

**KIM IL SUNG**

**ON THE RELATIONS  
BETWEEN THE DPRK  
AND THE USA**

**DPR Korea  
Juche 108 (2019)**

WORKING PEOPLE OF THE WHOLE WORLD, UNITE!

**KIM IL SUNG**

**ON THE RELATIONS  
BETWEEN THE DPRK  
AND THE USA**

**Foreign Languages Publishing House  
DPR Korea  
Juche 108 (2019)**

# CONTENTS

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS BY A JOURNALIST OF <i>L'UNITA</i> , THE ORGAN OF THE ITALIAN COMMUNIST PARTY (Excerpt) <i>June 25, 1956</i> .....	1
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS PUT BY THE CORRESPONDENT OF A FINNISH NEWSPAPER (Excerpt) <i>November 28, 1958</i> .....	4
TALK TO JOURNALISTS OF THE US NEWSPAPER <i>THE NEW YORK TIMES</i> (Excerpt) <i>May 26, 1972</i> .....	6
TALK TO A DELEGATION OF THE JAPAN CLEAN GOVERNMENT PARTY (Excerpt) <i>June 1, 1972</i> .....	13
TALK TO A JOURNALIST OF THE US NEWSPAPER <i>WASHINGTON POST</i> (Excerpt) <i>June 21, 1972</i> .....	15

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS RAISED BY THE  
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE  
AMERICAN-KOREAN FRIENDSHIP AND  
INFORMATION CENTRE AND THE  
EDITORIAL BOARD OF THE MAGAZINE  
*KOREA FOCUS* (Excerpt)

*June 16, 1974* .....18

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS RAISED BY  
THE SECRETARY GENERAL OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS  
INSTITUTE OF ITALY (Excerpt)

*October 13, 1975* .....21

TALK WITH THE CHIEF EDITOR  
OF THE JAPANESE POLITICAL  
MAGAZINE *SEKAI* (Excerpt)

*March 28, 1976* .....23

TALK TO A JAPANESE PUBLIC  
FIGURE (Excerpt)

*November 9, 1976*.....25

TALK TO THE CHAIRMAN OF THE  
DIETMEN'S LEAGUE FOR THE  
PROMOTION OF JAPAN-KOREA  
FRIENDSHIP (Excerpt)

*January 27, 1977* .....26

TALK WITH EXECUTIVE MANAGING EDITOR OF JAPANESE <i>YOMIURI</i> <i>SHIMBUN</i> AND HIS GROUP (Excerpt)	
<i>April 23, 1977</i> .....	31
TALK WITH THE EDITOR-IN-CHIEF OF THE FRENCH NEWSPAPER <i>LE MONDE</i> (Excerpt)	
<i>June 20, 1977</i> .....	35
TALK TO THE DELEGATION FROM THE INTERNATIONAL LIAISON COMMITTEE FOR THE INDEPENDENT AND PEACEFUL REUNIFICATION OF KOREA (Excerpt)	
<i>June 15, 1978</i> .....	39
TALK WITH A GROUP OF JAPANESE VISITORS (Excerpt)	
<i>May 5, 1979</i> .....	42
TALK TO THE DELEGATION OF THE ALL INDIA INDO-KOREAN FRIENDSHIP ASSOCIATION (Excerpt)	
<i>September 23, 1979</i> .....	44
TALK TO THE CHAIRMAN OF THE SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC PARTY OF DENMARK (Excerpt)	
<i>May 5, 1984</i> .....	47

TALK WITH THE DELEGATION OF THE  
JAPAN SOCIALIST PARTY (Excerpt)

*September 19, 1984* .....53

TALK TO A DELEGATION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL LIAISON  
COMMITTEE FOR INDEPENDENT  
AND PEACEFUL REUNIFICATION  
OF KOREA (Excerpt)

*October 11, 1985* .....60

ON OUR PEOPLE’S STRUGGLE FOR  
SOCIALIST CONSTRUCTION AND  
NATIONAL REUNIFICATION (Excerpt)

Talk to a Delegation from the Communist Party  
of the United States of America, *June 24, 1988* .....63

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS RAISED  
BY THE CHIEF OF THE BUREAU OF  
THE ITALIAN RADIO AND TELEVISION  
FOR THE FAR EAST (Excerpt)

*October 29, 1988* .....65

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS RAISED  
BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE *KYODO*  
NEWS SERVICE OF JAPAN (Excerpt)

*June 1, 1991* .....67

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS RAISED BY THE DIRECTOR OF THE IWANAMI SHOTEN, PUBLISHERS, JAPAN (Excerpt)	
<i>September 26, 1991</i> .....	69
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS RAISED BY THE MANAGING EDITOR OF THE JAPANESE NEWSPAPER <i>ASAHI SHIMBUN</i> (Excerpt)	
<i>March 31, 1992</i> .....	72
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS RAISED BY A DELEGATION OF JOURNALISTS OF <i>THE WASHINGTON TIMES</i> FROM THE UNITED STATES (Excerpt)	
<i>April 12, 1992</i> .....	74
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS RAISED BY A JOURNALIST DELEGATION FROM THE AMERICAN NEWSPAPER <i>THE WASHINGTON TIMES</i> (Excerpt)	
<i>April 16, 1994</i> .....	77
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS RAISED BY A JOURNALIST DELEGATION FROM CNN INTERNATIONAL (Excerpt)	
<i>April 17, 1994</i> .....	84

EVERY MEMBER OF THE KOREAN  
NATION MUST SUBORDINATE  
EVERYTHING TO THE REUNIFICATION  
OF THE COUNTRY (Excerpt)

Talk with a Korean Woman Journalist Resident  
in the United States, *April 21, 1994* .....86



**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS  
BY A JOURNALIST OF *L'UNITA*,  
THE ORGAN OF THE ITALIAN  
COMMUNIST PARTY**

(Excerpt)

*June 25, 1956*

**Question:** What do you think of the fact that the work of the Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission in Korea is hampered by the Western countries?

**Answer:** It is a common knowledge that the US ruling circles and south Korean authorities are obstructing its normal work. They are even attempting to disorganize it. We deem this as evidence proving that they are flagrantly violating the Korean Armistice Agreement, and as an act aggravating tensions in Korea and Asia and jeopardizing world peace. Naturally, their act is arousing great indignation among all the Korean people and the peace-loving people all over the world.

We have demanded that the Korean Armistice Agreement should be observed to the letter, and we will hold this stand in the future, too.

**Question:** What are the prospects for Korea's reunification

and what is the basis for its settlement?

**Answer:** Our attitude towards the question of Korea's reunification is already widely known to the world through our official statements and documents.

The reunification of Korea must on all accounts be achieved peacefully, on a democratic basis.

Since the question of Korean reunification is an affair of the Koreans themselves, representatives of north and south Korea should meet and solve it through talks and mutual understanding in keeping with the will and interests of all the Korean people, free from any foreign interference.

By an agreement of the representatives, democratic elections should be held throughout Korea, and a unified central government of Korea should be formed by the elected people's delegates.

In order to create the conditions for this, all foreign troops must be withdrawn from north and south Korea, truce in Korea be turned into a durable peace, and military strength of both sides be reduced to the minimum.

We deemed, and deem, it reasonable to call a Far East conference of countries concerned which can play a positive role in the peaceful settlement of the Korean question. This conference should be attended without fail by representatives of north and south Korea.

Such fair proposals and claims of ours have been rejected many times by the US ruling circles and south Korean authorities. But this does not mean that the

prospects for the peaceful reunification of Korea are dim.

As for the prospects of peaceful reunification, we are certain that Korea will be reunified peacefully without fail, despite the obstructive manoeuvrings of the US ruling circles and south Korean authorities. It is an urgent demand of all the Korean people and a desire of the peace-loving people throughout the world to reunify our country peacefully on a democratic basis.

# **ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS PUT BY THE CORRESPONDENT OF A FINNISH NEWSPAPER**

(Excerpt)

*November 28, 1958*

**Question:** Some people suggest the idea of abolishing the Korean Military Armistice Commission. What is your opinion about the meaning and work of this commission?

**Answer:** The Korean Armistice Agreement stipulates that all foreign troops shall be withdrawn from Korea and that the armistice shall be turned into a durable peace.

The Chinese People's Volunteers have already withdrawn from Korea.

The US troops must get out of south Korea so that the Korean armistice may be turned into a lasting peace and that the solution of the Korean issue may be left to the Korean people themselves. However, they refuse to get out of south Korea, flagrantly trampling down the Armistice Agreement.

The Military Armistice Commission must continue to exist until all the US troops withdraw from south Korea.

Also necessary is the activity of the Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission whose function is to supervise the

scrupulous observance of the Armistice Agreement.

The US side is hindering in every way the activity of the NNSC which plays a positive role in the preservation of the armistice. The US side must desist from this position; it is duty-bound to give proper assistance to the NNSC.

**TALK TO JOURNALISTS  
OF THE US NEWSPAPER  
*THE NEW YORK TIMES***

(Excerpt)

*May 26, 1972*

Even after the armistice the United States continued its unfriendly attitude towards our country.

The Armistice Agreement stipulated that a political conference between the two sides would be held immediately after the war to settle the Korean question by peaceful means. However, the United States did not abide by this stipulation. As a result, our country is still in a state of ceasefire. No peace agreement has been concluded and there has been no progress in the work of solving the Korean question peacefully. Therefore, I always tell our people that the generations are changing, but the target of our struggle remains the same.

The US authorities have persisted in their aggressive acts against our country in violation of the Armistice Agreement. Even after the *Pueblo* incident, the United States continued its aerial reconnaissance of our country. This places our country in a perpetual de facto state of war.

As this state of war has continued since the ceasefire,

we have been forced to increase the development of our defences and invest heavily in them. To be honest, this enormous expenditure on defence has, to a certain extent, slowed down the rise in the living standards of the people. Our people also blame the United States for this.

...

You have just said that you hope this abnormal situation between our country and the United States will improve. So do we. We do not want to have many enemies.

Now, let me answer the questions you have raised.

To begin with, I should like to refer to the question of relations between the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the United States.

You asked me what positive measures should be taken to end the abnormal state of affairs between Korea and the United States. In our opinion this is a very simple matter.

Relations between our country and the United States depend entirely on the attitude of the US government. If the US government changes its policy towards us, we shall do the same towards the United States.

If the US government wants to improve its relations with our country, it must, first of all, stop interfering in our internal affairs so that the Koreans can settle the question of Korean reunification independently. It is nearly 20 years now since the Armistice Agreement was signed, so why should US troops continue to occupy south Korea under the guise of "United Nations forces"? Some people say that the US troops are staying on in south Korea to protect it because we might "invade the south". This is a lie. We have declared time and again that we have no intention of

invading the south. It is high time to put an end to the situation where US troops play policemen in south Korea under the cloak of “United Nations forces”.

The US government disturbs us not only because it has stationed its armed forces in south Korea but also because it is helping to revive Japanese militarism. We are not happy about the US assistance to the revival of Japanese militarism. We can see from the joint communique of Nixon and Sato of 1969 that the United States is bringing Japanese militarism into south Korea as its agent for aggression against Korea and is encouraging it to interfere in our country’s internal affairs. Following the publication of the communique, Sato openly declared that he would interfere in Korea’s internal affairs. This is another aspect of the unfriendly attitude of the US government towards our country.

On the Korean question in the United Nations, the US government is also taking an unjustifiable attitude towards our country. It advocates inviting south Korea to the United Nations unconditionally while attaching conditions to inviting us. It alleges that we do not respect the United Nations Charter, although we have never violated or ignored it. The United States insists that it will only allow us to attend the UN General Assembly if we recognize the unlawful resolutions on the Korean question which were adopted at the United Nations. How can we go to the UN General Assembly under this condition? Furthermore, the United States has been inciting the “United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea” to give annual reports full of lies and fabrications



about our country, thus continuing hostile propaganda against us.

Because the US government has unwaveringly pursued this unfriendly policy towards our country, there has been no improvement in Korea-US relations and the reunification of our country has been greatly hindered.

If the United States wants to improve its relations with our country, it must stop interfering in our internal affairs so that the Koreans can reunify their country by themselves, withdraw its troops disguised as “UN forces” and dissolve the “United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea”. It must not continue the partition of the Korean nation but support its reunification. As long as the United States keeps our country divided, our attitude towards the United States will not change. The Korean peninsula is now cut into two parts. If the US troops withdraw from south Korea and foreign interference stops, the Koreans will be able to find common ground which will enable them to reunify their country by themselves. Furthermore, if the US troops get out of south Korea, I think the Koreans will come to terms easily and our people’s anti-US feeling will gradually decrease.

When US President Nixon looked at the Great Wall during his visit to China he said that the barriers dividing nations should be pulled down. If the US government wants to put these words into practice, it must begin with Korea. Nowadays Nixon says that he is going to improve relations with China as well as with the Soviet Union. Why, then, should the United States keep its military bases

in south Korea? The United States has argued that it keeps them there to prevent communist expansion. Now that it is going to have good relations with the large socialist countries, we consider that there is no excuse for keeping military bases in south Korea. So the United States must quit south Korea at once, dismantling all its military bases and withdrawing its army of aggression.

If the United States wants to improve its relations with our country, it must also stop assisting the revival of Japanese militarism and stop introducing it into south Korea. The United States is trying to substitute Japanese militarism for its own in its invasion of south Korea and to reduce south Korea to a commodity market and appendage of Japan. This is an unfriendly, hostile act against our people. The US government must discontinue such antagonistic acts against our country.

If the US government discontinues its hostile acts against our country and stops obstructing our reunification, then there will be no reason why we should be antagonistic to the United States. So we say that relations between the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the United States depend not on us, but entirely on the attitude of the US government. We shall keep a close watch on the policy the United States adopts towards our country in the future.

The US government should not only improve relations with large countries, but with small countries as well. We do not think improved US relations with large countries will greatly influence its relations with small countries. In fact, the US government has not yet changed its attitude in its relations with small countries.

In the joint communique of the People's Republic of China and the United States, the latter declared that it supports the relaxation of tension on the Korean peninsula and contact between north and south Korea. With regard to the influence the United States will exert on south Korea in this respect, we must wait and see. If the United States does not support the relaxation of tension in Korea and north-south contact in the future, it will mean that it gave empty promises under pressure.

Our people remember what Nixon said in China. What interests me most is that he said that no barriers should divide the people of the world. We are watching how he is going to put his words into practice.

You asked me if moves such as an exchange of journalists and cultural interchange to promote mutual understanding and reduce tension were possible between the two countries even before the US troops are withdrawn from south Korea. I will answer this briefly.

Frankly, we cannot understand why Americans are interested in coming to our country. We do not think our people would bring back anything interesting if they visited the United States in the present circumstances.

We do not mean that we want to shut the door to relations with the United States. But we consider that as long as the fundamental problem between the two countries remains unsolved, an exchange of journalists or cultural interchange would be of little value.

...

Since the US government is not changing its hostile policy towards our country, mutual visits had better be

limited in scope, as at present. We do not think that there is no need at all for our journalists to visit the United States. In our opinion, it is necessary for them to go there in order to let the American people hear our true voice, because at present you only hear the voice of the south Korean rulers. We welcome visits by American journalists and democratic figures on a limited scale. Such visits and interchange will help promote understanding between the two peoples.

# **TALK TO A DELEGATION OF THE JAPAN CLEAN GOVERNMENT PARTY**

(Excerpt)

*June 1, 1972*

You also asked about the influence the visit of Salisbury, a journalist of *The New York Times*, to our country may have on future relations between the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the United States. I shall answer this briefly.

Salisbury's visit to our country took almost ten years to achieve. Every year he wrote to us expressing his desire to visit our country, but each time we refused his request. This year, for the first time, we permitted him to enter our country.

The most important question raised recently by Salisbury in our country concerned the future of relations between the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the United States.

As we fully explained in our talk with Salisbury, relations between our country and the United States depend entirely on the attitude of the US government. We shall decide on our policy towards the United States according as whether or not the US government follows a hostile policy

towards our country. If it does not interfere in our country's reunification, withdraws its troops stationed in south Korea under the cloak of "UN forces", does not help revive Japanese militarism and does not take an unwarranted attitude towards our country in the UN, that is to say, if the United States renounces its hostile policy towards our country and does not interfere with our people's independent solution of the country's reunification, relations between our country and the United States can be improved. As long as the US government pursues a hostile policy towards our country as at present, our people will never look on the United States with good will.

I think that our talk with Salisbury must have been published in *The New York Times*. Before long it will also appear in our newspapers. A study of it will give you a better idea of our position on relations between the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the United States.

**TALK TO A JOURNALIST  
OF THE US NEWSPAPER  
WASHINGTON POST**

(Excerpt)

*June 21, 1972*

Your next question is on how to improve relations between Korea and the United States. Let me say a few words about this.

In order to improve Korea-US relations, the US government must stop meddling in Korea's internal affairs. It must not encourage our country's division but must help its reunification. In order not to hamper our country's reunification, the United States must first withdraw its troops from south Korea and refrain from threatening our security. Then, we think the relations between our country and the United States will be improved soon.

Because I have no time, I will not refer to the long history of US aggression against Korea.

During World War II when the American people joined in the common front against fascism and fought fascist Germany and Japanese imperialism, they were praised and supported by the Korean people. Afterwards, Korea-US relations worsened because the United States interfered in Korea's internal affairs and pursued hostile,

aggressive policies towards the DPRK.

If the United States gives up its hostile, aggressive policies towards our country and does not obstruct Korea's reunification, we are ready to change our US policy even now.

We Korean people distinguish the American people from the US imperialists. The Korean people are still promoting friendship with the American people and they will do so in the future.

You asked about a visit by our journalists to the United States. We are not against this. If the situation is right, we shall not object to sending our journalists to the United States and to their meeting its officials.

You asked whether our country will establish trade and economic relations with the United States if US troops withdraw from south Korea and tension is removed from the Korean peninsula. In that event, we shall not object to establishing trade and economic relations with the United States; we would welcome this.

The prospects of trade between our country and Japan also depend on the Japanese side. If they want to conduct trade with us, we shall do so.

Next, you asked me how we rate relations between Japan and the United States and their contradictions and which of them is a greater menace to Korea.

In the Political Programme of the DPRK Government we set it as a principle to promote friendly relations with all countries which want to establish relations with us on the basis of equality and mutual benefit and which harbour good intentions to us. However, we cannot have good



intentions towards countries which are antagonistic to us, treat us on an unequal footing and pursue aggressive policies towards us.

We have an old saying that you must show goodwill to a man of goodwill and treat the enemy as an enemy. It means that you must receive a visitor with a knife in his hand with a knife and entertain a visitor who brings you rice cake with rice cake.

We will show goodwill to anybody who does the same. But we cannot show kindness to those who are going to invade us, can we?

Our relations with the United States and Japan depend on what policies the US and Japanese governments pursue towards our country. If they adopt a hostile policy, we will do the same. If they abandon this attitude, we shall establish good relations with them in good faith.

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS RAISED  
BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE  
OF THE AMERICAN-KOREAN  
FRIENDSHIP AND INFORMATION  
CENTRE AND THE EDITORIAL  
BOARD OF THE MAGAZINE  
*KOREA FOCUS***

(Excerpt)

*June 16, 1974*

Now I should like to pass on to the question of relations between Korea and the United States.

Ever since its inception, the DPRK has always developed friendship and cooperation on the principles of equality and mutual benefit with all countries which are friendly towards it, irrespective of their size or social system. At present our country has state relations with more than 80 countries and promotes trade with over 100 countries, many of them capitalist countries.

However, there are still no friendly relations between the DPRK and the United States. This is entirely because the US government pursues a hostile policy towards our country.

You asked me what is the prerequisite for the establishment of state relations between the DPRK and the

United States. First of all, the US government should drop its hostile policy and stop aggressive acts against our country.

...

As long as the US government persists in aggressive acts against our people without renouncing its hostile policy towards our country, the relations between the two countries cannot be improved. How can one establish good relations with a man who has broken into one's house with a dagger in his hand? There can be friendly relations between countries and these relations can be fruitful only when they take a friendly attitude to one another on the principles of equality and mutual respect.

If the United States is to improve its relations with our country, it should also refrain from interfering in our internal affairs and stop hampering Korea's reunification.

The United States should not impede but should help the reunification of Korea. To do so, it must first of all remove its troops from south Korea.

The continued presence of US troops in south Korea runs counter both to the Korean Armistice Agreement which provides for the withdrawal of all foreign troops from Korea, and to the North-South Joint Statement which pledges that the Korean people will reunify their country independently.

Even from South Viet Nam, where a truce was made last year, the United States has withdrawn its forces. What need is there for it to maintain its troops in south Korea until now despite the armistice which was declared more than 20 years ago in our country? It is high time the US forces left south Korea.

In the international arena including the United Nations, the United States should refrain from acts which aggravate the division of Korea, and should stop adopting an unwarranted attitude towards our country. The US government is encouraging the Japanese militarists and the south Korean reactionaries to carry out the “two Koreas” plot for the permanent division of Korea. This is a very unfriendly, hostile act against our people. The United States must discontinue this unfriendly action against our country.

In a nutshell, for state relations to be established between Korea and the United States, it is necessary for the US government to discard its antagonistic and aggressive policy towards our country and stop impeding Korea’s reunification.

Provided these prerequisites are satisfied, we are ready to improve our relations with the United States, although Korea and the United States have differing social systems and many problems remain unsettled between them.

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS RAISED  
BY THE SECRETARY GENERAL  
OF THE INTERNATIONAL  
AFFAIRS INSTITUTE OF ITALY**

(Excerpt)

*October 13, 1975*

For the country's independent, peaceful reunification, the Armistice Agreement should be replaced by a peace agreement on condition that the US army is withdrawn from south Korea. Because it is simply an agreement to suspend hostilities, the Korean Armistice Agreement cannot guarantee a durable peace in our country. Therefore, by the conclusion of a peace agreement between the signatories to the Armistice Agreement—the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the United States—a guarantee should be provided for a lasting peace in Korea, and favourable conditions created for the peaceful solution of the Korean question.

If the United States wants peace in Korea and wishes the Korean issue to be solved peacefully, it should give up its "two Koreas" policy and its scheme to start another war, replace the Armistice Agreement by a peace agreement and withdraw from south Korea without delay.

Following the conclusion of a peace agreement between

our country and the United States and the withdrawal of the US troops from south Korea, concrete measures should be adopted for the north and south of Korea to observe the principles of the North-South Joint Statement, cut their armed forces drastically, prevent armed conflicts, and promise to refrain from resorting to arms against each other. In this way, genuine conditions would be created for removing the military confrontation and misunderstanding and mistrust between the north and the south and for achieving national unity and peaceful reunification.

**TALK WITH THE CHIEF  
EDITOR OF THE JAPANESE  
POLITICAL MAGAZINE *SEKAI***

(Excerpt)

*March 28, 1976*

**Question:** Speculation is rife concerning negotiations between your country and the United States. I would like to hear your views, Mr. President, on this.

**Answer:** There are a number of questions, including that of a peace treaty, on which we must reach agreement with the American authorities. So we are not preventing talks or contact with them.

But, whatever the circumstances, any talks or contact we have with the United States must be on an equal footing. We will not go to them as their inferiors.

We are ready to talk to the American authorities at this moment if they accept our proposal to replace the Armistice Agreement with a peace treaty. But they have not yet replied to our Republic's proposal to negotiate a peace treaty nor have they shown any positive reaction. Therefore, we shall not go knocking at their door, asking them for discussions. We have made the first move, asking the United States for talks about a peace treaty. However,

the American authorities did not reply. Under these circumstances we cannot make them hold talks with us against their will, can we?



## **TALK TO A JAPANESE PUBLIC FIGURE**

(Excerpt)

*November 9, 1976*

You have asked if there has been any change in our position towards the question of national reunification since the “Panmunjom incident”. We continue to maintain our principled position towards this question.

We would still like to talk with the US side about the question of concluding a peace agreement. We keep knocking at the door, but the Americans do not open it. But I believe that they will open the door of dialogue to us some time, for the time will come when they will awaken to the fact that their policy is misguided.

Following the “Panmunjom incident”, McGovern, Mansfield and many other people in the United States have expressed the opinion that it is high time for the US to make some changes in its Korea policy. We do not consider that this opinion is limited to just a few people there.

The time will come when the Americans will realize that it is useless to assist the Park Chung Hee puppets while maintaining their obstinate and unfair attitude to the solution of the Korean question. Therefore, we intend to continue to knock at the door of dialogue until the US opens it. Our insistence will never waver because it is just.

**TALK TO THE CHAIRMAN  
OF THE DIETMEN'S LEAGUE  
FOR THE PROMOTION  
OF JAPAN-KOREA FRIENDSHIP**

(Excerpt)

*January 27, 1977*

As for our relations with the United States, no problem can ever be solved if she stands by the principle of maintaining the division of our country in her Korea policy.

Regarding the relations between our country and the US, it is the Americans that are being stubborn, not us. The US has divided our country into "two Koreas" and is aiming at a permanent occupation of south Korea. Under such circumstances, there can be no hope of solving the problem.

We maintain that in order to solve the Korean question, multilateral discussions should be held on the premise that Korea will be reunified and that these talks must proceed from the principle of giving assistance to the Korean people so that they can form a harmonious union to achieve the reunification of their country. If it was division we favoured, rather than reunification, why would it be necessary for us to use diplomacy to approve it? There

would be no need for this. If this were to be our aim, we would be committing a treacherous act which could never be wiped from the pages of history. Ours is a homogeneous nation with a long history and a wealth of culture. We could never, therefore, approve the division of our country into “two Koreas”.

You have asked me about my opinions on Carter’s campaign pledge to withdraw US troops and nuclear weapons from south Korea, and I fully approve of this. President Carter’s statement that US troops and nuclear weapons would be withdrawn from south Korea may be a reflection of the opinions of many democrats and other people in the United States. We are following developments to see how his commitment will be put into effect.

We have already proposed to the US that the Korean Armistice Agreement should be replaced by a peace agreement and we have called for talks on a number of occasions. We shall continue to knock at this door, and we shall keep an eye on how the Carter administration responds to our proposal.

In the past Ford flatly rejected our fair proposals. Not only that, but he also tried to prove that the US troops’ occupation of south Korea was justified by provoking the “Panmunjom incident”. It is unprecedented in world history for the President of a major power to order that a white poplar should be cut down. This is something that only Ford could do. To be honest, he is a man who has no regard for the honour of being a President.

After your recent visit to Panmunjom, you said that the

white poplar in question would not have hindered the surveillance of the US troops in any way. The tree had been there for over twenty years. So, why did it become a hindrance to surveillance only on the morning of August 18 last year?

The reason Ford caused such trouble was to try and remain in office as President. In my opinion, Ford made a miscalculation. The American people will not be taken in by that kind of trick.

Park Chung Hee used the “Panmunjom incident” as an excuse to put Kim Dae Jung and other democrats on trial. This is the action of a political impostor. Ford’s actions belong to the past.

Since the “Panmunjom incident”, there have frequently been voices raised in the United States calling for a change in her policy towards Korea. I believe that Carter took both American public opinion and everything that had happened into account, before putting forward his policy of withdrawing US troops and nuclear weapons from south Korea. But powerful forces opposed to this policy are trying to hamper it in a variety of ways. Therefore, we must wait and see whether Carter’s promises will become reality.

As you know, the enemy planned and provoked the “Panmunjom incident” and our soldiers were caught out by this provocation.

All our soldiers are very patriotic and have a strong sense of national dignity. They will defend every tree and every blade of grass in the homeland. So they did not permit the enemy to cut down our tree without permission.

Not only did the enemy provoke us by cutting down the tree, but they were the first to show aggression by throwing an axe at our soldier, which made his nose bleed. How could our soldiers put up with being attacked like this? So a fight broke out between the two sides, in which some of our soldiers were wounded and two US soldiers were killed. Of course, the fact that men died is a cause for regret. But we were not in the wrong. There is no reason for us to apologize to the Americans, nor is there any reason for us to pay compensation. However, Kissinger demanded that we should pay compensation, apologize to the US and punish the soldiers concerned. They were the ones who provoked us and yet they asked us to make an apology. Isn't it likely that in the course of a fight, people may be killed or wounded? That is why we neither apologized to the Americans, paid compensation nor punished our soldiers. We appreciated that our soldiers were acting out of strong patriotism.

The enemy had prepared the "Panmunjom incident" and set up cameras. As soon as the incident started, these cameras began filming everything. Even so, the enemy still told the rest of the world that the incident had been provoked by us.

If we had planned the incident, why did we not prepare cameras as the enemy did? This all serves to demonstrate that they are lying.

We have experienced similar behaviour on many occasions. Johnson arranged the *Pueblo* incident and Nixon caused the *EC-121* spy plane incident immediately upon becoming President. Ford commanded his men to cut down

a white poplar at Panmunjom. Successive US Presidents have conspired to cause provocation. Carter has recently made a pledge publicly to withdraw US troops and nuclear weapons from south Korea. We harbour no illusions, but the idea is good. We shall keep a constant watch on how his policy is implemented.

**TALK WITH EXECUTIVE  
MANAGING EDITOR  
OF JAPANESE *YOMIURI*  
*SHIMBUN* AND HIS GROUP**

(Excerpt)

*April 23, 1977*

Next, you asked me how I evaluate the Carter administration. I think this is a very interesting question.

We have never commented on the Carter administration yet. But now I would like to talk to you about it.

In his campaign pledges, Carter said he would withdraw US troops from south Korea and would denounce any regime that tramples on human rights. Recently he announced the lifting of the ban on travel to some countries, including the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. All this can be interpreted as a favourable attitude towards our country. The problem is, what he said in his campaign pledges differs from what he has done since.

Of course, we have to wait and see how Carter fulfils his pledges. It is only a few months since he took office. But the remarks of certain people now about the withdrawal of the US troops from south Korea contradict Carter's election commitments on many points.

There is currently talk in the United States that the withdrawal of the US troops from south Korea will be effected gradually over a period of four to five years. The US President's tenure of office is four years. So I think this talk about the gradual withdrawal of the US troops from south Korea over a period of four to five years suggests that the US military presence in south Korea will not end while he is in office.

There is also a rumour that even if they actually did pull out the US troops from south Korea, there would not be a complete military evacuation because the air force would stay on. This is a far cry from Carter's pledge to withdraw US troops from south Korea completely. The air force is also a military force.

They say that the US troop withdrawal from south Korea will be made with the full understanding and consent of the south Korean authorities and the Japanese government. The south Korean authorities are opposed to the withdrawal of the US troops. The Japanese government is also against it on the whole. So it is hard to guess what the United States means when it says it will withdraw its troops from south Korea with the consent of the south Korean authorities and the Japanese government—whether it means that it will do so by talking round those opposed to it or that it cannot do so because of these dissenters.

Of course, Carter himself has made no statement about this particular issue. Mostly his subordinates, among them Vice-President Mondale, have made such statements. These people have passed many remarks in one context or



another. If these remarks express the position of the Carter administration, then he is renegeing on his campaign pledges. If they do not represent Carter's will but the opinion of his subordinates, I think further study is needed as to his administration. It is for this reason that we have not yet passed any critical comment about the Carter administration. As regards its attitude, we will have to wait and see. It is only three months since Carter assumed office and there is yet time for him to honour his campaign pledges.

But, in one respect, the Carter administration is blatantly renegeing on the campaign pledges.

The Carter administration threatens other countries by declaring that it will not support any regime which suppresses human rights. Yet it continues to give military aid to the south Korean authorities and stages joint war exercises with them.

The US forces and the south Korean puppet army persist in joint war exercises. This spring B-52 strategic bombers of the US air force frequently flew to south Korea from Okinawa and carried out bombing exercises. More recently, a large-scale war manoeuvre was carried out. I think you already know all about this.

The US forces have bombing exercise grounds all over the place. Why then do they come to south Korea for bombing practice? It is more to threaten and blackmail the south Korean people than to frighten us, and to encourage south Korea's reactionary rulers to intensify suppression of the people. That is why we consider that this runs counter to Carter's campaign

pledge that he would not support any regime which suppressed human rights.

Though we were favourably impressed with Carter's campaign pledges, we will be interested to see how he honours them. It would be premature to give a definite opinion about the Carter administration now.

**TALK WITH THE EDITOR-IN-CHIEF  
OF THE FRENCH  
NEWSPAPER *LE MONDE***

(Excerpt)

*June 20, 1977*

On more than one occasion we have declared that we will not “invade the south” nor will we ever try to impose our system on south Korea. But on the pretext of preventing this fictitious “southward invasion”, US troops remain in south Korea, obstructing the reunification of our country.

If the US troops withdraw from south Korea and the people are guaranteed democracy to allow them to act freely in south Korean society, our people will be able to settle the reunification question independently and peacefully.

The population of our country is large, the soil is good and there are abundant natural resources. Once the country is reunified, our people will be able to build a prosperous, independent and sovereign state where the life is as good as anywhere else.

We are fully convinced that the independent and peaceful reunification of Korea will surely be achieved, in accordance with the common aspiration of the whole nation.

Now, let me say a few words on your question about our thoughts on the Carter administration's policy of withdrawing the US land forces from south Korea.

When making his election commitments, Carter said he would withdraw the US troops from south Korea. Our opinion of this was favourable, because, if the US troops were withdrawn from south Korea, one of the problems standing in the way of our country's reunification would be removed.

But since assuming office, the Carter regime has said that it will withdraw US troops from south Korea by stages, over a period of four or five years. This goes back somewhat on Carter's election commitments. In the US the tenure of office of the President is four years, so when he says he will pull US troops out of south Korea in phases over a period of four or five years, Carter is really saying that the US troops will not be withdrawn from south Korea while he remains in office. Four or five years is too long.

And he says that even if the US troops are withdrawn from south Korea, it will not be a complete withdrawal, and the air force will remain. We think this is not right, either. The air force is also an armed force. Leaving the US air force in south Korea means that US troops will not be withdrawn completely. Of course, these statements did not really come from Carter himself, but from his subordinates.

Carter has not been in office long, so we are still observing his actions. We think we will wait and see how he puts his election pledges into practice.

However, we can say that on one point Carter has clearly run counter to his own election commitments.

When he made his election pledges Carter stated that he would oppose any regime that violated human rights. At present the Carter regime is browbeating some countries by saying that it would take exception to the regimes that trample on human rights, but it says not a word about south Korea where the violation of human rights is most severe. On the contrary, the Carter regime is increasing its military “aid” to south Korea and giving the south Korean “regime” political and economic support. What is this, if not a violation of his own election pledge to oppose any regime that suppresses human rights?

In addition, the US is creating tension in our country. It carries out high-altitude aerial reconnaissance of the northern half of Korea and conducts military exercises in south Korea almost every day. The US mobilizes its aircraft in Okinawa and makes continual practice bombing runs over south Korea. The US military has practice bombing areas throughout the world, so why should they make these practice runs over south Korea? In our opinion, this is contrary to the Carter administration’s election pledge to pull US troops out of south Korea in order to ease the tension in Korea.

As you have seen for yourself here, there is no “threat of southward invasion”; in fact, it is the DPRK that is being threatened with invasion. We are engaged in peaceful construction but they continue their military exercises, even bringing aircraft into the Korean peninsula from abroad.

In short, there is some discrepancy between Carter’s election commitments and the present actions of his administration. However, since it is not long since Carter

assumed office, he still has time to put his election commitments into effect, so we are keeping an eye on what he does.

You have asked me whether the relations between the DPRK and Washington are likely to become normal. This depends entirely on the US.

A long time ago we proposed replacing the Armistice Agreement with a peace agreement. But the US authorities have as yet given us no answer. Instead, they are continuing their war games and practice bombing runs in south Korea and are still giving “aid” to the south Korean fascist “regime” which oppresses the people there and in this way helping it to take the unjustified step of increasing its own military forces.

Since the United States has not changed its unjust policy towards our country, how can we establish normal relations with it? Therefore, establishing normal relations between our country and the US depends not on us, but on whether the US alters its policy or not.

We think that if the Carter administration withdraws the US troops from south Korea in accordance with its campaign pledges, renounces its unfriendly attitude and changes its hostile policy towards our country, then we can establish good relations.

**TALK TO THE DELEGATION  
FROM THE INTERNATIONAL  
LIAISON COMMITTEE FOR THE  
INDEPENDENT AND PEACEFUL  
REUNIFICATION OF KOREA**

(Excerpt)

*June 15, 1978*

The establishment of democratic power in south Korea will make it possible for Koreans themselves to reunify Korea peacefully. If democratic power is to be established in south Korea, it is imperative for the US troops to withdraw from there. Unless they are withdrawn, it will be impossible to make south Korean society democratic. If they stay there, Park Chung Hee will continue to have their backing to oppress the people. In assuming an air of importance he depends only on Americans and Japanese.

He is deceiving the people in order to maintain his "regime". He is conducting false propaganda about the intention of the north to invade the south and to make south Korea communist. We have proposed to the Americans on several occasions that a peace treaty should be concluded between our country and the United States. The ceasefire, which is neither peace nor war, cannot be

continued in Korea, can it? If a peace treaty is concluded between our country and the United States and the US troops leave south Korea, the Korean question can be solved by the Koreans themselves through talks. But the Americans have not accepted our proposal. This shows that they are attempting to perpetuate their occupation of south Korea.

Carter has not kept his election pledges. Now the Americans say that they will withdraw their troops after modernizing the south Korean puppet army. I am not sure to what extent they will modernize it and by what numbers they will increase it. It is a million strong now, and I cannot tell whether they will increase it to two or even three million.

I think that Carter's statement about withdrawing US troops from south Korea was aimed at deceiving the world. Why does he allow the US troops to stage frequent military exercises, while talking about their withdrawal?

This year, too, they held a large-scale military exercise in south Korea. It was the largest one since the ceasefire in Korea. Even in the past year since Carter proclaimed that the US troops stationed in south Korea would be withdrawn, US bombers deployed in Okinawa, Japan, flew to south Korea 29 times to conduct bombing exercises. They say that the aim is to get the bombers used to the route to south Korea. But this is a lie. Nowadays planes can fly easily to any destination without the need for training flights, because they are modernized. So why are flying exercises necessary? In addition, there



are many places for bombing practices near Okinawa, so why do they have to come to south Korea for training? Their continuous military exercises in south Korea are aimed at threatening us and the south Korean people. They have consistently maintained the tension in our country, menacing us.

## **TALK WITH A GROUP OF JAPANESE VISITORS**

(Excerpt)

*May 5, 1979*

Now, I would like to refer to the problem of relations between Korea and the United States.

In view of the fact that US-China diplomatic relations have been opened up through table tennis diplomacy, you have expressed your hope that contact will be established between Korea and the United States and that the relations between the two countries will be improved, with the current World Table Tennis Championships in our country as the occasion. As for this, I think we must wait and see. The table tennis diplomacy between China and the United States has taken place between major countries and borne great fruit. But, with regard to the problem of relations between Korea and the United States, I think that, by its nature, it will be somewhat difficult to solve in the same way.

However, I think the World Table Tennis Championships will have a great effect on the people of many countries in helping them to form a correct understanding of our country. You have said that the international demand for the resumption of the north-south

dialogue in Korea would increase with the World Table Tennis Championships as the occasion. I think it would be good if this were to happen.

As for our establishing contact with the Americans who are here for this WTTC, we are unsure because we have not yet met them. We will understand their intentions when our people meet them.

None of the Americans now here for the current WTTC has anything to do with state affairs. They are table tennis players and journalists. We must wait and see what attitude they adopt. I do not think they have anything special to say even if they meet our people. We have already said that it would be a good idea for Korea and the United States to exchange correspondents and sportsmen.

In our opinion, the people of America should gradually acquire a correct understanding of our country, then Korea-US relations will improve.

We have never met any US Congressman or any person in authority there, so it is impossible for us to know the views of the people of America. The point is that they should understand us correctly. We have already stated that the door is always kept open to dialogue with the United States.

# **TALK TO THE DELEGATION OF THE ALL INDIA INDO-KOREAN FRIENDSHIP ASSOCIATION**

(Excerpt)

*September 23, 1979*

In the “joint statement” published in conjunction with the puppet clique in south Korea, Carter proposed to us “tripartite talks”, that is, talks between the United States, the south Korean puppet authorities and the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea.

The “joint statement” issued by Carter in south Korea is a contradiction. In the statement he subscribed to the “two Koreas” policy advanced by the Park Chung Hee puppet clique. While the United States supports the Park Chung Hee puppet clique who want to split Korea into two, there can be no talks between the United States and ourselves.

If they want to negotiate, they must show the right attitude. Talks, at all events, are necessary for the sake of our country’s reunification, and consequently, they must prove conducive to reunification. What can be the use of talks that will make our nation divided into two?

When holding talks to bring about Korea’s reunification, we have one thing to discuss with the United States and quite another to negotiate with south Korea.

It is because the United States, under the cloak of the UN, once waged a war and then signed an armistice agreement with our Republic that the problem of replacing the armistice agreement with a peace agreement should be settled through talks between the United States and ourselves. We deem it necessary to conduct negotiations with the United States concerning the replacement of the armistice agreement for a peace agreement and the withdrawal of the American troops from south Korea.

If the south Korean authorities want to take part in the negotiations between the United States and us, we can allow them to do so as observers. Even then, this is not tantamount to “tripartite talks”.

As for the reunification question of Korea, it must be solved at all events by the Koreans themselves, that is, through consultations between south Korea and ourselves. The United States is a dead weight to talks between the north and the south on the question of national reunification. Should the United States want to be present at such talks, this amounts to interference in the internal affairs of our nation.

The so-called “joint statement” issued by Carter and the south Korean puppet authorities is worthless.

It is unreasonable for Carter to renege on the withdrawal of American troops from south Korea. He might be excused, had our military capability grown greater than that of south Korea; but this is not the case. We have no means by which to increase our military force over south Korea. As a matter of fact, south Korea has more armed forces and

a much larger population than has the northern half of Korea. Their ploy that our military capability is greater than south Korea's is aimed at hoodwinking the world public. The people of the world are now clearly aware of this, and so express active support and sympathy for our people's struggle to get the American troops withdrawn from south Korea.

**TALK TO THE CHAIRMAN  
OF THE SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC  
PARTY OF DENMARK**

(Excerpt)

*May 5, 1984*

The United States attempts to justify its military occupation and colonial rule of south Korea by claiming there is a “threat of southward invasion” from the north. The so-called “threat of southward invasion” claimed by the American authorities is a fiction and a lie. We have made it clear more than once that we do not intend to “invade the south”. Our people demand peace, not war. We have neither the intention of making war on the US nor the strength to do so. Our people, by tightening their belts, working hard and displaying great fortitude, have built up our country on the ruins of war, making it the beautiful country we see today. We do not want to see this country destroyed again by a new war. When I meet our friends who have close relations with the Americans, I request them to tell the Americans not to be afraid of us since we have no intention of “invading the south”.

We can easily tell that there is no “threat of southward invasion” in the Korean peninsula if we compare the populations and military strengths of north and south

Korea. South Korea has a larger population and army than north Korea. The population of south Korea is forty million, while that of north Korea is less than half as much. South Korea has more than 40 000 US troops and nearly one million south Korean puppet troops. In addition, it has more than three million “homeland reserve forces”. However, our People’s Army is less than half the size of the south Korean puppet army. As far as military equipment is concerned, the US troops occupying south Korea and the south Korean puppet army are armed with nuclear weapons and other kinds of modern armaments, but our People’s Army is equipped with our own weapons.

The United States provides large amounts of money and weapons to south Korea. Having submitted to the Congress a false report about the “superiority” of the military strength of north Korea over that of south Korea, the US authorities are continually supplying the latest weapons to south Korea under the pretext of needing to check the “threat of southward aggression”. The Japanese reactionaries are also providing a lot of aid to south Korea. Last year the Japanese Prime Minister visited south Korea and, as a result of a conspiracy with the south Korean authorities, promised to grant south Korea a “loan” amounting to 4 000 million dollars. Although Japan claimed that she would give this amount of money to south Korea in order to assist its economic development, it is in effect tantamount to giving “military aid”. So we see that the south Korean reactionaries receive large amounts of weapons and money from the United States and Japan.

However, our country, which pursues an independent



policy, does not receive any weapons or money from other countries. We are therefore unable to equip the People's Army with up-to-date weapons. In recent times, new weapons are continually developed as a result of rapid worldwide development of techniques for making weapons, but we are unable to buy these because of our shortage of money. Take planes, for instance. At present other countries produce large numbers of modern fighters, but they are extremely expensive. I suppose you are well aware how much money is needed to buy weapons because in the past you worked as Prime Minister. If we had spent a large amount of money on buying up-to-date weapons from other countries, we would not have been able to build the splendid country we have today.

We do not have to buy modern weapons if it means being indebted to other countries. We have never been in debt to other countries and we do not intend to be in debt to other countries in the future. We intend to live by means of our own efforts no matter what.

Because we are constantly exposed to the threat of aggression from US troops and the south Korean puppet army, we have to maintain a certain number of troops in order to defend our country and our people, and this imposes a very heavy burden on us. If not for the burden of supplying food and clothes for the soldiers of the People's Army and the military equipment required for the army, our people could be far more prosperous than they are now.

In the final analysis, the "threat of southward aggression" from the north is a fiction the United States has fabricated in order to justify intensifying its policy of

aggression and war and maintaining south Korea as a colony and military base.

In an attempt to reduce the tension created in our country and create favourable conditions for the independent and peaceful reunification of Korea, our Party and the Government of the Republic recently put forward a new proposal for holding talks between the DPRK and the United States, with the south Korean authorities also taking part on an equal footing. We proposed the tripartite talks to discuss the problem of replacing the Korean Armistice Agreement with a peace agreement and adopting a nonaggression declaration between the north and the south.

The Americans were the first to propose for holding talks between the DPRK, the United States and south Korea. Last year, too, through the Head of State of a certain country, the United States made a proposal to us concerning the holding of talks between ourselves, the United States and south Korea. However, now that we have proposed tripartite talks and offered to host them, the United States does not accept our proposal. In objecting to our proposal on tripartite talks, the Americans say that it would be a good idea to hold talks between the north and south of our country. Of course, it is also necessary to hold talks between the north and south of Korea. However, these talks alone cannot replace the Armistice Agreement with a peace agreement nor can they satisfactorily resolve the issue of adopting a nonaggression declaration. This is because the United States is the actual party to the conclusion of the Korean Armistice Agreement and also the real ruler of south Korea.

The Korean Armistice Agreement was concluded between ourselves and the United States. South Korea not only did not sign this agreement, but actually opposed its conclusion. The south Korean authorities have neither the will nor the authority to resolve the issue of a peace agreement. It is we and the United States who are the actual parties to the conclusion of the Korean Armistice Agreement and it is also we and the United States who now confront each other across the Military Demarcation Line which separates us. Only when we and the United States replace the Korean Armistice Agreement with a peace agreement through joint talks will it be possible to ease tension in the Korean peninsula, remove the danger of war and open the way to the peaceful reunification of Korea.

The United States, which once insisted on holding talks between us, the United States and south Korea, now does not accept, but in fact opposes our proposal for tripartite talks. This is because its aim is to maintain its military occupation of south Korea and its colonial rule over the south. If the tripartite talks proposed by us are put into effect and a peace agreement replacing the Korean Armistice Agreement is thus concluded between Korea and the United States and a nonaggression declaration is adopted between the north and the south, there will be no more excuse for the United States to continue its occupation of south Korea and perpetrate its aggressive manoeuvres aimed at igniting war. The United States' objections to our proposal for tripartite talks are also related to the complex situation within the south Korean puppet regime. At present there is power struggle taking place

within the south Korean puppet regime. Although the United States has set Chun Doo Hwan in the “presidency” and relies on him, there are many people in south Korea who oppose his “regime”.

The United States stubbornly opposes Korea’s reunification in order to continue its hold on south Korea as a colony and a military base for aggression while it viciously attempts to create “two Koreas”. The United States is attempting to divide our country into “two Koreas” by obtaining “cross recognition” of the north and south of Korea from the great powers. The south Korean puppets, at the instigation of the US imperialists, are also making frantic efforts to create “two Koreas”. The south Korean authorities openly talk about “cross recognition” and insist that the north and the south of Korea should enter the UN simultaneously as “two Koreas”. They are actively involved in the schemes of the United States to create “two Koreas”, hoping to realize their ambition to remain in office for a long time.

## **TALK WITH THE DELEGATION OF THE JAPAN SOCIALIST PARTY**

(Excerpt)

*September 19, 1984*

I should like to talk next about the question of tripartite talks.

At the beginning of this year we put forward a proposal for tripartite talks between the DPRK, the United States and south Korea.

Under the present circumstances, tripartite talks are the only way of easing the tension in our country and accelerating the process of national reunification.

As you, Chairman Ishibashi, said, the Americans were the first to propose tripartite talks. Carter, the ex-president of the United States, put forward the idea of tripartite talks in the “joint communique” which was published on the occasion of his visit to south Korea, and other Americans have also proposed this approach to us indirectly on several occasions. Since 1976 they have offered this proposal to our side through various channels.

Whenever the people who support us suggested to the Americans the idea of replacing the Armistice Agreement with a peace agreement in Korea, they pointed out the need to hold tripartite talks. Last September, the United States

put the suggestion of tripartite talks to us through a third country. In spite of this, they reject the proposal for tripartite talks now that we have made it.

The United States now wants four-way talks, or bilateral talks between the north and the south of our country. Of course, the north and the south can in principle negotiate directly. But the present situation does not permit it.

As you know, when the puppet Chun Doo Hwan “visited” Japan, the Japanese people, to say nothing of the south Korean people, were opposed to his “visit”. We cannot meet and talk with the puppet Chun Doo Hwan, whom the people oppose. If we now meet and talk to him, we will be ignoring the people who are fighting against him. How can we, who represent a people’s government, allow ourselves to negotiate with a man opposed by the people?

When he “came to power”, Chun Doo Hwan proposed “an exchange of visits between the heads of the north and south Korean authorities”. We said that if talks were to be held between high-ranking officials of the north and the south, Chun Doo Hwan must, first of all, apologize to the south Korean people for his suppression of the democratic movement and his massacre of the people. He slaughtered a large number of people during the Kwangju Popular Uprising and sentenced the democrat Kim Dae Jung to death in connection with the uprising. So we proposed that he should apologize to the south Korean people for his crimes before opening negotiations for national reunification in accordance with the principles of

the July 4 North-South Joint Statement.

We published the joint statement on July 4, 1972 when the late Park Chung Hee was “president”. It stipulates that the country should be reunified independently, peacefully and in accord with the principle of great national unity.

We also proposed that if talks between high-ranking officials of the north and the south were to be held, the anti-communist clamour in south Korea must be halted, and freedom of political activities should be guaranteed to Kim Dae Jung, Kim Young Sam, Kim Jong Phil and many other people. We said that if the south Korean authorities accepted these conditions, we would negotiate with them.

The south Korean puppets, however, did not accept the conditions which we proposed, saying that these amounted to interference in their internal affairs. Such conditions cannot be regarded as interference in their affairs. They do not concern another country or another nation, but one and the same nation, and therefore cannot be considered as interference in their affairs.

We proposed that if talks between high-ranking officials in the north and the south proved to be impossible for the present we could hold a political consultative conference of various political parties, social organizations and democratic figures in the north and the south, and suggested inviting democrats from home and abroad to the conference. However, the south Korean puppets turned down even this proposal. It is not we who object to talks between the north and the south.

The questions which we wish to discuss at the tripartite talks are those which cannot be settled anywhere else under the present circumstances.

The main items we have in mind for discussion at the tripartite talks are two in number. At the talks we intend, first of all, to replace the Armistice Agreement concluded between the DPRK and the United States with a peace agreement. Next, we wish to adopt a nonaggression declaration between the north and the south. These are the most rational plans for easing the tension in our country under the present circumstances, when we cannot achieve the country's reunification at once. In this situation, we want at least to reduce the tension in our country. If we replace the Armistice Agreement with a peace agreement, adopt a nonaggression declaration and reduce the armies of both sides, we shall be able to reduce the tension in Korea. Then the conditions for the peaceful reunification of the country will be created.

At present, the United States wants direct negotiations between the north and the south. But the south Korean puppet regime has no authority to settle the questions of replacing the Armistice Agreement with a peace agreement or adopting a nonaggression declaration.

The Korean Armistice Agreement was signed by our representative and the United States' delegate. It is true that a delegate of the Chinese People's Volunteers also signed it, but they withdrew from our country a long time ago. This being the case, the two signatories to the Armistice Agreement who are now in confrontation should negotiate



its replacement by a peace agreement.

At present, the commander of the “South Korea-US Combined Forces” is an American. Therefore, a nonaggression declaration will be really effective only when it is accepted by him. Even if the north and the south adopt a nonaggression declaration, it will be useless and remain merely a scrap of paper unless the Americans recognize it. Therefore, a nonaggression declaration between the north and the south has to be adopted at tripartite talks.

The United States is a signatory to the Korean Armistice Agreement. The United States refuses to hold tripartite talks because it wants to perpetuate its occupation of south Korea as a military base and a nuclear arsenal for threatening the Northeast Asian countries. Its negative attitude towards the tripartite talks can never be justified by any sophistry.

We still insist on tripartite talks, and we will continue in future to urge the United States to accept our proposal for these talks.

If we are to settle the question of the country’s reunification, we have to convince the United States authorities of the fact that we have no intention of “invading the south”.

At the moment, the American authorities are constantly putting out false propaganda that the military forces of north Korea are stronger than those of south Korea, and that a “threat of southward invasion” exists in Korea. This is nothing but a pretext for the permanent occupation of south Korea.

Chairman Ishibashi, you have remarked that it was proper for Mr. Kimura to say that there was no “threat of southward invasion”. I think he was right.

It is clear even from facts which are common knowledge that our military forces are not, in fact, stronger than those of south Korea. The population of the northern half of Korea is much smaller than that of the south; our People’s Army is less than half the strength of the south Korean puppet army. As far as military equipment is concerned, they are equipped with the latest US-made weapons.

I think that Japanese military commentators and commentators from any other country would say that the claim of our military superiority over south Korea is a lie. There are no grounds for supporting this argument.

Nevertheless, the US Congress says that our military power is greater than south Korea’s, and clamours every year for the continuation of military aid to south Korea.

Under the pretext of the fictitious “threat of southward invasion from the north”, the United States gives a huge amount of military aid to south Korea every year and carries out large-scale military exercises there. They staged the joint military exercises “Team Spirit 83” last year, and this year they staged “Team Spirit 84”, which was much larger than the previous year’s exercises. These annual military exercises have involved large forces of the US and south Korean puppet armies.

We will not invade south Korea, nor could we do it. We will not attack south Korea even in the event of an emergency in the south; we will not create any tension, but

will make unremitting efforts to reduce the existing level of tension.

The US authorities should believe that we will not invade the south. They do not believe it because they intend to maintain south Korea as a military base, and as their colony, for ever.

**TALK TO A DELEGATION  
OF THE INTERNATIONAL LIAISON  
COMMITTEE FOR INDEPENDENT  
AND PEACEFUL REUNIFICATION  
OF KOREA**

(Excerpt)

*October 11, 1985*

In an endeavour to ease tension in our country, we have advanced various proposals to the US and the south Korean side. Last year we proposed to hold tripartite talks between the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the US and south Korea. But the Americans have not responded to our proposal. So far there has been no word from the Americans.

US President Reagan demanded that the north and the south of Korea should first have talks. Taking this US demand into consideration, last April the DPRK addressed a letter to the south Korean "National Assembly" on holding north-south parliamentary talks. In the letter we proposed to the south Korean side that the north and the south hold talks of parliamentary delegates or a joint session of both parliaments to discuss the matter of making a north-south joint declaration of nonaggression. Our proposal on north-south parliamentary talks is designed to

ease tension in Korea and provide a favourable precondition for its independent, peaceful reunification through the north-south joint declaration of nonaggression.

The south Korean side put off their reply to our proposal for a long time before they suggested that the proposed talks be held, though not to discuss the problem of the joint declaration of nonaggression but rather that of instituting a “unification constitution”. In the tense situation now prevailing in our country, how can the problem of instituting a “unification constitution” be discussed at north-south parliamentary talks? Considering the opinion of the south Korean side, however, we proposed that the talks discuss both the problems of the joint declaration of nonaggression and a “unification constitution”. The south Korean side rejected that too. So we suggested that the north-south parliamentary talks simplify their agenda item and discuss the question of easing tension between north and south and promoting national reunification. The south Korean side said they would have to study our proposal as it contained something new.

The south Korean side is taking issue with us, saying that our proposal for simplifying the agenda item of the north-south parliamentary talks is not specific but too general. When we put forward the detailed agenda item of the parliamentary talks, the south Korean side criticized our proposal and would not accept it. Then, when we advance a single agenda item combining concrete problems, they do not accept it, claiming that it is vague.

The US and south Korean authorities do not agree to our proposals for tripartite talks and north-south parliamentary

talks because if, through these talks, a peace agreement is concluded between us and the United States to replace the Armistice Agreement, and a north-south joint declaration of nonaggression is made, there will be no pretext for US troops to remain in south Korea.

Alleging that there is the “threat of southward invasion” in Korea, the US clamours that its troops should remain in south Korea in order to “defend” it. If we and the US replace the Armistice Agreement with the peace agreement, and the north and south of Korea make a joint declaration of nonaggression, that would afford a legal guarantee that we would not “invade the south”.

We have declared more than once that we will not “invade the south” nor will we attempt to communize south Korea or force socialism upon it.

We hold that the country should be reunified by establishing a unified national government in which the north and the south are represented on an equal footing, on condition that the two sides recognize and tolerate each other’s ideas and social systems. However, the Americans and the south Korean puppets do not accept our just proposals, claiming that we are carrying on peace information to step up war preparations and that they do not understand our real intentions. In a word, the south Korean authorities do not want the easing of tension in our country and its reunification. They are trying to turn our country into “two Koreas” and leave south Korea to the US as its permanent military base.

# **ON OUR PEOPLE'S STRUGGLE FOR SOCIALIST CONSTRUCTION AND NATIONAL REUNIFICATION**

(Excerpt)

**Talk to a Delegation from the Communist  
Party of the United States of America**

*June 24, 1988*

We also believe that you can help us in promoting talks between the DPRK and the United States.

We hope to hold talks between the DPRK and the United States or tripartite talks with the participation of the DPRK, the US and south Korea to replace the Korean Armistice Agreement with a peace agreement and adopt a nonaggression declaration between the DPRK and south Korea. However, the US government opposes tripartite talks because of its misunderstanding of us. The US government misunderstands us because it has heard only the south Korean reactionaries or the misguided words of some foreigners who have nothing to do with the Korean question. The south Korean reactionaries cannot convey the earnest desire of the Korean people to the US government. To improve relations between the DPRK and the United States, the US government's misunderstanding of our country must be dispelled. To this end, we and the US

government must have face-to-face talks. Unless both sides sit down together, the misunderstanding cannot be removed.

I hope you will strive to hew a channel for talks between the DPRK and the United States. We can have both open and closed talks with the US government. In any case we want to create an opportunity to tell the US government directly of our Party's just stand for national reunification. We want to remove the distrust between the DPRK and the United States and ease tension in the Korean peninsula by all possible means.



**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS RAISED  
BY THE CHIEF OF THE BUREAU  
OF THE ITALIAN RADIO AND  
TELEVISION FOR THE FAR EAST**

(Excerpt)

*October 29, 1988*

**Question:** Mr. President, what are the conditions under which you consider you could hold negotiations with the next US President?

**Answer:** The US divided the homogeneous Korean nation and has imposed the suffering of national division on our people for more than 40 years. It is none other than the US that is exacerbating tension and jeopardizing peace on the Korean peninsula and obstructing Korea's reunification by pursuing the "two Koreas" policy.

The US policy towards Korea of violating the sovereignty of the Korean nation goes against the trend of the present age, which is moving towards independence. We think that it is high time for the US Government to re-examine its unreasonable Korea policy.

It is the consistent stand of the Government of our Republic to promote good-neighbourly relations with all the countries which respect our nation's sovereignty and

are friendly towards our country, irrespective of their social systems.

If the US abandons its unjust policy of obstructing our people's cause of reunification, this will herald a new phase in the relations between our country and the US.

In keeping with the trend towards detente and reconciliation, the Government of the United States must adopt practical measures to ease the tension on the Korean peninsula. If the US Government adopts such measures and shows a sincere attitude towards settling the Korean question, negotiations can be held between me and the US President.

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS  
RAISED BY THE PRESIDENT  
OF THE *KYODO* NEWS  
SERVICE OF JAPAN**

(Excerpt)

*June 1, 1991*

**Question:** Please tell us about the prospects for improving the relations between the DPRK and the US at government level, about the concluding of a peace agreement, about the nuclear issue, and about the problem of peace in Asia.

**Answer:** The abnormal relations between Korea and the United States are due entirely to the unfair policy towards Korea maintained by the US. In view of the changes taking place in the general situation today, I think it is high time for the United States to re-examine her policy towards Korea. If she genuinely supports the reunification of our country and wants to ensure peace on the Korean peninsula, there is no reason why she should not accept our proposal to replace the Armistice Agreement with a peace agreement, nor is there any question to which a solution cannot be found in the improvement of relations between Korea and the United States.

It is unreasonable for the United States to have raised

the matter of the nuclear inspection of another country while she herself has deployed a large number of nuclear weapons in south Korea and is frequently conducting nuclear war exercises that threaten our Republic. This shows that the United States has not yet discarded the outdated habit of imposing her will upon others by means of power politics.

Trying today to impose her will upon others by means of power politics is an anachronistic way of thinking. As I said in my speech at the 85th Inter-Parliamentary Conference, there can be no major or minor countries although there are large and small countries; nor can there be nations which are destined to rule or to be ruled, though there are developed and less developed nations.

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS  
RAISED BY THE DIRECTOR  
OF THE IWANAMI SHOTEN,  
PUBLISHERS, JAPAN**

(Excerpt)

*September 26, 1991*

**Question:** Your Excellency, Mr. President, you have for a long time been saying that the improvement of relations between Korea and the United States is very important in achieving the reunification of the Korean nation and in ensuring security in the Far East.

It is reported that measures to this end have been sought in recent years.

Do you have any intention to open concrete negotiations with the United States now when the cold war is ending? What are the conditions necessary for the improvement of relations between Korea and the United States?

**Answer:** Because the United States is directly responsible for the division of Korea, and the achievement of national reunification is closely related to the US policy towards Korea, our Republic has made tireless efforts to improve relations between Korea and the United States.

It is common knowledge that the division of Korea

began with the US military occupation of south Korea, and the danger of war on the Korean peninsula has been growing and great obstacles have been laid to national reunification because the US has turned south Korea into a nuclear military base.

From the point of view of justice in the international community, the present Korea-US relations are unequal.

Our Republic has never encroached upon the interests of the United States, nor can it do so. It is the United States that has always forced its will on us; we have never imposed our will on the United States.

When the two superpowers were opposed to each other, the United States could use the excuse that south Korea was necessary as a military base against communism; however, nowadays even this excuse no longer exists. Despite this, the United States, as ever, is maintaining its nuclear military base in south Korea and threatening our Republic militarily. Nevertheless, the United States insists that the Korean question should be settled by the north and south of Korea and is trying to evade its responsibility. This is a mistaken attitude which can convince nobody today.

As we have already said, there are large and small countries and developed and less developed nations in the world, but there should be no higher and lower countries nor predominant and dominated nations. We believe that the time has come when the United States should change its policy towards Korea. The American people are now demanding this, and it accords with the interests of the American and Korean peoples and with the common aspirations of the world people.

If the United States, in accordance with the trend of the times, reexamines its Korea policy and aids Korea's reunification, it will be welcomed by the Korean and world people, and a new phase will be opened in improving the relations between Korea and the United States.

Recently there has been contact between Korean and US diplomats and they have exchanged their views with each other, though on a limited scale. I think that it is a good thing. We hope that the contact between Korean and US diplomats will develop into dialogue for the signing of a peace agreement and the settling of other basic problems that exist between Korea and the United States.

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS  
RAISED BY THE MANAGING  
EDITOR OF THE JAPANESE  
NEWSPAPER ASAHI SHIMBUN**

(Excerpt)

*March 31, 1992*

**Question:** High-level talks have been held between Korea and the United States. How do you intend to develop relations with the US?

**Answer:** The United States is the very country that is directly responsible for the Korean problem, and the matter of Korea's reunification is related to US policy towards Korea. So we have been concerned about improving Korea-US relations and have made efforts to this end. The cold war is now over and a new situation is being created for the improvement of Korea-US relations. There is neither a need nor a reason for the United States to maintain its previous fallacious policy towards Korea. So high-level talks were held recently between Korea and the United States. This was of some significance in improving Korea-US relations; but it is no more than a beginning.

In future we will make continuous efforts to improve Korea-US relations. But an improvement depends entirely



on how the United States changes her policy towards Korea and how much effort she will make to improve Korea-US relations. If the United States judges the new situation and the current of historical development accurately and does not hesitate to change her policy towards Korea to meet the interests of the American people and in accordance with the aspirations of the peace-loving people the world over, the relations between Korea and the United States will improve.

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS  
RAISED BY A DELEGATION  
OF JOURNALISTS OF  
*THE WASHINGTON TIMES*  
FROM THE UNITED STATES**

(Excerpt)

*April 12, 1992*

**Question:** I see that efforts have been made recently to improve the relations between north Korea and the United States.

Mr. President, what is your view of the present relations between the two countries, and what do you hope will be done to improve the relations between your Republic and the United States?

**Answer:** Moves have recently begun to improve the relations between Korea and the United States, and this is attracting the attention of the world. The abnormal relations that have continued until now can be considered, in short, to be related to the cold war between East and West. It is natural that the matter of improving the abnormal relations has come to the fore with the end of the cold war.

Some people suggest that the end of the cold war

represents the victory of one side over the other. This can be considered to be a superficial view of a historic change. Since the cold war was a misguided competition to gain the position of superior power, now that the cold war itself has been nullified, there can be no question of the victory of one side over the other.

From the point of view of the development of world history, the end of the cold war means the nullity of power politics, and this can be viewed as a major precondition for independence to prevail in the world. If one side assumes that it has a monopoly of world power because it has defeated the other side and attempts to maintain and expand the outmoded order of domination and subjugation by means of power politics, it will not only meet the resistance of the peace-loving people of the world but also be deserted by its partners and ultimately invite its own collapse. On the other hand, if the United States, the only superpower, abandons power politics of its own accord now that the cold war has ended, and respects and implements the principles of international justice and equality, it will enjoy popular support, and the democratic progress of the international community and the cause of worldwide independence will be speeded up accordingly.

If the statesmen who are responsible for the destiny of the United States take a far-sighted view and amend their Korea policy in accordance with the trend of the present times towards independence, a smooth solution will be found to the question of improving Korea-US relations. We hope that the United States will amend its Korea policy without hesitation, make a due contribution to the peaceful

reunification of Korea and, moreover, join the historic trend towards worldwide independence.

...

**Question:** The remains of two soldiers believed to have died in the Korean war have been returned to the United States via Panmunjom during the last two years. This has given the United States a very good humanitarian impression.

I wish to learn whether there are still more remains of American war dead to be returned. The returning of their remains will be a very good sign in improving Korea-US relations.

Mr. President, would you tell me your opinion about this?

**Answer:** The Government of our Republic has, from a humanitarian stand, continued its efforts to discover such remains after returning remains in compliance with the Armistice Agreement concluded between the DPRK and the US, and in recent years it has returned several bodies. As DPRK-US relations improve, so this matter will be dealt with more satisfactorily.

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS RAISED  
BY A JOURNALIST DELEGATION  
FROM THE AMERICAN NEWSPAPER  
*THE WASHINGTON TIMES***

(Excerpt)

*April 16, 1994*

**Question:** What would it take, from your perspective, to get relations between the DPRK and the United States back on track, moving toward a peaceful resolution of all issues?

**Answer:** The joint statement agreed upon and published by the DPRK and the United States clarifies the principles of refraining from the threat and use of force, including nuclear weapons, respecting each other's sovereignty, refraining from interfering in each other's affairs and supporting the peaceful reunification of Korea. Both the DPRK and the United States must adhere to these principles and carry them out in good faith. Then, all the problems arising between the DPRK and the United States could be resolved satisfactorily.

...

**Question:** One US policy expert recently pointed out that the DPRK had been ignored for nearly half a century by the

United States but this changed with the nuclear issue.

Have you found that your nuclear programme is an important element in getting the attention of the United States and in being taken seriously by them?

**Answer:** It is well known that the United States has ignored our Republic for half a century and pursued a policy against socialism and the DPRK. It is good that, after the termination of the cold war, some far-sighted figures in the United States insist on establishing peaceful relations between the DPRK and the United States.

We are not using, as some people claim, the “nuclear issue” as a means to improve our relations with the United States. The relations between countries only improve, when they understand each other and reach agreement; they are never improved by the use of artifice by either side.

**Question:** What lies behind your nation’s seeming “on-again-off-again” approach to international inspections to which you agreed voluntarily in 1992?

**Answer:** Since the very first day, when the United States brought nuclear weapons to south Korea, we have striven to denuclearize the Korean peninsula. We acceded to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), to make the United States withdraw nuclear weapons from south Korea and effect the denuclearization of the Korean peninsula. Nevertheless, our sincere efforts were disregarded. Instead, attempts were made to violate our sovereignty through inspections, contrary to the principles stipulated in the

NPT; therefore, we were compelled to declare our withdrawal from the NPT as a measure of self-defence. Subsequently, however, as a show of our goodwill, to prove the innocence of our nuclear programme, we permitted the requisite inspections from the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA).

Certainly, some problems appear to have cropped up during the inspections, but these problems have been raised in the special circumstances, where we have suspended temporarily the effectuation of our withdrawal from the NPT. In essence, these are transitional circumstances and will be resolved of their own accord, when negotiations over the nuclear issue proceed satisfactorily in the future.

**Question:** Last month your Foreign Ministry announced that your nation may withdraw completely from the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), because IAEA inspections are “unfair.”

What will it take to resolve the nuclear issue from the DPRK’s perspective?

**Answer:** The satisfactory resolution of the nuclear issue on the Korean peninsula depends entirely on the attitudes of the parties concerned. If one side attempts to exploit the nuclear issue for its selfish goals, or if the international agency, governed by the principle of fairness, adheres to someone’s unreasonable demands, the nuclear issue will never be resolved. As mutual understanding between both sides is a precondition for negotiations, it is intolerable that one side makes its demands absolute.

The first and foremost principle for settling the nuclear issue is fairness. If fairness is ensured and there is mutual understanding, the nuclear issue will be resolved without difficulty. We have consistently stated that the issue must be resolved through dialogue and negotiations.

If the United States adopts a sincere attitude to resolving the issue, it will not be as complicated as has been made out today, and can be resolved more easily than we think.

...

**Question:** No doubt you have deeply analyzed US intentions as regards the DPRK. What is your assessment of the US position towards your nation?

What outcome is the US seeking?

**Answer:** Apparently there are still many people in the United States, who have failed to get rid of the concept of confrontation dating back to the cold war and are not willing to shake off the war psychology of the '50s. They emphasize the "alliance" with south Korea, avoid talks with us and increase the military threat and pressure upon us. I believe that all this is due to such old conceptions.

Such sections are resorting to attempts to isolate and stifle our Republic. Such a policy which runs counter to the times, is bound to fail.

**Question:** The United States has announced its intention to deploy *Patriot* missiles in south Korea.

Top defense officials have told me that they are confident that your military has accurately assessed that these are for defensive,



not offensive, purposes only. What is your assessment of this planned deployment?

**Answer:** The United States is now bringing *Patriot* missiles to south Korea and advertising them as defensive, rather than offensive, weapons. To all intents and purposes, *Patriot* missiles are war weapons, regardless of their use. Shipping them to south Korea will increase the tension in the Korean peninsula. Therefore, the south Korean people also oppose their shipment to south Korea. Nothing can justify the shipment of *Patriot* missiles to south Korea.

**Question:** Your nation has declared that the imposition of possible economic sanctions by the United Nations against north Korea would be considered “an act of war.”

What would the DPRK’s response be to such sanctions?

How damaging would sanctions be to your economy?

**Answer:** If the United States forces unwarranted pressure like “economic sanctions” upon our Republic through the UN Security Council, we will consider this to be a grave challenge.

We will never permit all manner of hostile acts, encroaching upon the sovereignty of our country. No military provocations or economic sanctions will bring us to submit or stifle us.

**Question:** The big question among experts in Washington is what does President Kim Il Sung ultimately want from the United States?

In the area of diplomatic relations? Economic relations?  
Do you have a timetable for advancing such relations?

**Answer:** An improvement in relations between countries does not mean that one side is charitable.

We do not want to improve our relations with the United States because we seek some kind of benefit from this country. We want the peoples of Korea and the United States to abandon hostile relations and establish normal relations and thereby live in peace with each other and make a contribution to peace in Asia and the rest of the world. I think it is high time that the United States discarded its hostile policy towards us and established a policy of goodwill towards Korea.

We consider it desirable to normalize relations between Korea and the United States as soon as possible.

**Question:** You have served as leader of your country through the terms of every American President since President Truman. But this is perhaps the most significant period involving relations with the United States since the Korean war.

What is your impression of President Clinton and his policy towards the DPRK?

**Answer:** I think it is significant that talks have begun between the DPRK and the United States and that agreement has been reached on important principles during the Clinton Administration. It is most important that we continue consistent and sincere efforts to bear good fruit.

**Question:** The US State Department still classifies the DPRK as a “terrorist state.”

What do you say to this accusation?

**Answer:** This is part of the policy against the DPRK. The Government of our Republic not only rejects all sorts of terrorism, but also opposes any encouragement and support for terrorists.

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS  
RAISED BY A JOURNALIST  
DELEGATION FROM  
CNN INTERNATIONAL**

(Excerpt)

*April 17, 1994*

**Question:** Do you believe that the relations between the DPRK and the US will be improved in the future? Do you have any personal message to President Clinton in this regard?

**Answer:** It is a common desire of the peoples of the DPRK and the US and the requirement of the present times to end long-standing undesirable relations between the two countries and establish normal relations. I think the present trend of international relations towards reconciliation, friendship and cooperation since the end of the cold war, must also be reflected in DPRK-US relations.

The Government of our Republic, whose basic ideal of foreign policy is independence, peace and friendship, has established good-neighbourly relations and is developing exchange and cooperation with those countries, which respect the sovereignty of our country and are friendly towards us, regardless of their social system.

We believe that the DPRK and the US can become

friends, if the US abandons its concept of confrontation with us and is ready to normalize the relations with our country by respecting the freedom of choice. The matter depends on whether or not the United States has such a political will.

We believe that if he is ready to resolve the international problems in conformity with the trend of the times, President Clinton can make a significant contribution to eliminating the vestige of the cold war from the Korean peninsula and improving the DPRK-US relations.

**EVERY MEMBER OF THE  
KOREAN NATION MUST  
SUBORDINATE EVERYTHING  
TO THE REUNIFICATION  
OF THE COUNTRY**

(Excerpt)

**Talk with a Korean Woman Journalist  
Resident in the United States**

*April 21, 1994*

As you know, unfavourable relations have existed between our country and the US for a long time. We think that the unhappy relations should be remedied and normal relations established. This is the common aspiration of the peoples of the DPRK and the US and it conforms with the trend of present times. If the US is willing to abandon the approach of confrontation with us and normalize its relations with us on the principle of respecting the freedom of choice, DPRK-US relations will surely be settled without a hitch.

In January this year the Rev. Billy Graham of the US visited our country. He brought with him a verbal message from the US President that the US wants to establish good relations with us. I told him that we also want to see relations improved and I could meet the US President at the

proper time to exchange opinions on improving relations between the two countries. Billy Graham conveyed my words to the US President on his return.

To be candid, the US has no reason to act unfavourably to us. If it tries to have a contest of strength with us, it cannot solve the problem. If it fails, it will only lose face, gaining nothing. Improving its relations with us will also be good for its image in Asia.

We are now going to hold third-stage talks with the US and, if DPRK-US relations are improved through the talks, we will be able to achieve the cause of national reunification earlier.

The issue of Korea's reunification largely depends on the Americans. South Korea is a complete colony of the US and the man in power in south Korea is no more than a puppet with its wires pulled by the Americans. While the Japanese imperialists enforced a savage sabre-like rule in Korea through their government-general, the US is now enforcing neo-colonial rule through its puppet, appeasing and threatening him. Therefore, we cannot settle the issue of national reunification if we talk only with the south Korean authorities, who have no independence and real power. For the solution of this question, we have to talk with the Americans, the real master who controls the south Korean authorities, and improve DPRK-US relations. If the relations are improved and the two countries maintain amicable relations, all problems arising in Korea's reunification will be solved smoothly.

The United States is not willing to withdraw from south Korea. It tries everything to continue remaining in south

Korea partly to contain us but more importantly to contain China, Japan and Russia by using south Korea as its military base. Americans view Germany and France as their contenders in Europe and China, Japan and Russia as their dangerous rivals in Asia. As China, Japan and Russia are adjacent to the Korean peninsula, they attach great importance to south Korea. As a matter of course, they aim to see economic profit to some extent by entrenching themselves in south Korea, but they attach greater importance to using it as their military base to contain China, Japan and Russia. They regard south Korea as a juicy morsel and will not let it go.

In order to improve relations between the DPRK and the US, it is first of all important that the Americans have a correct understanding of us.

Because of their poor knowledge of us, the Americans now misunderstand us in various ways. We do not do things harmful to others under any circumstances and we neither copy others nor do as others dictate. In the course of fighting wars against Japanese imperialism and US imperialism, and conducting an arduous struggle to build a new society, our people have come to realize through their own experiences that solving all problems arising in the revolution and construction by their own efforts and in accordance with their own conviction is best, so they do not follow others meekly. The Americans must realize that our country is a fully-fledged independent and sovereign state that does not trail behind the foreign forces. Though separated, all the people in the north are united single-hearted around the Party and the leader and solve every



problem by their own efforts; so no one dares dictate to us.

There are few countries in this world that follow the road of independence and democracy like ours. If the Americans sincerely wish independence and democracy, they have no reason not to make friends with us.

When the north and south are reunified in the future, our country will not become a satellite state subordinate to any of the big powers; it will be an independent, non-aligned and neutral state. As big countries are now covetous for our country, a reunified Korea should be a neutral state like Austria and Switzerland. If Korea, when reunified, becomes an independent, non-aligned, neutral state, it will raise no problem.

I think the Americans should also have a correct understanding of our policy on national reunification.

Some people slander us now, saying that we are trying to “reunify the country through communization”; we never intend to “communize” south Korea. We try to reunify the country through federation, leaving the ideologies and systems existing in the north and south as they are; we do not intend to turn south Korea socialist. In order to apply socialism to south Korea, the people there must accept it as their ideal and support it; forcing it upon them will bring us nowhere. Even after the reunification of the country through federation, we will not care whether south Korea follows capitalism or anti-capitalism. We are not opposed to all capitalists in south Korea without discretion. When the Rev. Mun Ik Hwan came to Pyongyang, I explained to him the proposal of federation for national reunification. Expressing his support for it, he asked me what we are

going to do with the capitalists in south Korea when federation is realized. So I told him: We are not opposed to the capitalists in south Korea in general, but the evil ones who sell the interests of the country and nation and harass the people; the south Korean young people and students are fighting, shouting the slogan, “Down with evil capitalists”; this is laudable; we are opposed only to evil capitalists and we do not reject native capitalists who sincerely aspire after the development of the country and nation; this is a stand we have maintained consistently from the days immediately after liberation. Then I related to him the gist of the speech I had made on my triumphal return to Pyongyang after liberation.

On October 14, 1945, I went to the Pyongyang Public Playground to make a speech on my triumphal return and found many people there. The number of people who came to hear my speech was so great that not only the playground but Moran Hill were white with people. I took the platform and delivered a speech without a note, appealing to the whole nation to unite and contribute positively to the work of building a new country; those with strength giving strength, those with knowledge giving knowledge and those with money giving money. I told the Rev. Mun that our people had engraved this part of my speech on a large piece of granite and erected it near the Arch of Triumph and that we would maintain this stand in the future, too. He said that he had been nervous about the issue of capitalists in south Korea and now everything was as clear as daylight.

If we force socialism upon south Korea, the foreigners

who have invested there would not be well-disposed towards us. Many countries including the United States, Japan, France, Germany and Canada have invested a considerable amount of capital in south Korea. In these circumstances, if we force socialism upon south Korea after the realization of federation, these countries would become our enemy.

As a matter of course, south Korea's economy must develop to be an independent national economy. Since it is dependent on foreign capital now, it lacks independence and is unstable. If in future south Korea fully pays its debts to the creditor countries and develops its economy by relying on its native capital, foreign countries will withdraw their capital. But it will take some time to realize this, so we are going to leave the foreign capital in south Korea untouched even when federation is implemented. Since the south Korean people are also members of the Korean nation, our stand is that they and we should live together forever in a reunified country in disregard of whether they follow capitalism or anti-capitalism.

Our contention of national reunification through federation does not aim at driving out the US troops to the last man from south Korea right now. As an agreement of reconciliation and nonaggression has been adopted between the north and south and as we have clarified that we do not intend to "communize" south Korea, it is true that the US troops' stationing in south Korea cannot be justified. The US is unwilling to pull out of south Korea as they are trying to contain China, Japan and Russia. We insist on the phased withdrawal of the US troops if they cannot

withdraw right now. If the north and south become reconciled with each other and reduce their armed forces, the US troops in south Korea must withdraw by stages accordingly. Since the north and south have agreed on the issue of nonaggression and promised not to fight each other, they need not keep large armed forces. As I frequently say, they should reduce their armed forces gradually and keep 100 000 men. By then the US troops must withdraw from south Korea completely. Nevertheless, the successive rulers of south Korea have not heeded this proposal of ours; they have increased armaments and solicited for the stationing of US troops in south Korea.

If the relations between the US and us are improved and the north and south become reconciled with each other, both parts of Korea will no longer need their respective allies. Thenceforth, we will have to rescind our alliance with China and Russia, and south Korea with the US.

*Printed in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea*

No. 198129