

KOREA: LIBERATION ANNIVERSARY; LEGALISM; "CANNIBALISM"

Korea

With the advent of the 15 August anniversary of Korea's liberation by the Soviet Army, Moscow turns its attention slightly away from the legalistic argument establishing the fact of American aggression in Korea and from the emotionally-charged assertion that American forces barbarically mistreat the Korean people. The anniversary is widely exploited in a number of commentaries but in all of them the war for liberation and unification and the liberation anniversary are correlated.

There is factual attention to the debates at the U.N. and Delegate Malik's addresses are reported in a TASS transmission. The Indian proposal that a six-man committee examine the situation is reported, but Warren Austin's characterization of the North Korean Government as a "zombie" regime appears to be ignored.

Attention to American mobilization continues to be only moderate in volume; it follows the familiar line in avoiding speculation on American strength and in highlighting the profits of munitions makers and the burdensome taxes by which the worker is being forced to pay for the aggressive war against the Korean people. There are persistent but non-specific hints of America's desire to expand the war in Asia as part of its aggressive ambitions and to compensate for losses in Korea.

The claim that the peoples of the world oppose American aggression continues to be heavily exploited.

a. The Anniversary of Liberation: With marked enthusiasm Soviet commentaries recount the glorious achievements of the Soviet-guided Korean people since their 1945 liberation by the glorious Red Army. Broadcasts note that all Moscow papers observe the anniversary, report a literary meeting at which the great day was commemorated, and quote Pyongyang's anniversary slogans. There is the usual exchange of messages between Kim Il Sung and other dignitaries in the Soviet orbit. And there is a noticeable revival of propagandistic exploitation of the allegedly vast difference between conditions in the American-occupied South and the Soviet-assisted North.

A Leontiev commentary, one of the most widely-circulated, contrasts the "remarkable progress" of the North aided by the USSR with South Korea's conversion into "a U.S. colony and military springboard in the Far East." More specific comparisons are found in articles by Kim Do Bong and Lt. Gen. Kim Buk which include concrete contrasts, e.g. between hospitals in the North and South. There is repeated reference to the contrasting standards of living and to the morale of the people in the two areas.

APPROVED FOR RELEASE
DATE: 14-Jan-2010

~~RESTRICTED~~

- A 2 -

b. America's Aggressive War: Following up the IZVESTIA editorial so widely distributed last week, which in turn followed Delegate Malik's address in support of the same argument, Moscow broadcasts articles and commentaries by a variety of Soviet periodicals and authorities in which the legalistic definition of aggression is applied to the American action in Korea. These authorities cite international protocols and conventions and historical precedent to establish the irrefutable fact that America is guilty of aggression against the Korean people, who have a right to engage in a civil war without outside interference. Monitored commentaries do not elaborate on the claim that events in Korea constitute a civil war, nor do they invoke Malik's claim that North Korean forces are using equipment purchased from the USSR in 1948.

These articles customarily include one or more references to State Department "ignorance of international law" concerning the definition of aggression. And they frequently berate the U.S. for attempting to convert the United Nations into a rubber stamp of aggression.

Incidentally, Soviet Satellite radios in Europe and Asia do not appear to belabor this argument with the same enthusiasm displayed by Moscow.

c. A War Between Races: As has been noted before, Soviet and Asian Communists do not generally portray the war in terms of white Americans fighting yellow Koreans. But there are occasional hints at this racist type of propaganda. A LITERARY GAZETTE article approaches it by implying that the U.S. "adventure" in Korea is a present-day instance of the "white man's burden" theory of the 19th century. A Pyongyang broadcast quotes the People's Committee as maintaining that Koreans do not want to be forced to endure the type of mistreatment received by "colored people" in America and are consequently resisting the Americans. Kim Buk also declares that the war is really between Americans and Koreans since the South Korean forces have been wiped out. And there are occasional attempts to identify the U.S. with Japan's colonial oppression of other nations.

The war-between-races theme receives only passing mention, however, and there is no exploitation of the American use of the term "gook" in references to Koreans nor is there any attempt to claim that American officers and troops have better quarters and equipment than Koreans. Earlier American criticism of the fighting qualities of South Koreans was noted, but without comment, and is not referred to now.

Propagandistic vilification of the American forces continues to be a prominent theme. In the first days of the conflict Moscow and Pyongyang dwelt on the alleged American desire to enslave Korea. This theme is still present but takes second place to the claim that Americans resort to barbarities, atrocities, and cannibalistic acts toward Koreans. U.S. troops and Embassy officials are charged with torturing, slaughtering, and massacring Koreans by barbaric methods and the charge is kept alive by protests from Korean and Chinese sources directed to U.N. authorities.

~~RESTRICTED~~

- A 3 -

Soviet broadcasters also make much of the charge that American imperialists seek cannonfodder--or "human bullets"--in other countries. They are accused of seeking to impose immense suffering on the people of other nations, and immense taxes on the American people, in furtherance of their desire for war-increased profits.