

APPROVED FOR RELEASE
DATE: MAY 2007

~~SECRET~~



5 April 1961

OCI No. 1190/61

Copy No.

107

CURRENT INTELLIGENCE STAFF STUDY
SINO-SOVIET COMPETITION IN NORTH KOREA
(Reference Title: ESAU XV-61)

Office of Current Intelligence
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

~~THIS MATERIAL CONTAINS INFORMATION AFFECTING THE NATIONAL DEFENSE OF THE UNITED STATES WITHIN THE MEANING OF THE ESPIONAGE LAWS, TITLE 18, USC, SECTIONS 793 AND 794, THE TRANSMISSION OR REVELATION OF WHICH IN ANY MANNER TO AN UNAUTHORIZED PERSON IS PROHIBITED BY LAW.~~

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

CURRENT INTELLIGENCE STAFF STUDY

SINO-SOVIET COMPETITION IN NORTH KOREA

This is a working paper, the first of a series examining Soviet and Chinese relationships with other components of the world Communist movement.

Because the November 1960 conference of the Communist parties resolved few if any of the important disagreements between the two principal parties of the movement, because a significant number of important parties (both bloc and non-bloc) supported the Chinese in varying degrees in the Moscow discussions, and because the procedures set forth in the 6 December declaration for the conduct of the world Communist movement would seem actually to encourage "polycentrism" in the movement, it strikes us as worth while to try to assess Peiping's potential as a competing center. We hope in these papers, inter alia, to assess the possible consequences of attraction to Peiping--by parties and elements of parties--for the policies of the parties: e.g., whether a bloc party may decide to organize communes, or a non-bloc party may be encouraged to try to overthrow a bourgeois nationalist government by violence.

We are grateful to other analysts of OCI [redacted] --and [redacted] the Current Support Staff of ORR for comment on this paper. We would welcome further comment--addressed to Philip Bridgham, who wrote the paper, or to the acting coordinator of the Sino-Soviet Studies Group.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

SUMMARY

Victimized by its strategic location throughout history, North Korea appears once again to be the scene of competition for dominant influence between its powerful neighbors. Developments during the past three years indicate that the issues involved in the Sino-Soviet dispute have exercised a profound effect on the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. As a contiguous Asian country confronted by similar problems in both domestic and foreign policy, North Korea has constituted a prime target in Peiping's drive to win acceptance of its more radical approach to the domestic construction of Communism and its more militant approach to international Communist strategy.

The appearance of Communist China's commune and "leap forward" programs in the summer of 1958 injected an element of discord into Sino-Soviet-North Korean relations which persists to the present day. Attracted by the Chinese pretension to have discovered a special road for Asian countries leading to the early achievement of socialism and Communism, the Pyongyang regime embraced a whole series of Chinese Communist policies and programs in the summer and fall of 1958, even to the point of flirting with the heretical commune organization.

Imitation of the Chinese example began in June when it was decided to launch a mass movement for construction of small industrial installations combining "native and modern" technology. A far more significant step was taken at a September central committee plenum which inaugurated North Korea's "flying horse" program of economic development and the simultaneous amalgamation of some 13,000 collective farms into 3,800 political-economic units of township size. In a major policy speech of 20 November, Kim Il-sung revealed the extent to which these programs had been inspired by the Chinese Communist model.

First, Kim disclosed that the rationale, scope and objectives of Pyongyang's "flying horse" program were nearly identical with those of China's "great leap forward." Even more suggestive of Chinese influence was the clear implication that North Korea was incorporating salient features of Communist China's commune program into its own reorganization

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

of rural society, including the commune system of distribution featuring the "free supply" of commodities determined "according to need." In a subsequent address, the North Korean leader appeared to endorse Peiping's claim that China constituted a model for the underdeveloped nations of Asia.

In the face of obvious Soviet displeasure with its defection, Pyongyang then appeared to abandon its plan to emulate Peiping by "advancing to socialism and Communism with flying leaps." On the occasion of Communist China's tenth anniversary celebration in October 1959, however, Kim Il-sung once more spoke out vigorously in defense of Mao Tse-tung's unorthodox programs. The North Korean leader's declaration of support, in conjunction with the East German delegate's even more candid acknowledgment of China as the model for Asia, posed anew the threat of an emerging Asian bloc of Communist nations looking to Peiping for inspiration and guidance.

Following his abortive October conference with Mao in Peiping, Khrushchev apparently decided to resort to more forceful measures designed to pressure Communist China and its bloc supporters back into line. North Korea's participation in an unprecedented top-level bloc conference on agriculture in Moscow, which almost certainly leveled criticism at China's communes, was an indication of continued susceptibility to Soviet pressures and, perhaps, of growing disenchantment with Chinese programs as a solution to its own agricultural problems. Apparently reacting to pressures applied here and at the subsequent Bucharest Conference, Pyongyang studiously ignored the existence of China's communes throughout 1960.

In part responding to this development and in part preparing for the impending summit conference in Moscow, Peiping began to exert a number of countervailing pressures in order to maintain its position in North Korea. Caught in this crossfire, North Korea's attitude towards Communist China's distinctive program of socialist and Communist construction displayed marked ambiguity. By increasingly stressing "the individuality of North Korea's revolution," it appeared that Pyongyang aspired to a position of neutrality in the deepening Sino-Soviet controversy over the "correct" road to socialism and Communism on the eve of the Moscow Conference in November 1960.

- ii -

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

only slightly less grandiose pretension that Communist China was uniquely qualified to lead "the countries of the East" and, by extension, all the underdeveloped areas of the world, to socialism and Communism. As a backward Asian country and, what is more, a vital buffer area along China's northeastern frontier, North Korea has constituted a prime target in Pei-ping's drive to win acceptance of its more radical approach to the domestic construction of Communism and its more militant approach to international Communist strategy.

Domestic Construction of Communism

The appearance of Communist China's commune and "leap forward" programs in the summer of 1958 introduced a new element of discord into Sino-Soviet-North Korean relations which persists to the present day. Conceived as the instrument for achieving rapid economic and social development leading to the early advent of the Communist society, the commune epitomized a distinctive Chinese road to socialism and Communism with special applicability to the underdeveloped nations of Asia.

The main outlines of the Chinese ideological challenge were present in a 16 July Red Flag article entitled "Under the Banner of Chairman Mao." It was here that Mao Tse-tung was credited with discovering in the commune and "leap forward" programs a special road enabling China to accelerate socialist construction and to realize Communism "in the not distant future." Moreover, he had done this in accordance with Lenin's injunction to "the Communists of Eastern countries" to "creatively develop" Marxist theory "in the light of special conditions unknown to the European countries...realizing that the peasants are the principal masses." The implication was strong that Mao had solved the special problems of socialist and Communist construction which confronted all Asian countries.

Communist China's "special conditions," which have been summed up by Chairman Mao in the phrase "poor and blank," are usually identified as an impoverished agrarian economy, a shortage of arable land relative to population, and cultural backwardness resulting from past imperialist oppression. In the Chinese view, a program calling for total mobilization of all available resources was necessary in order to break through

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

these barriers to industrialization and modernization. As the radical social organization designed to implement this program, the commune was expected to perform the following economic functions: centralization of control over all means of production in the countryside as a first step toward "all-people ownership" (i.e. state ownership); mobilization of the peasants to implement a "mass line" of industrial development featuring the "native" production of iron and steel; extension of more effective controls over peasant consumption through the commune mess hall and the "free supply" system of distribution (hailed as the beginning of the Communist system of distribution "according to need"); and intensive exploitation of human labor to a degree unknown in modern history. In addition, the commune was expected to perform various ideological functions which were to play an equally indispensable role in China's leap to modernization. The very term "commune" connoted--intentionally so--an advanced status on the road to Communism. Pleading special conditions, the Chinese Communists undertook to substitute moral and psychological incentives--the early attainment of Communism--for material incentives as the major stimulus for production. The claim of priority in the march to Communism was stated explicitly: "Tomorrow we shall build a paradise of happiness never before attempted in history--Communism.*"

Communist China's pretension to have discovered a special road for Asian countries leading to the early achievement of socialism and Communism evoked an enthusiastic response in North Korea. Deviating from its traditional role as a docile Soviet satellite, the Pyongyang regime embraced a whole series of Chinese Communist policies and programs in the summer and fall of 1958, even to the point of flirting with the heretical commune organization.

Imitation of the Chinese example began in June at a Korean Workers Party plenum. At that time it was decided to launch a mass movement for construction of small industrial installations combining "native and modern" technology--a movement which followed closely, both in time and content, Communist China's "mass line" of local industrialization. Even the

*For an extended discussion of this first ideological challenge to Moscow, see ESAU VIII-60: "The Commune, The 'Great Leap Forward', and Sino-Soviet Relations."

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

propaganda slogans were the same, including exhortations to rely on the "activism and creativeness" of the masses in a campaign of "all the people operating industry." The next and far more significant step was taken at a September central committee plenum which inaugurated North Korea's "flying horse" program of economic development and the simultaneous amalgamation of some 13,000 collective farms into 3,800 political-economic units of township size. In a major policy speech of 20 November, Kim Il-sung revealed the extent to which these programs had been inspired by the Chinese Communist model.

First, Kim referred to his people as "poor and uncultured" (calling to mind Mao Tse-tung's characterization of China as "poor and blank") and, as such, compelled to engage in a "bitter struggle" for a "leap forward" in economic development which would permit "catching up" with the more advanced socialist countries of Europe. As a capsule statement of the rationale of Communist China's "great leap forward" program, this could hardly be improved upon. Next, Kim advanced claims for North Korea's "flying horse" program of economic development which bore a striking resemblance to the "leap forward" pretensions in Communist China. Pyongyang had already "solved" the food problems and "within two to three years"--the same time period featured in Chinese propaganda--food was to become "extremely abundant." An accelerated program of agricultural development based on mobilizing the peasants and a similarly spectacular development of industry would lead to completion of the stage of socialist construction and initiation of the "transition to Communism" within four to five years.

Even more suggestive of Chinese influence was the clear implication that North Korea was incorporating salient features of Communist China's commune program into its own reorganization of rural society. Kim placed heavy emphasis on moral, rather than material, incentives as the stimulus for production, holding forth as the reward for "bitter struggle" the realization of Communism "in the not distant future." He disclosed that North Korea was contemplating establishing "comprehensive, Communist, all-people ownership" (i.e. state ownership) in the countryside, another basic characteristic of China's commune. Even more striking, he revealed that Pyongyang was considering introducing the commune system of distribution featuring the "free supply" of

- 4 -

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

commodities determined "according to need." Kim made this point in the form of a conversation with a peasant woman during a visit to an agricultural cooperative.

When I asked her how she would like it if all textile products, rice and everything else were supplied free of charge; if the peasants were placed under the same wage system as the workers; and we proceeded thus in the direction of practicing the Communist principle of distribution along with the socialist principle of distribution at the same time; she replied that that sounded simply wonderful.

The very same cooperative visited by Kim had already established, according to a 28 November People's Daily article, most of the collective livelihood institutions of China's communes, including public mess halls, nurseries, kindergartens and sewing teams.

Immediately after this remarkable speech, Kim Il-sung spent three weeks in an extended tour of Communist China. The recipient of signal honors and popular demonstrations throughout his visit, the North Korean leader responded with an enthusiastic endorsement of Communist China's unorthodox programs which by now were, to a significant extent, those of his own country. Asserting that "the two countries of Korea and China...are advancing to socialism and Communism with flying leaps," he made the following laudatory appraisal of China's communes.

We are very much interested in the communization movement.... As a result of setting up public mess halls, nurseries, etc., you have achieving collectivization not only of production but also of livelihood; this means that...you have advanced a step towards Communism.... We will certainly pass on to our peasants the great results you have achieved from your commune movement. Also we will strive hereafter...to strengthen our mutual cooperation in building socialism and Communism.

Kim's endorsement of the Chinese model was made even more explicit in a 10 December speech after returning to North Korea, when he hailed the Chinese programs as "an example of

- 5 -

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

the creative application of Marxism-Leninism to the realities of their country and a particularly good example for socialist revolution and construction in countries which were backward and under colonial oppression in the past." (Emphasis added)

It is important to assess the significance of this development--the Chinese initiative and the North Korean response--as viewed from Moscow. Whereas the argument of "special conditions" had been advanced earlier to justify the deviation of "national roads" to socialism (e.g. Poland), it was now being advanced to justify a separate and distinct road (what is more, a short cut) to both socialism and Communism for the entire continent of Asia or even, by extension, for all underdeveloped areas of the world. By implicitly denying the validity of the Soviet model for the special problems of economic and social development in Asia, the Chinese were in effect staking a claim for hegemony over Asian Communism, and the North Koreans, by acknowledging a Chinese prototype for the underdeveloped areas, appeared to have recognized this claim.

The Soviet reaction revealed a thorough appreciation of the fundamental nature of Peiping's challenge. In rapid succession, the Russian leadership attacked China's premature attempt to introduce distribution "according to need" as "unworkable" and as "discrediting Communism;" the Chinese undertaking through the commune to move rapidly to "all people ownership" as a violation of "economic laws;" and the Chinese pretension to be in the vanguard in the march to Communism as a vulgar manifestation of "equalitarian Communism." By announcing Russia's own accelerated program of Communist construction featuring a highly developed "material and technical base" and by stressing that rapid progress of the "economically backward countries" was dependent on Soviet aid, it was made quite clear that the Soviet Union intended to determine the pace and order of bloc progress to Communism and that Khrushchev, not Mao Tse-tung, would solve the "problems of Marxist-Leninist theory connected with the transition from socialism to Communism."

Soviet denial of the Chinese claim to have discovered a special road for Asian Communism was sharp and unmistakable. The strategy was first to stress the "general laws" of Marxism-Leninism which have universal application and then to assert the validity of the Soviet model, as the embodiment of

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

these laws, for both Europe and Asia. In a 6 November speech in Peiping commemorating the October Revolution, Soviet Ambassador Yudin emphasized that both "Europe and Asia," in accordance with Lenin's prediction, "must sooner or later" follow the "correct" Soviet road. The Draft Theses of Khrushchev's Report to the 21st Party Congress were even more explicit.

V. I. Lenin foresaw that the Soviet Union would exert chief influence on the entire course of world development by its economic construction. Lenin said: "If Russia becomes covered with a dense network of electric stations and powerful technical equipment, our Communist economic construction will become a model for the future socialist Europe and Asia. (Emphasis added)"

Although the Soviet counteroffensive was directed primarily at Communist China, many of its strictures applied to North Korea as well. In the face of obvious Soviet displeasure with its defection, the North Korean regime appeared to abandon precipitately its plan to emulate Peiping by "advancing to socialism and Communism with flying leaps." At the Soviet 21st Party Congress in late January 1959, Kim Il-sung pointedly described his country as proceeding "along the road to socialism", with "the rich experiences accumulated by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet people always serving as a guide in all our work." At the same time, the North Korean regime continued to imitate Peiping's "great leap forward" by claiming "miraculous successes" in production and by adhering to hopelessly unrealistic long-term goals. As late as mid-August 1959, Deputy Premier Kim Il still spoke of doubling grain output and either tripling or quadrupling industrial output by 1964-65.

Responding to a new Chinese initiative in the fall of 1959, the North Korean regime once more spoke out vigorously in defense of Communist China's unorthodox programs. After a period of relative moderation and retrenchment, Communist China's leadership had launched a spirited counterattack against Soviet criticism of the commune and had reiterated the claim that China constituted a model for the underdeveloped nations of Asia. In articles celebrating Communist China's tenth anniversary on 1 October 1959, Foreign Minister Chen I asserted that "all oppressed nations and peoples... see in the Chinese people their tomorrow", and party secretary-

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

general Teng Hsiao-ping declared China's experience in "rapidly getting rid of poverty and backwardness" to be "an example of going over from democratic revolution to socialist revolution in a colonial and semi-colonial country and of transforming a backward agricultural country into an advanced industrial country." (Emphasis added)

In marked contrast with the Soviet and most East European delegations attending this anniversary celebration, Kim Il-sung predicted "new and greater achievements in the great leap forward and people's commune movements;" hailed them by implication as "a great contribution to further developing Marxist-Leninist theory and enriching the experience of the international Communist movement;" declared that his countrymen "always learn from your achievements;" and asserted that "no force can break...the friendship of the Korean and Chinese peoples based on common ideas and aims." This declaration, in conjunction with the even more candid acknowledgment of the Chinese model by East German delegate Herman Matern (who hailed the commune "as an example...for the millions of Asian peasant masses"), posed anew the threat of an emerging Asian bloc of Communist nations looking to Peiping for inspiration and guidance.

Following his abortive October conference with Mao Tse-tung in Peiping, Khrushchev apparently decided to resort to more forceful measures designed to pressure Communist China and its bloc supporters back into line. As noted subsequently in an official Chinese party letter, the Soviet leader publicly attacked China's foreign and domestic policies on four separate occasions in the fall of 1959. On 1 December, for example, he launched a polemical, if oblique, attack on China's commune and "leap forward" programs in addressing the Hungarian party congress, characterizing them as a "distortion of the teaching of Marxism-Leninism on the building of socialism and Communism" resulting from "conceit...and mistakes in leadership..." This public criticism was followed almost immediately by a North Korean decision to halt temporarily its own "flying horse" program, with 1960 designated a "buffer year" in order to correct deficiencies in agriculture and provide a much needed breathing spell in its economic development program.

Another Soviet countermeasure was the convocation in Moscow in early February 1960 of an unprecedented top-level

- 8 -

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

bloc conference on agriculture. North Korea's participation in this conference, which almost certainly leveled criticism at China's communes, was an indication of continued susceptibility to Soviet pressures, and, perhaps, of growing disenchantment with Chinese programs as a solution to its own agricultural problems.* The absence of China and North Vietnam, usually regarded as oriented to Peiping, and the fact that a speech delivered by Khrushchev on this occasion has never been released suggest that this was the first of a series of multilateral conferences convened by the Russian leader in 1960 for the purpose of "isolating" Peiping within the ranks of the international Communist movement.

The pressures exerted in February were redoubled at the now famous Bucharest meeting of world Communist parties in June. According to reliable accounts of the proceedings of this conference, Khrushchev subjected China's domestic programs to a sweeping indictment. After citing Peiping's "contempt for material things," the Soviet leader attacked the communes as a fake, the mass iron and steel campaign as a mistake, and the "great leap forward" policy as indefensible in both theory and practice. Voicing an even more serious objection, Khrushchev accused the Chinese of "wanting to force their concepts on others."

Apparently reacting to the pressures applied at these conferences, North Korea proved to be an early casualty among those who had defended Peiping's heretical programs. In marked contrast to previous laudatory appraisals, North Korean commentary throughout 1960 studiously ignored the existence of China's communes. A striking example of this new subservience to Moscow appeared in Kim Il-sung's message of greetings in observance of China's eleventh anniversary celebration on 1 October. Whereas a year earlier he had proclaimed the vitality and creativity of this radical social organization, the North Korean leader now felt constrained

*Attracted by Communist China's claim to have doubled grain production in 1958 by means of a revolutionary high-yield agricultural technology, the North Korean regime had followed Peiping's lead by reducing planted grain acreage in 1959. Instead of the anticipated increase of 35 percent, however, grain output in that year dropped nearly 10 percent.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

to enter into the Soviet-sponsored conspiracy of silence by ignoring the people's commune in his congratulatory message.

In part responding to this development and in part preparing for the impending summit conference in Moscow, Peiping began to exert a number of countervailing pressures in October 1960 in order to maintain its position in North Korea. First was the grant of a loan of 105 million dollars to finance deliveries of equipment and technical assistance for industrial development. With this new credit, Communist China's total assistance to Pyongyang since the end of the Korean War now exceeded that of the USSR. Coming at a time of stringency in China's own economic development program and of similar sizable loans to Outer Mongolia and North Vietnam, this extension of aid indicated a new effort to compete with the Soviet Union for influence with the Asian members of the bloc.

Next was the dispatch of a high-ranking military goodwill mission to North Korea in late October for a joint celebration of the tenth anniversary of China's entry into the Korean war. Politburo member and chief of mission Ho Lung utilized this occasion to attack the "modern revisionists" (an epithet directed at Moscow at this stage of heated polemics in the Sino-Soviet dispute) for their "bitter envy and hatred of our country's construction achievements," their "vain attempt to isolate China" and, more pointedly, their "vain attempt to sabotage...the friendship and unity" of China and Korea. Even more suggestive of a continuing struggle for influence in North Korea was a curious passage in the report issued by deputy mission chief Lo Jui-ching on returning to Peiping. By contrasting China's consistent "wise" policy of "showing respect" for the leaders of North Korea with the "non-Marxist-Leninist" practice of "great nation chauvinism", he seemed to imply that other bloc nations had been guilty of intervening in Pyongyang's internal affairs.

Caught in this crossfire, North Korea's attitude towards Communist China's distinctive program of socialist and Communist construction on the eve of the Moscow summit conference displayed marked ambiguity. On the one hand, succumbing to Soviet pressures, it had disavowed the commune not only as a model for North Korean emulation but even as a legitimate form for building socialism and Communism within China itself.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

On the other hand, there were indications that Pyongyang still subscribed to a number of the premises underlying Communist China's neo-Stalinist hard-line program of economic and social development.

The North Korean regime continued to endorse China's "great leap forward" and to implement, although at a somewhat reduced tempo, its own "flying horse" program.* There was continued stress on an integral feature of these related programs--the construction of small-scale local industrial installations combining "native and modern" technology. There was continued reliance on moral exhortation and revolutionary zeal, rather than material incentives, to stimulate rapid advances in production and construction. In keeping with Kim Il-sung's discovery (after Mao Tse-tung) of "the decisive role played by human consciousness in developing the productive forces," political indoctrination designed "to mobilize the masses" continued to receive top priority in all phases of the country's development program.

Most significant of all was the growing tendency to characterize North Korea's domestic policies as the product not of Soviet experience but of Kim Il-sung's "creative application of Marxism-Leninism" to the special conditions of his own country. By increasingly stressing "the individuality of North Korea's revolution," it appeared that Pyongyang aspired to a position of neutrality in the deepening Sino-Soviet controversy over the "correct" road to socialism and Communism on the eve of the Moscow Conference in November 1960.

*The new seven year plan unveiled by Kim Il-sung in August 1960 signaled the resumption of North Korea's forced draft development program conducted at "flying horse" speed. The goals of more than tripling industrial output and increasing grain production (which has remained stationary for three years) by over 50 percent still appear highly unrealistic.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

International Communist Strategy

The Sino-Soviet dispute on international Communist strategy has entailed equally disturbing consequences for the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. Although couched in ambiguous doctrinal terms, this acrimonious public debate has reflected very real and broad differences over policies to be pursued toward the non-Communist world, with Khrushchev advocating a relatively gradual long-term policy of victory through "peaceful coexistence" and Mao Tse-tung countering with a more aggressive, high-risk policy promising quick gains in Asia, Africa and Latin America.* Despite uncertainty and equivocation, the North Korean response to these divergent views since the fall of 1959 has revealed a marked predilection for Peiping's more militant line in approaching its own number one foreign policy objective--the unification of Korea under Communist rule.

North Korean divergence from Khrushchev's foreign policy pronouncements first came to light in September 1959 when, in contrast with a prior Soviet declaration of neutrality, Pyongyang proclaimed its "full support" for the Chinese People's Republic in the Sino-Indian border dispute. Despite occasional statements admitting the possible value of East-West negotiations, North Korean commentary after Camp David displayed open skepticism of one of the principal ingredients in Khrushchev's "peaceful coexistence" policy--his contention that a growing number of Western leaders, specifically including President Eisenhower, were sincere in their desire to reduce international tensions. Echoing Chinese Communist views, Pyongyang's propaganda in October charged that the United States "plans to solve the Korean question by war;" in December launched abusive personal attacks against the American President; and in January 1960 characterized the President's State of the Union Message as a "document of aggression and plunder, reeking of gunpowder."

*For an extended discussion of this second ideological challenge to Moscow, see ESAU XI-61: "The Sino-Soviet Dispute on World Communist Strategy (Autumn 1959 to Summer 1960)."

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

A number of developments in the spring of 1960 intensified the Sino-Soviet dispute on bloc strategy. In April Peiping launched a public attack on the theoretical rationale of Khrushchev's foreign policy by reviving Leninist dicta on the inevitability of war, the intrinsically aggressive nature of imperialism, and the need for direct revolutionary action to promote international Communism. The South Korean riots and subsequent overthrow of the Rhee government in April, the collapse of the summit conference in May and the violent Japanese demonstrations in June appeared to cast serious doubt on the efficacy of Khrushchev's detente policy and to lend substance to Peiping's view of a rising tide of revolution in Asia. At the same time, the Bucharest Conference in June revealed to other bloc parties for the first time the fundamental nature and disruptive effect of the Sino-Soviet dispute. According to [] reports, Khrushchev utilized this occasion to accuse the Chinese party of "disloyalty and insincerity," of employing "Trotskyite methods," and of pursuing a "bellicose" foreign policy. The Chinese countercharges were equally bitter, including the allegations that Khrushchev had supported anti-party elements within Communist China, had attempted to coerce other bloc parties, had been guilty of "revisionism and right opportunism" and had treated the Chinese "as enemies." The North Korean response to these developments revealed grave apprehension over the growing rift in Sino-Soviet relations and a consequent desire to remain neutral, and, at the same time, a continuing affinity for Peiping's militant policy of unremitting struggle against the West in Asia.

After a significant delay, the Korean Workers Party issued a brief communique on the Bucharest Conference which balanced a declaration of "full support of the peace-loving foreign policy of the CPSU based on Leninist principles of coexistence" with an immediate reminder that United States imperialism, the "sworn enemy of the people," remained inherently aggressive. More informative was Kim Il-sung's lengthy Liberation Day speech of 15 August 1960 which launched a new propaganda drive for "peaceful unification" of Korea. Advocating a confederation of North and South for joint development of the national economy, the North Korean leader betrayed the propagandistic nature of this proposal by offering to rescue "our South Korean brothers from starvation and poverty" and contending that "socialist construction and the happy life of the people in the northern part of the republic are exercising tremendous revolutionary influence

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

on the South Korean people." This stratagem, paralleling an earlier confederation scheme advanced by East Germany, conformed nicely with the Soviet prescription of final victory through "peaceful competition" and Khrushchev specifically endorsed it in a 23 September address to the United Nations General Assembly.

The dominant tone of Kim's speech, however, was one of struggle and militant appeals for direct revolutionary action in South Korea. Employing Chinese Communist invective, he depicted United States imperialism as "the most atrocious enemy of mankind and vicious enemy of the Asian people;" as "intensifying the arms race and aggravating tensions;" and as scheming to establish in South Korea "a military base for provoking another war." The only solution was "an anti-imperialist struggle" of the South Korean people, encouraged and abetted from the North, to compel "the United States aggressors...to withdraw." After drawing a parallel between South Korea and Taiwan, Kim asserted that "our people, joining forces with all Asian people, will struggle for the withdrawal of the aggressive United States army from the whole area of Asia."

Communist China's high-ranking military mission to North Korea in October, noted above in the discussion of domestic policy, made much of this community of national interest. Indeed, when coupled with the charge that "modern revisionists" (i.e. the USSR) were attempting to "isolate" China and "to sabotage the friendship and unity" of China and Korea, General Yang Yung's blunt assertion (in a 24 October People's Daily article) of a special relationship between China and Korea appeared directed as much at the Soviet Union as at the West.

China and Korea are separated by only a river. They are as dependent on each other as the lips and the teeth. What is concerned with one of them is also concerned with the other. The security of China is closely connected with the survival of Korea.

In addition to reiterating a number of Chinese positions in the Sino-Soviet dispute on strategy, the Chinese military spokesmen took sharp issue with an earlier judgment of Khrushchev that the United States was "not seeking a military conflict" in Korea. Chief of mission Ho Lung on this occasion characterized "the United States aggressors in South Korea"

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

as "bent on...unleashing a new aggressive war, attempting once again to invade the Korean Democratic People's Republic...annexing the whole of Korea...and launching a new world war...."

The upshot of this new initiative was to swing the North Korean regime even more solidly into line behind Communist China on two key issues of the Sino-Soviet dispute. First was the open espousal of Peiping's charge that the "modern revisionists" were engaged in "covering up the aggressive nature of imperialism, beautifying imperialism and...denying the universal legality of socialist revolution." Next was the enthusiastic seconding of the Chinese view that revisionism, not dogmatism and sectarianism as maintained by Moscow, constituted the most serious ideological deviation within the international Communist movement. The reasoning advanced for this assessment by Vice Premier Chong Il-yong was instructive. Within North Korea itself, revisionist elements had engaged in "counterrevolutionary plots" against the Korean Workers Party in the past and were still considered a clear and present danger. As a consequence of carrying on "socialist construction amid the fierce class struggle against United States imperialism...and domestic counterrevolutionaries," it was necessary to "arm the working people with hatred against imperialism and class enemies and bring them up as self-sacrificing and ardent revolutionary fighters."

Thus on the eve of the Moscow summit conference in November 1960, North Korea appeared to be following the lead of Communist China in opposing Khrushchev's policy of relaxing international tensions. What is more, the considerations prompting this decision appeared to be strikingly similar to those animating Peiping. As a country with unsatisfied territorial claims, it could only view friendlier relations with the West as tending to freeze the status quo. As a have-not nation determined to industrialize at maximum speed, it favored external tension as a justification for sacrifice and a goad for production. And as one of the satellites plagued by chronic factionalism and purges, it appeared firmly committed to the pre-Khrushchev model of Stalinist totalitarianism.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

The Moscow Conference and After

Developments at the Moscow Conference and after tend to confirm the existence of strong ideological bonds between Peiping and Pyongyang. First, it appears significant that Mao Tse-tung and Kim Il-sung were the only Communist Party leaders in the bloc who did not attend this summit conference. Next, fragmentary reports on the proceedings of this conference indicate that North Korea provided valuable support to Communist China on a number of issues in the Sino-Soviet dispute, either by endorsing Chinese positions or by failing to endorse the opposing views advanced by the Soviet Union. The credibility of these reports is enhanced by subsequent North Korean editorial comment on the hybrid documents issued by the Moscow Conference, commentary which has slighted Soviet-inspired passages for those expressing the more militant Chinese line.

On the overriding issue of peace or war, neither the 12 December party editorial on the Moscow Appeal nor the 24 December party resolution on the Moscow Declaration mentioned Soviet formulations on the "horrors of modern war" or the crucial alternative confronting the bloc: "either peaceful coexistence or a nuclear war of extermination." Other Soviet passages in the Moscow documents were either completely ignored (the cult of the individual, problems of Communist construction, long-term economic competition and negotiations with the West) or acknowledged perfunctorily (peaceful coexistence, general disarmament and dogmatism). By contrast, these authoritative party assessments of the Moscow Conference echoed long-standing Chinese contentions in the Sino-Soviet dispute over international Communist strategy.

A major theme was the odious and inherently aggressive nature of United States imperialism, "the sworn enemy of mankind," which was "intensifying the arms race, international tensions and provocative war schemes" and "running wild preparing for a new war...in South Korea." Contrary to the views of the "modern revisionists" who sought to "emasculate the revolutionary spirit of Marxism-Leninism...to garnish imperialism in every way" and to spread "illusions about the imperialist aggressors," it was necessary to wage a militant struggle to "inflict blows on the imperialists, bring pressure on them and bind their hands and feet." An essential ingredient in this struggle was "fanning the flames of the

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

national liberation movement" and in particular "fanning the flames of the anti-American and national salvation movements... for driving the United States imperialist aggressive forces from South Korea." In view of these pronouncements, it was not surprising that Peiping featured North Korean commentary on the Moscow Conference above that of any other nation in the bloc.

Equally revealing have been North Korea's pointed declarations of friendship and support for Albania, the East European satellite which has consistently backed Communist China in the Sino-Soviet dispute and which, accordingly, has aroused Soviet ire. In an unusually laudatory article in late November, the semi-official government organ Minju Chosen asserted that "our two countries are very close to each other, like real brothers, because of common ideology and aims" and that "no force on earth can break the invincible friendship and solidarity between the Korean and Albanian peoples." The address of the North Korean delegate to the Albanian party congress in mid-February 1961 contrasted sharply with that of his Soviet counterpart. Whereas the Russian representative attacked the Albanian party leaders (obliquely of course) as "renegades... foaming at the mouth in fits of hatred and hostility against our party," Pak Kum-chol praised the Albanian Workers Party for "firmly preserving the purity of Marxism-Leninism" and once again hailed the "invincible friendship and solidarity formed between our two peoples and two parties."

Most important of all, North Korea has explicitly recognized Communist China as co-leader of the Communist bloc following the Moscow Conference. By referring to "the socialist countries led by the Soviet Union and the Chinese People's Republic," a 12 December editorial in the official organ of the Korean Workers Party appeared to be announcing the arrival of a new stage in intra-bloc relations. In view of its previous record of sympathy and support for Communist China, it was fitting that North Korea should reveal what was perhaps the most significant result of the Moscow Conference--the emergence of "polycentrism" as a reality within the international Communist movement.

~~SECRET~~