It does not indicate our position except that we tried to maintain objectivity and that's why we can fund such a large bureaucratic element as INR and also the policy planning council that Ambassador O'Donohue was on because our leaders need objective reports, and you don't even always get those from our embassies.

SUN: I think the location, the position of the flag is very important [laughing], where you put the flag [is very important]. You know when I went to Iran during



MAO ZEDONG AND RICHARD NIXON

the Iraq-Iran War in 1988, I was staying at the former Hilton Hotel. Of course at the time the name of the hotel was changed to an Iranian name, but I found the American flag being used as a doormat. [Laughter] But Dr. Lee suggested that the North Korean flag was hanging above the door, that's a problem, that's a problem.

SCHAEFER: May I change the subject a little bit. I would like to raise a question to Dr. Lee about the South Korean proposal of simultaneous accession of both Korean states with the United Nations and just elaborate just a little bit on what I found in East German files, because the German case obviously was one of the models because both German states acceded to the United Nations in 1973. What you can find in the East German files of course is a lot of discussion actually of the different concepts of nation which in this case communist Germany and communist North Korea had. They were almost completely opposite. I mean the East German position was that there are two German nations, one socialist East German nation and one capitalist and purist West German nation divided forever, completely separate. The North Korean notion of course was that there was only one nation indivisible. It is led by North Korea. South Korea is just occupied by puppets pulled by American strings and once the Americans are out, it of course will be unified.

But at least they had an absolutist and very consistent concept of the nation which they also followed through in 1972 with the inter-Korean dialogue and when they dealt with the communist allies. So the North Korean concept of the nation is actually much closer to the West German capitalist nation concept and the East German concept is much closer to the South Korean concept. The East Germans were very defensive about the nation. South Korea also appeared to be rather defensive. North Korea took a very offensive position. So it was very clear that North Korea would never accept to accede to the United Nations with South Korea together and they made it very clear and the Soviet Union and China actually supported it. Of course both of them were on the Security Council, so there was no way that the South Korean proposal would come through. Then my question is, when President Park came up with that [proposal] I mean it was absolutely clear that this was a losing proposition. It would never

have any chance. Of course it could be a political move to put North Korea on the spot, but in a way it also backfired. So why did South Korea really think at that point it made sense, political sense or even tactically, to come up with a proposal which certainly would get defeated and maybe even get South Korea on the spot as being the defensive part of the Korean nation, not the offensive part like the North Koreans?

LEE: Well, you know, although the exchange of summit meetings between the two Germanies took place in 1970, it was in 1972 when the two Germanies concluded the basic agreement. So the two-Germany formula was not used as a benchmark when we had the initial round of inter-Korean dialogue in the early 1970s. The two-Germany formula was picked up as a benchmark in the early 1990s when the Roh Tae-woo government began pursuing “northern diplomacy.” Even at the time, the Republic of Korea was falling a little bit short of fully accepting the two-Germany formula because whereas the two-Germany formula was accepting a two-sovereign German states concept, we were falling short of reaching that even when we agreed to the inter-Korean basic agreement, the Agreement on Reconciliation, Non-Aggression and Exchange and Cooperation. We picked up the expression that the relationship between the two sides of Korea is a relationship in the process of unification. We did not give any descriptive description of what that relationship was. So I think that is a point which is necessary to be pointed out.

SCHAEFER: What about 1973? Why did South Korea propose it in 1973?

LEE: Well, the June 23 Declaration was a maneuver, a tactical maneuver to prevent certain things from happening. So we were not confident that we were going to be able to penetrate into the Non-Aligned Movement and we were aware of the fact that the United States had a limited influence over that area. So we were not... we were trying to leave the United Nations, make a departure from the United Nations. So the June 23 Declaration was not aimed at achieving certain things; it was more aimed at preventing things from happening.



CHRISTIAN OSTERMANN

Let me ask Ambassador Mitov a question. The impression I got after I read the verbatim transcript of the conversation between Kim Il Sung and Zhivkov was that what Kim Il Sung said was this; while he spoke about confederation, it was not so much the confederation in itself as it was revolution in South Korea. So his talking about confederation was bait, so to speak, to bring revolution to South Korea. Am I correct?

MITOV: Yes, that is correct.

STUECK: We're kind of running short on time and one thing that has not appeared so far in our discussion in this session is the kidnapping of Kim Dae-jung. It strikes me that it's a very important event in this time period and I wonder if we could get the perspectives of Mr. Kim and Dr. Lee on what was going on with that event, especially who was behind it within the ROK and why.

SUN: On the kidnapping of Kim Dae-jung. Yes of course it is in one form or another related to the United Nations, right.

LEE: You know I think it is a matter of fact that Mr. Kim Dae-jung, as he was resisting the *Yushin* Constitutional Amendment and *Yushin* takeover, chose to remain away from the country. And as he was staying outside of the country he somehow got himself into an association with North Koreans. Actually when he went to Japan shortly prior to his kidnapping, he was scheduled to participate in a certain convention sponsored by the pro-North Korean elements in Japan where he was supposed to make some kind of a speech whose content was later known

to us, which was pretty much in such a way that he was aligning himself with North Korea.

So that was I think one of the major mistakes that Mr. Kim made at that time. But the abduction of Kim Dae-jung had actually little to do with inter-Korean relations, although that kidnapping was picked up by North Korea to justify North Korea's departure from the inter-Korean dialogue. But aside from that, Mr. Kim Dae-jung's abduction had little reason to be related with the development of inter-Korean relations, although North Korea used it as an excuse to justify its decision to make a departure from the dialogue.

SUN: Mr. Kim do you have any comments on Kim Dae-jung's abduction?

KIM: There is not much I can say on this topic.

STUECK: How about the personalities within the regime, the Park regime? You placed emphasis on Lee Hurak as an initiator. Any comment on that?

LEE: I don't think this is based on any official version or explanation, but my observation of that timeframe leads me to say this: the Kim Dae-jung kidnapping had its origin with an earlier political development, the General Yun Pilyong incident. You know General Yun Pilyong was commanding general of the garrison command. He was detained by the investigative authorities, and then it was later known that it was more directed against Lee Hurak than against Yun Pilyong. After the *Yushin* Constitutional Amendment, Mr. Lee Hurak's stature rose very high, and then, according to some explanations, President Park began feeling suspicious or ill at ease with the rise of Mr. Lee Hurak's stature politically. So that provided the background from which the arrest of General Yun Pilyong originated.

Then following that arrest of General Yun Pilyong and his interrogation, Lee Hurak's role as the director of the KCIA was fundamentally reduced to a large extent, so much so that he was unable to secure access to President Park. So it was during that timeframe when the KCIA was under the instruction of Director Lee that it began making reports on the activities of Kim Dae-jung at regular meetings

“[...] the abduction of Kim Dae-Jung

had actually little to do with inter-Korean relations, although that kidnapping was picked up by North Korea to justify North Korea's departure from the inter-Korean dialogue.

**“After the Yushin
Constitutional
Amendment, Mr.**

Lee Hurak’s stature rose very high, and then, according to some explanations, President Park began feeling suspicious or ill at ease with the rise of Mr. Lee Hurak’s stature politically.”

which were held every Thursday, a National Security Review Meeting presided over by President Park. And in each round of the sessions there was the report that Kim Dae-jung was doing this and that and Kim Dae-jung was aiming at creating a provisional government opposed to President Park’s government and abroad. So much so that after repeated reporting of this nature, according to some explanations, Director Lee came to conclude that he had enough signs from President Park condoning his taking action to pick up Kim Dae-jung in Tokyo. So that is one explanation. Director Lee decided to do that as a means to win back President Park’s favor, but it did not work that way.

SUN: So Lee Hurak was still the director of the KCIA, not the ambassador in Tokyo?

LEE: No, he was the director of the KCIA.

SUN: When did he go to Japan?

LEE: Well, he was dismissed as the chief secretary to the president in 1969, and then he went to Japan as ambassador. Then he got back to Seoul toward the end of 1970, appointed as director of the KCIA.

WOO: I have a quick question about North Korea’s decision to discontinue this dialogue with South Korea. Of course it was followed by the June 23 Declaration in South Korea and Kim Dae-jung’s kidnapping, but actually, as Dr. Dongbok Lee has testified, Kim Dae-jung’s kidnapping was just used as a pretense. I want to ask the American diplomats or the Korean participants, why do you think North Korea stopped talking to South Korea and why was there a change? Was it a change of grand strategy or maneuvering tactics?

O’DONOHUE: I think that the American side really would think that Mr. Kim and Mr. Lee would have a far more concrete view. I think our own view at the time was that it had worn its welcome or had really ground to a halt already. But in terms of concreteness, we were completely dependent on the South side for their

picture. And I would put it that we never felt that they, the Koreans, told us everything, but that everything that they told us tended to be correct.

LEE: North Korea was unhappy with the June 23 Declaration and inter-Korean dialogue was clearly used by President Park for the production of the June 23 Declaration, so much so that North Korea began realizing that the Inter-Korean dialogue was taken advantage of by the South Korean side in blunting some of the North Korea's diplomatic advances. So it was in March 1973 when North Korea issued a very strongly worded statement denouncing the June 23 Declaration. North Korea quickly began losing interest in continuation of the dialogue so the dialogue became dormant without certain regularly held meetings being held for some time. Then the Kim Dae-jung kidnapping occurred and North Korea instantly picked it up to issue Kim Dae-jung's statement, dated August 28 that year, denouncing South Korea and expressing North Korea's intention to make a departure from the dialogue.

KIM: Well, the kidnapping of Kim Dae-jung had been quite a shock and was very upsetting to the Korean people. On the one hand however, there were certain people in South Korea who felt that when Kim Dae-jung was so closely aligned and perhaps even controlled by North Korea and that he wanted to establish a government in exile, so it was correct that he was abducted. On the other hand, we had the South Korean people who felt that this was morally reprehensible that the political enemy who had ran against President Park during April of '71 should be abducted.

So the criticism was mounting internally as well as externally, especially in international community against President Park. And also President Park was harshly rebuked by Washington on this kidnapping. So at this juncture as indicted to you before during my testimonies, that through the rotational basis of exchanges that were taking place with North Korea, North Korea was quickly losing its interest in continuing the dialogue with South Korea. And with the amending of the socialist constitution in North Korea during December of 1972, it seems apparent that Kim Il Sung had made up his mind that there would be a dynastic succession in North Korea. So at this time, Kim Il Sung felt that rationalization of this dynastic

**“With the
amending of
the socialist
constitution in**

North Korea during
December of 1972,
it seems apparent
that Kim Il Sung had
made up his mind
that there would be a
dynastic succession
in North Korea.”

succession would be quite difficult even for his own regime in North Korea, and he felt that there was a need to heighten the tension on the Peninsula.

So I think when Kim Dae-jung’s abduction had taken place this was a great excuse for North Korea to engage in a very big offensive effort to perhaps even knock out the regime of Park in the South, so this was an offensive that was taken by North Korea. We can tell what was on the mind of North Korean government by looking at the events that ensued the stopping of the Inter-Korean dialogue. There were additional underground tunneling by North Korea and also there was the axe incident at Panmunjeom on August 8.

LEE: Can I pose a question to the American colleagues with regard to the Kim Dae-jung case? You know after his release from the kidnappers in 1973, Mr. Kim Dae-jung had continuously been putting up the argument that while his life was at risk in the course of the abduction, he had his life saved by the intervention of the United States. And I don’t understand, I don’t think I have any hard evidence supporting the intervention of the U.S. authorities, although I remember having heard Don Gregg on one of the social evenings that he had somehow been involved in that aspect, but I do not know what kind of a role the U.S. played at that time.

O’DONOHUE: I can describe it. The DCM [Deputy Chief of Mission] and I were together talking at about 6 o’clock one evening and our DCM in Tokyo called and reported he had these reports. Ambassador Habib immediately—well as soon as he got a little bit more information—had almost every one of us in action. He told the military to approach their military counterparts; Don, to approach his; I was sent to talk to Bud Hahn to get a message to the prime minister. The ambassador—if it wasn’t that evening, it was the next morning—talked to the chief secretary, and the message he wanted us to send was a very simple one: Kim Dae-jung must not be killed. Part of his instructions were, “don’t get into arguments about people explaining to you that it wasn’t them, just very simply get this message across.” The Korea Desk prepared a very strong statement which the press officer used the next day. From our point of view the message was that he must not be killed.

Then as it unfolded beyond that immediate period, when Kim Dae-jung appeared on the streets and the government in effect signaled that he was going to stay quietly at home, then our role tended to fade. Then the Japanese began to speak less about Kim Dae-jung than the insult to the Japanese people of him having been kidnapped in Japan. Our role after that was... that we accepted we were not going to try to force access to him.

LEE: You know what you describe is more diplomacy, but one of the interesting points of argument that Mr. Kim has been raising is that he heard his kidnappers talking about taking his life. And then thereafter he heard the noise, sound of helicopter propellers and later he came to know that that was the helicopter flown by the U.S.

O'DONOHUE: I've heard the story; I certainly couldn't confirm it and I can't imagine where the helicopter would have come from.

Sun: We didn't know that at the time the U.S. military was such an efficient force.

O'DONOHUE: Well, they were off the coast of Japan as he describes it. So as I said I certainly can't confirm it and I've heard this story, but I never quite contemplated how you were going to get an American helicopter where they were located.

LEE: Mr. Kim [Dae-jung] had a couple of remarks which sounded quite weird; like he was introducing himself to some of the audiences that he was a brother of Jesus Christ, you know, things like that.

O'DONOHUE: A religious context.

THOMPSON: I just wanted to go back to the question of the fall of détente and the end of the North-South talks because the last document that we've been provided here is our report on the meeting that was called because of the sinking of the North Korea fishing boat. And the meeting was held in Panmunjeom and after that Dr. Lee Dongbok announced the results of the meeting which were

“The message he wanted us

to send was a very simple one:

Kim Dae-Jung must not be killed.”

inclusive, and then we reported that you referred to the North as the puppet regime. And since we both are here, I'm wondering, were we correct in placing some significance in the fact that you used the term "puppet regime," and was this really the final death melt for the North-South talks.

LEE: I do not remember having called North Korea "a puppet." I don't think I have ever done that, but let me tell you a little bit about that sinking incident. Our navy did sink the North Korean fishing boat and then caught hold of eleven or nine fisherman, and we took them ashore. And because it was found that that sinking was an accident, a mistake, as I recall our people and the authorities tried to somehow persuade these fishermen to decide in favor of remaining in South Korea. The captain of the fishing boat decided to remain, his name was Oh, but the rest of the fishermen were telling us that they were going to go back [to North Korea]. So I think authorities spent some time, maybe a couple of months to show them all the juicy things of South Korea. They were taken around the country and they were taken to some families of the same origin. We have North Korean people, refugees in South Korea. So each of them entered into some kind of ties with some of these families and they were returned. And in some of the families when each of these fishermen visited before returning to North Korea, the families tried to give them some gifts and they almost unanimously wanted to have some gold, so they were given gold rings. How many I don't know, but maybe several of them, and they had them stowed in their underwear...in the belt so they could hide them when they returned to North Korea. But when they were turned over to the North Korean side in Panmunjeom they disrobed and left everything that they were wearing in the neutralization conference room.

So the rings did not make it to North Korea. And then about two months later they appeared on North Korean television to conduct a group televised interview. And each of them, when asked, came up with three major accusations. One was that they found people starving in South Korea, so much so that there were beggars all around. Secondly, they found South Koreans so fond of wrist watches, so much so that when they were taken ashore after the sinking of the ship the South Korean people took their wristwatches and the South Korea officers were seen

having several wristwatches on their arms. And thirdly, when they were taken to the Myeongdong area, which is the busy downtown area, they saw many South Korean girls working as prostitutes in the service of American soldiers. And we analyzed them and found out that when they were taken around South Korea they were surprised mostly by three scenes – First, when they were taken to restaurants there was such a long list of menus and they found that South Koreans in the restaurants would order first and pay later, so much so that the abundance of food was something which struck them most. Secondly, when they were taken to department stores they saw that in each of the watch shops watches were in abundance. And thirdly, when they were taken to the Myeongdong area they saw many young girls wearing short skirts leaving their legs exposed. Before they were sent back to North Korea, they were asked some questions about their observations while in South Korea and they cited these three things as the scenes that impressed them the most.

Now we came to conclude that after their return to North Korea they had been subjected to interrogations about what was their feeling having been in South Korea and they appeared to have come up with three observations. And then they were told to say what they said in the television interviews.

SCHAEFER: I just wanted to add something to the end of the talks because I think it is important for the record. I think it's pretty clear from the Eastern European documents that by mid-November or late-November at the latest it was clear for the North Korean side that the talks would go nowhere, but this was due to the emergency measures and *Yushin*, not to other reasons. But they were also pretty clear that they do not want to be the ones looking to be the ones closing the talks, so “we do not want to shut the door.” But they were just basically waiting for the first opportunity when the door could be closed with a face-saving measure by putting the blame on the South. So I think the talks were dead by the end of the November and then the final opportunity for North Korea came with the Kim Dae-jung abduction.

SHIN: The fact that the dialogue had stopped I think is problematic if you were try to put a finger on it and say that this was somehow related to a South Korean

domestic situation, such as the kidnapping of Kim Dae-jung. For example, we have the record of the discussion held between Kissinger and Zhou Enlai in regards to the UN admission in 1973, and the discussion is very short actually, in comparison to the discussions that were held in 1971 and 1972. So in 1973 what we can tell from the exchange between Kissinger and Zhou Enlai is that China was no longer willing to be the spokesperson for North Korea. Somehow it was more reluctant to discuss issues with Kissinger. And as to North Korea's position, North Korea did not come to inter-Korean dialogue for the purpose of bettering the relationship between South and North Korea, but North Korea was trying to find ways to have the American troops withdraw from the Korean Peninsula. However, as time had passed North Korea came to realize that their efforts were being foiled.

So whereas North Korea was in effect trying to piggyback on the détente that was taking place between the U.S. and China, they came to realize that it would not work that way and that they would have to do the work themselves. That's why they decided that it would be better for North Korea to engage the U.S. directly rather than through China. And so the incidents that had occurred domestically in South Korea, like the June 23 Declaration or the kidnapping of Kim Dae-jung, these were just a pretext as has been discussed in this room and so they were not the cause for the halting of dialogue.

SUN: I thank all of you for your active participation. This is the end of our panel.

OSTERMANN: Let me just also thank on behalf of the Wilson Center Ambassador Sun for chairing this session. I think we all owe a round of applause to the translators for getting us through this.

I think we had a day and a half of very productive discussions. A good measure for me is that Bill Stueck took a lot of notes and scribbled away I think more than your average conference notes. That is a good sign for me that we had productive sessions.

It was mentioned that we gained some insights on North Korean perspective as well. In the end, we're still missing authentic North Korean voices and documents at the table. I think we had an historic conference here and this group will probably not get together again in this formation, but I hope that future conferences of this sort will also include North Korean scholars and perhaps officials someday.

Thank you all so much. Thank you especially to the eye witnesses and the veterans for sharing their insights, to the scholars for posing good questions, to my team and James Person above all for assembling these important documents. Thank you again also to our partners at University of North Korean Studies.

Thank you.

NOTES

1 The Paris Peace Talks began in 1968 between representatives of the United States, the Republic of Vietnam, and the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and sought to establish peace in Vietnam.

2 During the Liberation Day speech of August 15, 1970, Park Chung Hee proposed a new unification policy and “peaceful competition” with North Korea.

3 Seeking to augment presidential power and remove term limits, Park Chung Hee proposed the Yushin Constitution in October 1972. A heavily rigged plebiscite approved the constitution on December 27, 1972.

4 On May 16, 1961, Park Chung Hee and other officers from the Republic of Korea army staged a military coup and seized power, overthrowing the Second Republic of South Korea.

5 See Document No. 22 in the Document Appendix.

6 The official title of the June 23 Declaration was the “Seven-Point Declaration for Peace and Reunification”

7 See Document No. 21 in the Document Appendix.



GEORGI MITOV

Document Appendix

DOCUMENT NO. 1

[Source: MOL, XIX-J-1-j Korea, 1970, 54. doboz, 81-108, 002584/3/1970. Obtained and translated for NKIDP by Balázs Szalontai]

December 12, 1970

Report, Embassy of Hungary in North Korea to the Hungarian Foreign Ministry.

[...]

On November 21st of this year, the departing Bulgarian ambassador, Cde.[Comrade] *Misbo Nikolov* [emphasis in the original], left for home for good. [...]

The utterances which the Korean leaders—in sequence: Kim Il Sung, general secretary of the KWP CC [Central Committee] and chairman of the DPRK Council of Ministers; Pak Seongcheol, member of the KWP Politburo and second vice-chairman of the Council of Ministers; Kim Donggyu, member of the KWP Politburo and CC secretary; and Heo Dam, member of the KWP CC and foreign minister—made in the presence of the departing Bulgarian ambassador were particularly important, partly because these statements were made on November 18, 19, and 20, respectively, i.e., only a few days after the end of the 5th congress of the KWP, and they covered various important questions of internal and foreign politics which had been left unmentioned, or covered in a conspicuously brief way (and in a rather debatable perspective), at the Korean party congress [...].

On November 18th, Comrade *Kim Il Sung* [emphasis in the original] received Comrade Ambassador Nikolov for a farewell visit. [...] [Kim Il Sung:] Comrade Ambassador, please tell Comrade [Bulgarian leader Todor] Zhivkov that when the relationship of

these two allied [Communist] Great Powers was good, the Koreans were relaxed, but when their relationship deteriorated, the situation of the Korean people became very difficult. It is very difficult to regulate our relations with our two big allies without offending any of them in the process. *We, Koreans, make great efforts not to offend any of our elder brothers. We Koreans, on our part, intend to reinforce our contacts with both elder brothers on the basis of Marxism-Leninism, and during this process we do not intend to please any of them to a greater extent than the other* [emphasis in the original].

[...] Following the signing of the armistice, different and contradicting views and tendencies appeared in our party, but we overcame them. Due to similar circumstances, a few fraternal parties found themselves in a difficult situation in 1956. Here the situation did not degenerate to such an extent as in other countries, because the membership of our party remained united. *Our experiences have proven that one should not weaken the education of the party membership and the youth, not even for a single moment, because otherwise both the party membership and the youth will fall victim to the enemy* [emphasis in the original].

[...]

When the KWP and the government of the DPRK insist on solving the Korean question, they do not want to make the international situation more difficult. The KWP does not want a world war to break out because of Korea [emphasis in the original]. [...] The outbreak of a war between South Korea and the DPRK may indeed result in the involvement of their allies, which would mean the start of a new world war. *We, Koreans, do our best to keep the solution of the Korean question within the confines of Korea, or rather that of South Korea. Comrade Ambassador, please tell Comrade Zhivkov: if we use sharper words now and then, this does not mean that we give up the idea of peaceful unification* [emphasis in the original]. In our opinion, the most important element of our efforts for [achieving] a solution is [our effort to facilitate] the growth of the South Korean revolutionary forces and carry out the South Korean revolution. In our view, the essence of the solution is the following: the South Korean people should overthrow Park Chung Hee, seize power, and start negotiations with the DPRK about the peaceful unification of the motherland. We do not want to, and will not, negotiate with Park Chung Hee, because he is a national traitor, a servant of American imperialism. Up

to now he has invariably rebuffed every proposal of ours to establish contacts [between the two Koreas]. Park Chung Hee's latest proposal to establish certain contacts between South and North is nothing but a deceitful electioneering trick used in the campaign preceding the South Korean presidential elections of 1971. If Kim Dae-jung, the presidential candidate of the oppositional New Democratic Party, wins next year's presidential elections, we will negotiate with him. Although Kim Dae-jung is also an anti-Communist, his public as well as unofficial plans are the following: creating a democratic power structure in South Korea, guaranteeing the democratic rights of the population, establishing contacts with the Soviet Union and China, initiating talks with the DPRK about peaceful unification, and pursuing a neutralist foreign policy. And if all this can be realized, it will be indeed unnecessary to wage war to solve the Korean question. [...]

Certain people may disapprove and fail to understand our triple slogan, "independence, self-reliance, and self-defense" [emphasis in the original]. Certain people happen to think that the DPRK does not need support and assistance, or they think that by using this slogan, we want to keep the foreign assistance from our people. But this slogan is not directed against the fraternal countries [emphasis in the original]. When we announced this slogan, we had the South Korean situation in mind, because the South Korean people does not know proletarian internationalism. By using this slogan, we want to detach the South Korean people from the USA and Japan. This slogan already has many supporters in South Korea. Recently it was the South Korean students who raised this slogan, making a declaration in which they demanded that the USA cease interfering in the internal affairs of South Korea. We consider the revolutionizing of the South Korean masses an important task." [...]

[Pak Seongcheol:] "It appears to us that *a few foreign comrades do not sufficiently understand us* [emphasis in the original]. They give us the following advice: we, Koreans, should practice greater self-restraint. Certain people are of the opinion that, for instance, we should not have sunk the South Korean patrol boat No. 56, we should not have captured the *Pueblo*, we should not have shot down the American EC-121 spy plane, and so on. But this is demagoguery based entirely on misinformation and illusions about the USA. We do have to react to the provocative steps taken by the enemy, and we must firmly defend our achievements."

On November 20th, Foreign Minister *Heo Dam* [emphasis in the original] gave a farewell dinner in honor of the departing Ambassador Nikolov and his wife. [...]

[Heo Dam:] *A few foreign comrades misinterpret our struggle against revisionism, of which our leader spoke at our 5th party congress* [emphasis in the original]. Some of them already asked whom Comrade Kim Il Sung meant by speaking about revisionists. It is clear that Comrade Kim Il Sung meant, and spoke about, the revisionists of our country. This is also revealed by the fact that this subject was covered in the chapter on party work, rather than in the chapter on international activity.” [...] (Heo Dam did not tell that to the Bulgarian ambassador, but Kim Yangseon, the deputy head of the International Liaisons Office of the [Korean Workers’ Party] CC, told the Soviet ambassador, whom he informed about the results of the congress, that the revisionist elements criticized at the congress were, above all, Pak Geumcheol, Yi Hyosun, Kim Doman, and Pak Yongguk, who had been replaced before or in the wake of the party conference held in 1966. At the time of their dismissal, the first was a Politburo member and CC secretary, the second a Politburo member and the head of the South Korean department of the CC, the third the deputy head of the CC department for agitation and propaganda, and the fourth the head of the International Liaisons Office of the CC.) “Some of them even asked whether Comrade Kim Il Sung had had the Soviet Union in mind when he spoke about the struggle against revisionism,” Heo Dam continued. “We replied that this was not the case! After all, in the report [of the congress] there was no such term as ‘modern revisionism,’ the term that the Chinese habitually use when they castigate the Soviet Union.

The recent development of Korean-Chinese relations has raised doubts in some foreign comrades, [inspiring them to ask] whether we want to worsen our relations with the Soviet Union [emphasis in the original]. I can say,” Heo Dam emphasized, “that this *will never happen!* [emphasis in the original] We strive to improve our relations both with China and the Soviet Union.” [...]

Jenő Sebestyén
(ambassador)

* * *

DOCUMENT NO. 2

[Source: Archives of the Central Committee of the Romanian Communist Party, 43/1971.
Obtained and translated for NKIDP by Eliza Gheorghe]

Minutes of Conversation on the Occasion of the Party and Government
Delegation on behalf of the Romanian Socialist Republic to the Democratic
People's Republic of Korea

Pyongyang, June 10, 1971 –

Participants to the talks:

- On the Romanian side: Comrade Nicolae Ceaușescu, Secretary General of the Romanian Communist Party, President of the State Council of the Romanian Socialist Republic (RSR), Ion Gheorghe Maurer, member of the Executive Committee of the Permanent Presidium of the Central Committee of the Romanian Communist Party (CC RCP), President of the Council of Ministers, Manea Mănescu, member of the Executive Committee of the Permanent Presidium, Secretary of the CC RCP, Vice-President of the State Council, Dumitru Popa, member of the Executive Committee of the CC RCP, first secretary of the Bucharest Party City Committee, Mayor of Bucharest, Ion Iliescu, deputy member of the Executive Committee, secretary of the CC RCP, George Macovescu, member of the CC RCP, first deputy of the Minister of Foreign Affairs (MFA), Aurel Mălnășan, Romanian Ambassador to Pyongyang, Emilian Dobrescu and Constantin Mitea, deputy members of the CC RCP, councilors of the CC RCP.

- On the Korean side: Comrade Kim Il Sung, Secretary General of the Central Committee of the Korean Workers' Party (KWP), President of the Ministers' Cabinet of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK), Choe Yonggeon, member of the Political Committee, Secretary of the KWP CC, President of the Presidium of the Supreme People's Assembly, Kim Il, member of the Political Committee, Secretary of the CC KWP, First Vice-Premier of the Council of Ministers, Pak Seongcheol, member of the Political Committee of the CC KWP, Second Vice-President of the Ministers' Cabinet, O Jinu, member of the Political Committee, Secretary of the

KWP CC, Joint Chief of Staff of the People's Army, Yang Hyeongseop, alternate member of the Political Committee, Secretary of the KWP CC, Jeong Juntaek, alternate member of the Political Committee, Vice-President of the Ministers' Cabinet, Heo Dam, member of the Political Committee, Minister of Foreign Affairs, Kim Yeongnam, member of the Political Committee, First Deputy of the Foreign Section, Chief of the CC KWP, and Kang Yeongseob, Ambassador of the DPRK to the RSR.

[...]

[Comrade Kim Il Sung]: The problem, in general, is unification. There are some people who blame us for abandoning the unification of the country through peaceful means. We did not give up this option, this is actually our guiding principle. If we don't manage to unify the country by peaceful means, we don't envisage another solution. The main problem in South Korea and the things that have to be solved there are supposed to be the responsibility of the South Koreans. The way to solve this problem in South Korea depends on the concrete circumstances and on the respective opportunities. That it will be peaceful, that it will be revolutionary or not, all this depends on the growing revolutionary impetus in South Korea. We do not want to force anything; we don't want to rush things, because we cannot exert any pressure.

South Korea is linked to Japan through agreements; they signed such agreements with the Americans as well—and these are military agreements. We have friendship and mutual assistance agreements with the People's Republic of China and with the Soviet Union. The outbreak of a conflict between the North and the South will definitely involve the Soviet Union and China, as well as Japan and the United States. If we are not careful enough, we could trigger a global-scale war out of an Asian conflict. The peoples of the world will not welcome this and they don't want this to happen; neither the People's Republic of China nor the Soviet Union wants to get involved in such a confrontation. To our mind, the South Koreans are not more willing to enter such a clash; Americans don't want to continue this fight. The Americans let us know that it's not their intention to fight the Koreans again. They transmitted their intention through Podgorny. We then asked Podgorny to tell the Americans that we didn't want it either, but to be careful and keep away from us, because if they create situations like Pueblo and EC-121, then we are entitled to capturing them or to shooting them down. We keep our business to our territory, we don't do it in the waters of the

United States of America. It's obvious that unless they came into our territorial waters, we couldn't have captured or sunken their vessels.

There are other comrades that blame us for increasing tensions in the region, but we are telling you that we don't need something like that. If we are asked about the probability of war, we could say yes, such a probability exists. If there hadn't been the conflicts we mentioned, if vessels like the *Pueblo* hadn't crossed into our territorial waters, if American spy planes like the EC-121 [had not flown over our territory], we of course would not have reacted like that. When Comrade Podgorny came and told us this, we advised him that instead of telling us that we were increasing tensions in the region, he should go and talk to the Americans and tell them to stop acting like they had.

Should the Americans withdraw from South Korea, there wouldn't be any reasons for such incidents, because the South Koreans do not have the material and military basis for such things, and therefore, the main reason for such a conflict would not exist.

Regarding the existence of the danger of a war, the reason is just one: the presence of the Americans in South Korea. They know we neighbor the People's Republic of China, the Soviet Union and that we are close with other countries of the world, so they wouldn't dare to do anything, especially because they have the experience of the past war.

If the Americans pull out of South Korea, the possibility of a war becomes limited.

Except for this, what other danger is there? There would be that of Japanese militarism. The Americans have had the sad experience of a war with us; they have the one in Vietnam too and they can only envisage technical support for the South Koreans but they don't even consider the human casualties involved. Nixon said that the place of Americans in South Korea should be taken over by the Japanese. Concerning the revival of Japanese militarism, there are many elements pointing to it. We have a lot of materials proving it. I don't have the time and I don't intend to present them to you. Sato made his intentions to dominate and rule over the territory of South Korea clear on several occasions. Park Chung Hee is considering taking advantage of the Japanese and getting economic and military assistance on their backs and when he feels ready, he will attack North Korea. This is his mindset, in his subconscious. In his mind, a certain plan emerged, namely to defeat communism and to unify the country. Therefore, this would be the plan of Park Chung Hee. But the problem should be put this way: can communism be defeated? I think this is impossible. He himself

admits that for the time being, communism cannot be defeated. He is making 7- or even 8-year plans regarding the development of the economy, the strengthening of the army, and then, when he feels more powerful than the North, he will pursue the unification of the country. In other words, unification is not possible now. When will it be possible? He says that it will be possible when the South is more powerful than the North economically and militarily. My opinion is that this is only a dream of his. I don't know what he is thinking; does he imagine that we will be sleeping and not developing in the meantime? Therefore, we can say that we didn't get scared by his slogan to defeat communism and unify the country.

What we salute is the successful fighting against fascism that is currently taking place in South Korea, for democracy and for the democratization of the entire social life. It is likely that Park Chung Hee will be overthrown and genuine democracy will be established. There has been a strong fight for democracy in South Korea in recent years. We are aware that this fighting cannot be successfully completed through elections, because Americans are in South Korea and there is the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea. Under these conditions, even the democratization process is hard. Of course, the possibilities for democratization will increase if the Americans withdraw. In the past years, there have been several attempts in the South. In 1959 there were some slogans for the unification of the country and for the creation of a progressive party. This was the case back in the day of Rhee Syngman when the Progressive Party took part in elections and lost by a margin of a few hundred thousand votes. Following the election fraud in 1959, students went out in the streets to protest. On April 19 1960, students' riots took over the entire country, which led to the overthrow of the Rhee Syngman government. Mr. Chang Myeon took over his position. He realized he couldn't govern in the same manner as Rhee Syngman and then he turned a little bit more democratic. In those circumstances, the students and the youth exerted some pressures from within, started asking for visits to Panmunjeom and to ask to meet with representatives of the North in there to discuss the problem of the unification of the country.

The Americans became aware of the danger and organized a military coup, which resulted in the assumption of power by none other than Park Chung Hee. In the South Korean Constitution, it is stipulated that the president in office cannot run for president more than two times in a row. Park Chung Hee modified the Constitution and ran for president for a third time. In this situation, opposition parties boycotted

the elections and then he ran in the elections by himself. Although he managed to modify the Constitution, he said he could relinquish his position at any given time; however the recent elections proved otherwise. Opposition parties joined forces and formed a democratic front—a progressive one, a front for the defense of democracy.

Students organized themselves, all mass organizations did so. Therefore, a powerful united front was formed, so as to eliminate Park Chung Hee and to elect another president.

In this context, Kim Dae-jung emerged as the president of the new Progressive Party. He even had some good slogans, which resembled our position regarding the unification of the country. He promised that if he became president, he would solve all conflicts in the area and he would advocate the unification with the North; secondly, he would reform the police force and the internal intelligence apparatus; he would reduce military forces and he would install a civilian government; he would reduce the penetration of foreign investments, he would protect and even stimulate the development of national capital. Concerning foreign policy, he would like to have good relations not only with the United States and with Japan, but to establish relations with the People's Republic of China and with the Soviet Union too. He offered wide democratic possibilities to all mass and community organizations in South Korea. There was only one thing missing from his platform: the pull out of the Americans from South Korea. In spite of it, his platform managed to mobilize the South Korean population. It was even feared that Park Chung Hee would lose the last month's election.

In these electoral circumstances, in the city of Seoul, the new candidate managed to get 80% of the votes; he got many votes in the countryside too, but eventually when Park Chung Hee saw that his presidency is under threat, he mobilized the police and the army and falsified the results of the election, winning by a margin of 1.2 million votes.

After the presidential election, the parliamentary elections took place. Within these elections too, the electoral fighting was very strong. It was likely again that Park Chung Hee won a minority of the votes, but he proceeded with the falsification of the elections again. During the parliamentary elections, Park Chung Hee got 113 votes while the democratic forces got 89 votes.

Judging from all these, it ensues that the fight for democracy is growing more and more powerful in South Korea. Over a period of almost two months, students and the youth in general got involved into bitter fights, going out in the streets and protesting.

What could be the conclusions from what has been said until now? If the Americans continue to stay in South Korea, victory through elections is not possible. For this reason, the problem of the unification of the country is linked to this issue. In conclusion, it can be said that, in the absence of the Americans in South Korea or of any other foreign forces, the South Korean people could install a democratic progressive government, through its own forces, and the establishment of such a government would draw us very close to each other, so that, without fighting, we could unify the country. It is not that we don't want it. We believe this can be achieved once the Americans are gone, excluding the possibility that the Japanese replace them. Actually, the Japanese are infiltrating into South Korea by other means, such as the Japanese investments in South Korea. Sato was the one to enjoy the victory of Park Chung Hee in the presidential elections the most. Park Chung Hee was a general in the Japanese army during the Japanese occupation. For this reason, he is very well regarded by Sato. Sato declared that he would be present on the July 1st ceremony for the presidential re-inauguration of Park Chung Hee. At Seoul [National] University and at other higher education institutions, on the occasion of a plenary session, a declaration against the participation of Sato at the ceremony was released.

This is the situation in South Korea. Regarding the support of revolutionary activities in South Korea, regarding unification, you are aware of the declaration adopted recently at the Supreme People's Assembly of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. Should Park Chung Hee be overthrown, we will be able to discuss the unification of our country with anyone who desires this. This is the current situation. The evolution of the situation in South Korea depends on the struggle of democratic forces; on the [struggle of the] South Korean people.

Among the population of South Korea, the spirit of hatred against the Americans has taken root and is spreading. Should the revolutionary forces in South Korea intensify, the ones that are more likely to intervene are not the Americans, but the Japanese.

Between 1894-1895, the Sino-Japanese war took place; between 1904-1905 the Japanese-Russian war took place. In those circumstances, a peasant uprising took place. The 1894 riot was the biggest one in history. Within the Korean leadership back then, there were three groups—I am referring to the feudal leadership: a pro-Japanese group, a pro-Chinese group and a pro-Russian group. So, since 1894, there has been this attraction towards the three parties. In these conditions, the Japanese were called for help to suppress the peasant uprising; the pro-Chinese group asked for China's

help and this sparked the Sino-Japanese war. The current situation in South Korea can be compared to the one back then. Even if the Americans pull out, a South Korean rebellion would be suppressed by the Japanese.

In 1969, Sato released a televised interview through which he expressed his desire to have the Japanese replace the Americans in the surrounding areas in Asia. He made a similar statement in September 1970 too. Moreover, Sato declared that since the Americans are cutting back on their military forces in South Korea, there is no alternative [for South Korea] but to accept Japan as the security guarantor.

I won't talk for too long about these tendencies in Japanese militarism, but I would like to tell you that the Japanese conceived, together with the South Koreans several action plans. One of these is the "Three Arrows Plan;" there is also a "Flying Dragon Plan," the "Yellow Bull Plan." You must be aware that these are military plans. Currently, the Japanese are carrying out various military preparations, drills, in similar conditions to what the South Koreans are doing, with land forces, air forces and navy. Moreover, they built a strategic highway between Busan and Seoul so that they can more easily get from the South of Korea to the 38th parallel. The Japanese Joint Chiefs of Staff is in South Korea. Except for these high-rank visits, there are frequent visits of Japanese military cadres of all sorts to South Korea.

Concerning the penetration of foreign capital in South Korea, it is estimated that approximately 20% of the total foreign investment capital is Japanese. It can be stated that the Japanese will reserve their right to defend the capital they invested there. According to some estimates, 3,000-5,000 Japanese soldiers are in South Korea; they investigate the battle ground and, according to certain maps, they examine the best possibilities for carrying out battles. I could state that but for the present dictatorship, should an uprising occur, the greatest danger for South Korea currently is the Japanese.

There were statements that if the Americans allow the Japanese to take over South Korea, the Japanese would offer South Korea twice as much in military assistance as the Americans had.

It is common knowledge that any American withdrawal from South Korea will be made in close connection with the Japanese. Sato has an agreement with Nixon in this respect.

For this reason, we decisively fight against Japanese militarism. Of course, Japanese militarism cannot be mistaken for the entire Japanese people. We don't want to mis-

take it for the year 1894, [or] 1905, to mistake the people from back then with the present people, the level from back then with the current level. Of course, the situation in the years I referred to cannot be compared with the situation nowadays. Nowadays we have the Soviet Union, the People's Republic of China and so on. The situation changed radically. We must be aware that just like with Federal Germany, which is a menace for Europe, Japan is a menace for Asia. Of course, in the future, we will improve our means for fighting against Japanese militarism.

In general, these are the problems I wanted to discuss with you regarding the situation in South Korea. Of course, if they are of interest to you and if you want us to, we could provide you with documentary materials so as not to extend our talks now.

How do you think we should proceed? Should we continue our discussions now or should we take a short break and then discuss bilateral relations and some aspects of the international situation?

Comrade Nicolae Ceaușescu: Let's take a short break.

[...]

* * *

DOCUMENT NO. 3

[Source: National Archives and Records Administration]

Secret (Translation)
Seoul, September 16, 1971

My Dear Mr. President,

I would like to bring to your attention, through this personal letter, my views on matters of great concern for the Government and people of the Republic of Korea, especially in connection with the recent rapid changes in international situation and your forthcoming visit to Peking.

In the light of such changing international situation and the prevailing mood of détente, your decision to make a journey to Peking is considered a most important

and a significant one, and my government has welcomed it in the hope that it will contribute to the relaxation of tension in Asia and further, to the building of a lasting peace in the world.

Although it is anticipated that primarily matters concerning communist China and the United States will be discussed during your meeting in Peking, we are deeply concerned about the speculation arising in certain quarters that Korean questions may be put forth by the Chinese communists.

We note that you have already made it officially clear that your [sic] seeking a new relationship with Red China will not be “at the expense of old friends,” and in view of the traditional close bonds of friendship and solidarity existing between our two countries, I have no reason to fear any decision being made on Korea without prior consultation with my government. What I do hope is that if any important discussion on Korea is anticipated during your visit to Peking, it might do well to have a thorough exchange of views between our two governments before your departure.

As I have mentioned above, the world today is undergoing great changes with a strong trend for relaxation of tension. However, the north Korean communists, contrary to such world trend, are persistently following their policy of communizing the whole of Korea by force, and are relentlessly carrying out armed provocations and infiltrations against the Republic of Korea.

It is well-known to us that such policy has been overtly supported by communist China. Despite new international currents, the Chinese communists are showing no signs of change in their attitude towards north Korea; in fact they are making clear their intent to further strengthen the military capabilities of the north Korean communists, as evidenced by the military grant aid agreement concluded as recently as 6th of this month between the military leaders of both sides. Under such circumstances, tension continues to run high on the Korean peninsula, posing a great threat to the security of the Republic of Korea.

I cannot but emphasize again that, in order to forestall recurrence of war and ensure the security of the Korean peninsula, it is essential that our mutual defense system be strengthened, modernization programs to upgrade the combat capabilities of the Korean armed forces be expedited, and that the United States military and economic assistance to Korea be maintained at an adequate level. In particular, I consider the maintenance and effective implementation of the existing

ROK-US Mutual Defense Treaty to be indispensable to the defense and security of the Republic of Korea.

We note with serious concern that one of communist China's aims is to have the United States withdraw its forces from Korea and elsewhere in Asia. The existing defense system between our two countries, needless to say, is purely for defense purpose. Therefore, the presence of the United States forces in Korea constitutes the most effective deterrent against the recurrence of war on the Korean Peninsula. Likewise, the presence of the United Nations Command is to fulfill the United Nations objective and responsibility of maintaining the peace and security of the Republic of Korea. As such, the Red Chinese claim for what they call the withdrawal of foreign troops from Korea should in no case be accepted.

At this opportunity, I would like to assure you that the government and people of the Republic of Korea are directing their utmost efforts to the achievement of a self-reliant defense posture, with firm determination and readiness to assume, within their growing capability, more of the responsibility for their defense and security. But you will agree that Korea, as a developing country, needs a considerable length of time to do this.

In this context, I trust that, at this juncture, the United States, not only as a most important Pacific Power but also as our closest ally, will continue to play a major role in safeguarding the peace and security of Asia.

As you are already aware, the government of the Republic of Korea is devoting its sincere efforts to attain national unification by peaceful means. In this regard, it is vital to foster conditions conducive to peace on the Korean peninsula, if any such efforts are to bear fruit.

If Red China really seeks easing of tension and rapprochement, it should, first and foremost, desist from its military assistance to strengthen the north Korean communist forces and support for their policy of unification by force. Instead, it should exercise its influence upon the north Korean communists to help ease tension on the peninsula.

I hope that my brief explanation of our position above has served to further your understanding of the important problems facing Korea at this time. I solicit your support and cooperation, and once again wish that your journey to Peking will bring about results that will go a long way in contributing to a durable peace of the world.

With best wishes for your continued good health and happiness.

Sincerely,

/s/ Park Chung Hee
President

His Excellency
Richard M. Nixon
President of the United
States of America
Washington, D.C.

* * *

DOCUMENT NO. 4

[Source: MOL, XIX-J-1-j Korea, 1971, 67. doboz, 81-20, 002308/3/1971.
Obtained and translated for NKIDP by Balázs Szalontai]

November 1, 1971

Telegram, Embassy of Hungary in North Korea to the Hungarian Foreign
Ministry.

[...]

On October 8th, the Soviet ambassador unexpectedly traveled to Moscow, from which place he returned on October 26th. On October 30th, he visited me, and informed me about the following:

A [North Korean] delegation headed by Pak Seongcheol had traveled to Moscow. Deputy Foreign Minister Li Manseok and Kim Yangseon, the deputy head of the International Liaisons Office of the [Korean Workers' Party] CC, were also members of the delegation. There were also experts traveling with the delegation. They spent

two days in Moscow. On the request of the Koreans, Comrade Brezhnev had talks with the delegation. The essence of what was said by Pak Seongcheol is the following:

I) According to the Korean leadership's evaluation, the influence of the rightist parties is considerably decreasing in South Korea, [whereas] the strength of the opposition parties has substantially increased. This is clearly shown by the electoral results, the growth of the movement of progressive forces, and the actions of the student movement. Park Chung Hee is becoming more and more isolated.

II) The DPRK must take advantage of this situation so as to compel the South Korean [political] forces to accept the peaceful unification of the motherland. The DPRK has worked out a number of measures with regard to that.

1) In the international sphere, they take advantage of every opportunity and occasion to recruit as many supporters for their policy of peaceful national unification as possible. As far as possible, they intend to make use of the UN and other international organizations, too.

Through political and diplomatic means, they want to bring great international pressure to bear on the USA in order to achieve the withdrawal of its troops and the abrogation of the U.S.-South Korean military treaty.

2) They want to make Japan understand that the U.S. presence in South Korea and Japan as well as the South Korean-[Japanese] treaty hinders the unification of the motherland. They want to achieve the abrogation of the treaty.

3) They turned to the Soviet Union with the direct request that [the USSR] should try to achieve the aforesaid results [in the course of its negotiations] with the USA and Japan.

– 124 – S[ebestyén] –

* * *

DOCUMENT NO. 5

[Source: MOL, XIX-J-1-j Korea, 1972, 59. doboz, 81-130, 00808/10/1972. Obtained and translated for NKIDP by Balázs Szalontai]

January 20, 1972

Telegram, Embassy of Hungary in Poland to the Hungarian Foreign Ministry.

[...]

On the basis of the information received from the deputy head of the competent main department of the F[oreign] M[inistry], I report the following:

[...] The Korean comrades indefinitely postpone the date of national unification, but at the same time they initiate a dialogue with the leaders of the South Korean regime. Their demands are limited to insisting on the withdrawal of foreign troops. They do not consider it necessary to emphasize that the USA should cease supporting the South Korean regime.

[...]

– 16 – Pintér –

* * *

DOCUMENT NO. 6

[Source: PolA AA, MfAA, C 1080/78. Obtained for NKIDP by Bernd Schaefer and translated for NKIDP by Karen Riechert]

GDR [German Democratic Republic] Embassy to DPRK
Pyongyang, 13 March 1972

Note

on a Conversation with the 1st Secretary of the USSR Embassy, Comrade Kurbatov, on 10 March 1972 in the GDR Embassy

During the conversation there was an exchange of opinions on the following questions:

The DPRK Position on the Nixon Visit to Beijing and Its Influence on the Situation in Korea

Based on a written draft, Comrade Kurbatov asserted the DPRK reaction demonstrates how the Korean leadership is very content with the result, in particular with the inclusion of the Korean Problem into the [Shanghai] communiqué between China and the United States. It [Korean leadership] is very pleased with the support of the DPRK Eight-Point-Proposal and the demand to dissolve UNCURK¹. The Korean leaders think that the Chinese maintained a firm position on Korea. As *Rodong Sinmun* writes, the Korean leadership is viewing this as a great assistance “by the fraternal Chinese people.” During Nixon’s actual stay in Beijing, the Koreans stated how the DPRK position was laid out in Kim Il Sung’s speech from 6 August 1971. Nixon would not arrive in Beijing as a victor but as the defeated. This Korean position had been reiterated in the [Kim Il Sung] interview with [the Japanese newspaper] *Yomiuri Shimbun* [in January 1972]. The Nixon visit was interpreted as forced upon the American president. This way the Korean side assisted China’s policy and agreed to the discussion of the Korean question in the talks.

In its publications, the Korean leadership attempts to hide from its people the parallel interests of China and the United States. It is pursuing its nationalist course and fails to notice the anti-Soviet aspect of rapprochement between the Chinese leadership and the United States. The Korean leadership asserts that China is a “socialist power,” “stands firm on the basis of proletarian internationalism,” and so on. The Korean leadership’s position consists entirely of a course of pragmatism. In their policy toward the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, the Korean leaders are increasingly guided by pragmatic considerations. They are eager to achieve Korean unification primarily with Chinese assistance. It became evident that, in preparation for the talks with Nixon, Chinese leaders were not interested in tensions on the Korean peninsula (like, for instance, during the declaration of a state of national emergency in South Korea). The Chinese were successful in moving the Korean leadership from its entrenched position. The inclusion of the Korean question into the talks in Beijing, which had occurred with the full knowledge of the Koreans, speaks to new elements in relations between DPRK and China and to new aspects in the Chinese leadership’s policy towards the DPRK. The Chinese increasingly take matters to solve the Korean question into their own hands.

Kim Il Sung's visit to Beijing—which allegedly did not occur in early February according to the official version—served the purpose of finalizing the exact joint position on the Korean question for the talks with Nixon. Also the stay of a group of Koreans in Beijing in close regular contact with the Chinese side further demonstrated the increased stability of relations between both sides. The Korean side denies a visit by Kim Il Sung to Beijing. Yet Chinese diplomats do not express denials but indicate how permanent consultations are possible, and a visit must not have been unusual. It can be assumed that the Koreans and Chinese recently had another exchange of opinions about the Nixon visit. The [*Rodong Sinmun*] editorial of March 4 seems to be an indication for that. It can be expected in this context that steps will be taken to create a favorable situation for the withdrawal of U.S. troops from South Korea. The Korean leadership views this as its main objective in the near future. Information exists according to which the Korean leadership has been continuously informed by secret material about the course of negotiations with Nixon. The talks with him in Beijing proved that China and the United States have common interests and want to resolve Asian and other problems without the Soviet Union. He [Kurbatov] also referred to differing assessments of the Nixon visit by DPRK and DRV [Democratic Republic of Vietnam].

I thanked Comrade Kurbatov for his presentation and informed him in turn about the evaluation of the Nixon visit by our Embassy.

Note: A comparison of the text of the [Shanghai] communiqué between China and the United States and the published version in the DPRK press shows that it was printed almost verbatim with only few omissions: The last sentence in the first paragraph, the third paragraph, the term “Republic [of] Korea,” and the last paragraph.

Conversation of Comrade Brezhnev with Foreign Minister Heo Dam in Moscow

Here Comrade Kurbatov remarked that Comrade Heo Dam told Comrade Brezhnev that the DPRK will assume a new position towards Japan. There are also new elements in Japan's attitude towards the DPRK. Another aspect of the talks with Comrade Brezhnev were Comrade Heo Dam's statements concerning the United Nations. The DPRK, according to Comrade Heo Dam, is expecting from the Soviet Union and the socialist countries to support and defend DPRK positions in the U.N. The PR

[People's Republic of] China would stand up and support the DPRK there as well. Comrade Heo Dam continued how it would be positive if the socialist countries will act in the U.N. in a coordinated and identical fashion with China's positions.

The issues of Japan and the U.N. were not included in the "Joint Message" [of USSR and DPRK on the visit]. Comrade Brezhnev just listened to the statements on Japan and remarked about the U.N. that this question warrants close study.

Comrade Kurbatov stated furthermore that currently the Soviet Union is excluding an attack by the South against the North.

On DPRK-PRC relations Comrade Heo Dam noticed the improvement of relations, though it had not occurred at the expense of DPRK relations with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. Moreover, Comrade Heo Dam said in his talk [with Brezhnev] that the Chinese side will be fully informed about what the Korean side expressed in its talk with the Soviet comrades.

Although it is an important question, there had been no [Korean-Soviet] consultations about party relations [KWP-Communist Party of the Soviet Union, CPSU] on this level [Brezhnev-Heo Dam].

Later Ambassador Sudarikov will inform more extensively about the Heo Dam visit.

Some Aspects of KWP Activity in the Communist World Movement

Based on a written draft, Comrade Kurbatov made the following remarks:

In 1971 and 1972 the KWP continued relations with communist and workers' parties. It participated in party congresses of several parties and practiced exchanges of delegations. It invited delegations from different parties to the DPRK. As before, the KWP builds its party relations on a bilateral basis and refrains from multilateral cooperation. It increases its efforts to summarize the ideology of *Juche* into a comprehensive system and declares Kim Il Sung's *Juche* ideology as the only basis for party activities. The 5th Party Congress pushed through a petit bourgeois, nationalist line contradicting socialist development. These nationalist tendencies and the strengthening of relations with China have increased some negative tendencies in the communist movement and in KWP relations to the communist and workers' movement. Despite official KWP declarations about the need to build relations with individual parties on the basis of Marxism-Leninism, by its actual activities in the international communist

movement, the KWP is contradicting Marxism-Leninism with the nationalist *Juche* ideology, and proletarian internationalism with “autonomy” and “independence.”

The KWP leadership does not consider the experiences of the communist world movement, and it does not follow the collectively agreed decisions of fraternal parties. Instead it praises Kim Il Sung as an eminent leader of the communist and workers’ movement and praises him as a genius of the revolution. The KWP is guided by his works where he “provided wise analysis of the features in the current international situation.” It is guided by Kim Il Sung as “a leader of the anti-imperialist forces” because his ideas “accelerate the demise of imperialism and guide the world revolution on the path of victory.” Kim Il Sung’s works, his statements during internal meetings with foreign party officials, and his published speeches invite the assumption that he has a negative view of theory and practice of the construction of socialism and communism in the Soviet Union and the socialist fraternal countries. Apparently he sees the path to socialism in the DPRK as the “only correct and exemplary one for other countries.” For instance, he declared in a conversation with the delegation of the leftist party of Swedish communists visiting the DPRK that he does not agree with the CPSU course to develop the Soviet Union as a people’s state, since in his opinion such leads to a weakening of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

According to Kim Yeongnam, Deputy Head of the [International] Department IV in the [KWP] Central Committee, who based his statement on the sayings of Kim Il Sung, “individual countries where the proletariat has risen to power cannot ignore the facts of a danger of imperialist aggression and the restoration of capitalism through encirclement by the international capital, before communism will be eventually established on a global scale.”

Based on Kim Il Sung’s ideas, Korean propaganda is currently leading a broad campaign that defines all parties as supporters of revisionism which do not agree with positions of Kim Il Sung on questions like the personality cult, dictatorship of the proletariat, class struggle, and so on. In this context a couple of embassies from the socialist countries have reached the conclusion that such a campaign leads to the development of camouflaged anti-Sovietism in the DPRK.

All this said and considered, the appeals by the Korean leaders for unity and closeness of the communist movement are just declaratory in nature, dishonest, and they are not corroborated by practical measures. The tendency becomes ever clearer that the KWP leadership does not focus on the unity of the communist world move-

ment but aims at the revolutionary peoples of the world, of which the so-called united front of the revolutionary people in Asia constitutes the core (Korea, China, Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos). This approach testifies to a gradual departure from the class position of proletarian internationalism for a transition towards a nationalist, pragmatic position. In this context internal Korean propaganda has begun to claim that the “socialist countries have lost their revolutionary spirit and therefore can currently serve only as a material base for the struggle of the revolutionary peoples.” In public propaganda this position was to be found in somewhat modified form in the *Rodong Sinmun* article “Let Us Defend the Dictatorship of the Proletariat and the Proletarian Democracy.”

As the KWP is counting China among the revolutionary countries, and based on the ideological and political closeness of positions [between DPRK and PRC], we have to conclude that the KWP is on the path to solidify party relations with China. Since 1971 they exchange party delegations. Korean propaganda welcomed the “assignments for the struggle” by the so-called 9th Party Congress of the Chinese Communist Party (CCP), as well as the implementation of the so-called “Cultural Revolution.” A “Rodong Sinmun” article celebrating the 50th anniversary of the CCP claimed, “After the Cultural Revolution, the CCP turned into an even purer, steeled and strong party.”

The KWP and PRC have established contacts and organize informational changes. In the DPRK the Chinese journal *Hongqi* continues to be circulated. In pursuing its own goals, the KWP leadership does not pay attention to the anti-Soviet aspects of China’s foreign policy. At the same time it comes close to Chinese positions, as it showed in particular concerning the events in Sudan, India/Pakistan and the Middle East.

Recently the KWP has increasingly activated its relationship with the Party of Labor of Albania. So far, DPRK efforts have not resulted in desired Korean reactions on the Albanian side, they only activated bilateral relations on the state level. For the occasion of important anniversaries they exchanged congratulations to underline traditional and friendly relations. The most active development of relations is the one with the Romanian Communist Party (RCP) on a nationalist base and under the labels of “autonomy” and “independence” of the parties. Contacts between KWP and RCP are activated according to an agreement from 1971.

KWP participation in the party congresses of the fraternal parties in 1971 (Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Mongolia, GDR, Poland, Soviet Union) has not resulted in progress of relations between the parties. The gatherings were used by the KWP leadership as a podium to propagate its special positions in front of the international communist movement, namely to emphasize “autonomy” and “independence” of parties as the base for their mutual relations.

The KWP leadership is departing from an exchange of experiences and delegations with the fraternal parties. For instance, despite respective agreements there were no party officials sent in 1971 for vacations in our respective countries. The KWP leadership pays close attention to the tendencies of parties that deviate from the documents of [the international communist and workers’ parties meeting] 1969 [in Moscow]. It is anything but coincidence that after the 1969 Moscow meeting, certain parties have paid visits to the DPRK (Sweden, Spain, Norway, Italy, and Reunion).

In its relations with the parties of capitalist countries, the KWP leaders aim to, in our opinion, influence these parties according to KWP policy and use them as a vehicle to establish diplomatic relations. We must pay close attention—and this is a dangerous phenomenon—that the KWP might establish relations with pro-Chinese separatist groups. For the first time ever, a congratulatory telegram to the KWP was published by the Communist Party of Thailand, which is completely in sync with Chinese positions.

An important vehicle to increase influence abroad is the propagation of Kim Il Sung ideas through dissemination of his works and the founding of circles. Recent observations show that more attention is paid to those circles. They attempt to include communists in them in order to create permanent organizations. The Korean leadership tries to gain increasing ground through ideological infiltration into the international communist and anti-imperialist movement. There are ever more publications of congratulatory telegrams to Kim Il Sung with praises of his personality. Those congratulatory telegrams and messages cannot hide their Korean authors. Among other things, they want to manipulate the Korean people into believing that the entire world is studying the works of Kim Il Sung.

The slide of the Korean leadership into the nationalist *Juche* ideology, the proclamation of this ideology’s universal character, and its dissemination abroad, creates an ever growing danger for the socialist community of states and the communist world

movement. It requires us to pay increasing attention and to hold consultations between our parties how to approach and deal with these KWP activities.

I thanked Comrade Kurbatov for his statements and expressed that we are in agreement about the assessment of KWP activities in the International Communist Movement.

Note

A public demonstration of DPRK-PRC relations are facts like how the PRC Embassy in France organized a friendship meeting when on 25 February the DPRK “Mansudae” Ensemble visited France (telegram of 29 February 1972). When the ensemble arrived in Geneva on 8 March, it was welcomed at the train station by, among others, the Chinese ambassador to Switzerland and employees of the Chinese Embassy. In the evening of the same day the Chinese side hosted a reception in Geneva in honor of the ensemble (telegram of 10 March 1972).

60th Birthday of Kim Il Sung on 15 April

At the end of our conversation, Comrade Kurbatov asked whether the GDR will give a present to Kim Il Sung or wants to award him an order. This is a very problematic question and the [Soviet] embassy has so far not reached a result in its discussions. Here I remarked that so far I only know that we are preparing a congratulatory letter. My personal opinion: A present should have symbolic character, if a present will indeed have to be given.

Comrade Gensicke, attaché of our Embassy, also attended this conversation.

Merten
Acting Ambassador

CC

1x Far East Department [Foreign Ministry]
1x Central Committee, Department IV
1x ZID [Foreign Ministry Central Information Service]
1x Embassy, Political Department

* * *

DOCUMENT NO. 7

[Source: South Korean Foreign Ministry Archive. Translated for NKIDP by Song Jihei]

Date and Time: March 16, 1972 10:00-11:05

Location: Panmun-gak, Panmunjeom

Details:

NORTH: I have accurately delivered Director Lee Hurak's message to Comrade Kim Yeongju, the director of organization and guidance at the Central Committee of the Party. Director Comrade Kim Yeongju in principle agrees to the issues you mentioned. We will accept Representative Jang Giyeong and his assistant Jeong Taeyeon according to the process and method you wish. We will also clearly provide a memorandum regarding safety assurance signed by Comrade Director of Organization and Guidance when we greet them. We believe it is preferable that we mutually don't describe detailed positions in the memorandum. You should address the memorandum to Director Kim Yeongju and we should address it to Director Lee Hurak. The detailed schedule for your delegate and his assistant will be planned with sufficient consideration of your delegate's opinion and we also have no objection that the schedule should be discussed between Mr. Jeong and Kim Deokhyeon when it is confirmed and whenever changes are made.

Comrade Director of Organization and Guidance Kim Yeongju mentioned that people hope that the South and the North reach a peaceful resolution on the South-North issues, and also that it is very important to accelerate the Red Cross meeting. However, our meeting is even more important. The best procedure will be to facilitate conversation first and then solve the nation's issue of peaceful reunification. Comrade Director of Organization and Guidance, Kim Yeongju, in principle, welcomes your suggestion to send your delegate and his assistant to the North on April 25th, and also mentioned that the dates between April 1st to 11th is more efficient for us. Director of Organization and Guidance Comrade Kim Yeongju mentioned that we will have a modest celebration for Premier Kim Il Sung's sixtieth birthday. Premier Kim Il Sung prohibits any political event on April 15th. Therefore, we have not invited any visitors from foreign countries and are not expecting any event.

The circumstance is completely different from what it is currently being discussed in the media. In fact, our schedule is expected to be more complex after April 15th. Around April 25th, we have May 1st [event] and are expecting some foreign visitors. Therefore, we will be busier during this period. That is to say, you will be able to meet with Comrade Director Kim Yeongju and other comrades if you visit between the dates of April 1st to 11th. I propose we meet tomorrow afternoon or during the morning the day after tomorrow regarding this issue. When we meet, please provide us with a response regarding this. I could directly phone comrade Director Kim Yeongju from this location to report [your response] and receive a conclusion. This is the end of the official message.

SOUTH: You just mentioned that our meeting is even more important than accelerating the Red Cross meeting. What do you mean by our meeting?

NORTH: It refers to the meetings such as the ones between Mr. Jeong and Kim Deokhyeon and visits from Representative Jang Giyeong. In other words, it refers to our meetings that are processed aside to the Red Cross meeting.

SOUTH: What is your response to the issues that I mentioned as personal opinion when we met on the 14th? I assume you have reported my personal opinion to Director of Organization and Guidance, Kim Yeongju. (Read through notes.)

NORTH: I have indeed reported what you described as your personal opinion to Comrade Director of Organization and Guidance, Kim Yeongju in person. Kim Yeongju, director of organization and guidance welcomed it, mentioning it is as a good idea. He mentioned that he is willing to meet with Director Lee Hurak if he is the one with President Park's deepest trust. He mentioned, if so we will be able to solve the issues most quickly through a direct approach. However, regarding the meeting location, he stated we should reconsider since there is no reason to travel to a third country when we have sufficient places that are quiet and appropriate to meet within our country. When the two officials meet, it seems there are sufficient issues to be discussed.

SOUTH: I personally believe it is quite difficult to hold the meeting within the country in terms of maintaining confidentiality. When the high-level officials determine to meet, Director of Organization and Guidance, Kim Yeongju must visit us or Director Lee Hurak must cross over to the North somehow. However, considering the current circumstances, they must pass through Panmunjeom and there are quite a number of hardships in the process in terms of confidentiality. In order to maintain confidentiality, the officials must stop over at a third country to visit Seoul or Pyongyang. In this regard, a third country will be an appropriate location. Anyways, Mr. Kim and I should make cooperative efforts to promote a meeting for the high-level officials. When we move on to discussing it in detail, we could both examine the issue of where to hold the meeting.

NORTH: Did you also report to Director Lee Hurak on the statement that you mentioned as your personal opinion?

SOUTH: I certainly did. I have reported to him in detail even on the conversations that we discussed as personal opinions along with the official discussions. Director Lee Hurak also provided positive remarks regarding the meeting between Director Lee Hurak and Director of Organization and Guidance, Kim Yeongju. Have you reported to Director of Organization and Guidance, Kim Yeongju on my personal suggestion regarding Mr. Kim and I exchanging visits between Seoul and Pyongyang with permissions from high-level officials?

NORTH: I have not reported regarding the issue [to Director Kim Yeongju].

SOUTH: Please report to him on the issue and provide us with a response when we meet next time. I believe it will be very helpful if Mr. Kim visits Seoul to meet with Director Lee Hurak in person, and also if I visit Pyongyang to meet with Director of Organization and Guidance, Kim Yeongju. If we listened to the [high-level] official's messages in person and report to the supervisors in person, it will be very helpful for the high-level officials to meet with each other. President Jang Giyeong's visit to the North is only a part of exchanging conversation. The two of us (Kim Deokhyeon and Jeong Hongjin) will be able to provide more practical functions.

NORTH: If Mr. Jeong will visit, when would it be?

SOUTH: In this case, it can happen much faster. We could enable Mr. Kim and I to visit Seoul and Pyongyang with ease, couldn't we? The reason for us to set President Jang's visit on April 25th was because we considered your schedule but also because we considered President Jang Giyeong's health so that he is able to make the visit during the end of April when it is warmer. The date was set as it is also because President Jang Giyeong himself needed some time to prepare.

NORTH: Then let's meet tomorrow (12th) again.

SOUTH: Let us meet at the Freedom House on the 12th. Since we have the Red Cross working-level meeting tomorrow, I will confirm the time when the meeting finishes. Let us plan on around 13:30 to 14:00 roughly.

* * *

DOCUMENT NO. 8

[Source: South Korean Foreign Ministry Archive. Translated for NKIDP by Song Jihei]

Meeting with Director of KCIA Lee Hurak (1)

Date and Time: April 19, 1972 13:43-14:30

Location: KCIA Director's Office, 19th Floor, Government Complex, Seoul

Participants:

SOUTH

LEE Hurak - Director of Korean Central Intelligence Agency

LEE Cheolhee - Acting Deputy Director of Intelligence Service, Korean Central Intelligence Agency

JEONG Hongjin - Director of Conference Management, Conference Office, Korean Red Cross

NORTH

Kim Deokhyeon - Chief Officer of the Political Bureau, Central Committee, Korean Workers' Party

SOUTH: Welcome. It is unfortunate that it started to rain as you arrived.

NORTH: How is President Park?

SOUTH: How are Premier Kim and Director Kim Yeongju?

NORTH: I'd like to deliver Director Kim Yeongju's regards along with his letter of confidence and a personal letter.

SOUTH: (Confirmed the letter of confidence)

NORTH: Comrade Director of Organization and Guidance Kim mentioned he does not have a particular message since Mr. Jeong Hongjin visited and spoke with him. He mentioned that he'd appreciate if you could provide us with many good remarks.

SOUTH: I've heard all about the things discussed through comrade Jeong Hongjin. Director Kim's thoughts were completely in accord with my thoughts. I believe I have the feeling not because I heard about it. It is because we [both] belong to the white-robed race.

While there may be some repetition, I'd like to speak to you frankly about what I think. There are clearly some politicians in both the South and the North who hope for our reunification promoted through military force. It is also a fact that both the South and the North have been building war preparations for the past 20 years. There are some people in the South who wish for a northward reunification using military force. In such a case, it may be possible that we triumph and reach reunification. Moreover, I believe there are some people who wish to use armed force in the North as well and it may be possible to achieve reunification through the invasion of the South. However, if we reunify through a war again, "Hicheon Factory" in the North and Ulsan Second Industrial Complex or the oil refinery in the South will be devastated and our people have to go back to the point before the Korean War.

I feel responsible for the circumstance as I am in charge of a section of the government. The North has a Communist system and the South has a capitalist system. The systems are different to both extremes. Therefore, reunification requires a sufficient amount of time and effort. Nonetheless, we can't sit still and wait for reunification to happen. We must promote non-political exchanges. We have established the Red Cross meetings as a step towards these exchanges.

We should conduct the conversation between Director Kim Yeongju and me as the both of us are well acquainted with the highest-level officials' thoughts. I believe it is best that Director Kim and I take on such tasks on our own back. Instead of remaining indifferent until we achieve reunification, we should exchange [material matters] and interchange [non-material matters] if we can. I suggest that we need to get rid of any discomfort in our people's social lives even prior to our reunification. There are two ways in order to achieve this objective,

First is for Director Kim Yeongju and me to meet after drawing our opinions closer through working-level meetings. The other is for Director Kim Yeongju and me to meet in person first to speak openly and then hold working-level meetings.

I will study the issue. However, I hope Director Kim Yeongju has a chance to examine the issue as well. To summarize,

1. We must initiate political meetings in order to achieve reunification as soon as possible;
2. We should exchange officials and communications on the economy even before we solve the issues with political reunification;
3. In order to promote this objective, Director Kim Yeongju and I should hold meetings.

North: You have mentioned that there are two methods. You have mentioned the first is to hold working-level meetings and the other is for the two [high-level] officials to meet first and discuss the issues openly. Comrade Director Kim Yeongju stated the latter is very much desired.

SOUTH: I endorse the idea that we meet first and then hold working-level meetings. We shall so proceed.

NORTH: I will accurately report Director Lee's statement [to Director Kim].

SOUTH: In the letter, you mentioned that you will entrust the date of visit to me. I will deliver the answer through Comrade Jeong later.

NORTH: The international circumstance is changing rapidly. We must meet as soon as possible. Please notify me the preferred date of your visit. The two high-level officials must meet to find a desired solution for the South and North misunderstandings and peaceful reunification of our motherland. If you are unable to visit during April, we would like to have another official who President Park trusts to visit us. Among them we would like to have Mr. Jang Giyeong visit. When Mr. Jang Giyeong visits, Second Vice-Premier Pak Seongcheol will meet with Mr. Jang Giyeong. He [Director Kim Yeongju] stated the best would be Director Lee Hurak visiting us.

SOUTH: Even after Mr. Kim Deokhyeon's departure, I will contact [you] through Comrade Jeong in the near future.

NORTH: Would you be able to answer us if you could visit us soon during April?

SOUTH: I would like to visit you soon. Of course, it is best that I visit. Anyways, I will try to remain within the range of what Mr. Kim Yeongju had planned. The details include the possibility of who will visit [whether I will visit or someone else will visit] and also when to visit. Mr. Kim Yeongju is occupied in many tasks, isn't he?

NORTH: He is occupied with a number of tasks. However, he is looking forward to discussing issues with Director Lee Hurak.

SOUTH: I was previously told that you are quite occupied during April...You also have the "May Day" events...

NORTH: We both had different reasons then.

SOUTH: Even within the government, there are some people who support the idea that we force one-sided suggestions [to the North]. I am arguing to avoid it from happening.

We shall not force one-sided suggestions. Such things (one-sided suggestions) rather get in the way of achieving reunification. In order to coincide with the prevailing opinion in the international community, [forcing] one-sided suggestions is to be avoided.

NORTH: In order to solve such issues, the two high-level officials ought to meet as soon as possible.

SOUTH: Very well. It is the most urgent task among our nation's historic assignments.

North: It is true. We must resolve the misunderstanding and distrust between the South and the North. We should resolve what we can and we should pass over the things we can. This is what comrade Director of Organization thinks.

SOUTH: I am able to tell because I sympathize with him. Even without a long conversation, I've become aware of what you think. Although it may be somewhat uncomfortable, we must meet face to face to talk openly and it will lead to finding solutions to our issues.

NORTH: Comrade Kim Yeongju wishes for an unconstrained procedure without diplomacy. He is also well acquainted with the Premier's intention. For instance regarding the defamation issue, we are able to solve it soon.

SOUTH: Although we were unable to reach an agreement on the agenda you previously proposed, the media has changed quite a lot for the past three days, don't you think?

NORTH: I was very glad to listen to the [change in the] media.

SOUTH: It is a short distance [from the North] to Seoul, isn't it?

NORTH: It is very close indeed. I am deeply touched.

SOUTH: Anyways, I believe Mr. Kim has visited and accomplished the tasks for Mr. Kim [Yeongju]. Although it is short, I hope you take a good rest. I will speak with you again tomorrow if there is anything I forgot or anything I'd like to add. We, people of

the same motherland, were set apart because the 38th parallel divided us. Anyways, please take a good rest.

NORTH: I consider I am at my own home.

SOUTH: You do not need to be concerned. Let's say this out loud. Mr. Kim is a Communist and I am a capitalist. Will it work even if someone tries to brainwash us? "Mr. Jeong, show them as it is." We should meet tomorrow at 18:00. Since we have the Indonesian CIA Director visiting us today, Mr. Kim and I should have dinner together.

* * *

DOCUMENT NO. 9

[Source: South Korean Foreign Ministry Archive. Translated for NKIDP by Song Jihei]

Meeting with Director of KCIA Lee Hurak (2)

Date and Time: April 20, 1972 17:00-17:35

Location: KCIA Director's Office, 19th Floor, Government Complex, Seoul

Participants:

SOUTH

LEE Hurak - Director of Korean Central Intelligence Agency

LEE Cheolhee - Acting Deputy Director of Intelligence Service, Korean Central Intelligence Agency

JUNG Hongjin - Director of Conference Management, Conference Office, Korean Red Cross

NORTH

KIM Deokhyeon - Chief Officer of the Political Bureau, Central Committee, Korean Workers' Party

SOUTH: Does Mr. Kim have anything else to ask?

NORTH: There is nothing more.

SOUTH: I would like to clarify one more time. Director Kim Yeongju mentioned that he would prefer my visit to occur during April. However, since today is April 20th, it is somewhat too close in hand. Also, there are some personal reasons. Therefore, I'd like to visit during the beginning of May. In such case, I will notify you at least a week ahead. Frankly speaking, I have determined to visit the North solely based on my trust for comrade Director Kim Yeongju. Nonetheless, we must study how we can avoid the future historians speaking of my visit as a careless journey. Mr. Jeong should study this matter.

I couldn't care less about such a matter. However, you should examine what [kind of] memorandum I should accept [to make the visit] in regards to the administrative procedure. Comrade Jeong should discuss this with Mr. Kim Deokhyeon. Mr. Kim might or might not remember this. However, when I suggested that Mr. Kim Yeongju and I meet in a third country, Mr. Kim Yeongju mentioned it is better that we meet at a domestic location. Afterwards, he added we could meet in the country or also outside the country. When I suggested meeting at a third country, what I had in mind was that we must jointly announce our issue in order to avoid giving the impression that one [actively] proposes and the other [submissively] accepts. The details of our announcement should include who and who met from when to when at where to discuss the South-North issues. As a result, we have agreed to the following in pursuit of our nation's peaceful reunification. We will each make our best effort to utilize our influence in attaining what we have agreed.

1. We will initiate the negotiation for our nation's reunification in the near future;
2. As a part of the negotiation, we should facilitate the exchange in human and material resources and in communication.

Once we present such a joint-statement, the spokesperson for our government officially announces that the government welcomes the agreement. This was my original plan. Now that we are shifting the location to Pyongyang, I am not certain how we should apply this...I am speaking without any concealment that it was the main reason I suggested meeting at a third country.

Director Lee Hurak in the South and Director Kim Yeongju in the North, the two of us endeavor ourselves as the flag-bearers of peace, it will be solved peacefully. If we are unable to provide our influence [in solving the issue], and when we fall to the challenge of those who argue for solving the issue through force, the result can be fatal since there are extremists in each society and organization.

NORTH: I greatly appreciate your candid statement. I will accurately report [to Director Kim] without omitting a single word. When Director Lee visits Pyongyang, we will be able to achieve some good results.

SOUTH: The issues that we have are tasks that need to be handled. I expect there will be troubles on both side when handling such tasks. However, regardless of what people say, I believe if we strive with sincere patriotism, the opposing party will eventually understand us. When I visit Pyongyang, you should not consider me as a foreigner and treat me as a foreigner.

NORTH: We will welcome you with our heart. When we return, we will start preparations to greet you as a guest of the state.

South: You shouldn't do that. We should never be involved in a war. In the South, I will be the advocate [for not having a war], and on your side, Director Kim Yeongju should take the role. Although there may be some hardship in the peaceful resolution of our issues, we must never hastily engage in a war.

NORTH: Regarding the issue, comrade Director Kim Yeongju also clearly mentioned that not engaging in a war is highly desired.

SOUTH: During the Korean War, the South was largely destroyed. The North was likewise, correct?

NORTH: In terms of destruction, the North was worse. The population in Pyongyang then was about 400 thousand. There were 500 thousand bombs dropped on Pyongyang city. Only two buildings (one of them was Hwashin Department Store, built by the Japanese) survived the bombing. Not only that, but all the factories were destroyed.

SOUTH: You don't need to mention destruction. I have watched a documentary film on the Korean War today. I have not only seen the destruction the war resulted but also the distress people experienced due to the war. We must prevent such an event from happening, and there has to be people working to stop this. The media [in the South] speaks about your intent to invade the South. There are people on our side arguing for a solution using force. I am quite certain there are some people who argue the same on your side. Whoever attempts to make it happen, we must oppose the idea to solve our issue with force and stop such unfortunate event from happening. I would like to stress one more time. If we experience a war at the current time, it will be not at all like the war we experienced 20 years ago. I am especially anxious about having the shape of our land intact.

NORTH: We have repeatedly mentioned that we have no intent to invade the South. While you may be unable to trust it, you will be able to when you meet with Comrade Kim Yeongju.

SOUTH: It is not an issue of trusting or not. Regardless of which society you look at, there are always [a group of] extremists. Especially you should not trust what the military men say. Regardless of whether they are from the South or the North, military men always speak confidently [even when they are unsure].

* * *

DOCUMENT NO. 10

[Source: PolA AA, MfAA, C 951/76. Obtained for NKIDP by Bernd Schaefer and translated for NKIDP by Karen Riechert]

GDR Embassy to DPRK
Pyongyang, 9 June 1972

Note

On Information from DPRK Deputy Foreign Minister, Comrade Li Manseok, on 8 June 1972 for the Ambassadors of the European Socialist Countries (except Albania) (content already reported in telegram of 9 June 1972)

Comrade Li Manseok had invited us to provide the following collective information. Orally, he informed us extensively about the historic course of the Red Cross Organization talks between the DPRK and South Korea:

They had begun on 20 September 1971 at the initiative of the DPRK in accordance with the DPRK's course of peaceful and independent unification. The South Korean side had to agree to these talks following domestic and external pressure.

During the entire course of talks the South Korean side applied delaying tactics. Yet the patience and perseverance of the DPRK in defense of the justified national interest of the entire Korean people led to a certain interim result.

In order to reach a final agreement on the proposed agenda for substantial content negotiations, the preparatory meetings were interrupted through confidential expert negotiations that took place in the time between 21 February and 5 June 1972. The most recent expert meeting resulted in the following agreed upon agenda for the content negotiations:

1. Research and transmission of addresses and the fate of family members and relatives scattered over the North and the South;
2. Implementation of free visits and free reunions between family members and relatives scattered over the North and the South;
3. Implementation of free postal exchange between family members and relatives scattered over the North and the South;
4. Re-integration of family members and relatives scattered over the North and the South on the base of declarations of free will;
5. Other questions to be resolved on humanitarian grounds.

The expert talks stretched over some time as the South Korean side wanted to propose another course through its delaying tactics. The South Korean side desired to have the first reunion between such family members and relatives in Panmunjeom, or another

location to be decided under control of the Red Cross organization. Also the exchange of letters should be conducted under supervision of the Red Cross. The DPRK, however, demanded all along to have free visits and free reunions at a location to be chosen by family members and relatives themselves. During the course of meetings the South Korean side finally ran out of arguments and agreed to the correct argumentation of the DPRK.

With the agreement on a proposal for a joint agenda the confidential expert meetings have now ended. During the next, the 20th meeting of the preliminary talks scheduled for 16 June 1972 this joint proposal must now be finally confirmed. Those preliminary meetings also have to decide on the composition of delegations and the date for the first meeting of content negotiations, as well as on additional procedural matters.

The DPRK wants to start the content negotiation as soon as possible “to minimize the suffering of the people and to serve as a springboard to unification.” The DPRK is expecting further delaying tactics by the South Korean side, but it will continue also in the future to display patience and perseverance. Swift progress on this question now depends entirely on the South Korean positions.

USSR Ambassador Comrade Sudarikov thanked me for this information in the name of the ambassadors present and asked for a continuation of this form of information policy. He wished the Korean comrades the best to achieve their just objectives.

Addendum

Comrade Li Manseok did not mention that the DPRK also had made concessions during the course of negotiations. In our assessment, this applies in particular to the fact that the term “friends” was eliminated from the original DPRK proposal of “family members, relatives and friends.”

During all our recent conversations, in the Foreign Ministry as well as in the KWP Central Committee department, the Korean comrades showed vivid and concrete interest on how visits are organized between West Germany and the GDR, as well as between West Berlin and the GDR. They asked straightforward whether the same extent of visitor traffic between West Berlin and the GDR is also organized between the GDR and West Germany, and the GDR and West Berlin. I explained the political reasons still advocating against a wide extension of the latter direction of visitor traffic. I expressed our principled and cautious approach on this issue. The Korean com-

rades always responded that they desire “completely free mutual traffic.” Ambassador Sudarikov told me during a conversation that Kim Il Sung had once used this metaphor: “White is easily colored over red, yet it is much harder to color red on white.”

There is no doubt that the DPRK comrades are harboring certain illusions on the question of unification in general, as well as on the issue of visitor traffic. Obviously we support through our remarks and statements the more realistic DPRK position to the fullest extent and wish for its success.

Henke
Ambassador

CC

Please see back! [page not provided]

* * *

DOCUMENT NO. 11

[Source: PolA AA, MfAA, C 951/76. Obtained for NKIDP by Bernd Schaefer and translated for NKIDP by Karen Riechert]

GDR Embassy to DPRK
Pyongyang, 4 July 1972

N o t e

on Information provided by DPRK Deputy Foreign Minister, Comrade Kim Yongtaek, on 3 July 1972 for the Ambassadors and Acting Ambassadors of Poland, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Mongolia, Romania, Hungary, and the GDR at 20:40 hours in the DPRK Foreign Ministry

The Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs released important information on the problem of Korean unification. Reading from a written manuscript, he made the following statements:

The problem of unification of the country has to be solved without any interference from outside, without foreign forces, with the forces of the Koreans alone, and in a peaceful manner. Party and government of the DPRK have focused all their efforts in this direction and recently achieved important results through contacts and meetings. He [Kim Yongtaek] defined the Red Cross talks in Panmunjeom as unofficial contacts with South Korea on a low level. With the agreement on an agenda their first phase has come to a certain conclusion.

Between 2 and 5 May 1972 Lee Hurak, head of the South Korean intelligence service, visited the DPRK and had talks with Kim Yeongju (Note: brother of Kim Il Sung). Among other things, during his visit he was also received by Kim Il Sung.

From 29 May to 1 June 1972 Pak Seongcheol, and not Kim Yeongju, visited Seoul and talked to the intelligence chief [Lee Hurak] and Park Chung Hee.

The three principles of unification were instantly agreed upon, and they will be publicized at an appropriate time. Afterwards there was another meeting where a joint declaration was agreed to become public simultaneously in the DPRK and in South Korea on the 4th of July 1972 at 10:00 hours. Yet prior to this publication, the DPRK Deputy Foreign Minister emphasized, the Foreign Ministry wants to inform the ambassadors of the fraternal countries. Then Kim Yongtaek provided more details of the joint declaration:

1. The unification of the fatherland is supposed to occur on the basis of the agreed upon three principles:
 - a. The problem must be solved without any interference from outside with the Korean people's own forces;
 - b. Unification must be implemented without any arms involved, it has to be realized in a peaceful manner;
 - c. Notwithstanding all the ideological and other differences of the political systems, national unity, and a great, unified nation, is supposed to be created.

2. An atmosphere of mutual good faith and trust has to be created. Thus all slander and military provocations have to cease in order to exclude a sudden military incursion.
3. There was a complete accordance of opinion that exchanges between North and South Korea shall be opened up on all areas and levels.
4. Both sides will work towards the success of the Red Cross talks.
5. There was an agreement about the installation of a direct phone line between Seoul and Pyongyang to exclude a military attack and to solve all upcoming operational questions.
6. In order to increase speed in implementing the points mentioned above, in particular the unification of the fatherland on the basis of the agreed principles, a committee for coordination and guidance shall be established with Kim Yeongju and Lee Hurak as chairmen.
7. Both sides are convinced that the points agreed upon reflect the will of the people and shall be realized.

The declaration was signed by Kim Yeongju and Lee Hurak.

Comrade Kim Yongtaek continued:

- The agreement became reality since the South Koreans have adopted the correct course of the DPRK government. It is correct since it represents the path to victory.
- The joint agreement can become a turning point for the unification of the fatherland.
- Despite the agreement there are still many issues unresolved, and the struggle for the solution of the problems is complicated.

Deputy Foreign Minister Comrade Kim Yongtaek requested to inform our governments as soon as possible about the above-mentioned issues. He voiced the expectation for even stronger support of the struggle of the Korean people for the unification of the country.

Note: On 3 July our Embassy was invited to a press conference for 4 July at 10:00 hours to be held by the 2nd Deputy of the Prime Minister, Pak Seongcheol.

Merten
Embassy Counselor

CC
1x Foreign Ministry, Far East Department
1x Central Committee, Department IV
1x ZID
1x Embassy/Political Department
1x MA Comrade Grünberg

* * *

DOCUMENT NO. 12

[Source: MOL, XIX-J-1-j Korea, 1972, 59. doboz, 81-107, 00958/25/1972. Obtained and translated for NKIDP by Balázs Szalontai]

July 10, 1972
Telegram, Embassy of Hungary in North Korea to the Hungarian Foreign Ministry.

In reply to a question, the South Vietnamese [NLF] ambassador, who paid me a farewell visit on [July] 8th, stated, among others, the following:

1) In his view, the North Korean-South Korean joint declaration is as harmful to the existing but weak South Korean revolutionary forces as useful it is for relaxing the tension on the Korean Peninsula, because it disarms [the revolutionaries].

2) In his view, for the time being the joint declarations benefits primarily Park Chung Hee, reinforcing his position.

Comment: it is possible that this is not merely the personal opinion of the South Vietnamese ambassador but also the opinion of Vietnam, under the present difficult circumstances in Vietnam.

The South Vietnamese ambassador also emphasized that they, the Vietnamese, had supported the idea of [finding] a peaceful solution for the Korean question from the very beginning, and they also would like to solve their own Vietnamese question by peaceful means, but only in a principled way, without yielding of their principles. The North Korean-South Korean joint declaration makes one think that the North yielded of its principles, but this issue requires further analysis.

– 137 – K. –

* * *

DOCUMENT NO. 13

[Source: MOL, XIX-J-1-j Korea, 1972, 59. doboz, 81-107, 00958/32/1972. Obtained and translated for NKIDP by Balázs Szalontai]

July 13, 1972

Memorandum, Hungarian Foreign Ministry.

[...] The 8-point proposal that the DPRK had made on 8 April 1971 has demonstrably undergone incessant changes up to mid-1972, and in matters of principle, at that. There is a qualitative change in the new proposals, namely, that the DPRK—in contrast with its earlier demands—no longer makes the withdrawal of the American troops a precondition of a peaceful settlement (because these [troops] will depart anyway, sooner or later), it does not demand the immediate dissolution of UNCURK [United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea] (because, in any case, the cancellation of the commission's work can be achieved only

in the UN), and it is ready to negotiate with Park Chung Hee and his colleagues (because this is only a transition period, as the influence of the opposition forces is growing in South Korea).

[...] (In the fall of 1971, Pak Seongcheol, [during his visit] in Moscow, proposed to abrogate the Soviet-Korean treaty [of friendship, cooperation and mutual assistance]; the Soviet side, of course, could not approve this [idea].)

In the spring of this year, the leaders of South Korea also came forward with new proposals for national unification. The new element of these proposals was that the Republic of Korea attached an important precondition to national unification, namely, that the North should renounce armed [unification] as a solution, and declare that it would not attack the southern part of the country.

[...] In the spirit of “limited withdrawal,” the USA has reduced the strength of the troops it is stationing in South Korea, but at the same time it sent more advanced military equipment there, and supported the South Korean stabilization [by providing the ROK] with economic assistance. This undoubtedly yielded several results: along the Demilitarized Zone, in the first line, the South Korean army has wholly taken over the position of American troops, its military potential has increased, and at the same time living standards have also increased. [...] China’s involvement in the efforts aimed at solving the Korean question may also be motivated by the following objective: this way China seeks to demonstrate that there is no need for collective security in Asia—[a conception] initiated by the USSR—since “it is possible to achieve a solution, or at least break the logjam, in some Asian questions without [creating such a collective security system],” only “the superpowers must cease their control over, and interference in, other countries” (quoted from a recent speech of Zhou Enlai).

[...]

In the press of the developed capitalist countries, but also in the press of the developing countries, one can frequently find statements which hold the Korean agreement up as a model for the DRV and the PRG [Provisional Revolutionary Government of

South Vietnam]. The Saigon regime makes particularly great efforts to use this diversionary maneuver in its attempts to disarm the Vietnamese revolutionary forces. [...]

Sándor Etre

* * *

DOCUMENT NO. 14

[Source: Diplomatic Archive, Bulgarian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Sofia. Record 28, File 1705. Pgs 114-123. Translated for NKIDP by Sveta Milusheva]

Information regarding: New developments concerning the issue of the uniting of Korea and relations between the DPRK and South Korea, August 16 1972

For official use!

Information

The 38th parallel, determined by the world powers as a temporary dividing line of the military activities of the Soviet and American troops, with the goal of accepting the surrender of the 200,000 Japanese army in Korea, after World War II, and especially after the three year Korean War (1950-1953), turned, in fact, into a border between the two countries with different societal and political structure, created on the territory of the country in 1943, [countries] which did not recognize each other, and both were laying claim to represent of the entire Korean population—the DPRK and the Republic of Korea, whose governments had placed, and continued to place the issue of reuniting the country as a main task of their internal and foreign political activities.

The position of the South Korean government, declared repeatedly and not changed in the course of almost 20 years, boils down to “reuniting through holding common elections throughout the whole country under the observation of the United Nations.” The proposals of the DPRK government are diametrically opposed to this position. Their essence is the focus on the solving of the Korean issue “without foreign in-

tervention, independently, on peaceful democratic ground” and “the formation of a united central democratic government through holding of free common elections in the southern and northern parts of the country,” after the withdrawal of all foreign armies from the South Korean territory.

Standing on fundamentally different poles, after the three-year Korean war between the DPRK and South Korea, all contacts and connection were cut off, and their official positions on the issue of reuniting the country had more of a propagandistic goal, as opposed to tangible value and were mostly aimed at the countries, aiding one or the other side in the examining of the Korean issue in the UN.

During the 60s, the governments of the North and South brought forward an unofficial plan, unachievable in practical terms, course towards preparations for the reuniting of the country through military force. The term “in a peaceful way and through democratic means” was deprived of all substance and was used solely as a propagandistic slogan.

The South Korean administration called for a “march toward the North” and “a reuniting through victory over communism,” and in the DPRK one could not “think about a peaceful reuniting with the presence of the aggressive troops of the American imperialism in South Korea and today’s puppets.”/Kim Il Sung—report of the CC of the KWP at the 5th congress of the KWP./

The main efforts in both parts were aimed at the modernization of the military and the building of solid defense systems, eating up the greater part of the annual budgets of both governments, raising the combative and moral spirit of the soldiers and officers, and the training and arming of “the whole population.”

These mutually irreconcilable policies were accompanied by constant incidents along the DMZ, the sending of individuals and groups with the goal of spying, and the constant sustaining of tension on the Korean peninsula.

The past 1971 year was characteristic with certain changes and the appearance of new moments in their positions on the issue of reuniting the country and their mutual relations. Without ceasing their hostile policies, in different statements of officials from the North and the South, a readiness was expressed for establishing direct contacts, organizing meetings and carrying conversations. Of course, these statements in the preliminary stages contained many prerequisites, which at the beginning of the present year formed into two main [ones]:

- the South Korean government to renounce “its orientation towards foreign powers” for the reunification, and
- the DPRK government—“from its plans of achieving reunification through military force.”

The international setting which has changed and the general tendency for reducing tensions in the whole world, the disapproval on the side of the USSR and other socialist countries, including China, finding itself in the process of improving relations with the USA, of the policies for reunification of Korea through military force, and also the presence of American troops in South Korea, compelled the DPRK government to give up /for the moment/ its military ventures and to raise again as a primary plan the peaceful and democratic way for the reunification of the country, which was imbedded in the foundation of the policies of the “peaceful advance,” conducted by the DPRK’s government during the present year.

While in the proclamation of the Supreme People’s Council of the DPRK to the people of South Korea on April 13, 1971, expressing in 8 points the official position of the government of the DPRK on the issue of the reunification of the country, it is underlined that “we are ready to resolve peacefully the issue of reunifying the country through negotiations between the North and the South, in the event that after the removal of Park Chung Hee’s puppet faction in South Korea, a real people’s rule is established, or a patriotic democratic figure comes to power,” already in Kim Il Sung’s speech on August 6th there is talk of readiness for negotiations, including with Park Chung Hee’s ruling Democratic Republican Party.

These changes were confirmed by him during the interview with the chief editor of the Japanese newspaper “Asahi Shimbun,” in which it was expressed the DPRK’s readiness also to conduct a political meeting of the parties for a peaceful resolution of the Korean issue and for the simultaneous annulment of the agreements of the DPRK with the USSR and the PRC and of South Korea with the USA and Japan, in regard of removing them as a hindrance on the path to reunification.

In answer to the questions of the correspondents from the newspaper “Yomiuri Shimbun” on January 10 this year, Kim Il Sung proposed the transformation of “the truce agreement in Korea into a peace treaty between the North and the South,” which in fact established the beginning of the policies of “the peaceful advancement” for the reuniting of Korea. Later during the talks that Kim Il Sung had with correspondents from the newspaper “the New York Times” on May 26, it was pointed out

that “the differences between the North and the South should not be an obstacle in the realization of national unity and the reunification of the homeland.”

Of course, the return to the peaceful way of reuniting the country can be qualified as a tactic move of the DPRK’s government, with which it also aims to convince the USA and the South Korean government of the unsoundness of the fears about “aggression of the North towards the South” so that it might contribute to the hastening of the withdrawal of American troops while waiting for a more suitable time, when the process of carrying out the reunification would not cause international complications.

The changes in the South Korean government position can also be considered tactical.

Facing the “impregnable fortress” and the “armed people” of the DPRK on one side and the “danger” from the withdrawal of the American troops and the reduction of American military aid—on the other, the South Korean government was basically forced to find ways of reducing the tension between the two parts, which would give it time and opportunities to finish the process of modernizing the South Korean army, which had fallen behind in comparison with the DPRK—and which was necessary for the maintaining of the military balance on the Korean peninsula after the withdrawal of the American troops from South Korea. It was forced to make some contacts with the North and to accept, even though just for appearances for now, the “principle of independence” for the reuniting of the country.

At the same time, though, with the goal of straightening the internal regime, at the end of the last year, 1971, a state of emergency was announced in South Korea, and “a law for emergency measures for the defense of the country” was passed, which gave unlimited powers and opportunities to Park Chung Hee to deal with his inside adversaries and to hold centralized, under his direct watch and leadership, talks with the government and the representatives of the DPRK.

The first contacts between the North and the South were established through the Red Cross organizations during the second half of 1971.

As the South Korean telegraph agencies report, at a press-conference on August 12, 1971, the president of the Red Cross organization of South Korea, Choe Duseon, proposed a meeting of representatives from the organizations of the Red Cross in the North and South so that “the Korean families separated for the last 20 years” can be helped.

The government of South Korea immediately expressed its full support of the proposal, and “two days later—so did the DPRK.”

After 5 meetings of messengers for mutual exchange of letters, on September 20, 1971 in Panmunjon, the first round of preliminary negotiations was started.

Right at the very beginning of the conversations between the five-member delegations of the two organizations, the place for the main negotiations was agreed on—alternating between Pyongyang and Seoul. The installation of two direct telephone lines between the two points in Panmunjon was also agreed upon.

After 19 preliminary meetings the principle agreement of the two parties concerning the agenda of the main negotiations was reached, and was presented to a group of experts for finalizing.

With the conclusion of the experts' work, which took place behind closed doors, on the 20th round of preliminary talks, the daily agenda of the main negotiations was decided on, which included the following issues:

1. Tracing the addresses and clarifying the fate of the separated members of the families and relatives, and letting them know of this.
2. Establishing a free mutual visit and a free meeting of the families and relatives.
3. Establishment of a free correspondence between the separated members of the families and the relatives.
4. Bringing together the separated families by their own free will and desire.
5. Other issues subject to a humanitarian solution.

At the 23rd round of the negotiations the date of the opening of the main negotiations was agreed on—August 5th this year, and the makeup of the two delegations and the accompanying experts were also agreed on. It was decided that the two delegations would be made up of 7 members, headed by the leaders of the organizations of the Red Cross of the two countries or by one of their deputies and [there would be] 70 experts.

At the moment when the conclusion of the preliminary talks was expected, during the 24th round, the DPRK delegation came out with an additional proposal for the invitation and participation during the first two meetings—in Pyongyang and in

Seoul, of representatives of the political parties and the public organizations of the North and South, which was met with reserve by the South Korean delegation. [The proposal] made impossible the opening of the negotiations on the already agreed on date—August 5th, and it was used to pressure the South Korean delegation for the specifications of the place of the first meeting.

The two unagreed issues, along with other such, subject to specification were put forth again for review by the group of experts, who after a couple of meetings were able to achieve a certain amount of agreement, stated in the 25th round of the preliminary negotiations on August 11th this year. It was announced that the first meeting of the main negotiations would take place on August 30th this year in Pyongyang, and the second—in Seoul on September 13th.

In the DPRK as well as in South Korea, the negotiations between representatives of the Red Cross organizations are considered as a first step on the road to reuniting the country.

The second step towards this goal was unexpected to the world public, as well as to the Korean people just.

On July 4th this year at 10 o'clock in the morning at press conferences in Pyongyang and Seoul, as well as in the press and on the radio stations in North and South Korea, a "Joint Statement of the South and North" was announced, a result of visits to the DPRK /2-5 May 1972/ of the head of the South Korean CIA, Lee Hurak and his conversations with Kim Yeongju and Kim Il Sung and the visit of Pak Seongcheol to Seoul /29 May-1 June 1972/ and his conversations with Lee Hurak and Park Chung Hee.

The first point of the agreement determines the three main principles based on which the reunification of the country will be realized, namely:

1. "independently, without the support of foreign powers, without interference from the outside;"
2. "in a peaceful way without the use of armed forces" and
3. "regardless of differences in the ideology, the ideals, and the system."

In the DPRK the authorship of the above “three principles” is ascribed to Kim Il Sung, who, according to the bulletin of the CC of the Red Cross organization in the DPRK on July 20th this year, “feels a pain in his soul more than anyone, because of the tragic circumstances of the divided country.”

In South Korea, the propaganda qualifies the Joint Proclamation as a result of Park Chung Hee’s “efforts” and policies for a “peaceful and independent reunification” of Korea.

Without a doubt though, is the fact that the elaboration and agreement of the above “principles” are a result of the policies implemented by the governments of the two parts, identical in form, particular, with a heavily nationalistic character, and the concessions and acceptance of the mutual conditions: “the independent principle”—by the South and the “peaceful path”—by the North.

The shared nationalistic features were also underlined by Kim Il Sung in his talk with correspondents from the American newspaper, Harrison Salisbury and John Lee of the “The New York Times” on May 26th this year. He stated that, “lately the South Korean leaders, although only in word, talk about “self-initiative,” “independence” and “self-defense,” and about the desire for the independent reunification of the country. If this is looked at positively, it can be said that it has something in common with our ideas about independence, self-dependence, and self-defense.”

In reality, in both the DPRK and South Korea an active ideological brainwashing of the population is carried out in the spirit of “Juche”/self-dependence, independence and self-defense/, against submission to foreign influence. These nationalistic traits, in practice, have a very controversial character. They are placated when the “ingenuity and greatness” of Kim Il Sung and Park Chung Hee is being proved, accordingly in North and South Korea, and are completely forgotten when the receiving political, military, economic, and other aid from third countries is an issue.

This is confirmed, as well, by the third principle—the achievement of the great national consolidation, “independently from the differences in the ideology, the ideals, and the system,” or as it is underlined in South Korea, on the basis of “the national Juche ideology,” which in fact replaces the class principle with the “national” and foresees joint existence in the ideology.

In the following six separate points of the agreement are included the issues agreed on between the two countries:

-- “not to offend or attack one another;”

- “to restrain themselves from armed provocations;”
- “to undertake active measures for the prevention of sudden violent outbreaks;”
- “organizing of a multilateral exchange in different areas;”
- “to collaborate for the Joint Proclamation and the realization of the independent peaceful reuniting;”
- “to support and contribute to the faster, successful conclusion of the negotiations of the Red Cross;”
- “to establish a direct telephone line between Pyongyang and Seoul;”
- “to form a “Committee for regulation” of the question between the North and the South” and others.

Both countries began the fulfillment of the promises taken up through the joint agreement—mainly technically, on the day after it was published.

In the press and on the radio the two countries stopped hurling abuses at Park Chung Hee and Kim Il Sung. Announcements have not appeared concerning armed incidences and breakings of the dividing line.

According to a South Korean radio station in Seoul, during negotiations an agreement was signed for the establishment of a direct telephone line between the work cabinets of Kim Yeongju and Lee Hurak, which can be used only by them or by three people designated by them, every day, except on Saturdays, Sundays and holidays.

But there have not yet been seen any real changes in the internal political activities of the two governments in the spirit of the “principles” of the Joint Proclamation, which puts under suspicion their actual value.

The announcement of the mutual visits and the fact of the signing of the agreement were a surprise for the South Korean people as much as for the diplomatic circles in Pyongyang. Already the next day after its announcement though, the newspapers, the radio, and the television shows were full of messages about “the huge interest of the people from the North and South” for its complete approval. The optimism of the Korean people regarding the issue of reuniting the country was also expressed repeatedly by the representatives of the Korean public at their meetings with representatives from different countries.

According to agencies in South Korea, the agreement between the North and the South was met by the South Korean people with great “excitement” as “a sensational piece of news.”

The reaction of the opposition New Democratic Party was and still is somewhat different, seeing in the Joint Proclamation “a certain amount of danger” for “the isolation of South Korea” and insisting with the South Korean government for “inside reforms” and “the change of all laws on the basis of the principles of reunification,” “revoking the state of emergency, and reducing the tension on the Korean peninsula with the help of the USA, Japan the Soviet Union, and China, which would provide the opportunity for “consolidating the power of the country and achieving the reunification independently, through a peaceful way and on democratic principles on the basis of the South Korean social system.”

The changes which have taken place in the relations between the North and the South found a reaction among the world public as well.

The press of the fraternal socialist countries reflected the agreement and the press conferences of Pak Seongcheol and Lee Hurak held in Pyongyang and Seoul in broad announcements, without taking a specific stance on the agreement.

The Romanian leaders sent a telegram to Kim Il Sung and Choe Yonggeon, in which they expressed full support of the agreement. George Marshe also sent a telegram to Kim Il Sung.

The reaction of China was the strongest where the press, together with detailed information, published a lot of its own material—articles and commentaries supporting the agreement.

The Joint Proclamation is met with a certain amount of reserve and restraint by the representatives of the GDR and the DRV embassies. The German and Vietnamese comrades see in it elements that are contradictory to the principles of the policies carried out by them concerning relations with the FRG [Federal Republic of Germany] and South Vietnam.

The reaction of the capitalist countries is also different.

The governments of the USA, England and other western countries welcome the agreement and again express their support for the South Korean government.

The Japanese government acted in a more reserved manner.

In spite of the signed Joint Proclamation, the DPRK and South Korean governments continue to express their two different approaches towards review of the Korean issue in the United Nations.

The DPRK insists on the review of the Korean issue at the 27th session of the UN, stemming from the desire for a discussion of the questions concerning the withdrawal

of all foreign troops from the South Korean territory and the dismissing of the UN Commission on Korea, statement of obligation by the rest of the countries for non-interference in the internal affairs of the Korean people in the process of reuniting Korea and accepting according resolutions.

This position of the DPRK's government is dictated most of all by its desire for complete change of the interpretation of the Korean issue, from one connected directly to international security, to an issue of purely internal national character whose resolution has to be fulfilled by the Korean people themselves without any foreign intervention.

The South Korean government, on its part, “conducts policies directed towards not allowing the Korean issue to be included in the daily agenda of the 27th session of the UN, considering that “discussing the Korean issue will...escalate the argument around Korea and cause negative impact on the development of the negotiations between the South and North.”

The South Korean government builds its position based on its fear of the possible acceptance of a resolution at the UN session that requires the dismissal of the UN Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea, and the withdrawal of the American troops from South Korea. In confirmation of such a conclusion are the efforts of the South Korean administration to ensure the continued long-term presence of American troops in South Korea which is also one of the proofs about its formal attitude toward the “principle of independent, absence of foreign intervention” reunification of Korea imbedded in the Joint Proclamation.

* * *

The changes in the positions of the governments of the DPRK and South Korea on the issue of reuniting the country and in their mutual relationship for the moment are undoubtedly positive move in reduction of the tension on the Korean peninsula and for the peaceful resolution of the Korean Issue, which is met with approval by both the Korean people and by the all of the progressive mankind.

At the same time though, the existing contradictions between the propagandistic nature of the three “principles” for the reunification of Korea which are the base of the Joint Proclamation between the North and the South on one side, and the internal and international actions of the two governments aimed at mutual elimination and absorption—on the other hand, throw some doubt on achieving quick and significant

progress in the development of the issue of reuniting Korea and in regarding relations between the two parts.

Prepared by:

/Z. Yanakiev/

Pyongyang, 16 August 1972

* * *

DOCUMENT NO. 15

[Source: PolA AA, MfAA, C 951/76. Obtained for NKIDP by Bernd Schaefer and translated for NKIDP by Karen Riechert]

GDR Embassy to DPRK
Pyongyang, 15 September 1972

Note

on Information Provided by Head of 1st Department of DPRK Foreign Ministry, Comrade Kim Jaesuk, about 1st Main Negotiation of Red Cross Committees from DPRK and South Korea on 12 September 1972

This information was provided to ambassadors and acting ambassadors of several socialist countries (among others Poland, Czechoslovakia, GDR, Mongolia, Hungary, Cuba) simultaneously in territorial departments concerned [in DRPK Foreign Ministry].

Main elements of the information were as follows:

- The 1st Main Negotiation was a victory for the course of Comrade Kim Il Sung, and a result of the peace offensive by party and government.

- The peace offensive was started last year to create favorable conditions for the realization of South Korean revolution and the unification of the fatherland.
- In his historical speech of 6 August 1971 Kim Il Sung declared the DPRK's willingness to negotiate with all political parties and associations of South Korea, including the [Democratic] Republican Party, in order to launch the peace offensive.
- The DPRK wanted to achieve by this peace offensive: to thwart the Nixon Doctrine which intends to have Asians fight Asians and, in our case, Koreans against Koreans; to counter efforts by the U.S. imperialists to modernize the South Korean puppet army, to further divide Korea and turn South Korea into a military base; to thwart the further penetration of South Korea by the Japanese imperialists; to prevent further negotiations between South Korea and the U.S., respectively between South Korea and Japan, that were to serve the purposes mentioned above. Another objective of the peace offensive is the elimination of fascist repression in South Korea.
- The South Korean puppet regime has attempted, using the pretext of alleged DPRK plans for a "march on the South," to increase the fascist repression against the South Korean people.
- The DPRK has no intentions whatsoever "to march on the South." This is supposed to be proven to the South Korean people. At the same time the South Korean government apparatus must be deprived of the pretext to suppress the people and the democratic forces. The growth of revolutionary forces in South Korea ought to be strengthened as soon as possible. In order to achieve such, the repressive measures and anti-communist hysteria by South Korea's reactionary circles must be stopped.

With its peace offensive, the DPRK wanted "to open the door between North and South" in order to influence the South Korean people in the spirit of the ideas of the DPRK and thus achieve democratization in South Korea.

- The South Korean puppet clique was forced
 - to agree to the proposal of preliminary Red Cross negotiations;

- to sign the joint declaration containing the three principles;
- to agree to hold the 1st Main Negotiation of both Red Cross Delegations in the city of Pyongyang.

On DPRK Positions in Red Cross Negotiations, especially the 1st Main Negotiation:

- The DPRK will do what it can to lead the Red Cross negotiations toward success.
- Through negotiations and the proposed exchange of people's visits between the South and the North a base for the unification of the country ought to be created. It is intended to have meetings between representatives of parties and public associations in addition to the Red Cross delegates. In contrast, the South Korean side wants to limit the Red Cross talks only to the discussion of "humanitarian issues" in order to buy time.
- More than 80 percent of the participants in South Korea's Red Cross delegations are members of the intelligence service. They pursue tactics to cheat the world, to support U.S. imperialism's policy of aggression, and to achieve a "victory over communism." Therefore the preliminary negotiations were this tedious, and these intentions also influenced the main negotiation.
- The DPRK proposed to invite to the negotiations members of the respective advisory team which, in the North Korean case, is composed of representatives from various parties and mass organizations. After initial resistance, the South Korean side agreed to form advisory teams according to this composition. The South Korean insisted neither to enter this agreement in the official documents nor make it public.
- Furthermore, the South Korean side attempted to turn the 1st Main Negotiation into an expert meeting. On this question the DPRK position also prevailed. With a speech given by a member from the South Korean advisory team, the South Korean side itself created the opportunity that representatives from the advisory teams could give speeches during the negotiation.

- A number of receptions and sightseeing visits were arranged for the delegation members. This was reported all over the world, even in the press and broadcasts of South Korea. Thus the South Korean people were informed of the participation of the democratic forces from the North in the 1st Main Negotiation.
- During the entire course of negotiations, the DPRK was eager to solve the entire problem according to the ideas of “Juche.”
- Meeting a request from the South Korean side, its delegates were given the opportunity to visit Kim Il Sung’s birthplace, the “cradle of the revolution.” They also visited the new residential quarter in Pyongyang and a primary school. To influence the South Koreans in an “anti-imperialist and national spirit,” the delegation was shown the “revolutionary opera” “Sea of Blood” and the movie “The Flower Girl.” They also watched a performance by the “Pyongyang Ensemble.”

On Successes Achieved Through the 1st Main Negotiation:

- The superiority of the social system in the Northern part of the country, and the desire of its people for peaceful unification, was clearly proven to the South Korean people.
- The attempt by South Korean agencies to influence the DPRK people with phrases about “freedom” was thwarted.
- It worked to tie the Red Cross negotiations closely to questions concerning the unification of the fatherland. This is evident by the fact that South Korea’s opposition parties already demand from the Park Chung Hee clique the South Korean advisory team should include representatives from other parties and social organizations.
- The members of the South Korean delegation recognized the political-ideological unity within the Northern population. They rally monolithically around the party and Kim Il Sung as their “leader.”
- Some of them stated, “General Kim Il Sung is a great personality and unprecedented in Korean history.”

- The course of KWP and General Kim Il Sung was acknowledged as correct. One has emphasized that the planning economy of the DPRK is more successful than the “free economy” in the South.
- South Korean delegates could convince themselves [by seeing the North] of the lies spread about the DPRK in Southern coverage.
- The DPRK people displayed a high level of class conscience during the presence of the South Korean delegation. They welcomed the delegation without enthusiasm but friendly, and during encounters they performed very uniform and conscious.

On Further Perspectives of Red Cross Negotiations:

- The Red Cross negotiations are a fierce battle between socialism and capitalism.
- The DPRK does not live under illusions that these negotiations will run without problems. It is completely up to the South how long they will last. The DPRK is interested in their quick conclusion.
- The DPRK will continue its peace offensive. Future Red Cross negotiations will be held once in the DPRK and once in South Korea.
- The South Korean side will certainly do everything to delay negotiations. They fear the economic, political and military strength of the DPRK.
- The Three Principles, as it became clear during the main negotiations, are a proper foundation for a peaceful and independent unification of the country.

Comrade Kim [Jaesuk] used the opportunity to thank the governments of the GDR, Poland and Czechoslovakia for their support of the DPRK’s struggle. The DPRK has high expectations for further support on questions of the independent and peaceful unification of the country.

Note: This information was read out from a manuscript and must be considered as uniform DPRK official playbook language, as other conversations held on different levels demonstrate.

Helga Merten
3rd Secretary of Embassy

CC:

1x Foreign Ministry
1x Central Committee, Department IV
1x ZID [Foreign Ministry]
1x Embassy

* * *

DOCUMENT NO. 16

[Source: Romanian Foreign Ministry Archive. Obtained for NKIDP by Mircea Munteanu and translated for NKIDP by Eliza Gheorghe]

Minutes of Conversation between Nicolae Ceaușescu and the economic delegation from the Democratic People's Republic of Korea

September 22, 1972

The following comrades took part in the discussions: Ion Gheorghe Maurer, member of the Executive Committee of the Permanent Presidium of the Central Committee of the Romanian Communist Party (CC RCP) and President of the Council of Ministers; Ion Patan, deputy member of the Executive Committee of CC RCP, Vice-President of the Council of Ministers, President of the Romanian delegation within the intergovernmental advisory commission; Stefan Andrei, Secretary of the CC RCP, and Radu Constantinescu, Vice-President of the Governmental Collaboration and Economic and Technical Cooperation Commission.

The Korean delegation is composed of the following comrades: Jeong Juntaek, alternate member of the Politburo of the Korean Workers' Party Central Committee, Vice-Premier of the Cabinet of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, President of the Korean delegation within the intergovernmental advisory commission, dealing with economic and technical relations between the Socialist Republic of Romania and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, head of the economic governmental delegation, Yi Giseon, Vice-Chairman of the Committee for Foreign Economic Cooperation, Bang Giyeong, Deputy Minister for Foreign Trade, and Kang Yeongseob, Ambassador of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to Bucharest.

The talks started at 11:30 and they ended at 13:40.

COMRADE NICOLAE CEAU ESCU: How are you feeling in Romania?

COMRADE JEONG JUNTAEK: We are grateful for the attention we have received from the party and state leadership of Romania; we are feeling very well. Our beloved leader, Comrade Kim Il Sung, is very grateful for the good state of our relations in all respects. I would like to thank you, Comrade Maurer, above all, for the warm welcome you offered us. Upon our departure [from Pyongyang], our beloved leader, Comrade Kim Il Sung, asked us to give you, Comrade Maurer, and all other comrades, his warmest regards.

COMRADE NICOLAE CEAU ESCU: I would like to thank you for these warm greetings, to express my satisfaction with the good relations between our countries, between our parties, and to wish you a pleasant stay in Romania.

COMRADE JEONG JUNTAEK: Thank you.

I have a message for you, Comrade Ceaușescu, from Comrade Kim Il Sung. I would like to explain the content of this message to you, but as we are under the constraint of time, our secretary will read a translation provided by the embassy. (The text of the translation is read; it is attached to the minutes of conversation.)

COMRADE NICOLAE CEAU ESCU: I would like to thank you for this message and I would like to ask you to give Comrade Kim Il Sung, upon your return to the moth-

erland, a warm greeting on my behalf, on Comrade Maurer's behalf, and on behalf of other comrades, and also [give Comrade Kim Il Sung] our best wishes.

COMRADE JEONG JUNTAEK: I would like to thank you and assure you that I will send him everything you requested.

COMRADE NICOLAE CEAU ESCU: I regret the fact that we couldn't hold the meeting until now, and I understand the problems which Comrade Kim Il Sung is currently facing and we hope that we will find the right time to hold this meeting.

COMRADE JEONG JUNTAEK: Upon my departure, Comrade Kim Il Sung asked me to inform you in detail about his planned visit to Romania.

As you already know, Comrade Ceaușescu, the president of the Supreme People's Assembly, Comrade Choe Yonggeon is bedridden with a serious illness that prevents him from working. The head of the Organizational Division is not feeling so well so he is also working less. Therefore, Comrade Kim Il Sung is faced with a situation where he has to work extremely hard, on both party and state affairs. As far as the Council of Ministers is concerned, a share of the tasks have been assigned to Comrade Kim Il, but it's again Comrade Kim Il Sung who has to solve a great deal of the problems [of this division]. What is more, his health is also not perfect, and for this reason, his doctors recommended that he not take long trips, such as the one to Romania. In this respect, Comrade Kim Il Sung asked me that, when I meet you, I send you his regrets for not being able to make this trip now. At the same time, he told me he was looking forward to visiting the Socialist Republic of Romania, to meeting you and other members of the party and state leadership.

COMRADE NICOLAE CEAU ESCU: I understand that there are various problems; such problems occur all the time; we have problems as well. I would like to wish Comrade Kim Il Sung good health. I hope that his doctors' recommendation is not too serious; doctors tend to exaggerate!

COMRADE JEONG JUNTAEK: We too want it to be an exaggeration made by his doctors. Comrade Kim Il Sung also asked me to convey his deepest feelings of gratitude to you, to the party and state leadership and to the Romanian government for your full sup-

port that you are giving us in our struggle to unify the motherland. The active support we are receiving from Romania, from the Romanian Communist Party and from the Romanian government is truly important for our struggle. For this reason, once again, I would like to express the gratitude of our leader, Comrade Kim Il Sung, our party and state leadership and our government for this support.

COMRADE NICOLAE CEAU ESCU: We are pleased by the initiative taken by Comrade Kim Il Sung, by the Korean party and state leadership in the direction of peaceful reunification of the North and South.

COMRADE JEONG JUNTAEK: Thank you.

COMRADE NICOLAE CEAU ESCU: Of course, we appreciated this initiative; we congratulated you on it, as we believe that the approach you adopted is particularly important not only for Korea, but also for international politics. We understand that the international proletarian movement [and] solidarity between socialist countries must be applied in real life in the form of supporting the policy carried out by a party and a government with a view to solving its problems in favorable conditions.

COMRADE JEONG JUNTAEK: Thank you. It is for this reason that we highly value the support we received in the discussion about the reunification of the motherland, from the Romanian Communist Party, from the Romanian people. For this reason, I was tasked by our party and state leadership to offer you and the other members of the party and state leadership in Romania a detailed account of the problems posed by the reunification of the motherland. I am asking for your opinion [on this]. The brief we have for you is rather long and we have translated it in Romanian; in order to save time, we suggest having the secretary of our delegation read it to you in Romanian.

COMRADE NICOLAE CEAU ESCU: I agree.

COMRADE JEONG JUNTAEK: Thank you. He will read it in Romanian.

“As instructed by Comrade Kim Il Sung, our party secretary general, I would like to inform you about the most recent measures adopted by the Central Committee of our

party regarding the problems raised by the peaceful and independent reunification of our motherland.

First, I will briefly inform you about the activity of our party so far, directed at the reunification of the motherland and then, more concretely, about the latest measures we adopted.

As you know, it is the twentieth anniversary from the end of the war in our country and from the signing of the armistice. Nonetheless, the problem of reunification is not solved to this day. After signing the ceasefire, we adopted a series of measures directed at the issue of reunification of the motherland, and we forwarded a series of equitable and fair proposals to the South. But the puppet government in South Korea did not take these proposals into account and shut its doors [to us].

In the meantime, we exerted a lot of effort to strengthen the revolutionary forces in South Korea. In 1955, we suggested that revolutionary forces in South Korea run peacefully in elections against the clique of Rhee Syngman, to see which one the people prefer. At that time, the Workers' Party could not run in elections, because it was banned and it wasn't strong enough. Afterwards, the Progressive Party in South Korea restructured itself as a centrist party. The Progressive Party managed to rally a lot of people [to support it]. Above all, a lot of intellectuals joined it.

In 1956, the so-called presidential elections in South Korea took place. Then, the leader of the Progressive Party, Cho Bong-am, launched the motto of peaceful reunification, which reflected the will of the people and thus, he posed a challenge to Rhee Syngman. Cho Bong-am got a lot of votes in this election. He couldn't win because of the retaliation and rigging of votes carried out by American imperialists and by the puppet government in South Korea. There was a 500,000 difference between the votes obtained by the two candidates. Afterwards, the Americans and the puppet government of Rhee Syngman arrested and killed Cho Bong-am, since the peaceful reunification of the motherland was the approach of the Communist Party, and they forcibly dismantled this party. Afterwards, we found out that even the secretary of Cho Bong-am was an American spy.

With the intensification of the struggle of the people of South Korea, the Socialist Mass Party emerged in 1960. This one too was a centrist party. But this party did not have strong relations with the workers and the peasants; on the contrary, it attracted mostly intellectuals. The popular uprising for the overthrow of Rhee Syngman in April 1960 was led, behind the scenes, by the Socialist Mass Party. Rhee Syngman was

crushed in battle, but they couldn't take the reins of political power from his hands. Then, the Americans suggested that Mr. Chang Myeon be "president" as a middle ground solution, so that he promotes so-called democratic governance.

Under the leadership of the Socialist Mass Party, the youth movement gained momentum. The youth and South Korean students joined ranks, mobilized under the motto "let's go to the North, come down Southward, and let's meet at Panmunjeom" and they fought for this motto. Through this motto, they made their voice heard and they asked for the peaceful reunification of the motherland.

In these circumstances, Park Chung Hee organized a military coup on May 16, 1961. The Socialist Mass Party was eventually defeated and dismantled. The leader of this party was thrown in jail, and according to the so-called law of "political brotherhood" some tens of thousands of party members were arrested.

Afterwards, a semi-legal party emerged—the Revolutionary Party for Reunification. Currently, there is this organization in South Korea—the Revolutionary Party for Reunification. Of course, it does not have too many branches; there are regional committees and local committees only in the more important cities. The respective comrades did not keep this all secret; they did not work properly, which led to losses in some organizations, and to the arrest of some cadres. The party committee in Seoul was dismantled; the same thing happened to the party committee in the South Jeolla province.

We have some organizations of our party in South Korea, but because of the intensification of fascist and terrorist governance towards these organizations, they cannot operate in a sustainable manner.

The struggle in South Korea is very hard. In these circumstances, we ask ourselves a very important question: how can we increase and mobilize the revolutionaries and revolutionary organizations in South Korea? We can't wage war in South Korea. We signed a military treaty with the USSR and with the People's Republic of China and South Korea signed one with the United States. If we start a war in South Korea, it can turn into a world war. Up until now, we used a wide range of methods in South Korea, but we have achieved nothing. In these circumstances, we can't wage war. What should we do? Taking the current situation into account, we thought the best thing to do is to launch a peaceful offensive.

Currently, the New Democratic Party in South Korea is following a somewhat progressive line. The New Democratic Party has its branches in [all] regions and districts

and it is rather big. According to the Constitution of South Korea, the President cannot be elected for two terms. Park Chung Hee was forced to change the Constitution so that he could be elected several times. Opposition parties in South Korea, including the New Democratic Party, have fought against the measure to change the Constitution adopted by Park Chung Hee. We tasked our illegal branch in South Korea to support this struggle. Democratic forces in South Korea organized a Popular Advisory Committee for the Defense of Democracy, while young students organized the National Union of Young Students for the Defense of Democracy and thus they fought a consistent campaign [against that decision]. Nonetheless, the Park Chung Hee clique managed to change the Constitution without the consent of opposition parties, during the night, at 3:00 AM, only with the participation of members of Parliament from the Democratic Republican Party. For this reason, the opposition parties in South Korea were forced to run against Park Chung Hee again in the elections.

With a view to supporting the struggle of the people in South Korea and of opposition parties, we convened the Supreme Popular Assembly and we suggested the eight points regarding the reunification of the motherland. Kim Dae-jung became the candidate nominated by the New Democratic Party and by other opposition parties and started his bid against Park Chung Hee. Of course, we are aware he can't win the elections, but his candidacy gave us the opportunity to measure the real strength of the population in South Korea. In other words, we could tell who and to what extent is supporting the peaceful reunification of the motherland. At the same time, Kim Dae-jung launched the motto "peaceful reunification." He said that if he took power, reunification would be carried out in a peaceful way, the army would be cut down, the army reserves for regional defense would be dismantled, the South Korean army would be withdrawn from South Vietnam, foreign relations will be expanded beyond America and Japan, to include the USSR and the People's Republic of China and other countries. He launched some good mottos. For this reason, he received 70% of the votes in Seoul. The Park Chung Hee clique carried out a series of frauds and did not open the voting booths until a week later, being very worried [about its competitor]. Kim Dae-jung could not win the elections, losing by a margin of 900,000 votes. In South Korea, the army and the police had more than 1 million votes. If Park Chung Hee had not received these votes, he wouldn't have won.

Then the struggle for the election of members of the National Assembly began. After the elections, the New Democratic Party had 89 seats; the Democratic Republican

Party had 113 seats, which meant that the Park Chung Hee clique could not have won more than two thirds of the vote. Since he didn't win more than two thirds, he cannot modify the Constitution again and get elected president for a fourth time. Although Park Chung Hee stood in power, the population in South Korea scored significant victories in the struggle embodied in these elections. The population in South Korea gained the right to freely express its opinion on the matter of peaceful reunification of the motherland. On the occasion of these elections, Park Chung Hee understood that the elements opposing [the way] South Korean society looks now are quite strong, and that the situation became too complicated for him to get elected in the foreseeable future. This was a terrible psychological blow for Park Chung Hee.

While Park Chung Hee was facing this impasse, Comrade Kim Il Sung clearly showed, in his speech on August 6th last year, that we are ready to have contacts at any time with all political parties, including the Democratic Republican Party, with all social organizations, and with all personalities in South Korea. After our new proposals, the population in South Korea together with other peoples of the world raised their voice to support us. The Park Chung Hee clique participated in the talks between the Red Cross organizations in North and South Korea, being pressed by internal and international public opinion to do so. They thought we wouldn't accept talks on the line of the Red Cross organizations. Putting the issue of political negotiations aside, we agreed to holding talks on the line of the Red Cross organizations, an idea they proposed. They suggested we discuss only the issue of separated families, but we proposed the free circulation of families, relatives and friends between North and South.

Currently, there are 200,000 people on our territory who used to be part of the voluntary army organized during the war, on the territory of South Korea. Most of these people studied in our universities. South Koreans know that we are highly trained in political and economic affairs. When free circulation is enforced, it is detrimental to them, and as a consequence, they refuse this measure. For this reason, we have been pressing for one year to introduce this matter on the negotiations agenda. Eventually, they agreed to enforce the freedom of reciprocal visits. The freedom of circulation and the freedom of visits are one and the same thing.

After talks between Red Cross organizations in the North and the South began, the South Korean population raised its voice more and more, demanding peaceful reunification. Worried by this situation, the Park Chung Hee clique declared a

state of national emergency. We always carried out a peaceful offensive, while they always proposed we meet in secret, putting aside the preliminary talks between Red Cross organizations.

They suggested that we contact them only and not other political parties in South Korea. We took those opportunities, however, to establish contacts with other political parties and organizations in South Korea. Worried by this, the Park Chung Hee clique suggested we meet only with them. They proposed a meeting with the head of our Organizational and Coordination Section to be held abroad. We asked why meet abroad, when we have such a beautiful country; [I told them that] if you want to meet us, we could do it in Pyongyang, Gaesong or Wonsan. After our suggestions, they accepted to come to Pyongyang. Afterwards, Lee Hurak, the head of the Central Intelligence Agency in South Korea came to Pyongyang, at the beginning of May this year.

When he met the head of our Organizational and Coordination Section, he said he was tasked by Park Chung Hee to solve some of the frozen problems between us. The head of our Organizational and Coordination Section told him that we were against them because they wanted to invade us, benefiting from the protection of American-Japanese imperialists. The head of the South Korean Central Intelligence Agency replied that they were afraid we would invade them.

The head of our organizational and coordination section told Lee Hurak that even if South Korea was not under the protection of American-Japanese imperialists, we would still not invade them. Communists never attack first. Lee Hurak said that in the future, they will stop serving the interests of American-Japanese imperialists. The head of our Organizational and Coordination Section asked him why they are fighting against their brothers in South Korea. We are not attacking South Korea so why are they retaliating against their brothers?

Afterwards, Lee Hurak asked to meet Comrade Kim Il Sung, the secretary general of our party. Comrade Kim Il Sung received him. Comrade Kim Il Sung told him that since they don't want to invade us, we should proceed with the peaceful reunification of the motherland. Comrade Kim Il Sung, the secretary general of our party, told him: we are completely independent. The Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China are our allies but they don't interfere with our internal affairs; the Soviet army withdrew a long time ago and the Chinese volunteers, also, were pulled out of our

country. But you continue to have American troops; you should do something to have them withdraw.

Moreover, you must resist Japanese militarism, because [if you don't] South Korea will become Japan's colony. He recalled real facts when, in 1897, Japan, faced with a rebellion of the South Korean peasantry, brought its army to South Korea under the pretext of defending the properties of its citizens. Comrade Kim Il Sung told him that if they allow Japanese in South Korea, the same situation can occur. If Japanese militarists enter South Korea, the youth and the South Korean population will fight against them, and we will support them. Lee Hurak swore in front of the president of the Council of Ministers, Comrade Kim Il Sung, that he wouldn't be a traitor neither now nor in the future. Lee Hurak also said that he would legalize the Communist Party and would release political detainees from prisons.

Comrade Kim Il Sung said that when all those promises have been achieved, peaceful reunification would be possible. After creating the confederation between North and South, we would hold general elections. This is the second point of the three principles for the reunification of the motherland. Lee Hurak agreed with this one as well. Then Comrade Kim Il Sung told Lee Hurak: now, there is the difference between regimes – we have a socialist society, while you have a capitalist society. In South Korea you don't have monopolistic capitalists, but you have predatory capitalists. We are against predatory capitalists and reactionaries which are selling our country. We are not against good faith national capitalists. I believe we will defend our socialist society while you will defend your regime. We can't impose a socialist regime on South Korea, but you shouldn't take any measures either to put our regime in jeopardy. The nature of the South Korean regime will be decided by its people. In spite of these regime differences, we are one nation, let's not act against each other's interests; let's reunite our nation, look for things we have in common through cooperation between the North and the South. This is the essence of the second point of our three principles.

Comrade Kim Il Sung said it is very important to proceed with the reunification of our nation so that together we can resist the maneuvers aiming at splitting the Korean nation. By allowing different regimes to exist, they should, above all, unite to achieve independent reunification [sic], to resist the interference of outside forces. We should establish economic and cultural ties. In addition, Comrade Kim Il Sung told him that North Korea can supply South Korea with heavy industry products and raw materials and, in return, it is eager to receive light industry products. Then economic coopera-

tion will be on the right track. Kim Il Sung told him this: you have economic ties with the United States and Japan; why can't you have economic ties with us?

Comrade Kim Il Sung told him that if they agree to the three principles that we proposed—independence, peaceful reunification and great national unity, then we can exchange opinions with a view to peaceful reunification.

Afterwards, on behalf of the head of our Organizational and Coordination Section, Comrade Pak Seongcheol, the second vice-president of the Council of Ministers, went to Seoul, at the end of May. We thus had our first meeting with our enemies after 27 years. For this reason, we decided to tackle simpler problems. We assigned three tasks to Comrade Pak Seongcheol.

First, he was tasked to get Park Chung Hee to agree with the three principles for the reunification of the motherland.

Second, he was tasked to get the South Korean side to agree to the creation of the Committee for Coordination between the North and the South on political, military, economic and cultural problems.

Third, he was tasked to get a joint statement released.

The South Koreans agreed to the three points we proposed.

Having these three tasks in mind, Comrade Pak Seongcheol left for Seoul and met with Lee Hurak and with Park Chung Hee. During the discussions they had there, Park Chung Hee said he supported the three principles proposed by President Kim Il Sung and he agreed to the creation of the Committee for Coordination between the North and the South. He said, nonetheless, that he couldn't agree to release a joint statement; Comrade Pak Seongcheol had a draft of the joint statement with him. Park Chung Hee told Comrade Pak Seongcheol that the internal situation in South Korea was very complicated, while the North is very united. If in Pyongyang, President Kim Il Sung asks for a certain thing, it gets done; while in the South, even if he asks for something, it still doesn't function too well. Park Chung Hee said that the army is the most dangerous element, because the United States is in charge of the South Korean army, and Japanese militarism has penetrated the South Korean army. There are many frictions in the South Korean army. Park Chung Hee said that he preferred that these contacts between the North and the South remain secret from the United States, basically asking us to keep the secret of our contacts. For this reason, they could not agree to a joint statement.

After Comrade Pak Seongcheol came back to Pyongyang, the South Korean side told us that it agreed to release a joint statement. As a consequence, on July 4th we released the joint statement to the public and we exchanged the signed documents. We repeatedly discussed this problem in the Central Committee particularly because it was not an easy matter.

We don't know if these contacts were imposed by the South Koreans, by the Americans or by the Japanese. We do know that other South Korean political groups agreed to meet us, including the Prime-Minister, Kim Jong-pil. But Lee Hurak said he had preferred we had had these contacts only with them and not with others as well, but we didn't give our consent on this matter, and we wanted to meet with other political parties, including the brotherhood in Park Chung Hee's party.

The population in South Korea warmly greeted the release of the joint statement, strengthening the trend in favor of the reunification of the country. With the release of the joint statement, Lee Hurak held a press conference, whose content was not too bad. He made one negative statement. When he was asked by journalists whether he thinks of UN troops as foreign troops, he said no. After the release of the joint statement, the South Korean National Assembly started its session, which gave the opportunity to opposition parties to ask lots of questions, such as, "Why is it that you can go to North Korea and we can't? The Head of the Central Intelligence Agency went there and we can't go! Why haven't you discussed such important issues with other political parties as well?" Moreover, the opposition parties asked Park Chung Hee to cancel the state of national emergency, as the Communist Party had no plans of invading South Korea, and to order foreign armies to withdraw as they have no business in this country.

Our purpose was that through the joint statement to mobilize the South Korean population even more in the direction we wanted.

Initially, the Americans said they supported the Joint Communiqué, but after a few days, when the trend in favor of reunification of the motherland gained momentum within the South Korean society, they said that the American army will not withdraw from South Korea and it will accelerate its plans to modernize the South Korean army.

Kim Jong-pil started saying gibberish that it was only because of Park Chung Hee that Lee Hurak went to North Korea, while others cannot go there, and that Park Chung Hee can't end the state of national emergency because the Communist Party cannot be trusted and it's unclear what its next move would be.

What upset us the most was the killing of three members of the Revolutionary Party for Reunification; retaliation against this party has increased since the release of the joint statement.

We have thus pointed out for you the most important events that took place since the release of the joint statement. Now I would like to tell you a few things about the major goal that we pursued through our peaceful offensive.

Comrade Kim Il Sung, the Secretary General of our party, said that the goals of our peaceful offensive can be summarized in three points.

First, the South Korean matter cannot be solved only through underground [illegal] struggle. Therefore, the ranks of revolutionary forces must quickly increase, so as to unblock the situation between the North and the South, and democratize South Korean society. There are many people in South Korea who want peaceful reunification. There are many progressive personalities. If we manage to prevent Park Chung Hee from turning the country into a fascist one, then this would lead to strengthening democracy and increasing the ranks of revolutionary forces in South Korea.

Second, [we aim] to expose the devious propaganda of the minority clique in the South, [which claims] that we want to invade the country. The puppet government in South Korea has absolutely no reason to stifle opposition parties and the South Korean people; it has absolutely no right to let South Korea be invaded by the US army and by Japanese militarism.

Third, [we aim] to expose the maneuvers of American imperialism, which came up with the so-called Nixon Doctrine regarding the permanent division of Korea and the continuation of the fighting between Koreans.

Currently, in South Korea, the New Democratic Party is taking the right steps so as to address a congratulatory speech at the second meeting of the actual talks. This time we arranged things in such a way so as to allow the Democratic Republican Party to organize a reception. In these circumstances, the New Democratic Party insists on organizing the reception and it is very persistent in this respect.

If we fight properly, we can persuade Park Chung Hee to accept the creation of the confederation. In our view, the creation of the National Supreme Committee is feasible, so as to allow the two social regimes in the North and in the South to exist as they are now. The President of the Committee would be appointed by rotation, on an equitable basis. This is our first principle.

Secondly, if we extend our talks, it is likely that at the next presidential elections, Park Chung Hee is eliminated and the position of president is occupied by the New Democratic Party. But, to our mind, the New Democratic Party is heavily penetrated by spies sent by Park Chung Hee, which are doing their best to split the party. In any case, if we intensify our struggle, then it is possible that the next elections are won by the New Democratic Party. However, this can give rise to a more important problem: we must not provoke the Americans and the Japanese, as they can stage another coup.

There are factionalists within the camp of Kim Jong-pil and Park Chung Hee, and they don't get along so well, yet both of them want to win our hearts. To our mind, they felt that in the foreseeable future, an event will occur, and the international situation will unfold in our favor, and that within Korea, the trends for reunification are gaining momentum.

Currently, all South Korean officials are saving money, stored in banks abroad, such as in the United States or in Japan and so on, which shows that they are all getting ready to leave the country. The most important [objective] is to get the population to ignore Park Chung Hee, and to get him to face even greater difficulties. It is only then that he will listen to what we are saying, to our proposals.

Today, the Park Chung Hee clique is serving nice words on a plate to socialist countries in an attempt to get out of the delicate situation in which they find themselves. In this respect, Park is establishing commercial ties with the so-called "immoral" states. For this reason, our request is that socialist countries reject his offers, and, on the contrary, threaten him even more. It is only through this effort that South Korea will abolish the state of national emergency and will accept the confederation we suggested.

If democratization in South Korea is achieved, and the activity of all political and social organizations is legalized, then the Revolutionary Party for Reunification will be able to strengthen its ranks even more, and at the same time, strengthen all revolutionary forces. It is only then that we will be able to create a democratic unified government, through free general elections in both the North and the South. We have a long way to go to achieve this.

A particularly important issue at this point in time is the removal of the UN mandate from the American troops deployed in South Korea. This can only be achieved through the struggle of the South Korean people. At the same time, the UN Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea must be dismantled, as

it carries out a yearly report which contains the most appalling propaganda against us. For this reason, we believe that socialist countries must act with a view to dismantling the UN Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea and to remove the UN mandate from the American troops deployed in South Korea. If both problems can't be solved at the same time, then let's solve at least one of them. If the UN Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea is dismantled and the UN mandate is removed from the American troops deployed in South Korea, then this entire frenzy in South Korea for the United Nations Organization will disappear. To our mind, American troops will immediately leave South Korea. The Americans are not withdrawing because they fear that we will attack the South Koreans or that Park Chung Hee will embark on an adventurous path. Moreover, the US is also afraid of Japanese occupation. At the same time, the US wants to stay in South Korea, to use the South Korean army in South Vietnam.

Currently, the Americans and the South Koreans are doing everything in their powers to prevent the UN from discussing the Korean matter, saying that since the North and the South are finally talking; discussing this matter will become an obstacle in the way of reunification. We are in favor of discussing this matter in the UN forum, thus creating the conditions and eliminating all the obstacles in the way of reunification of the Korean nation by Koreans themselves. We believe we should continue our fight at the UN, even if we lose in the voting process, because we believe it's not a good thing to capitulate in front of your enemies. We are sure that you will vote in our favor at the UN, supporting our fight.

These are the rationale, the scope, and the prospects of the peaceful offensive pursued by our party for the independent reunification of the homeland. Needless to say, this will be a difficult fight, but we will continue fighting in the future with all our firmness to achieve the independent and peaceful reunification of the country, a policy designed by our beloved and respected leader, Comrade Kim Il Sung. We are convinced that we will be victorious in our fight.

Once more, we express our conviction that, in the years to come, as you have done it in the past, you will support and actively help our fight for the just cause.”

COMRADE JEONG JUNTAEK: Thank you for the attention with which you followed my presentation.

COMRADE NICOLAE CEAU ESCU: I would like to thank you for this detailed presentation of problems and efforts relating to the peaceful reunification of Korea. In the spirit of our good relations and of the solidarity that links our parties and our countries, Romania will continue to fully support [you], including at the United Nations.

We agree with your judgment that some actions which may lead to military intervention are not acceptable and should not be pursued, since the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China and the United States of America may become involved with dear consequences for the entire world. For this reason, we believe you adopted the right approach: to do anything possible for a peaceful, political solution, and we can notice, indeed, that the possibility to do so is there. Of course, since yours is a political struggle, it requires time and effort, but this is the kind of struggle in which the people will win and it will take you to victory. We only want to wish you good luck in this very important political endeavor.

COMRADE JEONG JUNTAEK: Thank you very much for your kind words. We believe the reunification of the motherland can't be achieved in any other way but through a peaceful political struggle. As you said, our struggle for reunification will be a long one, and a very hard one. We regard it as a struggle between socialism and capitalism, between revolution and counter-revolution, between patriots and traitors, between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. We regard it as a continuation of very fierce class struggle. The puppet government in South Korea is doing everything in its power so as, together with American and Japanese imperialists, to obtain economic superiority. They are striving to achieve this but they will not manage to. In the 27 years that have passed since the liberation of the country, we took on the path of socialism, and they took on the road that transforms the country into a colony of the United States.

COMRADE NICOLAE CEAU ESCU: Like any other struggle, yours too has a series of objectives, but the progress of international politics favors socialism and progressive forces. So your endeavor is unfolding in favorable circumstances. Of course, the struggle may be a long-term one, but results can be achieved more rapidly; it also depends on the efforts of the internal forces and the ones from the South, as well as on the international balance of powers. But we believe the current circumstances are favorable so that through this struggle, positive results are achieved.

As far as Romania's problems are concerned, I will briefly discuss a few issues.

Of course, the main objective of the party and of the people is the success of the 5-Year Plan. We organized the National Congress of the party in July this year, when we established new measures to fulfill faster the tasks imposed by this 5-year plan. Currently, we are working on creating the necessary measures, including a supplementary plan, to insure the fulfillment of these tasks in the best conditions [possible]. Therefore, I can tell you that as far as industry is concerned, everything is going well, we already have a surpassing of the Five Year Plan in the first and a half years, and that there are real conditions to achieve even greater successes in the following years. In agriculture too, in spite of all climate hardships, we will have a good harvest this year, especially the grain harvest. Therefore, there are successes and good prospects in our economy, both in industry and agriculture. I know you are planning on visiting some of our sites; I guess the other comrades told you that I won't talk too much about these topics.

As far as international problems are concerned, it must be noted that compared to our discussion with Comrade Kim Il Sung, we have achieved an improvement in our relations with socialist countries and things are going generally well. Our party is doing everything it can to normalize relations and to have relations as good as possible with all socialist countries and to contribute to the normalization of relations between all socialist countries. At the same time, of course, we are making sure to respect the principles that you already know, from our discussion with Comrade Kim Il Sung, and thus to establish our cooperation efforts on the basis of these principles, of respect for national independence and sovereignty, equality of rights, non-interference in internal affairs. We estimate that the prospects for having success in this respect are good, provided all socialist countries, each for its own, show willingness and do their best to allay and eradicate divergences, to cooperate. In any case, we will behave in this way.

As you already know, since the visit of Comrade Kim Il Sung, there were many changes on the international arena, but they are of the nature that we already discussed. The unfolding of events proves that the influence of socialist countries and of socialism in general, of anti-imperialist forces has increased; [it also proves] that the path to cooperation and détente is gaining momentum on the international arena. Of course, it is again a matter of struggle and establishing new relations on the international arena; if the imperialist principle of use of force and dictate is to be eliminated,

then it will be the result of anti-imperialist struggle, which, of course, will be mainly carried out by socialist countries.

Of course, we held in high regard the visit of US President Nixon to the People's Republic of China and the beginning of the rapprochement between the United States of America and the People's Republic of China. The unfolding of events will prove that this is in the interest not only of both countries, but also of all peoples who are in favor of independence, in favor of the principle of full equality of rights. Moreover, we held in high regard the visit of US President Nixon to Moscow, the discussions he had there and in general, and the impact of this visit on the development of relations between the Soviet Union and the United States. In this case too, the unfolding of events will prove that the agreements they reached are addressing the interests of both the two countries and of all other countries which favor independence and the principle of equality between all states.

To our mind, there is still one danger, namely the illusion that international problems can be solved only through contact between these two countries. This impression would pose a great danger to the successful fight against imperialism, to the effort to create new relations on the international arena. We believe that a successful new policy can be achieved only through the intensification of the effort of all socialist countries, of all anti-imperialist forces, through the active participation of all peoples to international affairs, that in any problem, for example, the peaceful reunification of Korea, it is still a matter of class struggle, of anti-imperialist struggle at the international level, which requires an intensification of the efforts of all anti-imperialist forces, above all of socialist countries, of communist and workers' parties, of national liberation movements and all other democratic and anti-imperialist forces.

We are aware that the capitalist world itself is experiencing significant changes, that the dominant position of the United States of America has diminished as the result of the more assertive position adopted by the Common Market, of the Federal Republic of Germany, and of Japan in Asia, which prove to be quite strong competitors for the US and that eventually the more intense this competition and the more emerging forces, the more likely the success of the effort to establish a new international order. This makes it necessary to develop ties and to collaborate with other countries of the world, not only with the states that favor independence, with developing countries, but also with developed capitalist countries. Therefore, in this context, and starting

from these judgments on the changes that have occurred on the international arena, Romania believes it is necessary to intensify the efforts of all socialist countries on the international level, to actively participate in the resolution of great problems which have plighted humanity today, because it is only in this way that we can have the certainty that these solutions will be in the interest of all peoples, in the interest of the cause of peace and cooperation, of equality of rights for all nations.

I don't want to linger on these issues for too long. If you comrades don't mind, we should go eat and then continue some of these discussions over a meal.

COMRADE JEONG JUNTAEK: Thank you very much.

I would like to thank you for your warm welcome, for your presentation of the internal issues that concern you, for talking to us about your foreign policy concerns, as well as for your support for our struggle for the reunification of Korea.

Before leaving, I raise one more issue to your attention: giving you a mandate on one of the problems raised by our party and state leadership to be sent to the Socialist Republic of Romania.

As I already mentioned, the puppet government in South Korea, benefiting from the help of American and Japanese imperialists, is doing its best to strengthen its position, politically, economically and militarily. We are paying a lot of attention to the problem of reunification of the homeland, as we consider the fight for reunification a very serious one, and we are ready and willing to overcome any kind of hardship posed by the enemy. In the 27 years that have passed since the country was liberated, we have scored a number of successes. The lifestyle of our society is very strong and it has a very strong penetrating force within the South Korean population, yet we are not satisfied with the results of our activities in this respect. Comrade Kim Il Sung repeatedly indicated to our party and our people that we must not rely only on the superiority of socialism and on the fact that we have achieved certain successes, but we must do everything possible to correct those mistakes we are still making. He pointed out that even if it's just small mistakes, we must do our best to correct them. Owing to our socialist order, we have solved the main problems related to lifestyle: food, clothing, and housing. Starting with this year, we will introduce mandatory education until the 10th grade. The entire population is relying on free medical insurance. Our society is obviously superior, but in order to prove the superiority of our social order

in all aspects, we have a lot to do. For this reason, we want to proceed in such a way so that those visiting our country, meaning those from South Korea visiting our country, come naturally to us and embrace socialism.

Comrade Kim Il Sung showed that we had to build socialism while being confronted with imperialism, that we had significant defense expenses, and for this reason we are facing a lot of hardships lifestyle-wise. For instance, our light industry does not meet the demands of the population. Therefore, Comrade Kim Il Sung said there are smaller problems lingering, which require all our attention if we want to solve them.

For this reason, upon my departure, I was tasked by my government to ask the Romanian Communist Party for help in this respect. Concretely speaking, we would like to import light industry products from you or equipment to mass-produce consumer products, given to us as credit, which we will start paying off only in 1976. We approximated it to be around 50 million rubles, to be paid back in three years after 1976.

COMRADE NICOLAE CEAU ESCU: This is a very serious issue as you know; Romania's situation is not very good right now, after several years of draught and then after being blighted by floods. Of course, we will have to discuss this request with the leadership of our party. In any case, consumer goods are impossible for us to supply. If there is anything we can do in terms of equipment, [we will do it], but we need to analyze this problem. In any case, you will be given an answer by the time you leave; the leadership of the party will discuss this.

COMRADE JEONG JUNTAEK: I would like to thank you, Comrade Nicolae Ceaușescu. We are aware that this is a problem whose solution is not an easy one. In any case, even if you helped us with a smaller amount, it would still be important for us.

* * *

DOCUMENT NO. 17

[Source: Diplomatic Archive, Bulgarian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Sofia. Record 28, File 1717. Pgs. 33-40. Translated for NKIDP by Sveta Milusheva]

Information concerning: 1. The first conference of the co-chairs of the Committee on regulation of the issues between North and South Korea, which was held on October 12th in the Panmunjeom area, and 2. The announcement of “martial law” in South Korea on the 12th of this month. October 19, 1972

“For internal use”

Today, the ambassadors of the People’s Republic of Bulgaria, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and Mongolia, as well as the acting [ambassadors] of Poland and the GDR were summoned to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, where the deputy minister of foreign affairs, Kim Jaebong, read the information, printed in advance in Korean, concerning the issues stated above.

He stated the following: “On October 12th, the first conference of the representatives of the Committee on regulation of the issues between the North and the South was held, and on the 12th this month, Park Chung Hee declared martial law in South Korea. I asked for the present meeting with you in order to inform you on these issues.

First, I would like to discuss the issue of the first conference of the representatives of the Committee on regulation of the issues between the North and the South.

It was held in Panmunjeom by South Korean request. From our side, because of Comrade Kim Yeongju’s health condition, the Second Vice Chair of the Cabinet of the Ministries, Comrade Pak Seongcheol participated, and from South Korea—the Chief of the Central Intelligence Bureau—Lee Hurak.

The conference took place three months after the publication of the Joint Proclamation of the North and the South on July 4th this year.

The Joint proclamation, based on the three principles of the beloved and respected leader Comrade Kim Il Sung, found warm response and support amongst the political parties and people of South Korea. Their aspirations for a peaceful reuniting of the motherland and the struggle against the fascist dictatorship, for the seizure of democratic rights and freedoms, grew stronger.

After the first, and especially after the second, round of the main negotiations between the delegations of the Red Cross, the feelings of respect towards the beloved and respected leader, Comrade Kim Il Sung, grew amongst the South Korean people. Kim

Il Sung's "Juche" ideas and the successes achieved in the socialist construction of the Northern part of the Republic spread quickly among the South Korean population.

These changes in South Korea's situation caused dismay and confusion among the American imperialists and the Japanese militarists.

The South Korean reactionaries, resorting to hypocrisy, in the conditions of the established relations between the North and the South, were the first to begin the campaign against us, speeding up the military preparations and increasing their anti-communist activities.

At the first conference we were able to expose this campaign, insisting on ending the attacks toward the DPRK and the anticommunist activities, in the conditions of the negotiations being carried out between us.

As we have already stated more than once, the dialogue between the North and the South and the struggle for the reunification of the motherland represents a struggle between patriots and traitors, a struggle between internationalism and servility, between progressivism and reactionism, between socialism and imperialism. In so far as the struggle for a peaceful reunification of the motherland is a class struggle, we sharply denounce the essence of the South Korean reaction.

At the conference, right after the greetings, the business work began with a speech by our representative—Comrade Pak Seongcheol.

In his speech he criticized sharply the fact that South Korea has not adhered to the obligations which it assumed with the Joint Proclamation between the North and the South, in the period from July 4th until this very moment.

By pressing the other side, we exposed many facts pointing at when and what Park Chung Hee, Kim Jong-pil, and Lee Hurak have said separately. Our criticism at first did not please the South Korean representatives. Two questions were put forth by our side:

- Will we walk together towards a peaceful reunification, or will we talk against communism? If you want us to walk together, you need to give up your anticommunist campaign.

- If you do not give up the anticommunism, is there any sense for us to continue the dialogue?

Since our criticism was sharp and effective, Lee Hurak agreed with it.

He stated that he was doing everything possible to abide by the principles of the Joint Proclamation, that he ordered the ending of the anticommunist campaign, but

because of the extremely complicated system, it was hard for him to control the execution [of that order].

In answer, Comrade Pak Seongcheol stated:

-“Fine, but here the issue is not what the common people say. This is being said by leaders such as Park Chung Hee and Kim Jong-pil. How should we understand this?” To which Lee Hurak answered: that “he held no blame.”

- “You say that the UN is not a foreign power. Why do you think that?” asked Comrade Pak Seongcheol.

- “Yes, the UN is not a foreign power!” – Lee Hurak emphasized again.

- “That means” – said Comrade Pak Seongcheol – “that the American troops in South Korea standing under the UN flag are also not a foreign power. But the UN regulations forbid the placing of troops in foreign territories.”

- “If the issue is put forth so” – said Lee Hurak – “you are right.”

During the talks the following fact was cited by us:

“On the day of the 15th anniversary since the creation of the puppet army of South Korea, Park Chung Hee stated that he would fight for the reunification of the country on the basis of the free democracy. We take this to mean that this is trying to impress on us that the reunification has to occur on the basis of the imperialist order. Therefore, how should we interpret the principle ‘independent from differences in ideology, ideals and system?’ Doesn’t this mean anticommunism?”

To what was stated above, Lee Hurak answered that when he was writing Park Chung Hee’s speeches, he always excluded the words “on the basis of the free democracy” and that that was written by the journalists.

Wanting to transfer the blame from himself to others, he emphasized that he did not think this way.

Right away we criticized such activities, pointing out that it did not matter who wrote the speech, the essence of the issue is made up of the fact that Park Chung Hee says it.

“How can the dialogue between the North and the South continue,” asked Comrade Pak Seongcheol, “if your leaders make such statements!”

Lee Hurak accepted our criticism, admitted his mistakes concerning the issues stated above, that “the UN was not a foreign power” and about the anticommunist statements, but he underlined that he was not responsible for Kim Jong-pil’s words.

Because Lee Hurak admitted his mistakes, we did not put forth other questions.

The South Korean side put forth the issue concerning the makeup of the Committee on the regulation, to which we answered that we had already given our proposals, but if the South Korean side had some comments, we are ready to discuss them.

The South Koreans proposed that the Committee be made up of five representatives from each country. We stated that we had nothing against such a proposal.

At the conference it was agreed that the specific issues on the makeup of the Committee on the regulation would be examined at the following conferences.

During the talks, Lee Hurak put forth the question “what is the system of confederation?” meaning, Comrade Kim Il Sung’s explanations.

Comrade Pak Seongcheol answered that “the confederation foresees the creation of a high-ranking national committee made up of representatives from the North and the South for the preservation of the order that is in place in the two parts, which would act together on foreign and internal issues.”

“If the makeup of the Committee on regulation is expanded,” asked Lee Hurak, “can it not lead to a confederation?”

To this question we answered that in the future this is possible, but the issues connected with the will of the masses need to be resolved on a democratic basis.

At the end, Lee Hurak stated that everything was clear to him and he asked that in the future we trust him, that we do not lead a war between us, that we exist together and that we develop the contacts for a peaceful reunification of the country.

At the conference it was agreed also that the following meetings of the leaders take place in Pyongyang and Seoul. It was decided that the second conference would take place on November 2nd in Pyongyang and the third—after November 20th this year in Seoul.

With this ended the first conference of the representatives of the Committee on the regulation of issues between the North and the South.

But on October 15th, through the direct telephone line, the South Korean side proposed a meeting between representatives for communication on October 16th.

Our representative met with the deputy representative of South Korea. As requested by Lee Hurak, the South Korean representative asked that the following be brought to the attention of Comrade Kim Yeongju:

“The reunification of the country has to occur at all costs during the leadership of Kim Il Sung and during the power of Park Chung Hee, meaning during the 70s.”

“It was also underlined that during the first conference of the representatives, South Korean [representatives] did not understand well the critique expressed by us, but while listening to the recording of the conference, they understood everything, and they ascertained their rightness and reached the conclusion that on their part they need to undertake some measures.

Our representative was interested in what these “measures” were.

Then the South Korean representative said that Park Chung Hee and Lee Hurak desire the reunification of the country, but they had many opponents. That is why some measures were necessary for the establishment of order in the country. [He] stated that on October 12th a statement would be published, and he asked that it be listened to carefully on our part. He also asked, if we had comments on it, to present them to South Korea.

On October 12th, one hour before the publication of this statement, they informed us from Seoul by telephone that at 19 o'clock an “Emergency Statement” from Park Chung Hee would be released on the radio, and they asked that we listen to it. At the end they proposed a new meeting of the representatives for the communication between the North and South on October 18th.

With relation to the content of the statement, I think that the comrade ambassadors are acquainted with it and I will not pause.

The meeting proposed by South Korea took place yesterday—October 18th. The South Korean representative expressed Lee Hurak’s request that the following be released to Comrade Kim Yeongju:

“At the beginning of the 70s in the ambient setting of Korea some changes took place. The bipolar relations between the USSR and the USA changed. At the same time, changes took place also in relations between the USA, USSR, PRC and Japan. With these circumstances we consider that the national issue needs to be resolved independently, without the support of foreign powers. In this spirit was the Joint Proclamation between the North and the South on July 4th this year.”

After the publication of the proclamation, in South Korea many groups sprung up, as opponents of its principles. Many of them are accusing us of breaking the Constitution. In spite of this, we wanted to adhere to the proclamation’s obligations, but because of the strong opposition, we did not have the chance to fully control the situation. As a result of this we received Kim Yeongju’s critique. The present “State of National Emergency Statement” has as its goal—the modification of the Constitution.

The current Constitution was created on the basis of the bipolar system, in anti-communist spirit, without considering the issue of reunifying the country.”

The South Korean representative stated that for the “Emergency Statement” the USA and Japan were informed just two hours before its proclamation. They opposed it.

The South Korean representative also emphasized that in South Korea they have decided to institute the “Juche” system, in the spirit of the national self-determination, raised by the Prime Minister Kim Il Sung.

Although the USA and Japan were against the principles of independence in South Korea, they desired the creation of a new system.

After the South Korean representative was carefully listened to, our side put forth the question: Why was a state of emergency and martial law announced, why are you going towards a new system?

It was answered that due to the strong opposition, the internal issues in South Korea cannot be resolved along the normal path. That is why the South Korean leaders were forced to establish martial law in order to modify the Constitution without chaos and disorder in the country. He also added that in Park Chung Hee’s “State of National Emergency Statement” there were no points that affected or offended the DPRK. Again a request was made for expressing of our comments and proposals on the statement. It was underlined that there was a wide range of reactions in South Korea towards the statement and martial law. The right wing said that “these measures are aimed towards us,” others asked “where this statement is heading,” yet others [said]—“don’t these measures represent a retreat from the dialogue between the North and the South?” others said that “this is a procommunist coup,” and others [asked] “doesn’t this statement lead along the path towards right wing?” etc.

The South Korean representative stated that in the new proposed Constitution a clear fixation on the issues of the reunification of the country and the creation of a national assembly is expected, which would be able to guarantee the peaceful dialogue between the North and the South. He underlined that with the modification of the Constitution they aimed to “lead talks between the North and the South based on law.” “The changes of the Constitution, he stated, do not mean the repudiation of talks, on the contrary—their energizing.”

He again requested, as ordered by Lee Hurak, that everything said by him be reported to Kim Yeongju.

The political committee of the CC of the KWP examined this issue, analyzed it, but has not yet come out with a final decision.

According to the facts at our disposal, it can be said that the situation in South Korea is very complicated.

After the announcement of the Joint Proclamation between the North and the South on July 4th this year, the pursuit of a peaceful reunification quickly grew in South Korea.

The activity of the oppositionist parties became energized. Many activists appeared, raising their voices for reunification.

This brings dismay and scares the leading South Korean circles.

According to facts which we have, after the Joint Proclamation, about 90 people, actively devoted to reunification, were arrested in South Korea.

There's no question that the South Korean leaders are reactionaries, and that the South Korean economy goes through big hardships. The medium and small businesses are ruined. The yields in agriculture are also bad.

Currently, Park Chung Hee is putting into practice the "Saemaedul" movement / New village/, which greatly resembles Chiang Kai-shek's old reforms in China and it has nothing in common with the movement in our country for the construction of cultural villages.

In South Korea the villagers are forced to build new villages. This leads to the springing up of new kulaks and corruption.

In this setting more and more desire and hope grow for a socialist order, sanctioned in the North part of the Republic. The population is very happy and actively struggles for the reunification.

The students' spirits rose. Until the publication of the Joint Proclamation, the student movement was at a standstill, but later it became active.

Park Chung Hee is most afraid of the actions of the masses and the students. And on this basis, after the establishment of martial law in the country, the activities of the parties were outlawed and the institutes were closed.

Why did Park Chung Hee announce martial law in the country?

We look at his goals in two instances.

The first instance can be reduced to the following: Park Chung Hee thinks that in the circumstances of established political contacts and the holding of political discussions, the emergence of other political parties is possible, which would also ask to take part in the dialogue between the North and the South. In the present moment the

proportion in the talks is 1:1, but provided that another political party participates in them, the proportion would change in our favor to 2:1. That is why Park Chung Hee is trying to prohibit all political parties, in order to secure his long-term stay in power and so that he can solely lead talks with us.

Park Chung Hee is afraid of the war and wants to lead the dialogue with the DPRK for a peaceful reunification, alone. And that is why, by announcing martial law, he says that a system needs to be created that would allow an active dialogue between the North and the South and a joint existence with us.

The second instance depends on the goal of receiving more credit from the USA and Japan. In words Park Chung Hee talks about “independence.” But what independence can he implement? Through martial law, he will ask for more loans from the USA and Japan.

As I already said, in the political Committee of the CC of the KWP, the situation in South Korea was examined and analyzed. A final decision has not been made yet though.

Among other things, I would like to let you know that in the present moment Park Chung Hee is afraid even of his own army.

According to facts that we have, when he announced martial law, Park Chung Hee prohibited all flights of military airplanes. All members of the armed forces were prohibited to leave the military bases, and for those who were on home leave—to leave home. All movements of military divisions were also forbidden.

The question arises, what will our position be in connection to the situation that was created?

It is impossible for us to not undertake something because that would mean that we would be closing our eyes to the repressions of the South Korean population. If we are quiet, South Korea could turn into an anticommunist country.

In connection to the situation that was created, we foresee two measures:

First: An article with which to prove that the repressions taking place under the mask of the peaceful reunification are wrong. The article will clarify that the words “peaceful reunification” means the peaceful participation of very large circles of masses. The more people participate in this process, the better. That is why the suppression of the movement for a peaceful reunification is wrong.

Second: In the name of all the political parties and public organizations a statement will come out, condemning the prohibition of political parties in South Korea.

The Union of students will also come out with a statement in connection to the closing of universities.

The materials will be in a discreet tone.

In Park Chung Hee's statement there is an issue that deserves attention. He says that "these measures need to be approved at the referendum. But if the referendum is without success, that will mean that the South Korean people do now want the dialogue between the North and the South. In that case, we will search for new measures for the reunification of the Motherland."

At the end I ask you comrade ambassadors to bring to the knowledge of your party leadership the contents of this present information."

Ambassador:

/Y. Georgiev/

Pyongyang, 19 October 1972

Typed in three copies

1. for the CC of the Bulgarian Communist Party
2. for the Ministry
3. for the file

* * *

DOCUMENT NO. 18

[Source: PolA AA, MfAA, C 6855. Obtained for NKIDP by Bernd Schaefer and translated for NKIDP by Karen Riechert]

GDR Embassy to DPRK
 Political Department
 Pyongyang, 23 October 1972

N o t e

on an Information given by the 1st Deputy Foreign Minister of the DPRK,

Comrade Kim Jaebong on 19 October 1972 in the DPRK Foreign Ministry for the Embassies of Bulgaria, Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Mongolia and the GDR during 17:00 and 19:00 hours

Present: The Ambassadors of Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Mongolia, Hungary, the Polish Acting Ambassador, Comrade Merten (Ambassador Comrade Everhartz was away in Hamheung) and further diplomats from these embassies.

Based on a written manuscript, Comrade Kim Jaebong gave a information about the 1st Meeting of the co-chairmen of the Coordination Committee North-South on 12 October 1972 in Panmunjeom and about the declaration of emergency and state of war in South Korea on 17 October 1972. Comrade Kim Jaebong stated the following:

As Kim Yeongju, Head of the Organization and Instruction Department of the KWP Central Committee, was unable to participate in the [Coordination Committee] talks due to his health, negotiations were led by Comrade Pak Seongcheol, 2nd Deputy Prime Minister, and on the South Korean side by intelligence chief Lee Hurak. During the three months since the publication of the Joint Declaration North-South with its three principles of unification outlined by Comrade Kim Il Sung, a movement toward consent has developed with different parties, various groups, and among the people of South Korea. Efforts for peaceful unification have increased, and the anti-imperialist, anti-fascist struggle in South Korea is on the rise. Especially after the 1st and 2nd Main Negotiations of the Red Cross Committees, an ever growing feeling of respect and veneration towards the venerable and beloved leader, Comrade Kim Il Sung, was on display among the South Korean people. The revolutionizing influence of *Juche* and the positive example of socialist construction in the Northern part of the Republic steadily grew.

The South Korean authorities use disingenuous tactics, they run a defamation campaign against the DPRK, they are leaning on foreign powers, they enforce military preparations and anti-communism. The objective of the DPRK during the negotiations was this: To criticize the South Korean side fiercely in order to stop their despicable machinations behind the scenes.

As already known, the dialogue North-South and the struggle for peaceful unification is both an offensive and defensive battle. It is a battle between defenders of the nation and traitors, between *juche* and deference, between the united revolutionary forces of internationalism and the united forces of the bourgeoisie, between capitalism and socialism. Given the fact that the struggle for peaceful unification is in essence a class struggle, it was required to criticize the policies of the other side.

Pak Seongcheol who spoke first criticized the non-compliance with the Joint Declaration of 4 July 1972 by South Korea and bolstered this criticism with many examples. He proved when, where, and with what statements, Park Chung Hee, Lee Hurak and Kim Jong-pil acted in South Korea in violation of the principles from the Joint Declaration.

Pak Seongcheol asked the following alternative questions to Lee Hurak: Do you want to support, together with us, the peaceful unification, or do you want to continue anti-communism? If you want to join forces with us, then there must be no more anti-communism. If anti-communism continues to exist, then where will your policy lead to? Lee Hu-Rak, who got confused by the force of the evidence, had to recognize this. He stated that he had actively supported compliance with the Joint Declaration. However, due to the complicated domestic structures of South Korea and its society, there was no chance to control the implementation of his instructions with regard to anti-communism.

Pak Seongcheol: What you are telling us here, is actually stated by a close confidant and personal friend of Kim Jong-pil. You are after all no ordinary people but those who govern South Korea.

LEE HURAK: I am innocent.

PAK SEONGCHEOL: You assert the United Nations is not an external force. We do not understand that.

LEE HURAK: The United Nations is indeed not an external force.

PAK SEONGCHEOL: The American forces in South Korea act in the name of the United Nations and serve in South Korea under the U.N. flag. Isn't that an external force? The Charter of the United Nations prohibits interference in internal matters.

LEE HURAK: If you pose the question that way, then the criticism is justified.

PAK SEONGCHEOL: At the 15th Anniversary of the foundation of the South Korean army, Park Chung Hee declared that Korea ought to be unified on the basis of a free democracy. This means that he wants to impose the capitalist order upon us. Since we agreed to achieve the unification of the nation without taking into account the differences in our systems, how can his statement be reconciled with this principle? This is anti-communism.

LEE HURAK: I acknowledge that mistakes have been made. When I wrote speeches for Park Chung Hee I did not use such words. It is very likely that journalists added such lines to reports on their own.

PAK SEONGCHEOL: What kind of dialogue is this when Park Chung Hee speaks on one hand in the spirit of anti-communism, and on the other hand supports the dialogue between North and South?

LEE HURAK: I cannot assume responsibility with regard to the statement that the United Nations does not constitute an external force, and that unification ought to occur on the basis of free democracy, as well as for other words of Kim Jong-pil.

After this exchange, there were discussions about the establishment of the Coordination Committee. Our proposals had already been turned in earlier. So we were interested to hear what the South Korean side was thinking about them. The South Koreans suggested to have a Coordination Committee with five members from each side. We stated that we do not mind, and the number of members is actually of not much relevance. We agreed to return to the problem of the levels to be represented in the Coordination Committee later on.

Lee Hurak posed the question, with reference to a quote from Kim Il Sung, what we actually envisage by a confederation? Pak Seongcheol replied that, under preservation of the different systems in North and South, a Supreme National Committee should be established with a unified position in public and the task to solve internal questions through joint effort.

LEE HURAK: If you would expand the Coordination Committee, would it serve as a nucleus for the establishment of a confederation?

PAK SEONGCHEOL: There is the possibility to do it this way. Yet important is a statement of will from the masses that have to decide this question on a democratic basis.

LEE HURAK: I have understood everything. You should trust me. I am in favor of not to fight against each other in the future but live together in coexistence between both systems.

It was agreed to hold the next meetings of the co-chairmen in turn in Pyongyang and in Seoul. The 2nd meeting will be held on 2 November 1972 in Pyongyang, the 3rd on 20 November 1972 in Seoul.

On 15 October there arrived a proposal from South Korea via telephone to convey a meeting between representatives from North and South on 16 October. The meeting took place. The South Korean representative asked to submit the following messages to Kim Yeongju:

1. We want to achieve unification at any cost as long as Kim Il Sung and Park Chung Hee are still personally in power, i.e. during the 1970s.
2. The content of the North Korean speeches during the 1st Meeting was not fully comprehended. After repeated listening to the tapes, we can now say that the criticism voiced [by the DPRK] is justified. We have committed mistakes. Therefore it is necessary to launch new measures from our side.

We asked: What kind of measures?

The South Korean side responded: Park Chung Hee and Lee Hurak want to unify the country. Yet many in South Korea are against this. Therefore order must be established. On 17 October Park Chung Hee will publish an important declaration to which North Korean should listen to attentively. If it has comments, it can ask questions about it.

Then Comrade Kim Jaebong continued:

One hour before the publication of Park Chung Hee's declaration there came a phone message from South Korea that it will be made public at 1900 hours. Also it was proposed to have a meeting on 18 October. On 17 October the extraordinary declaration of Park Chung Hee about the state of emergency became public. On 18 October a meeting between representatives from North and South Korea took place.

The following message was transmitted from Lee Hurak to Kim Yeongju:

The situation in Asia has very much changed in the seventies. In particular there are changes in the bipolar system USA-USSR, and also in relations between the four powers USA-USSR-China-Japan. Given these circumstances, we hold the opinion that we have to solve the national question through our own means without the reliance on the United States and Japan.

That is the reason why the Joint Declaration of 4 July was published and the dialogue between North and South began. After this declaration became public, there were many groups formed in South Korea that were against it. There have been many accusations against the government that the Joint Declaration has violated the [South Korean] constitution. This was behind Kim Yeongju's criticism of the current disturbances in South Korea against the line of peaceful unification. The opposition existing in South Korea has interfered with the implementations of obligations [from the Joint Declaration of 4 July]. The extraordinary declaration [of 17 October] to impose a state of emergency aims at changing the constitution. The current constitution was written under the influence of a bipolar situation. It is based on a doctrine of anti-communism, and there are no options for compromise.

The current South Korean constitution does not correspond to the peaceful unification of the country. Therefore we want to adapt the new constitution according to the new conditions. The United States and Japan are against these intentions. Yet we have nonetheless made the decision to solve these questions on the basis of *Juche* and in the spirit of the principles of national self-determination. Although the United States and Japan are against this self-determination, we still have the intention to create a system that serves the purpose of dialogue between North and South and which will have a President in its center after the amendment of the constitution.

We asked this question: Why was the state of emergency and of war declared? What kind of new system is this supposed to be?

The response from the South Korean side: Since our domestic questions are irresolvable by normal means, we want to guarantee the drafting and acceptance of a new constitution through a state of emergency. This way we avoid chaos in our country. When we draft a new constitution, we have to ascertain that no new misunderstandings occur. If you have questions about this, we are ready to answer them. [end of quote]

Currently there are many opinions in South Korea. The rightist elements think those emergency measures are directed against them. Others do not know where this 17 October declaration will lead South Korea. There are questions whether this might be a pro-communist turn and non-abandonment of dialogue [with the North]. There are also discussions whether this new development might signal a turn toward the right. The new constitution is said to fully address the question of unification. A National Assembly is supposed to be established that could guarantee a peaceful dialogue between North and South. There are intentions to amend the constitution in such a way that it will serve as a legal basis for the process of dialogue. Amending the constitution does not mean to abandon dialogue but to enforce it.

The Political Committee of the KWP Central Committee has examined and analyzed all aspects of the situation in South Korea. So far we have not arrived at final conclu-

sions. For now we can say, however, that the current situation in South Korea is very complicated.

After the publication of the Joint Declaration, aspirations of the South Korean masses for peaceful unification have grown. Activities by the opposition parties and within the population increased. This is unsettling for the South Korean government. They are afraid. According to our information, after the publication of the Joint Declaration of 4th of July, 90 progressive cadres were arrested in South Korea. Anti-communism continues to exist. The South Korean economy is currently facing major problems. Small and medium businesses are going bankrupt. The agricultural situation is bad. There will be a poor harvest. People's suffering is on the rise. Currently Park Chung Hee pursues the so-called the "New Village Movement." This movement is about the forced creation of new villages. Peasants are putting up resistance against it. The implementation of "agricultural reform" has resulted in a numerical increase of large landowners, as well as in corruption and so forth. Currently the situation in South Korea is similar to old China under Chiang Kai-shek [Jiang Jieshi]. Therefore the hope for socialism like in North is growing among the South Korean people. Up to the publication of the Joint Declaration there was a standstill in the students' movement. After the 4th of July the movement became jolted again. Park Chung Hee is much afraid of the opposition parties, the people's masses and the students. This is why parliament has been dissolved, the activities of all political parties have been suspended, and the universities have been closed.

After the 19th of April, Park Chung Hee has implemented a militaristic-fascist upheaval. At the end of last year a state of emergency was declared. Now a state of war has been added. Why did Park Chung Hee declare a state of emergency and of war? Park Chung Hee thinks the opposition parties will go against him if, in the current situation, he wants to have dialogue and political meetings with us just on his own. [If opposition parties would join], then the score in those meetings would not be 1:1 but 2:1 in favor of the North. This is why the opposition parties, freedom of speech, and freedom of the press have been abolished and Park Chung Hee is establishing a one man rule.

This is an enforcement of militaristic-fascist dictatorship, an attempt to repress the revolutionary movement, and to secure the further stay of Park Chung Hee in power. This way he will have the monopoly to conduct the dialogue with us, and the score is back to 1:1. Park Chung Hee fears a military conflict. Therefore he wants to solve the unification question peacefully. His objective is to create a system that is favorable to dialogue and peaceful unification.

Park Chung Hee is acting from an autonomous position. However, what kind of autonomy does he have if, on the other hand, he is dependent on the United States and Japan and wants to receive their aid. Park Chung Hee is afraid of his own army. By declaring state of war, he barred all airplanes from flying over South Korean territory. Military employees were barred from leaving the barracks. Those on leave were prohibited from moving around. All army movements have been banned.

What is now our position? If we do not do anything, it will mean we are closing our eyes to the repression of the people [in South Korea]. Therefore we must not remain passive. If we stay passive, we remain silent in the wake of South Korea becoming anti-communist.

We will take up the two following measures:

1. We publish an article in our newspaper and prove that repression of the South Korean people under the pretext of peaceful unification is unjustified and wrong. The more the masses will participate in peaceful unification, the better.
2. There will be a statement published in the name of all political parties to unmask the reasons behind the dissolution of the South Korean parliament. A similar statement is supposed to be issued in the name of the students of North Korea concerning the closing of universities in South Korea. In all that, we will conform to the polite form common so far.

Park Chung Hee's extraordinary declaration contains an interesting passage we will have to analyze in the near future: "Our measures will lead up to a referendum. If the new constitution will not be accepted, it will mean that the South Korean people do not want the dialogue between North and South. Then it will be necessary to look for new steps toward unification."

In conclusion, Comrade Kim Jaebong asked everybody in the attendance to forward this information to the politburos of their respective parties.

Signed: Gensicke, Attache

Initialed: Merten

CC:

1x Comrade Fischer [Deputy Foreign Minister]

1x Comrade Markowski [Central Committee, Department IV]

1x Comrade Schneidewind [Foreign Ministry, Far Eastern Department]

1x Comrade Grunert [Foreign Ministry, ZID]

1x Embassy, Political Department

* * *

DOCUMENT NO. 19

[Source: Translated for NKIDP by Song Jihei]

Conversation with Kim Il Sung

Date and Time: Nov. 3, 1972 10:15-12:20

Location: Pyongyang Government Building

Participants:

From Seoul

LEE Hurak - Co-chairman of the Coordinating Committee
 JANG Giyeong - Assistant to the co-chairman (IOC Committee and former Vice-Premier)
 CHOE Gyuha - Assistant to the co-chairman (Special Assistant to the President for Foreign Affairs)
 KANG Indeok - Assistant to the co-chairman (KCIA Director for Office 9)
 JEONG Hongjin - Assistant to the co-chairman (KCIA Director of Negotiation and Settlement)
 LEE Dong - Spokesman for the co-chairman

From Pyongyang
 KIM Il Sung
 KIM Il - 1st Vice-Premier
 PAK Seongcheol - Deputy Co-chairman
 KIM Jeong-lin - Secretary of Central Committee, Korean Workers' Party
 YU Jangsik- Assistant to the co-chairman (Deputy Director of Organization and Guidance Department and Director of External Affairs, Korean Workers' Party)
 LEE Gyeongseok - Assistant to the co-chairman (Cabinet Secretary)
 HAN Ungsik - Assistant to the co-chairman (Cabinet Secretary)
 KIM Deokhyeon - Assistant to the co-chairman (Chief Officer of the Political Bureau, Central Committee, Korean Workers' Party)

NORTH (KIM): Is President Park doing well and is healthy?

SOUTH (LEE): Yes, he is very well and healthy. He also requested that I deliver his regards.

NORTH (KIM): I am very pleased to meet you again, Director Lee. Also, it is my first time meeting with Mr. Jang and Mr. Choe, but I am well aware of your names. I planned to meet you in the afternoon. However, I had to rearrange the schedule due to other arrangements. Let's have a conference in the afternoon. How is the harvest in the South?

SOUTH (LEE): We have had good projections but suffered some damage towards the end due to the cold weather.

NORTH (KIM): We generally have two harvests a year in the North. The South also has two harvests in most areas, is that right?

SOUTH (LEE): That is correct. We must settle with organizing the South-North Coordinating Committee. As I mentioned to Vice-Premier Pak, I believe there has been significant progress in the South-North relations since the July 4th Joint Statement. We need to reach a consensus on organizing the South-North Coordinating Committee. During our previous meeting, Premier Kim mentioned, “We can’t expect we solve the issues at once. We must study them with the lapse of time and take care of the simpler matters one by one.” My research on the issues is generally based on your remarks.

NORTH (KIM): There has been a significant progress after that statement. I met people who I’ve never met before. Last time we had four guests and we have more guests this time... To my mind, we should reach an agreement regarding the Coordinating Committee ... Since Director Lee is here, we should reach an agreement during your visit and start resolving more practical issues next time. How about we discuss the issue in the afternoon meeting?

SOUTH (LEE): Since the premier has mentioned so, I’m certain the Vice-Premier will do as you suggest.

NORTH (KIM): The Coordinating Committee is very advantageous in solving the issues of our nation. Nevertheless, we do not need to be impetuous. A number of people in the world dislike us being reunified. Since early times, the great powers have ruled over small nations by splitting them apart. Looking through history and philosophy books, it appears that the great powers have been quite distrustful. Korea is located in the midst of China, the Soviet Union, Japan, and the United States. Thus, I imagine that outwardly they say they want us to reunify but in their hearts, many of

them don't. It's easier to control [us] when we are divided. We must reach reunification by any means. Some even call us different people when we are in fact the same.

For example, people in Germany called themselves "Germans" under Hitler's rule. Now they argue that they are different nations. We believe in Marxism, so how shall we define our people? People with common language, writing system, culture, and history shouldn't be split into two nations. Our people shouldn't belong to two nations. Although it's imperfect, King Sejong developed our own writing system in order to filter out the Chinese alphabet, and greatly contributed to the advancement of our culture. We share the same writing system, history and Korean blood. Why should we be divided? If we let this continue, our people could split into two. I recently spoke to the people who came from Japan that we shouldn't tolerate them to speak only Japanese and no Korean. There are people who try to connect with Japan. The Chinese are quite odd people. It is being said the Yuan and Qing took over China. In fact, China has been taken over by the Han. Chinese are quite difficult to assimilate. The Joseon people are quite frail in this sense...We somewhat lack strength in this. Nonetheless we hold on to the heart even when abroad. In this sense, the bloodline is not that simple. The Japanese Colonialists attempted to change our family names, saying "Japan and Korea are one" They ruled over the Joseon people for 36 years, but they failed to assimilate us into Japan.

Our nation should not be divided. If one diverges from us, he deserves to be declared a traitor. When Director Lee first came to the North, I spoke highly of you being brave and heroic. Once you have come to the North, shouldn't you prove to the world that our people cannot be divided? Liberalism? Socialism? Which one is better? We should sort out the virtues, dispose the vice, and select the strengths... What is the confrontation for? I heard some media in the South call this a *confrontation with dialogue*. Confrontation means to compete with each other, [and] people from the same nation confront each other. Competition results in winners and losers. We shouldn't win or lose, don't you think?

SOUTH (LEE): I need to clarify one misunderstanding. I believe there are some differences in the sentiment of the word. It seems you are disturbed by the word confrontation. In the South, confrontation does not necessarily relate to winning and losing.

What it means is to do our best to make something a success. I'd like to point out that the word confrontation does not carry a negative nuance.

NORTH (KIM): Regardless of whether you call it competition or peaceful coexistence, two nations may coexist but there can't be coexistence within one nation. We shouldn't argue with each other over liberalism and socialism. Competition within one nation is unnecessary as it merely measures the superiority between two systems.

Please deliver my words to President Park. We need to fix the misunderstandings if there is any. Anyhow, we must cooperate [*hap-jak*].² The Coordinating Committee should focus on cooperation rather than regulating military confrontation, defamation and aspersion. My faith is in the cooperation of the South and North. We should put ourselves together. Of course, the tasks won't be accomplished at a stretch. Let's start one by one. We should cooperate in sports, culture, and also economy. I have thought about a number of things for us to cooperate on at the present time.

Anyway, through the process of economic cooperation [and moving on to] political and cultural [cooperation], we will be able to develop a further understanding of each other, and it will be beneficial in pursuing the goal of our nation. For instance, the North has abundant underground resources. We recently discovered iron ore deposits. There are several billion tons. The Japanese, who came before to seek iron ore, only saw the surface of it.

SOUTH (LEE): Where did you find that much?

NORTH (KIM): It was also because the Japanese did not yet have developed technology at the time. In any case, the Japanese were not even halfway through with iron ore. We found hundreds of millions of tons in Gaecheon and several more billion tons in Pungsan. It's about ten billion tons altogether. We have plenty of iron ore. Our concern is that we can't drill deep enough since for now we can only excavate about four to five hundred meters ...

NORTH (KIM IL): We can currently dig down to 1,000 meters.

NORTH (KIM): Right, now it is 1,000 meters underground. We need equipment to dig as deep as 2,000-3,000 meters... but the equipment is awfully expensive. We also need about two hundred thousand geological researchers, but we only have around a hundred thousand.

SOUTH (LEE): How good is the quality?

NORTH (KIM): The quality is over 30%. It's about 70% when separated. The quality is outstanding. We trade iron ore with Japan and China. We exchange iron ore for coke.

There is plenty amount of iron ore. We also found nickel. Let's work cooperatively.

SOUTH (LEE): It is best to proceed with easier tasks and leave more difficult tasks for later, as you previously mentioned. Economic cooperation is also included in the function of the Coordinating Committee. It is said something "well begun is half done." I believe the Coordinating Committee will be organized soon to process things step by step.

NORTH (KIM): Let us develop a cooperative project.

SOUTH (LEE): The development itself is not that significant. However, the issues you have mentioned will be solved gradually.

NORTH (KIM): We have plenty of issues to cooperate. For instance, about five to six million tons of pollock and sailfin sandfish travel to our coast annually, but we are capable of fishing five hundred thousand to six hundred thousand tons at the most. I'm not certain about the depth but the large mass of pollock that crowds in is about three thousand meters wide and five thousand meters in length, according to the fishermen. If the fishermen of the South and North cooperate, we are capable of fishing much more.

Fishing is a seasonal business that lasts for about a month. We are now capable of fishing only about 10%. The scientists researching marine resources say catching about

50% of pollock will not damage the population of pollock. In other words, fishing 250 thousand tons of pollock is acceptable. Won't it be mutually beneficial if the fishermen from the South and North worked together? Let's cooperate in fishing as well.

The South has developed light industry and manufacturing industry, and the North has developed heavy industry ...

We decided to focus on machine industry since long ago. Since we have abundant iron ore, we produce tractors and automobiles to export to our neighbors. We have a big market. We can have a prosperous life promoting machine industry. Although there have been significant advancements, we are yet at a beginning stage. Still, there is some gap to compete in the capitalist market. South-North cooperation is desirable. We can also divide work. It will greatly reduce each other's burdens. As a result, we will prosper having no need to envy others.

I heard that the South is actively developing many industries. However, I wonder, is the South capable of further advancements without developing the resources in the North? Of course, you could import from other countries, but is it necessary to import resources when your closest neighbor has abundant resource? We need to cooperate one step after another in order to develop trust. Words can't tell one's true intention. If the Coordinating Committee has this task in the item, we ought to start from that specific task.

SOUTH (LEE): I am well aware. Indeed, we must proceed with the tasks one by one as the projects that Premier Kim mentioned are included in the Coordinating Committee's projects rather than [emphasizing the] organization of the Committee itself.

NORTH (KIM): We should put [the projects] in action. Let's work on a wide range of projects. Cooperation in culture is an integral part as well. One word could have multiple meanings. If the separation continues, we could separate into two nations. Language, writing system...

Kim Dubong who stayed in Yan'an, had an argument with us regarding our writing system. Reforming the writing system is what you studied and it will leave honor to

you, but in fact it will encourage a division of our nation. Thus, we rejected writing system reform. He proposed to reform our writing system similar to Latin. Exchange in science... That is the reason why I support cooperation than exchange.

Scholars in the South are more knowledgeable of what we are not familiar with. Likewise, our scholars may be more familiar what the scholars in South have less knowledge of. In order to develop industries, we will also need cooperation in the sphere of science. The mass media call it confrontation with dialogue, competition with dialogue. However, it is now the time for us to cooperate.

Since we have initiated a conversation, the Coordinating Committee should refrain from doing all talk and no action...

SOUTH (LEE): Listening to your remarks, Premier Kim, it is exactly the same as what President Park has in mind. President Park always mentioned that we will prosper when the South and North become one. We could develop Geumgang Mountains, go sightseeing in Mt. Geumgang, and visit Busan afterwards. When we put our efforts together, we will be able to display our might even without political integration. Since President Park and Premier Kim have similar thinking, the cabinet members around the President and the Premier must work hard to promote what you have in mind.

SOUTH (JANG): I heard President Park remarking the exact same thoughts, likewise.

SOUTH (LEE): For instance, we purchase the iron ore at Pohang Jonghap Jecheol³ from Australia for roughly eleven dollars per ton. If the North could supply the same resource, tariff barrier is abolished. How beneficial is that?

NORTH (KIM): I'd be delighted if President Park has same thoughts. It is perhaps a good time for us to cooperate. We will have understandings instead of misunderstandings. When the South and the North cooperate, all the issues will vanish.

SOUTH (LEE): If the athletes had came together and participated as a unified team in the last Olympic games, we could have better displayed the power of our nation to the international world, I believe.

NORTH (KIM): We are then truly invincible. Our football team came back yesterday from a game in India. India has four hundred million people and we only have twenty-five million but we were winning by 7 to 0. Then the Indian audiences cheered for more goals. We won by 9 to 0, eventually.

Was it “basketball”? It was not soccer. We had a match with West Germany and we were winning by a goal. The referee must have been bribed. We lost a point due to a penalty [shot]. Then he called for extra time but our team refused. We lost the game because he counted our refusal as a withdrawal. When we went to the Soviet Union, the Soviets [told us that they] also lost 6 to 0 with West Germany but with Chinese team... it is the Chinese team, isn't it? They won by 4 to 0. What does a large population matter? When we unite, we can defeat all. Our nation is strong and our people are full of fight.

SOUTH (LEE): We should form a unified team for the next Olympic Games. We should also participate as a unified team in international competitions prior to the Olympics.

SOUTH (JANG): We can cooperate in cheering even at the moment.

NORTH (KIM): Cooperation, from economic to cultural, and political cooperation, it is not much of a complicated issue. What is socialism? Nasser is known for his support for socialism. So are Somali and Sukarno. In fact, they were all nationalists mistaken for socialists. Our socialism doesn't know the Russian's quite well. Before the war, we hardly mentioned socialism. We developed socialism after the war. We published a thesis in April 1955. The Soviets and the Western world laughed at us because we wanted to adopt socialism. They derided us saying socialism has to be after industrial development. In fact, we were devastated in ashes due to the war. Middle-income farmers, wealthy farmers and small business owners all became penniless. We were already through with land reforms like in the South. An advanced country will not allow a feudal ownership of land... Since everyone is penniless, we needed to pull together. Then we discussed how and came up with a cooperative farming system. Thus we asked the people to choose among 1. Labor exchange fields, 2. Co-owned

labor fields, and 3. Possessions combined fields. In the cities, the small business owners had “empty hands and naked fists.”⁴ Therefore, the state had to lend them money, and we decided that loaning a sum of money to a group is more efficient than lending particles to individuals. It is how we came up with a production cooperative community. Now, we only have socialist-owned and state-owned [properties]. We did not replicate the Russian system by rote. We didn’t experience major tragedies, for instance beheading the wealthy farmers as in *Virgin Soil Upturned* (Sholokhov’s work). That is the reason why I believe in *Juche*. If we didn’t cooperate then, the development of current date was quite impossible. Because we irrigated the land without the distinction of ownership, we now have 7 billion m² of rice fields⁵.

SOUTH (LEE): In the South, we have about 20 billion m².

NORTH (KIM): Socialism is not a big threat [to cooperation between the North and South]. I would avoid giving you a lecture on socialism. In any case, we can progress from economic cooperation to political cooperation at any time.

SOUTH (LEE): As you have mentioned, we should expedite simpler assignments and take time with more complicated issues. We should work together under this principle.

NORTH (KIM): I have one concern. Politics, culture and society, none of these are completely independent from one another. In order to resolve this issue, that issue will come into conflict... We must loosen the tension between the South and the North. For we are uncertain of when we might have a war, we have significant burdens in military expense. The burdens in military expense need to be the first issue for us to solve. The South receives 250 million dollars in foreign aid but we have no foreign assistance. It is a lot of pressure for us. We need to take care of this issue first. Why would the U.S. support South Korea and for what would they continue the support? If political issues are not taken care of, there is not going to be any more chance in the future for us to progress. We should reduce the military expenses and promote peaceful operations. We produce guns, and you import them from overseas. We need political cooperation in order to solve this issue as well. Guns are not like food in a sense that it can’t be consumed. So what will unused guns become of? Prior to all, we need to cooperate instead of attacking each other and decrease the military expenses.

Also regarding the issue federation, we must proceed with a primary form of a federation to the international community, leaving the system in the South and the North as the way it is. It will lead us to clearing up all issues. We will need a common name externally. Do we want to join the UN as a divided country? No, I would never. Even when the South attempts to, you can't join the UN because we can veto. We could maintain as two countries domestically but to the outside world, we should become one country. The Republic of Korea, Democratic People's Republic of Korea... We can also come up with a new name. The Confederal Republic of Korea sounds reasonable. Under the agreement, we could co-chair the federation. This way we will be able to raise the nation's dignity. That's how we will raise dignity domestically. Let's study this. I meant to mention this when I meet with President Park but I decided to speak to you since we are running out of time. Without the tension loosened, we won't be able to solve the problems.

SOUTH (LEE): Shouldn't we consider the South-North Joint Statement a peace agreement? What matters is the will to conform to the statement. While President Park is in the office, there is no need for you to be occupied in producing guns. The federation issue is also very complicated that it requires a multi-dimensional research. I once read about your stance towards federation, Premier. President Park has also mentioned previously about the need of a board of representatives until we are finally reunified. All in all, we will need to study more.

NORTH (KIM): You tend to separate the matters but we look at the matters inter-linked. We call it dialectical materialism. For us, it is difficult to separate the matters individually. The exchange of dispersed family members through the Red Cross Societies ... Even though it may seem like a simple issue, it is not indeed. For example, Lee Beomseok, the chief South Red Cross delegate, has an aunt in the North. I asked them if they wanted to meet. However, the aunt didn't want to meet her nephew. Why was it? Her sons and daughters have to make their careers but she was worried that it may hurt her children's careers if people learned that her nephew is a high-ranking official in the South. I'm certain there are many people with similar concerns in the South.

If people worry that finding dispersed family could harm them, and thus, change names and tell lies to find dispersed family members, it is never a simple issue.

We are accused of linking politics, and you tell us that you are disappointed. Nevertheless, we must make sure that no one suffers any harm. At a factory, I met a man whose father left for the South. I asked him if he wanted to meet his father. He answered, he wouldn't meet his father because he did wrong, and if he did right, he will call him father. I asked him if he really meant it and he answered yes. We must be able to take care of the [South-North] issues considering related matters. Now that we opened up, we shouldn't reversely close the door. Who would blame Kim Il Sung or President Park anymore? Our thoughts and your thoughts can be different. The initial philosophy can be different. For us, everything is interconnected. You observe matters as separate. Individual matters can be solved in parts. Nonetheless, do the other matters follow? We can draw closer the differences in thoughts. The military issue... The South has about seven hundred thousand and we have about four hundred thousand to five hundred thousand. Why do we need such a number for? We only need about hundred thousand from South and another hundred thousand from us as strategic unit. Even in the case of Japanese invasion, two hundred thousand is enough.

SOUTH (LEE): We will need some in the Amnok River as well.

NORTH (KIM): Exploiting underground resources, economic and political cooperation, and decrease in military expenses ...

SOUTH (LEE): That is exactly the reason why we are organizing the Coordinating Committee. We will open the doors one by one.

NORTH (KIM): I heard that President Park hopes that we will be reunified in the 80s. Then I will be 70 [years old], and President Park will be around 67-68 [years old], right?

SOUTH (LEE): What he intended to say is that we will eventually be reunified in the 80s through economic and cultural exchanges. Even if we have some delays, aiming for the 80s will give us some time.

NORTH (KIM): Director Lee mentioned that I shouldn't take newspapers seriously but we ought to pay attention to what they say.

SOUTH (LEE): I am confident that these conversations bear significant meaning. I came to Pyongyang to listen to Premier Kim's thoughts, and Vice-Premier Pak came to Seoul to hear President Park's thoughts... When your remarks are drawn closer to your intents, things will proceed with one accord.

SOUTH (JANG): Yes, I suppose there are correlations. [I suppose we will reach] Political cooperation enabled through economic cooperation... Assuming that we proceed successively taking the material correlations into account, when do you expect we will be able to be reunified, Premier?

NORTH (KIM): We can right away. We can reunify even within a month. Only if we are determined, we are able to reunify right after this moment. [We will] Invoke a martial law one after another... We are afraid of nothing.

SOUTH (JANG): How long do you project it will take, presuming that we have a successful transition from economic cooperation to political?

NORTH (KIM): If President Park and I have our wills put together, it can happen in a day. It's because President Park and the people in power are suspicious of us. We should all leave the doubts behind.

SOUTH (JANG): A new form of federation will also require some time to fully unify as a country.

NORTH (KIM): Frankly speaking, I don't want to become the chairman when we reunify. I want to write philosophy. I haven't even finished writing books [on the ideas that I have in mind]... We should dismiss thinking about who will control over whom from our minds and unite as a nation. If we think negatively and behave reluctantly, it is impossible for us to reach solidarity. It all depends on your understanding. Without being concerned about time, let's have lunch together, hold proper discussions and leave after signing the treaty in the afternoon.

SOUTH (CHOE): There can't be a treaty between us. It should be [called] a statement.

NORTH (KIM): Please convey my messages to President Park that we are not impatient. It's been a year since the Red Cross Conference and half a year since the Joint Statement. It is time for us to show some achievements externally. Let's start with cooperation. Let's start with economic and cultural cooperation.

SOUTH (LEE): Since President Park thinks the same way, the methods will be quite simple.

NORTH (KIM): Let's cooperate. The military issue... We should cut down on the expenses. There is excessive burden upon military expenses. Decreasing the military burden is related to the increase in political trust.

SOUTH (LEE): In fact, it is the possibility of a military conflict that brought about the current state. The South and North mutually agree on the need to reduce military expenses. However, in the South there is no such word as "cooperation (*hap-jak*)."
I understand what you intend. We can promote cooperation of your intent in various fields including economic, culture and society. We ought to pour our efforts into promoting such cooperation.

We, the assistants to President Park, will discuss the matter with your assistants, and seek to resolve the issues as soon as possible.

NORTH (KIM): Why did you schedule your visit for such a short time? Is it all done when you publish documents and make announcements? You should stay longer so that we have sufficient time for conversation and to connect.

SOUTH (LEE): My job as the head of the KCIA is to arrest ex-communists. The KCIA is a crucial government agency responsible for national security. I was determined to visit because I believed reconciliation between South and North is as important as arresting communists for the pursuit of national security. It is a disgrace for our nation if we close the door after we open it. We need to widen the door to raise our nation's dignity.

NORTH (KIM): I fully trusted you, as you are the one who arrests communists. I distrust Mr. Jang and Mr. Choe. I have a greater trust and respect for you Director Lee, since the person who captures communists has come to cooperate with the communists. Director Lee has a tremendous responsibility in our nation's reunification and it is an honor for our nation's future.

That is why I called you a hero. I could give you the honor as a part of the people of this country. Kim Yeongju, the director of organization and guidance, is suffering from vegetable neurological disorder,⁶ and it seems it cannot be cured easily ... Kim Yeongju intended to visit Seoul to meet with President Park and hold discussions when he recovers... He will be better by December or the next new year. Director Kim Yeongju is planning on a courtesy visit. I could certainly send my brother to the South since Director Lee has visited us. He's [so sick that he is] unable to do his work. I will send him to the South to meet with President Park.

It is best that we cooperate. By the way, I heard someone named Shin Sangcho speaking to the media. He argued we should not reunify. He said if the South and North reunify, we will have to kill five million people each. Then he asked how we can we unify considering such casualties. Thus, I called the chief of general staff and asked how much casualties we expect. He answered that the number is definitely less than five million. Many people want to interrupt our reunification. We both have to avoid those journalists. If we want to cooperate, we shouldn't be against communism. We will offend each other and eventually fight against each other. We will be repeating the confusion [that occurred] during the Rhee Syngman [era]. We shouldn't make any anti-communist movements. Since Director Lee expressed the initiative, please visit us often. We may not be able to provide a great deal in the way of hospitality, but we can sure share a bowl of rice. The foreigners are going to be astonished if we cooperate in fishing and in developing underground resources.

SOUTH (LEE): Thank you for your time whenever I visit Pyongyang.

NORTH (KIM): Let's speak frankly if there is any misunderstanding. Why shouldn't we?

SOUTH (LEE): I'd be happy to see more people developing an understanding through the successful organization of the Coordinating Committee. It is better than my delivery of your thoughts.

NORTH (KIM): Bring more company when you visit next time. I'm very pleased to have Director Lee, who is in charge of arresting communists. That means you have a strong desire for our reunification. Please speak frankly if there is any misunderstanding. It is time we cooperate instead of merely talking.

SOUTH (LEE): President Park and Premier Kim have very similar philosophy. The theme of their thinking is almost identical.

NORTH (KIM): We should cooperate in fishing and mining underground resources..

SOUTH (LEE): What is your price for iron ore in the international market?

NORTH (KIM IL): It's five pounds per ton.

NORTH (KIM): When the congressmen from Japan's Liberal Democratic Party visited, I told them we have nothing for sale to you. The iron ore and hard coal (anthracite) we have... We do not wish to be your resource provider or consuming market. We want one-on-one trade. During the Khrushchev [era], we were asked to join the COMECON but we turned down the offer. If we merely export resources, we'll only be left with abandoned mines. You must import our machines. We want machines versus machine and resource versus resource trade. That is why we didn't join the COMECON. If they don't import from us, then we won't trade. The Soviets still purchase thousands of machines from us. We told them, you be the college students and we will be little children still growing up in kindergarten. We trade with the Soviet under the condition that we export machines and resources and import coal, coke and petroleum. China buys iron ore from us and brings us coke.

SOUTH (LEE): In the North, chemical industry still runs by coal. We run the industry by petroleum.

NORTH (KIM): Petroleum access is highly limited to us. Carbide has some electricity losses but we can produce it independently. We extract synthetic fiber from coal and carbide.

SOUTH (LEE): Wouldn't that raise the cost... the production cost?

NORTH (KIM): What's bad about having a slightly higher production cost, as long as we produce with what we have... We have expanded the current vinylon capacity from thirty thousand tons to fifty thousand tons.

SOUTH (LEE): Coal, limestone and synthetic fiber sounds like a significantly high production cost.

NORTH (KIM): The production cost may be high. However, we are completely self-sufficient. We produce with what our own resource... Lunch seems to be ready. Allow me to guide you to the dining area.

* * *

DOCUMENT NO. 20

[Source: AQPPSH, MPP Korese, D 1, V. 1973. Translated for NKIDP by Enkel Daljani]

To the First Secretary of the Albanian Workers' Party
Central Committee
Comrade Enver Hoxha
Tirana

Dear comrade Enver Hoxha,

Seeing with great delight how the brotherly relations of friendship and cooperation between the parties, governments, and peoples of our two countries are developing well from one day to the next, I send to You, and through You, to the ALP, the Government, and the Albanian people our most heartfelt greetings.

I would like to express to You, the CC of Your party, and the Government our deepest gratitude for the fact that in the international area, including at the UN, Your country is waging an active campaign in support of the great cause of our people for the reunification of our fatherland, and has taken the necessary measures to show its strong solidarity and support for the letter we have sent to the parliaments and governments of all the countries of the world, approved in the second session of the Supreme Peoples' Assembly of the Fifth Legislature of our country.

I take this chance to express my desire to inform You, and through You the CC of Your party and the Government of Your country, on the situation that has lately been created in our country in relation to the five point program for the peaceful reunification of the country that we recently published.

Over time the division of Korea causes ever more pain and suffering to our people, which during its thousands-of-years old history has always lived as a single people, and also creates problem for the issue of the preservation of peace and security in Asia and the world over.

The United States of America has been for 28 years now imposing the division of the territory of the country and the breakup of our nation to our people, and now by using their two-faced tactics they are trying to urge Koreans against Koreans, to consolidate the division of Korea for eternity, and to fabricate two separate Koreas.

Following the letter, these machinations of the USA, the South Korean officials are working hard toward a "confrontation" between the South and the North; they are placing all their forces to the increase of their military capacity, and are continually using intrigues to for the eternalizing of the division of the country.

Lately they have gone so far as to make the plans for the creation of the two Koreas their policy ant to openly announce a course of division for the country.

Due to all these facts and despite our continuous attempts for the independent and peaceful reunification of the country, we do not see at the moment the necessary progress in the talks between the South and the North; the previously miraculous perspectives for the reunification of the Fatherland that were presented to our nation

a year ago when the Joint Declaration of the North and the South was proclaimed are now becoming darker by the day.

At a time when inside the country, and outside, one can see the unusual tendency for the eternalizing of the division of the country, based on the sincere aspiration for overcoming the present difficulties and on the desire to accomplish as soon as possible our national aspiration—the peaceful reunification of the Fatherland—on June 23 of this year, we, once again proclaimed our program for the peaceful and independent reunification of the country:

First, we propose to liquidate the situation of the military confrontation and the elimination of the tensions between the South and the North.

The liquidation of the situation of the military confrontation and the elimination of the tensions between the South and the North is at the moment the most pressing and key issue to the necessity for the removal of misunderstandings and lack of trust, the deepening of the understanding and trust between the North and the South, the creation of an atmosphere of a great national reunification, the amelioration of the atmosphere between the North and the South, and the achievement of the peaceful reunification of the country.

For as long as the knife remains hidden under the jacket, it will not be possible to create an atmosphere of mutual trust and to successfully solve the problem of the cooperation and interchange between the North and the South.

That is why as a first step toward the peaceful reunification of the country, we have approached more than once the authorities of South Korea with proposals for a freeze to the increase of the armed forces and the armament race between us, for the removal of all the foreign troops, the reduction of the armies and the armaments, a stop to the delivery of armaments from abroad, and the conclusion of a peace agreement.

Secondly, we have presented the proposal for the achievement of multileveled cooperation and for trade between the North and the South in the different fields of politics, military arts, diplomacy, economy, and culture.

We think that the initiation of the multileveled cooperation and trade between the South and the North has a great importance for the eventual re-linking of the national relations that have been cut, for the amelioration of the relations between the North and the South, and the creation of the necessary premises for reunification.

We reiterated once more that the South Korean officials should not rely on external forces, but should, instead, accept the development of the economy in the interest of

our entire nation through the course of mutual exploitation of the natural resources of the country and the achievement of the national cooperation in all the fields.

Thirdly, we proposed giving to the various layers of the population of the North and the South at large the chance to take part in the patriotic, national process in the name of the reunification of the Fatherland.

We think that as long as the reunification of the Fatherland is a cause that must be exclusively solved on the basis of a common willingness of the entire people of the North and the South Korea, the dialog between the North and the South should not be limited only to the circle of the representatives of the authorities of the South and the North, but must be brought down to the level of the entire nation.

For the same reason, we proposed the gathering a great National Assembly comprised of various layers of the population, political parties, and social organizations of the North and the South, the free discussion of the issues, and the solution, through it, of the issue of the reunification of the country according to the will and desires of our people.

Fourth, we proposed once again the establishment of a confederation of the South and the North under the name of a single state—the Confederate Republic of Goryeo.

The gathering of the great National Assembly and the achievement of the great national consolidation, and the establishment on this basis of a confederative system, all the while keeping for a determined time the two different systems that exist in the North and in the South, is considered by us as the most rational course for the achievement of the reunification of the country.

We have proposed that should a confederative system comprised of the South and the North be established, this confederative state be called the Confederate Republic of Goryeo, bringing back the name of Goryeo, which is widely known to the world as the only state that has existed in the territory of our nation.

Fifthly, we have presented the proposal that the North and the South operate jointly in their foreign relations with the intention of preempting the consolidation of the division and the eternal separation of our nation into two Koreas.

Our nation, a single nation, which during our thousands of years of history has existed and continues to exist as a single culture and a single language, cannot be left to live separated into two parts.

We think that for the preemption of an eternal division of the country into a northern and a southern part, we must also jointly take steps in the field of the foreign affairs.

In the field of the international relations with other countries, we are also resolutely opposed to every attempt to exploit them for the fabrication of two separate Koreas.

We insist that the South and the North should not become separate members of the UN, and think that if they want to become members of the UN before the achievement of the reunification of the country, we must enter as a single state, with the name of a single state—the Confederate Republic of Goryeo—only after the establishment, at the very least, of a confederative system

But we are also of the opinion that, aside from the issue of the membership in the UN, whenever the issues related to Korea are included in the daily agenda or are discussed at the UN, the representative of the DPR of Korea, as a directly interested party, should be invited to take part.

We also think that all of our proposals are acceptable to all; they are the most rational and the most practical proposals that represent the immediate aspiration of the entire people of Korea, who seek to stop the division of the country, to completely improve their life, to improve the relations between the South and the North, and to achieve as soon as possible the reunification of the country and to further the cause of the day—*independence and peace*.

Now it has become easily clear who sincerely desires peace and reunification in Korea, and who really desires war and division.

I express my confidence that Your party, government, and people will pay a great deal of attention to the present situation in our country and will take active measures of various forms in support of the new course of the government of the DPR of Korea for the achievement of the reunification of the country without any interference from abroad, in an independent way, on a democratic basis, and in a peaceful way.

I express my conviction that the close relations of friendship and cooperation that we have established between the parties, governments, and peoples of our two countries, will in the future, as in the past, be strengthened and developed ceaselessly on the basis of the principles of Marxism – Leninism and of the proletarian internationalism. I wish You with all my heart good health and new successes in Your work in general.

Friendly greetings,

The General Secretary of the Central Committee of
The Korean Workers' Party
Kim Il Sung

Pyongyang, on July 7, 1973

* * *

DOCUMENT NO. 21

[Source: National Archives and Records Administration]

August 24, 1973

Memorandum for: The Secretary of State
Subject: Strategy of the Korean Question in the U.N. General Assembly

The President has reviewed your July 31, 1973, report on your talks with ROK President Park and other leaders in Seoul. The President has decided that we should proceed on the Korean question in the UNGA in accordance with the following strategy.

-- Our basic objective should be to minimize the risk of a major confrontation in the UNGA, while preserving our essential policy position on the U.N. Command (UNC) and UNCURK.

-- We should seek to have the UNCURK report recommending termination of the organization submitted as soon as possible. We should not favor a formal UNGA resolution on the report, however, unless the Communist side attempts to have UNCURK terminated with prejudice to its past activities, or unless necessary to retain the initiative on UNCURK.

-- Our objective is to defeat any moves at this UNGA aimed at terminating the UNC. We should, therefore, undertake immediate representations to all potentially responsive UN members setting forth this position and explaining the substantial differences between the UNC and UNCURK.

-- Regarding the simultaneous admission of both Koreas to U.N. membership, we should try to persuade South Korea to press its campaign less vigorously, in order to avoid stimulating the opposition to make greater efforts in support of a hostile resolution on the UNC and U.S. Forces in the ROK. The U.S. should be prepared to give modest support to the ROK's efforts to secure simultaneous admission in order (a) to support our Korean ally, (b) to avail ourselves of the tactical leverage this issue can provide against possible opposition efforts to press for a hostile resolution on the UNC and U.S. Forces in the ROK. The proposal for simultaneous admission should be phrased in a way that does not seem to impose U.N. membership on North Korea. At the same time, our effort both as regards simultaneous admission and the UNC/U.S. forces should be keyed to deal effectively with the level and character of challenge that may be raised by the opposition.

In addition to the above, a study should be prepared presenting options and related scenarios on the following questions, and should be submitted for the President's consideration no later than August 30:

- How we might prevent the UNC and U.S. forces in the ROK from becoming the center of a full-blown debate in this fall's UNGA.
- How we might prevent the opposition from mobilizing majority support for UNGA action against the UNC and U.S. forces in the ROK.
- How both legally and institutionally we could protect the continued effectiveness of the Armistice Agreement and the Military Armistice Commission, assuming a major attack on the UNC.

(signature)

Henry A. Kissinger

* * *

DOCUMENT NO. 22

[Source: From the personal archive of former Bulgarian diplomat Georgii Mitov.
Translation from Bulgarian by Donna Kovacheva]

Memorandum of Conversation
between Todor Zhivkov, First Secretary of the Central Committee of the
Bulgarian Communist Party and Chairman of the State Council of Bulgaria,
and Kim Il Sung, President and Secretary General of the North Korean
Workers' Party
30 October, 1973

RE: SOME ASPECTS OF MY CONVERSATIONS
WITH COMRADE KIM IL SUNG

First of all, I would like to point out that during our visit to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, our delegation was bestowed with extraordinary attention and hospitality. As our Korean comrades pointed out (and our comrades at the Embassy in Pyongyang confirmed later), they had not hosted a similar reception for another delegation in recent years. From our statement below it will become clear that the great hospitality and attention shown to us was, to a great extent, addressed towards the Soviet Union.

I will cover some aspects of our conversations with Comrade Kim Il Sung at the official meeting of the two delegations, and more specifically, of the conversations between the two of us on the train, on our way from Pyongyang to the town of Hamheung and back.

I am relaying these conversations in brief and from memory. The conversations between us were lengthy: the first conversation on the train lasted three hours and the second one about two hours and a half.

I will cover some of the issues that we discussed with Comrade Kim Il Sung:

1. On the issue of détente of the international situation, the transition from the stage of "Cold War" towards peaceful coexistence of countries with different social systems.

I spoke about this issue during the official meetings between the two delegations and, later, during my face-to-face talks with Comrade Kim Il Sung. The task I had assigned myself was: to explain that the policy of peaceful coexistence, which we, brotherly, socialist countries conduct now, is a class, internationalist policy; a policy that coincides with the key interests and the struggle of the international communist and labor movement, of the workers' class across the world, the national liberation movement, that the policy of détente creates favorable conditions for expanding the global revolutionary process, gives and will continue to give, positive results on all continents on our planet. I pointed out that it was this situation, indeed, that created an opportunity to end the war in Vietnam, the Middle East, etc. I pointed out that the assertion of this policy and its practical results are a major victory for our socialist countries, for the progressive part of mankind, a victory gained in the course of struggles lasting decades. I pointed out the role of the Soviet Union in this regard, the great significance of the Soviet Union's peace program adopted at the XXIV Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU), and the personal merit of comrade Leonid Ilyich Brezhnev.

My statement visibly impressed Comrade Kim Il Sung. At the end of the official meetings, he stated that they approved of this policy and after our conversation, he had learned certain things and understood them better.

2. On relations with China and China's leadership

The second issue that we discussed with Comrade Kim Il Sung was about the relationship with the People's Republic of China and the Chinese leadership.

At the official meeting between the two delegations, I spoke briefly about the issue of our relations with the Chinese. I only spoke about what their embassy was doing in Sofia, and pointed out that they were trying to establish pro-Chinese groups in Bulgaria. We provided them with a contingent for these groups from the Secret Service and they were established. But after some time, we told the Chinese that we should no longer play a game of hide-and-seek, that these were no pro-Chinese groups of any kind, but employees of our secret service, and that this game should stop. Now, the Chinese embassy in Sofia is gathering and exchanging information with the American

and other diplomatic missions in Sofia and leading a policy of discrediting Bulgaria in front of other diplomatic missions.

In my face-to-face talks with Comrade Kim Il Sung, however, I spoke in detail about the Chinese issue, pointing out the following:

- On the neutrality of our Korean comrades in their discord with the Chinese Communist Party and the People's Republic of China: I pointed out that by adhering to neutral positions on the Chinese dissent with the communist movement, in principle, this means support of the policy and the dissident activity of the Chinese, practical approval of the anti-Soviet policy conducted by the Chinese leadership. This could push the Chinese towards most dangerous steps with unpredictable outcomes for the smaller countries in Asia. Such a position means departure from the policy of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism.
- On the Chinese theory of so-called "super states," the division of the world not into socialist and capitalist states, but rather into big and small states, into white and colored: I pointed out that this theory is anti-Marxist and is taken from the ideological arsenal of imperialism, that the Chinese are using it as a tool in their struggle against the Soviet Union. You cannot put the Soviet Union and the USA on one plate.
- On the Chinese thesis about the socialist imperialism of the Soviet Union, the "threat from the North," and the Chinese provocations along the Soviet-Chinese border: China points out as enemy number one not imperialism, but the country of Lenin, the first socialist country in the world.

This was also openly expressed at the 10th Congress of the Chinese Communist Party. No "threat from the North" exists. It is a fact that China used weapons against the Soviet Union, that it constantly launches provocations against the Soviet Union. The talks about the "threat from the North" are demagogy. The Chinese need them for internal consumption and to play around with the imperialists. It is difficult to understand why China did not accept even one of the numerous specific proposals made by the Soviet Union for regulating and normalizing Soviet-Chinese relations.

- On the practical alliance of the Chinese with the most reactionary forces in the international arena: In support of this, I pointed out a series of facts: Zhou Enlai's appeal towards the Americans not to withdraw their troops from the Far East; the diplomatic relations between Peking and Franco; the expulsion of Allende's Ambassador from Peking, the practical support of the military junta in Chile, the support that the Chinese render to the reactionary forces in many countries in dealing with the communists, etc.

In conclusion on this matter, I summarized that we were talking not about some Chinese-Russian dispute, but about principle ideological and political disagreements between China's leadership on one side and the socialist community and the international communist movement as a whole on the other; and that the policy of the Chinese leadership was contrary to the collective policy developed by the brotherly parties for unification of the anti-imperialist forces.

Comrade Kim Il Sung responded on the issue about their relationship with China as follows:

We—he said—do not agree with China's policy. It is incomprehensible to us. It is incomprehensible to us why they speak about Soviet socialist imperialism, that there is socialist imperialism in the Soviet Union. In the Soviet Union there is no socialist imperialism and there is no socialist imperialism at all. We do not share China's idea about the two super-states. We do not agree with their theories, which they spread in the past as well, about the blooming of all flowers, the contradictions in socialist society, the peasant communities, the Cultural Revolution, etc.

During the Cultural Revolution, the Chinese set up along our border, which is 1,300 km long, loud speakers and they broadcast propaganda against our country day and night. The population along the border could not sleep. My son visited a village along the border at the time. When he came back he said, "Dad, I could not sleep a single night."

When the Chinese launched a military provocation along the Soviet border along the Amur and Ussuri Rivers, they launched a military provocation in our country too (he mentioned the name of the river and the village, but I could not remember them). The story that Kim Il Sung told was the following: In this village we had soldiers and

armed villagers (along the border our people bear arms), about 50 people; and the Chinese penetrated into our country with 100 armed soldiers and officers. I was out in the country at the time (on Saturdays and Sundays I usually go out in the country and I read,) and they told me about this infiltration by the Chinese soldiers. I gave instructions to our people to let them in and not to shoot at them straight away. But, if they tried to advance further into our territory and carry out actions, our people were to block their way and capture at least five of them alive. The Chinese soldiers, however, penetrated into our territory and after that withdrew, without undertaking any action. There were similar, less significant, incidents in other places along the border too.

I was in China last year. The reason for my visit was to meet with Sihanouk. The invitation was also from the Chinese. They groomed me at length against the Soviet Union. In the end, I told them that to us, the Soviet Union, the Soviet people are our brothers-in-arms, just as you, Chinese, are our brothers-in-arms. China is a big country and they believe that they can exist and fight on their own. They do not recognize the international communist movement. We have a saying: "Mountains have high and low peaks, but people are the same." (I don't know if the interpreter interpreted it correctly. He was Korean.)

China's policy in relation to the events in Chile is incomprehensible to us. Now, after the military junta's coup d'état, there are three embassies of socialist countries still remaining: those of China, Rumania, and Albania. I don't know the situation with the Vietnamese Embassy. After the Cuban Embassy, our embassy in Chile was the second one against which the military junta carried out provocations and made the future work of the Embassy impossible. China's establishing diplomatic relations with Franco's Spain is also incomprehensible to us.

We do not have a neutral policy towards China. But because of our specific situation, we are just keeping our mouths shut. There is a front against us in the South. If we open our mouths, that means to open up a second front. China is all around us. We have a small border with the Soviet Union. In the country, among the party and the people, we do not disseminate their theories and their views. We print out some of their speeches, they print some of ours. But, we do not publish in the press what is contrary to our policy, we delete it.

In the course of our face-to-face conversation, Comrade Kim Il Sung pointed out several times: we do not have a neutral policy towards China; we do not intend to maintain such a policy in the future either. We do not disseminate their concepts

inside our country. I believe you are right in maintaining an open struggle against the Chinese. But you have to understand us and our situation here, in this region of the world.

I raised the question: How do you, Comrade Kim Il Sung, see the future? Isn't there a danger for the nationalist, chauvinistic, super-state, and adventurous policy of China's leadership to bring about most unpredictable consequences aimed against the smaller countries and nations in Asia, and sacrifice their interests in favor of the super-state goals of Peking? Isn't there a danger everything that is most holy to you and to your people to be destroyed and desecrated tomorrow?

To this question, Comrade Kim Il Sung answered: Nobody knows that will be tomorrow. That is possible and we keep track of it. That is why we teach our people against subservience to other countries. In our country, we aim this not against the Soviet Union, but against China. China has influence in our country. Our language has many Chinese words in it.

When we discussed the Chinese issue, Comrade Kim Il Sung pointed out: This is my understanding on this issue. This is our policy. And this is not my understanding only. You, comrade Zhivkov, you see the people in our delegation, these are young people. They think the same as well and keep the same in mind in everything they do.

3. On collective security in Asia

I took the initiative on this topic and spoke first, keeping in mind that Comrade Kim Il Sung could get carried away and express views that are incorrect. What I said was basically the following:

- What does it mean to talk about collective security in Asia at this stage? At this stage, it is only an idea launched by the Soviet Union. By no means does it mean that this idea is to be achieved tomorrow. This is a task for the future, a task for the time yet to come. To turn it into a material force, the idea for collective security in Asia must become a collective task of the Asian people and it must be outlined in a program.

- The Soviet comrades, too, comrade Brezhnev, and you understand that the situation in Asia is very complicated, it is more complicated than in Europe and the idea for collective security in Asia will not be realized that quickly.
- But we, as Marxists-Leninists, are interested in developing this process, to eliminate the opportunity for generating military conflicts on the largest continent on earth. Moreover, after World War II, most military conflicts are in Asia and there is a danger for this continent to become a region of sharp and constant tension, serious conflicts and military clashes.
- Without this process of establishing collective security in Asia, I don't see how it would be possible for North and South Korea to unite.
- This development will change the ratio of forces in favor of the democratic forces, of socialism; it will give an opportunity to the Asian people to rise up in arms under more favorable conditions.

On the issue of collective security in Asia, Comrade Kim Il Sung stated that until now they had not spoken out neither in support of the idea, nor against it. We have not published anything in the press on this issue. First of all, we would like to clarify what our Soviet comrades have in mind and what they propose in relation to this idea initiated by Comrade Brezhnev. I spoke with Comrade Polyansky on this issue several years ago as well, and with Comrade Novikov during the celebration of the 25th Anniversary of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. But they spoke in general terms, they did not tell me anything specific. That is why we want to clarify these issues before we take a stance. Let the Soviet comrades send us a letter and explain the essence of the idea—along party or government lines—or send us other materials about it.

In relation to this, I told him that because we are on the Balkans, we deal more with Balkan and European problems, but apparently this case is about the following: the realization of this idea, the development of a program for its implementation will include the following key areas:

First, it will guarantee the independence and sovereignty of all countries on the Asian continent—large and small—their independent development, without foreign intervention;

Second, it will further strengthen and develop the progressive and democratic regimes in most Asian countries;

Third, it will bring about the elimination of foreign imperialistic military bases and the withdrawal of foreign troops on this continent, and it is well-known that the foreign troops and bases are the American troops and bases;

Fourth, in the future it will open wider opportunities to speed up the revolutionary process on this continent, in all Asian non-socialist countries;

Fifth, it will also create, as I had pointed out previously, more favorable conditions for the unification of North and South Korea. We should not harbor any illusions that the unification of Korea will take place without speeding up the process of Asian security.

I pointed out that the Chinese are against this idea, because, according to them, it was directed against them and was aimed at surrounding them. This, however, is not true, because China, as one of the largest countries in Asia, will have to take part in the system of collective security as well.

In the end, Comrade Kim Il Sung stated that, as comrade Zhivkov had pointed out, this was a difficult issue, he agreed with what was said, and concluded that it had to be developed further.

4. On the coordination of our actions in the international arena

During our conversations with Comrade Kim Il Sung we spoke at length about the issue of coordinating our actions in the international arena and in the area of economic cooperation. The key issues that I pointed out in this regard were as follows:

- Korea should not isolate itself from us, from the socialist countries, from the Soviet Union and, on key issues, coordinated unified actions in the international arena should ensure.
- Bilateral cooperation between the countries alone is not enough. It is important, however, it cannot ensure coordination and alignment of our actions and initiatives in the international arena. I pointed out that I understand the situation of Korea

right now. But despite this, you should find ways and forms for such coordination. I pointed out that for them, too, coordination was extremely necessary. I pointed out that it was of utmost importance for them to maintain coordination with the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, especially between him and Comrade Brezhnev. In this regard, establishing constant personal ties and consultations between comrades Brezhnev and Kim Il Sung would play a crucial role in favor of socialism, in favor of our common cause and, in particular, in favor of Korea. In this connection, I spoke in detail about comrade L. I. Brezhnev as a communist, as a leader, and a comrade.

In principle, Kim Il Sung did not object to what I said. However, there were some nuances in the explanation he gave later.

What did he say in essence on this issue? For example, he said the following: We were supposed to meet with Comrade Brezhnev last year, but because he was very busy this meeting did not take place. This year I had to go to Moscow to meet with comrade Brezhnev. But, because of the meetings with representatives from the South, and because of the circumstance that the Politburo prohibits me from travelling by plane, I did not meet with comrade Brezhnev (the reason for this decision of the Politburo of the Korean Workers' Party was the plane crash—as I remember, an IL-18—in which all passengers died, among them prominent Korean actors). Comrade Kim Il Sung suggested the idea that this meeting with Comrade Brezhnev take place somewhere in the middle between Pyongyang and Moscow.

Further, Kim Il Sung explained that he shared my views. But in their conditions they had to take into account many factors. We have to demonstrate independence from the point of view of the South as well. Otherwise we will give reason to the South Koreans to attack us, to carry out speculative actions on our country.

In the course of my conversations with Kim Il Sung, he made the following statement twice: Please tell comrade Brezhnev that I am not a revisionist; that I have not detached myself from the Soviet Union; that I will never be an opportunist and traitor. Ever since I was 16 years old—now more than 45 years—I have been in the revolutionary movement. I have about 5 more years of active work left. I will not disgrace myself, I will not discredit my revolutionary activity. He told me about his life and revolutionary activity at length and how he had faced death many times. The Soviet Union has helped us in the past; it is helping us now as well. And I will not become an opportunist, an anti-Soviet and a traitor.

When we left Pyongyang, on our way from the residence to the airport, he asked me once again to convey his personal greetings to Comrade Brezhnev and to state on his behalf that he was not going along with the Chinese, that he thinks highly of the Soviet Union, and that he will remain loyal to the Soviet Union.

5. On the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (COMECON) and the economic cooperation with the Democratic People's Republic of Korea

After the tour of the country and the visit to several factories and plants, I pointed out the great successes of North Korea. Once again I convinced myself of the great successes achieved by the Korean comrades, of the hard work of the Korean people. I pointed out that we, the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, have great respect for Korea, that for us, Korea is a brotherly, socialist country.

I pointed out that we, in Bulgaria, also have achieved success in the development of the economy. But, taking into consideration the times in which we live, the vigorous development of the scientific and technical revolution, and the circumstance, in these conditions, our socialist countries, especially smaller countries like the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and Bulgaria, cannot develop all areas of industry. Even the Soviet Union cannot afford to do this. Under these conditions we need to go resolutely towards economic integration and introduction of state-of-the-art technologies in manufacture. Each of our countries needs to specialize in areas for which it has the most favorable natural conditions and labor resources. I gave him the example with Bulgaria and Cuba, where with our help and that of the COMECON countries, major metallurgical capacities will be built for the production of nickel of which Cuba has in abundance.

Such economic integration with our countries, and especially with the Soviet Union, would allow Korea to develop its production capacities and become the first, or the second, country (after Japan) in the development of its economy, and the first country in improving the standard of living of its people in Asia. I pointed out that they have a lot of natural resources, ferrous and non-ferrous metals, coal, etc., water encompassing the coast of your peninsula, and so on. Economic integration would also create most favorable conditions, besides shipbuilding, to develop some other areas of machine building as well. That would have great economic significance for the future of Korea.

In relation to that, Kim Il Sung stated that he understood the issue. He spoke several times in detail about what they had built with the help of the Soviet Union and some socialist countries. He said that they did not want to engage with Japan which reached out to them with proposals all the time for the exploitation of Korea's natural resources.

But he did not give a specific answer to my proposal the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to engage more closely with COMECON. He pointed out that they had an observer at COMECON, and turned to a member of their delegation, a candidate member of the Political Committee and Deputy Chairman of the Council of Ministers, Choe Jaeu, and said that they needed to discuss the issue further for additional steps for joint activities with COMECON. He told me that they were thinking about the issue.

In relation to this, he pointed out that the economic integration, the specialization between the socialist countries gave an opportunity to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, in turn, to specialize and cooperate with our socialist countries on a bilateral basis.

When I discussed these issues, I took the opportunity to inform Kim Il Sung about the basic areas of enhancing socialist economic integration and improving the work of COMECON in the light of our last meeting in Crimea.

6. On the unification of Korea and the confederation between North and South Korea

When Comrade Kim Il Sung spoke about the unification of Korea, I asked him if he could elaborate more specifically on how a confederation would look like, if it was formed in the near future. Because the Democratic People's Republic of Korea is a socialist country, and South Korea, even though it does not have major monopolistic corporations, is a capitalist country. Apparently, the prototype of a unified Korea in the future would not be South Korea, but the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. How would a confederation look like between a capitalist and a socialist country?

In connection with this, Kim Il Sung said the following: The issue is whether the two systems—the socialist and the capitalist system—can exist in one country. There is a contradiction: on the one side we have socialism, and on the other there is capitalism. The issue is, what must we do so that South Korea does not become a colony of

Japan and a permanent base of American imperialism? The goal is to pull South Korea away from this danger.

- Our first task is to pull South Korea away from Japan's grasp and eliminate America's military bases along the way to the confederation.
- We cannot agree to give up socialism. Along with raising the issue of establishing a confederation, we are consciously changing the name of our constitution. We made it socialist to strengthen the achievements of socialism in our country.
- The confederation, for the creation of which we will insist, will be the retention of both forms: of their independence in domestic policy and joint activity in the area of foreign policy.
- I can point out the following example: the name and the actions of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea as a socialist country will remain the same; South Korea will also keep its name as the Republic of Korea, and above both governments there will be a joint body which will act on behalf of the confederation only in the area of foreign policy. This, however, will not cover domestic policy; in this regard, both countries will act independently. I think that this is the only right approach.
- If they listen to us and a confederation is established, South Korea will be done with. South Korea will have to reduce its army, we will reduce ours too. But this will bring about the elimination of the reactionary regime in South Korea, because without an army the people, themselves, will rise. That is why, in reality, the South Koreans do not accept our proposals at all.
- The goals of this slogan can be achieved because the patriots of South Korea, the democratic forces there, the people who want this unification, will understand that the traitors are, indeed, the ruling establishment in South Korea, and the patriots are the communists in North Korea.
- I believe we will not fail, we will not lose. Our cooperative farmers will not allow the landowners to come back to power. Many peasants from South Korea, when

they see how our cooperative farmers live, will want to establish such cooperative farms there too.

The political goals we are after with the confederation are: not allowing Japanese imperialism in South Korea, elimination of the US military bases in South Korea, and increasing our influence among the people of South Korea. Of course, if we are weak, raising up such a slogan would be dangerous for us. In reality, the achievement of this political slogan would be a difficult task, because the American enemy is not stupid, the Japanese are not stupid either.

Our idea is a political struggle, aimed at proving to the population of South Korea who is a traitor and who is a patriot.

If a more democratic power is established in South Korea, then we would not bring up the slogan for this confederation. We will simply call the revolution.

7. On the struggle with the faction group in the Korean Workers' Party

One of the issues that Kim Il Sung spoke about dealt with, as he put it, the struggle against the faction group in their party. This is related to the period after the Patriotic War of the Korean people.

He explained this factionary activity of some party leaders with the fact that they had split over the issue how to use the assistance provided by the socialist countries and mainly by the Soviet Union, amounting to a total of 500 million current rubles—whether to use it for importing commodities for general consumption of Korean people who were starving then, or for creating production capacities. The factionaries were of the opinion to import consumer goods, and Kim Il Sung and the others—for using it to build production capacities, industrial plants. He spoke in detail about the activity of factionaries during that period. He pointed out that after they were expelled from the Central Committee and from the party, they thought that they would defect to South Korea. They took measures to prevent that, but instead they defected to China and were there till this day. This deteriorated their relations with China at the time, and because of it they did not send a delegation to the 8th Congress of the Chinese Communist Party.

He said that after that, Khrushchev and Comrade Brezhnev stated that Kim Il Sung's position for industrialization of the country was correct.

These are the key aspects of our conversations with Kim Il Sung. From the beginning of our face-to-face conversations he informed me that he was talking to me openly, as he had never spoken to with anyone else before.

At his insistence we extended our visit by one day. Apparently, he wanted to have an opportunity to have a lengthy conversation. From the first day until the very end—while we were in the country, in the factories, the young pioneers' palace, and elsewhere—he was with us all the time.

So far as the Bulgarian-Korean relations are concerned, I believe that after our visit, there will be better opportunities to develop these relations further. The Korean ambassador in Sofia told some comrades that Kim Il Sung had called him before our visit and told him that they needed to develop the economic and other relations with Bulgaria on wider front.

Kim Il Sung told me that it would be reasonable, after establishing a joint economic committee for cooperation to establish a committee for the exchange of experience, that they would like to study in detail our experience and apply it in Korea.

The public events of our delegation, our meetings with the workers, the visits to the factories, companies, etc., were widely covered in their press and radio broadcasts. My speeches at the mass meetings in Hamheung and Pyongyang, the toasts at both receptions were published in full text with no omissions. The mass meetings in Hamheung and Pyongyang were broadcast on Korean television and radio.

Kim Il Sung made an interesting toast at our reception immediately before we left. He expressed his high appreciation of the visit of our delegation consisting of party and government officials. According to him, the visit of our delegation of party and government officials of the Republic of Bulgaria to Korea was a historic event that opened a new stage in the relations of friendship and cooperation between the parties, governments and people of both countries, Korea and Bulgaria, based on the principles of Marxist-Leninism and proletarian internationalism.

I believe that the visit of our delegation consisting of party and government officials in Korea was a useful one.

30 October 1973

Ulan Bator

T. Zhivkov

NOTES

- 1 UN Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea.
- 2 “hap-jak”: Kim continues to use the word while the delegation from South avoids the use of this word. Lee later tells Kim that the word is not used in the South.
- 3 The former name of Pohang Iron and Steel Company (POSCO).
- 4 “적수공권”: *jeok su gong gwon* = have no financial capability.
- 5 In the original document, *jeongbo*, is used. *Jeongbo* is a Korean unit of measuring a rice field. 1 *jeongbo* = 9917.4m²
- 6 “식물성 신경불화증”: North Korean medical term.

Index

- Albania, 56, 68, 150, 241-46, 252
- Atomic weapons, 17
- Bay of Pigs, 99
- Blue House Raid (1968), 12, 39, 40, 43
- Brandt, Willy, 30
- Brezhnev, Leonid, 51, 55, 144, 147-48, 248-60
- Bulgaria, 54, 151;
and Ambassador to Pyongyang, 129, 132;
and documents from archives of, 173-83, 208-16, 248-61;
and Embassy in Pyongyang, 54, 77, 79;
and Kim Il Sung's visit to, 69-70;
and relations with DPRK, 51, 55;
and Todor Zhivkov's visit to DPRK, 52
- Cambodia, 9, 15, 150
- Carter, Jimmy, 18, 34, 45, 73-75
- Ceaușescu, Nicolae, 71-72, 133-40, 188-207
- China. *See* People's Republic of China (PRC)
- Choe Duseon, 7, 16, 20, 176
- Chun Doo-hwan, 27
- Chung Ju-yung, 33, 35
- Cohen, Jerome, 33-34
- Cold War, 67, 106-8, 248
- COMECON, 28, 54-55, 240, 257-58
- Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU), 148-49, 249, 256.
See also Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.
- Cuba, 107-8, 252, 257
- Czechoslovakia, 188
- Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK),
and 1972 Socialist Constitution, 69, 93, 121;
and commandos, 43;
and economy of, 27, 33, 87, 187;
and foreign trade of, 51, 55, 230, 240, 257-58;
and foreigners living in, 54, 56;
and industry in, 198, 207, 231, 257;
and militarization of, 85-88, 90;
and railroads in, 84;
and relations with the PRC, 67-69, 126, 132, 134, 146, 148, 150, 249-53;
and relations with the USSR, 28-29, 56, 70, 108, 132, 134, 146, 148-49, 172, 197, 240, 252, 256-58;
and relations with the United States, 19, 35-40;
and spies of, 12;
and the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM), 64-65, 68, 106;
and views of Kim Dae-Jung, 78, 121, 131, 137, 194-95;
and views of the opposition in ROK, 131, 136-37, 144, 172, 186, 194, 199-200, 223;
and views of Park Chung Hee, 130-31, 144, 193-196;
and views of ROK-Japan relations, 50, 52, 131, 134-40, 184, 197-207, 224, 259-60;
and views of ROK economy, 28-29, 214, 223;
and U.S. troop withdrawals from ROK, 32, 37-38, 144-45, 147, 171-72, 176, 182, 197, 202, 243, 255;
and views of U.S.-PRC rapprochement, 6, 32, 50, 56-57, 68, 86
- Democratic Republic of Vietnam, 9, 71, 108
- Dialogue,
and breakdown of, 59-60;
and economies of the DPRK and ROK, 33-35, 57, 84, 90, 102-3;
and humanitarian issues, 12-14;
and initiation of, 19-21;
and international context of, 20-21, 66-67;
and KCIA views of, 12-13, 15-17;
and DPRK abandonment of, 59, 61, 129;
and DPRK motivations for, 8-9, 78, 80-81, 89-90;
and Park Chung Hee, 14-15;
and role of DPRK's allies, 52-53, 57-58;
and role of United States, 9, 28-30, 41-43;
and rotational visits, 35, 62-65;
and Socialist Constitution, 79-81;
and ROK motivations for, 8-9, 16-19, 24, 80-81;
and splits within the DPRK leadership, 7-8, 10, 12;
and unification, 26-28, 30, 52-53;
and *Yushin*, 77-82, 85-86, 101.
See also divided families; July 4 Joint Communiqué; June 23 Declaration; North-South Coordinating Committee; Red Cross
- Divided families, 7, 12-14, 62-63, 165-66.
See also Red Cross
- East Germany. *See* German Democratic Republic
- Eastern Europe, 36-37, 51, 90;
and documents from, 72, 125
- EC-121 reconnaissance plane, 41, 44, 131, 134-35
- Gaesong, 90, 196
- German Democratic Republic, 51, 116, 166-67;
and documents from, 145-52, 165-67, 167-70, 183-88, 216-25
- Guam Doctrine, 9, 15, 32, 89.
See also Nixon Doctrine
- Habib, Philip, 7, 45, 102;
and reaction to kidnapping of Kim Dae-jung, 48, 122;
and relationship with Henry Kissinger, 25, 32, 74-75

- Hallstein Doctrine, 105
- Harrison, Selig, 33
- Heo Dam, 132, 147-48
- Hungary, documents from, 129-32, 143-44, 144-45, 170-71, 171-73
- Hyundai Construction, 35
- Indochina, 9, 50, 69.
- Ingersoll, Robert, 33
- Jang Geumcheol, 95
- Jang Giyeong, 15, 94, 153-56, 159, 226
- Japan, 31, 69;
and economic relations with the two Koreas, 51;
and Kim Dae-jung, 48, 118-20, 123;
and Korean security, 44-45, 50;
and DPRKs living in, 24, 65.
See also Jochongryeon
- Jeong Hongjin, 80, 94, 155, 157, 226
- Jochongryeon, 24, 65.
See also Japan
- Johnson, Alexis, 66
- Johnson, Lyndon, 42
- Juche* Ideology, 148-51, 186, 209;
and ROK, 179-80, 213, 217-18, 222
- July 4 Joint Communiqué (1972), 36, 78, 82-84, 89, 185, 199;
and DPRK views of, 168-69, 243;
and ROK noncompliance with, 217-18;
and ROK views of, 221-23;
and Vietnamese views of, 170-71
- June 23 Declaration, 64, 66, 105, 126, 243;
and DPRK views of, 120-21;
and United Nations, 107, 110-11, 117
- Kennedy, John, 99
- Khrushchev, Nikita, 28-29, 240, 260,
- Kim Dae-jung,
and 1971 election, 49, 195;
and American response to kidnapping of, 48, 122-23;
and American views of, 47-49;
and opposition candidacy, 49;
and exile of, 118-20;
and kidnapping as DPRK pretext to end dialogue, 59, 61, 120-21, 125-26;
and kidnapping of, 43, 98-99, 118;
and Lee Hurak, 119-20;
and DPRK, 78, 118-19, 121-22;
and DPRK assessments of, 131, 137, 194-95;
and United Nations, 118
- Kim Deokhyeon, 80, 95, 153-55, 159, 162
- Kim Gyewon, 23
- Kim Il Sung University, 93
- Kim Il Sung, 50, 153;
and as "soft-liner," 7-8, 10;
and as President, 81, 83;
and cult of personality, 148-52, 179, 186-87, 217;
and document of conversation with Lee Hurak, 225-41;
and document of conversation with Todor Zhivkov, 248-61;
and dynastic succession, 121-22;
and Enver Hoxa, 241-46;
and Germany, 166-167;
and Kim Yeongju, 36, 94-96;
and Korean Confederation, 211, 220;
and Lee Hurak, 12-13, 29, 51-52, 81, 88, 94, 168, 197-98;
and Nicolae Ceaușescu, 72, 133-140, 189-92;
and Nikita Khrushchev, 28-29;
and peace treaty, 175-76;
and revisionism, 132;
and revolution in ROK, 72-72, 89-90, 96-97, 118;
and socialism, 205-6;
and ROK political parties, 16, 184, 195;
and *Suryeong* system, 79, 81, 86;
and Three Principles of Reunification, 178-79, 208-09, 217;
and Todor Zhivkov, 52-56, 69-72, 118, 129-30;
and United Nations, 105, 108, 202;
and Vietnam War, 69-71;
and views of the PRC, 56;
and views of U.S.-PRC rapprochement, 15-16, 146-47;
and views of ROK economy, 102-3;
and visit to the PRC (May 1975), 9-11, 68-72
- Kim Jong Il, 36, 57, 86, 91, 93-97
- Kim Jong-pil, 100, 199-201, 209-211, 218
- Kim Yangseon, 132, 143
- Kim Yeongju, 178, 180, 212-14, 220-21;
and as co-chairman of North-South Coordinating Committee, 60, 169;
and health of, 94, 208, 217, 239;
and Kim Il Sung, 94-95;
and Kim Jong Il, 36, 95-97;
and meetings with Lee Hurak, 168, 178, 180;
and ROK documents on role in inter-Korean dialogue, 153-55, 156-61, 161-64
- Kim Yeongnam, 134, 149
- Kissinger, Henry A., 30, 107;
and role in crafting Korea policy, 25, 74-75, 102;
and United Nations, 110-114; 246-47;
and visits to the PRC, 15, 24, 31-32, 68, 110, 126
- Koreagate, 43
- Korean Central Intelligence Agency (KCIA), 7, 13, 23, 73;
and inter-Korean dialogue, 12-13, 15-17, 94;
and Lee Hurak, 119-20
- Korean Federation, 51-53, 118, 211
- Korean War (1950-1953), 1, 84-85, 173-74;
and Armistice Agreement, 39, 113, 130, 192, 247;
and devastation of, 158, 163-64;
and memories of, 109;
and DPRK advance during, 41
- Korean Workers' Party (KWP),
and analysis of ROK, 214-15, 223;
and Central Committee of, 93;
and factionalism within, 260-61;
and Fifth Party Congress of, 93, 129;
and Kim Jong Il, 93;
and officials of, 91;
and plane travel, 256;
and relations with other fraternal parties, 148-52;
and Sino-Soviet split, 56;
and Sixth Party Congress of, 51-52
- Laos, 150
- Lee Beomseok, 235
- Lee Hurak,
and as Director of KCIA, 23;
and dialogue with DPRK, 7, 36, 81-82, 101, 169;
and Jang Giyeong, 15;
and July 4 Joint Communiqué, 82-83, 89, 178;

- and Kim Dae-jung, 99, 119-20;
and Kim Yeongju, 77, 153-55, 168, 180;
and meeting with Kim Il Sung, 15, 51, 81, 88, 94, 168, 196-97, 226-241;
and meetings with Kim Deokhyeon; 156-64;
and meetings with Pak Seongcheol, 198-99, 208-214, 217-221;
and North-South Coordinating Committee, 28-29, 60;
and relationship with Park Chung Hee, 10, 30, 82, 88;
and relationship with the United States, 10, 36, 42;
and visit to Pyongyang, 94-95, 155, 196;
and *Yushin* Constitution, 82-83, 88, 98
- Li Manseok, 143, 165-6
- Mao Zedong, 11, 68, 70
- Myeongdong Cathedral, 101
- Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission (NNSC), 102
- Nixon Doctrine, 16-17, 19, 25, 40-41, 44;
and DPRK, 184, 200;
and ROK, 13-14, 19, 24-25, 31, 41;
and troop reductions, 86-88, 105
- Nixon, Richard, 25, 68-69, 107, 135, 139, 143;
and visit to the PRC, 6, 15, 24, 68,-69, 146-7, 205
- Non-Aligned Movement (NAM), 64-65, 68, 106, 112, 117
- Nordpolitik, 67
- North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), 55
- DPRK. *See* Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK)
- North Vietnam. *See* Democratic Republic of Vietnam
- North-South Coordinating Committee, 60, 80, 101, 226-7, 229-32, 236, 240
- Nuclear weapons. *See* Atomic weapons.
- O Jinu, 70, 133
- Ostpolitik, 30
- Pak Seongcheol,
and visit to USSR, 143-44, 172;
and negotiations with ROK, 36, 82, 94, 101, 131, 168, 198-9, 208-11, 217-20
- Panmunjeom, 35, 136, 155, 193;
and Red Cross meetings, 34, 61, 166, 168;
and inter-Korean negotiations, 20, 34, 63, 80, 101, 208, 217;
and negotiations over the USS *Pueblo*, 39; and Axe Murder Incident, 122;
and return of fishermen, 123-4
- Paris Peace Talks, 14, 127
- Park Chung Hee,
and 1971 election, 47-49, 194-95;
and assassination attempts, 12, 39, 41, 73;
and Blue House meetings, 17, 23, 35;
and his regime in the 1960s, 19, 49;
and his regime in the 1970s, 10, 15, 79, 87, 121;
and July 4 Joint Communiqué, 178-80;
and June 23 Declaration, 105, 107, 109, 111, 116, 121;
and letter to Richard Nixon, 140-43;
and negotiations with DPRK, 12-14, 30, 34, 61-62, 81, 108, 159, 168, 172, 226, 229, 232, 235-40;
- and relations with the United States, 31, 36, 38, 42-44, 246;
and relationship with Lee Hurak, 81-82, 88-89, 119-120, 154;
and the *Yushin* system, 61, 77, 89, 208;
and views of U.S.-PRC rapprochement, 24, 41;
as viewed by DPRK, 78, 88, 130-31, 135-39, 144, 175-76, 186, 193-96;
as viewed by the United States, 98-100, 107
- Peace Treaty, 8, 10-11, 38, 51, 176
- People's Republic of China (PRC),
and Albania, 68;
and inter-Korean dialogue, 116, 181;
and Kim Il Sung's visit to, 9-11, 68-72;
and DPRK, 37;
and DPRK assessments of, 9, 56, 67, 126, 230, 240, 249-53, 260
and rapprochement with the U.S., 5-6, 205;
and ROK, 13-18, 24, 41, 44, 66-67, 141-42;
and the Non-Aligned Movement, 112;
and the USSR, 5, 132, 147, 250-51;
and the U.S., 31
- Phnom Penh, 9, 72
- Pohang Steel Mill, 29, 33, 232
- Porter, William J., 10, 33, 131
- Radio Seoul, 52-53, 58, 212
- Red Cross, 7, 13-17, 20, 30, 34, 59-65, 84-85, 89;
and references to in documents, 153-56, 158, 165-69, 176-80, 183-88, 195-96, 217, 235, 238.
See also divided families
- Republic of China. *See* Taiwan
- Republic of Korea (ROK);
and 1971 election in, 47-49, 78, 98, 131, 137, 194-95;
and declaration of martial law, 43, 79, 101, 208-16;
and economic comparisons with the DPRK, 26-31, 33-35, 50, 57, 60, 84, 90, 102-3;
and economy of, 18-19, 33, 43, 49, 51, 84-85, 135-36;
and intelligence on DPRK, 64-65, 97, 102-103, 115;
and Ministry of National Defense, 10;
and mistrust of United States, 17-18, 24-25;
and DPRK infiltration into, 12, 17, 62-63, 79, 141;
and relations with communist bloc, 64-67, 105;
and relations with the United States, 18, 25-26, 41, 43-44;
and sinking of DPRK fishing vessel, 123-24;
and state of emergency in, 61, 77, 79, 88, 101, 125, 146, 176, 181, 196, 199-201, 212-13, 217, 221-23;
and troop modernization plan, 39, 41;
and U.S.-PRC rapprochement, 23-25;
and U.S. troops stationed in, 31-32;
and U.S.-DPRK relations, 38-40
- Republic of Vietnam,
and DPRK, 50, 62-63, 69, 72;
and ROK troops, 194, 202
and ROK, 41-42, 87, 106;
and the Korean Peninsula, 170-173, 181
- Reunification,
and the PRC, 146;
and inter-Korean dialogue, 6, 26-28, 42, 50, 89, 158, 162-63, 168-69, 178-79;
and Japan, 45;
and Kim Dae-jung, 49, 78, 137;

- and Kim Il Sung, 70-71, 81, 86, 89;
and DPRK strategies for, 9, 11, 16, 50, 52-53, 57, 78, 81-82, 134, 144-45, 157, 168, 175;
and Park Chung Hee, 49, 77, 135-36;
and peaceful, 130-31, 144, 153;
and ROK strategies for, 14, 19, 142, 157;
and Three Principles of, 168-69, 179, 185, 187, 197-98, 208-9, 217;
and United States, 30-31, 138
- Richardson, John, 10, 36
- Road construction, 35, 63-64
- Rodong Simmun*, 146-47, 150
- Rogers, William, 114
- Roh Tae-woo, 48, 67, 117
- Romania,
and as U.S.-DPRK intermediary, 35-37;
and conversations between Kim Il Sung and Nicolae Ceaușescu, 71, 78;
and DPRK's briefings, 167;
and Kim Il Sung's visit, 68;
and relations with the DPRK, 150, 181;
and visit of DPRK delegation, 188-192, 203-7;
and visit to the DPRK, 133
- Saigon, 72, 173
- Seoul, 86;
and Olympic Games (1988), 67, 232-33;
and DPRK impressions of, 29;
and rotational visits to, 34-36, 62, 84, 155-56, 177-78, 220
- Sihanouk, Norodom, 15, 252
- ROK. *See* Republic of Korea (ROK)
- South Vietnam. *See* Republic of Vietnam
- Suryeong* system, 79, 81, 86
- Symington, Stuart, 40, 43
- Tokuma Utsonomiya, 69, 71
- Truman Doctrine, 16
- Ulsan Industrial Complex, 29, 33, 158
- Unification Revolutionary Party, 18, 32, 193, 200-201
- Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR),
and collective security, 253-54;
and inter-Korean relations, 51, 148;
and relations with the PRC, 56, 250-53;
and relations with DPRK, 28-29, 56, 70, 108, 132, 134, 146, 148-49, 172, 197, 240, 252, 256-58;
and relations with ROK, 66-67, 131, 137;
and relations with the United States, 205;
and revisionism, 132;
and United Nations, 108, 116, 147;
and World Health Organization, 105-6;
See also Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU)
- United Nations (UN),
and DPRK views of, 105, 148, 199, 202, 210-11, 218-19;
and dual admission of East and West Germany, 108, 116;
and dual admission of South and DPRK, 105, 107-11, 116, 235, 245;
and dual admission of South and North Vietnam, 108;
and General Assembly, 106, 182, 246-47;
and June 23 Declaration, 107, 110-111, 117;
and Kim Dae-jung, 118;
and Kim Il Sung, 105, 108, 202;
and role of PRC, 105, 126;
and U.S. views of, 28-29, 37-38, 41, 246-47;
and UN Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea (UNCURK), 108, 112-13, 136, 146, 172, 202, 246-47;
and United Nations Command (UNC), 45, 108-9, 112-13, 142, 202, 246-47
- United States (U.S.),
and contact with the DPRK, 19, 35-40;
and détente with the USSR, 107;
and rapprochement with the PRC, 5-6, 13-14, 16, 21, 32, 41, 50, 56-57, 68, 86;
and troop presence in Korea, 18, 31-32, 34, 45, 73-75;
and Vietnam War, 5, 16, 32, 42, 87
- United States Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), 10, 36
- United States Congress, 40, 114
- United States Department of State, 25, 114;
and Ambassador to Korea, 7, 25, 32, 45, 48, 102, 122-23;
and Bureau of Intelligence and Research (INR), 97, 112, 114-15;
and Embassy in Seoul, 25, 27;
and Liaison Office in Beijing, 37;
and Office of Korean Affairs, 25, 115, 122
- USS *Pueblo* Incident,
and DPRK, 52, 58, 131, 134-34;
and ROK, 40-41, 44, 51;
and U.S.-DPRK negotiations, 38-39
- Viet Cong, 16, 18, 32, 115
- Vietnam War, 5;
and U.S.-ROK relations, 16, 32, 42
and ROK, 87
- Wang Bingnan, 66
- Warsaw Pact, 55-56
- Warsaw Talks, 66-67
- Watergate, 107
- World Health Organization (WHO), 105-6
- Young, James, 74
- Yuil* System, 85-86
- Yun Boseon, 100
- Yun Pilyong, 119
- Yun Seokheon, 24
- Yushin* Constitution,
and inter-Korean dialogue, 77-82, 85-86, 101;
and Lee Hurak, 82-83, 88, 98;
and Park Chung Hee, 61, 77, 89, 208
- Zhivkov, Todor,
and Kim Il Sung, 69-72, 129-30;
and visit to DPRK, 52-56, 118, 248, 253, 255, 261
- Zhou Enlai,
and Henry Kissinger, 31, 110, 126
and Kim Il Sung, 11;
and Korean security, 172, 251

History and Public Policy Program
Critical Oral History Conference Series