

TITLE PAGE

**THE DETERMINATION OF INTERNATIONAL STATUS: THE CASE OF KOREA IN
MODERN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS**

BY: BARRY KEITH GILLS

SUBMITTED FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

**LONDON SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS AND POLITICAL SCIENCE
UNIVERSITY OF LONDON**

UMI Number: U074608

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI U074608

Published by ProQuest LLC 2014. Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This work is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.



ProQuest LLC
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

THESES

F

7206

x210674856



ABSTRACT

The thesis examines the adaptive responses of North and South Korea to change in the international system and analyzes the effects on their international standing. The framework of analysis is constructed from a selective review of the literature on hegemony and its relationship to international order and change. Special attention is given to the position of peripheral states, and how they are conditioned by and respond to the international order.

The framework of analysis includes concepts such as the structure of opportunities, emulation of forms, imposition of forms, and regime rigidities. It is posited that to the degree to which a regime achieves congruence between domestic and foreign policies and the main trends in the international system, it will be more successful in enhancing its standing. In order to do so, a regime must manage its own adjustment to overcome regime rigidities and exploit opportunities for ascendance in the international system.

The thesis examines the competition for international support between North and South Korea between 1948 and 1994. It analyzes the fluctuations in the level of international support for each regime, with reference to key changes in the international system. It produces an explanation for the pattern of international support for each regime, according to the policies they pursued during each distinct period of recent international history. It is shown that North Korea did comparatively well in the first two decades after the Korean War, and that South Korea did comparatively better in the subsequent two decades. This was due to the nature of changes in the international system and the divergent adaptive responses by the two Koreas. Regime rigidities increased in North Korea, while South Korea demonstrated pragmatic flexibility, accompanying its economic diplomacy.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title Page	p. 1
Abstract.....	p. 2
Table of Contents	p. 3
Introduction.....	p. 4
Chapter One: Hegemony, International Order, and the Adaptive Responses of States in the Periphery	p. 9
Chapter Two: The Emergence of the Korean Question in the Modern International System	p. 31
Chapter Three: Post-War Reconstruction: Breaking Out of Dependence?	p. 55
Chapter Four: DPRK Diplomacy 1960-75: The Success of Third World Solidarity	p. 93
Chapter Five: South Korea's Outward Orientation 1960-75: Economic Development and the Retreat From Anti-Communism.....	p. 128
Chapter Six: Diplomatic Reversal: The Triumph of Economic Diplomacy	p. 164
Conclusions.....	p. 201
References	p. 210
Bibliography	p. 242

INTRODUCTION

This thesis explores the theme of how states acquire the quality of statehood and how they compete among themselves to acquire international support to that end. This study is undertaken by first considering this subject through the literature on international political economy and hegemony, in terms of the general problem, and then more substantially, I address the particular experiences of the two Koreas. The substantive analysis examines how their respective responses to change in the international system, in terms of both domestic and foreign policy, affect their international standing and, in turn, their international status.

International status is defined as the quality of being a state. International standing is related to status or has bearing on status, and is largely a product of the degree of international support. To that end the thesis seeks to explain the changes in the level of international support for the rival regimes of divided Korea during the post Second World War era, and systematically analyze the effects of this changing level of support on the attempt to change their respective international status.

There are two theories of the status of statehood and its acquisition. A) a state becomes a state because it establishes control over territory and people. B) A state becomes a state because it is recognised as such by other states. (1)

In the case of Korea, both claimants had fulfilled the criteria of the first theory, i.e. control over territory and people. However, the international community failed to arrive at a sufficient consensus concerning recognition. Both Korean governments claimed to be the sole legitimate representative of the entire Korean nation, though neither controlled the entire territory of pre-liberation Korea, nor had jurisdiction over the entire Korean nation. International support for the rival Korean governments tended initially to mirror Cold War alliance patterns, and the same dichotomy prevented admission of either Korea into the United Nations.

The structure of the thesis is determined by the central research goals, as above. Therefore, the thesis includes a substantial discussion of international political economy and hegemony, in order to first establish a clear analytical framework encompassing both international system change and the opportunities for manoeuvrability by peripheral states such as Korea. A brief account is given of the historical background, but sufficient to explain key elements of the Korean Question, e.g. colonisation, liberation, and the character of the Korean War.

Subsequent chapters analyze the political economy of diplomacy, alternatively discussing

North and South Korean policies. This analysis is embellished with material on their domestic political economy. These chapters focus heavily on relations with diplomatic partners in the Third World. This is because the Cold War division on the Korean Question among major powers was quite rigid. Therefore, the primary sphere for increasing the level of international support was in the Third World, among the emerging nations. The political activity surrounding the UN and its annual debate on the Korean Question is another major topic, since it was central to the competition over status. The thesis concludes with observations on adaptability, international change, and international standing and status.

The central hypothesis bearing on the differential outcomes of North and South Korean policies is that "regime rigidities" are a key determining factor, which over the long run decides the success or failure of domestic and foreign policies. By regime rigidities, I mean factors that prevent a state from taking advantage of opportunities in the structure of the international system - through successful adaptation, or that cause a failure to modernise and develop by adjusting appropriately to the changing domestic and external environment. The fluctuations in the level of international support for the rival regimes in Korea cannot be properly understood except by analysis of the larger context of international change.

The level of international support for each regime is the primary measure of its international standing, and thus a measure of its status. The fluctuations in the level of international support for the rival regimes of Korea since 1948 are a product of the interplay of domestic and foreign policies on the one hand, with the main trends of change in the international system on the other. This thesis systematically explores this long term relationship between internal and external variables, and on this basis analyses the outcomes of the competition for international status.

The fluctuating level of international support for the rival regimes is partly a function of the degree of correspondence or "fit" between domestic and foreign policies and the main trends of change in the international system. When the correspondence between domestic and foreign policies and the main trends of change in the international system is good, the level of international support can be expected to increase. When the correspondence is poor, the level of international support should be expected to decline.

Thus, it is the capacity of each regime to adapt to the main current of change in the international system that should be the decisive factor in determining the outcome of the competition for international standing and status. The ability to adapt successfully is in turn dependent on the degree of regime rigidity and upon positive action to reduce such rigidities.

North Korea's domestic and foreign policies have been remarkably consistent since the mid-1950s. Its adaptability to change in the international system has, however, been relatively poor since the mid-1970s. To understand first the impressive gains of North Korea in the international system during the 1950s and the 1960s it is necessary to examine the correspondence between North Korea's domestic and foreign policies and key currents of international change from the mid-1950s to the mid-1970s, such as the systemic trends toward decolonisation, universality in the membership criteria of the United Nations, national liberation and socialist revolution in the Third World, and the growth of Third World solidarity as a significant force in world politics. This correspondence resulted in a dramatic increase in the level of international support for North Korea, thus enhancing North Korea's international standing.

The equally dramatic decline in the level of international support for North Korea during the period from the late 1970s to the present can be explained by the failure of North Korea to adapt successfully to new dominant trends in the international system, such as liberalisation, marketisation, privatisation, and the decline of national liberation, socialist revolution, and Third World solidarity. This poor correspondence between North Korea's domestic and foreign policies and the main trends of change in the international system is largely the result of its increasing regime rigidities. This increasing level of regime rigidity can, in turn, partly be explained as a consequence of the requirements of reproducing the Kim Il Sung regime.

South Korea, in contrast, has been less consistent over the long term in the formulation of its domestic and foreign policies. Nevertheless, South Korea has been much more capable than the North of adapting successfully to main currents of change in the international system since the mid-1970s. South Korea had significant initial political and diplomatic advantages in the competition for international support, largely a result of US hegemonic influence in the international system and the supportive role played by the United Nations, i.e. the tendency to give greater support to South Korea and exclude North Korea from UN participation.

Despite these favourable factors, South Korea did not fully exploit its initial advantages and subsequently suffered a relative decline in its level of international support, as North Korea significantly increased its level of international support in the 1960s and 1970s. The relative decline in the level of support for South Korea during the 1960s-1970s can be explained by the rather poor political and diplomatic adaptability of the ROK during this period, in contrast to its economic adaptability. This slowness to adapt during this period was largely a consequence of South Korea's commitment to anti-communist ideology and to its special

relationship with the US. This ideological and political rigidity by South Korea reduced the correspondence between its domestic and foreign policies and main trends in the international system. Particularly during the era of the Vietnam War (approximately from 1964-1975), South Korea's anti-communist ideology damaged its international standing.

The high levels of international support for South Korea in the 1980s and 1990s can be explained as a consequence of the progressive elimination of anti-communist ideological elements in foreign policy. This facilitated the adoption of a pragmatic trade-oriented foreign policy to accompany the strategy of export-led industrialisation. The significant reduction of regime rigidities by South Korea after 1979, and the consequently good correspondence between its domestic and foreign policies and the main trends of change in the international system (i.e. liberalisation, marketisation, privatisation, and the decline of liberation, socialist and Third World solidarity movements), combined to produce increased international support and eventually enhancement of international status, i.e. membership in the United Nations.

II. Methodology

International support can be measured by both quantitative and qualitative methods. The key quantitative index of international support is the number of full diplomatic partners. Secondly, the number of votes received on draft resolutions in the United Nations on the Korean Question is a key index of the level of international support. The number of high level diplomatic missions despatched and received is another useful measure. International support can be qualitatively assessed by interpreting the pattern and content of diplomatic relations over time, in substantive terms, i.e. to assess the quality and nature of support as opposed to mere quantity of partnerships.

International standing can be quantitatively measured by such indices as the number of memberships in international or inter-governmental organisations, and attendance at important international conferences or meetings. It can be qualitatively assessed by interpreting the pattern and content of participation in the institutions of the international system. The central forum for claims to international status in this case is the United Nations, particularly the General Assembly, representing the community of states. Full membership in the UN, since it is based on the principle of universality, is a key indicator of international status. This explains why so much of the two Koreas' competition for international standing and status focused on political processes in the UN.

To gather the data to make this assessment of the level of international support and the affects on international status, I have consulted a very broad range of source material. Wherever possible I have relied first on primary sources in preference to secondary

sources. These primary sources take a variety of forms, including official diplomatic documents and records in the Korean language, and a large number of interviews at high level in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Korea, conducted in 1986 and 1990. I have supplemented this material with a wide variety of secondary sources.

Chapter One: Hegemony, International Order, and the Adaptive Responses of States in the Periphery

I. Introduction

The subject of the two Koreas' adaptations to change in the international system will first be addressed through an exploration of the literature in terms of the general problem, i.e. how peripheral states adapt to changing circumstances in the international system. This will be attempted through a selective review of literature on hegemony, as it relates to the problem of how non-hegemonic peripheral states adapt to international change.

At the heart of International Relations is an enquiry into the nature of international order. Thus, the subject is embedded in international history. Indeed, there can be no international relations theory without international history. There is an extensive literature on hegemony, mostly pre-occupied with the attributes and character of the great powers and hegemonic state(s). This thesis addresses a gap in the study of hegemony and international order and change by focusing on how the less powerful states adapt to changing hegemonic orders.

In addressing the question of how peripheral states adapt to international change, two main elements are explored: 1) how hegemony conditions international order; and 2) how non-hegemonic states respond to changes in international order, as conditioned by hegemonic influences.

It is therefore necessary to first establish the nature of hegemonic order; i.e., the constitution of each distinctive hegemonic order, and the transition from one hegemonic order to another. The argument will then proceed to the next set of questions; i.e., what are the effects of shifts in hegemony on non-hegemonic states? How do such states adapt to the changing norms, economic, political, strategic, and ideological pressures and influences that arise through participation in the international system? What factors account for successful adaptation or unsuccessful adaptation?

The framework of analysis that emerges from the literature review is deployed throughout the remainder of the thesis, and re-examined in the conclusions. In this manner, the structure of the thesis moves from the general, to the particular, and back to the general.

II. Hegemony and International Order

The concept of hegemonic order has been gaining increasing centrality in International Relations literature. The notion of hegemony has perhaps become the most debated term in International Relations literature in recent years (1). The word itself is derived from the

Greek "hegemon", which simply means "leader". Some scholars use the term in a very general sense to mean the domination exercised by great powers over weaker states. However, hegemony has recently been developed into a special concept, with a variety of meanings. A number of scholars now refer to a hegemonic cycle, usually based on the notion that one state ascends to a pre-eminent position in the inter-state hierarchy, holds this pre-eminent position for a time, and eventually declines and is succeeded by another power.

Two notions seem to predominate in the literature on hegemony. First, hegemony is increasingly regarded as being as much about economic power as it is about military power, while also involving leadership exercised in terms of guiding norms or values. Secondly, it is usually held that hegemony passes from one power to another in a succession from "like to like" in so far as the attributes of each hegemonic power are held to be very similar - if not identical. The same usually applies to the functions in the international system the hegemon is held to perform.

The concept of hegemony was perhaps first suggested as a central organising principle by Martin Wight, who collaborated with Arnold Toynbee on A Study of History through volume VII (2). Wight drew upon Toynbee's comparative analysis of "Universal States" in Volume VI of A Study of History, developing an interest in the comparative study of historical hegemonic sequences in actual historical states-systems. Unlike realists such as Hans Morgenthau, Wight does not seek to present "a systematic theory of the goals of all states" in the abstract. Rather, he analyzes the "system of states", a concept Wight borrowed from Pufendorf's De Systematibus Civitatum. Wight concluded that "most states-systems have ended in a universal empire, which has swallowed all the states of the system." (3)

Hedley Bull, following Wight, stresses the historical process whereby "the expansion of the European states system all over the globe, and its transformation into a states system of global dimension" dominates modern international history. (4) Bull and Watson characterise this same process as the "expansion of international society" whereby the norms and the state-forms of the European states-system became universal. (5)

An international society, according to Bull and Watson, rests upon a sense of culturally defined sets of shared "common rules and institutions for the conduct of their relations." (6)

This process implies that the nature of international society, conceived of as a cultural nexus of norms and state-forms, is inextricably related to Wight's "succession of hegemonies". This is so in the sense that what determines the dominant culture of the

international system is the character of the dominant state(s) (7).

According to Bull and Watson, what was most distinctive about the European regional states-system was that it "came to repudiate any hegemonial principle and regard itself as a society of states that were sovereign or independent." Yet, at the global level, the European states established "a number of empires which, while they were rival and competing, taken together amounted to a European hegemony over the rest of the world, which in the nineteenth century became an immense periphery looking to a European centre." (8) As the centre of the new global states-system, Europe affirmed its hegemony vis a vis the non-European periphery. (9) Bull and Watson contend that this historical process "united the whole world into a single economic, strategic, and political system for the first time", i.e. Europe exercised the first "world hegemony." (10)

An even more realist view of hegemony is represented in the work of Modelski and Thompson, who operationalize "world leadership" through indices of military power. Though they do incorporate economic and technological factors in their analysis, their primary criterion is naval power, used for "global reach" (11), which are the keys to achieving control over and benefit from world trade. In Modelski's analysis there is a "strong association between the world power and the lead economy." (12)

Modelski rejects the idea that international relations are "anarchic", and suggests that order has been embodied in the "succession of orders of leadership".

Modelski insists that his concept of world leadership should be kept clearly distinct from any definition of hegemony as mere domination. He regards such dominationist hegemony as a deviant form, at either regional or global level. More importantly, he argues that the succession of states holding the world leadership position shapes the character of world order. (13) In Modelski's view, modern world order has been characterised by the rise of the nation-state to dominance in the inter-state system. Furthermore, each particular world power has special characteristics that become defining elements in successive world orders. A world power is defined as one which virtually monopolizes, by virtue of extreme power concentration, the function of keeping order at world scale.

Paul Kennedy's study of the process of the rise and decline of great powers likewise acknowledges a direct link between economic and military-political power over the past five centuries. In Kennedy's formulation, military-imperial power is ultimately unsustainable without a sufficient base of economic power. When a great power's military-imperial project grows too much larger than its economic base can sustain, it suffers historical decline from such imperial over-stretch. (14)

Robert O. Keohane also defines hegemony at global scale using a combination of economic and power criteria. According to Keohane, a hegemon "must have control over raw materials, control over sources of capital, control over markets, and competitive advantages in the production of highly valued goods." (15) Keohane's criticisms of hegemonic stability theory sparked off an important debate on the decline of the United States as a global hegemonic power and its relation to weakening the liberal or open international trading regime. (16)

Hegemonic stability theory posits a positive relationship between hegemony and world economic stability, with benefits for all members of the international system. This perspective is derived from earlier work by Charles Kindleberger. (17) Kindleberger explained the cause of the Great Depression as the lack of a global hegemon. When a hegemonic state provides leadership, however, it stamps its authority upon the states system. In order to do so, it must be willing to bear system-maintaining costs. This gives rise to the notion of hegemony as a benign institution providing a "public good" to the system.

In Kindleberger's view, the hegemonic power must be voluntarily willing to assume the burdens of world leadership. Merely to have a potentially hegemonic structure of international resources does not automatically produce hegemonic stability, since the potential hegemonic power may choose to pursue self-interested or free-rider policies, for example the United States' international economic policies in the 1920s and 1930s.

Kindleberger, Krasner, and Gilpin (18) are associated with an interpretation of hegemony whereby "open international economic structures are causally associated with hegemonic distribution of state power. Hegemonic powers, in other words, give rise to strong international regimes." (19) Krasner defines hegemony as a system "in which there is a single state that is much larger and relatively more advanced than its trading partners." (20) He contends that a hegemonic distribution of potential economic power "is likely to result in an open trading structure." (21)

Robert Gilpin is particularly concerned with the burdens on the hegemon of providing public goods, and the problem of the free rider(s) in the system. Gilpin has developed an elegant and persuasive analysis of the role of "uneven development" in generating change in the international system. Competition is the underlying force that animates the historical process of uneven development. Established industrial centres are eventually challenged by the ascendance of new industrial areas. This economic competition directly affects the relative power of states and their position in the international system.

Gilpin's formulation of the process of international change is central to our concerns here

about peripheral adaptability.

According to Gilpin, "...more than anything else it is the nature of the society and its policies that determine its position in the international division of labour." Furthermore, "Economic nationalism reflects the desire of the periphery to possess and control an independent industrial core... to transform the international division of labour through industrialization..." (22)

This is an explicit formulation of a strategy of "upward mobility" within the international system. Moreover, the opportunity for the periphery to ascend within the international system may vary according to the phase of international order. For instance, the cyclical expansion and contraction in the world economy should be taken into account. According to Gilpin:

"periods of extraordinary growth coincided with the eras of British and American economic and political hegemony and ... periods of slower but still good growth paralleled the decline of these hegemonies. The period of terrible growth was the interregnum between these two eras of hegemonic leadership. Whatever the causal relationships, a strong association certainly exists between relative rates of economic growth and the global political structure...these erratic economic shifts have been global phenomena. Originating in the core economies, their effects have been transmitted through the market mechanism... The periods of expansion and contraction have also been associated with profound shifts in the structure of the international economic and political system."

(Gilpin 1987:104-105)

Central to these international changes is the process Gilpin refers to as "catching-up", whereby technologies and industries in leading sectors, pioneered by a more advanced centre, are adopted by ascending economies. For example, continental Europe, the US, and Japan, ascended in the international hierarchy during the period of rapid growth 1853-1873 by emulating British industrialization. Similarly, under post-war American hegemony and rapid growth, Europe, Japan, and the NICs ascended by adopting technologies pioneered by the United States in the preceding inter-war period.

Most importantly, "...the completion of the catching-up process and the slowing of the global rate of economic growth stimulate forces of economic nationalism", giving rise to increasing economic protectionism, the decline of hegemony and of free trade. (23) There is a "traumatic experience" approximately every fifty years. Following Schumpeter, Gilpin argues that innovation is central to understanding the long waves in the international political economy:

"The clustering of technological innovation in time and space helps explain both the uneven growth among nations and the rise and decline of hegemonic powers. The innovative hegemon becomes the core of the international economy and, as the most efficient and competitive economy, has a powerful incentive to encourage and maintain the rules of a liberal open world economy. As it loses its inventiveness, the declining hegemon is unable to maintain an open world and may even retreat into trade protectionism. For a time, the declining centre (or centres) of growth is unable to sustain the momentum of the world economy and the rising centre is unable or reluctant to assume this responsibility. Periods of slowing rates of growth appear to be associated with the shift from one set of leading industrial sectors and centres of economic growth to another and with the transition from one hegemonic leader to the next."

(Gilpin 1987:109)

Furthermore, **"Structural crises...appear to be an inherent feature of the modern world political economy."** Such structural crises entail **"transitions from one global industrial structure to another"** and are **"characterized by intensive commercial conflict."** (24) Gilpin cites the late nineteenth century, the 1920s, and the 1980s as such periods of intense competition and structural crisis.

Therefore, given that peripheral states must adapt to these cyclical conditions in the international political economy, we may hypothesise that rapid ascendance may be more likely in periods of "catching-up", when technologies are being diffused, the world economy grows at a fairly rapid rate, and the hegemon sustains a liberal international trade regime. It is precisely these conditions that generally characterise the period of the rapid ascendance of Korea from the periphery, through state-led industrialisation, from the late 1950s to the early 1970s. Restructuring or regime change, on the other hand, are more likely, or necessary, during the intensely competitive structural crises. Again, the late 19th century, the 1920s, and the 1980s were each periods in which Korea experienced profound restructuring or regime adjustments.

Gilpin argues that international order has been characterised by **"successive rises of powerful states that have governed the system and determined the patterns of international interaction and established the rules of the system. Thus the essence of systems change involves the replacement of a declining dominant power by a rising dominant power."** (25)

Gilpin follows Toynbee (26) in identifying the fundamental **"tendency of the locus of power to shift from the centre to the periphery of an international system"** and **"the tendency for technology and inventiveness to diffuse from dominant power to peripheral states (which in turn become dominant powers of an enlarged international system)."** (27) This leads to

historically grounded theory of international change based on "the occurrence of fundamental shifts in the locus of political and economic power." (28) Gilpin looks not only to changes in the production structure, infrastructural and logistical development, but also to changes in "social formation" to explain long term, large scale transformations in world politics. Following Samir Amin (29), Gilpin puts emphasis on the special characteristics of different social formations, which "influences the distribution of wealth and power within societies as well as the mechanism for the distribution of wealth and power among societies." (Gilpin 1981:108).

By extension, we may assume that the specific characteristics of the hegemon's social formation directly affect the character of the hegemonic order it constructs. Moreover, we can assume that as a peripheral state makes the transition from an agrarian to an industrial social formation, its political organisation will also change, toward the modern nation-state form. Likewise, its position in the international system may undergo significant change in this process.

Critics of hegemonic stability theory challenge the notion that the world economy requires a hegemon to function well. Keohane explored the hypothesis that there could be cooperation "after hegemony", on the basis of well entrenched international norms and institutions, as well as over-riding mutual interests in sustaining the system. (30) Susan Strange developed the concept "structural power", based on security, production, finance, and knowledge structures, in response to the prevailing notions of relative power. (31) Strange deploys this framework to bolster her argument that "the United States government and the corporations dependent upon it have not in fact lost structural power in and over the system." (32) Both Keohane and Strange "disaggregate" hegemony into components.

This debate hinges on the perceived economic capabilities of the hegemon. Some define hegemony by incorporating very specific economic criteria. For instance, in Immanuel Wallerstein's view (33), a single core power achieves supremacy, sequentially, in the spheres of production, commerce, and finally finance. In the historical moment when a single core power is supreme in all three economic spheres, it holds the hegemonic position in the world-system. Wallerstein contends that as "soon as a state becomes truly hegemonic, it begins to decline", but he ascribes this decline as due more to the relative gains of other states than to absolute, internally generated decline.

Wallerstein considers hegemony to be a rare condition and a temporary historical moment: "...there is only a short moment in time when a given core power can manifest simultaneously productive, commercial, and financial superiority over all other core

powers. This momentary summit is what we call hegemony." (emphasis added) (34)

The emergence of each hegemony is followed by a "major restructuring of the interstate system...in a form consonant with the need for relative stability of the now hegemonic power." (35) For Wallerstein, hegemony exists when "one power can largely impose its rules and its wishes (at the very least by effective veto power) in the economic, political, military, diplomatic, and even cultural arenas." (36)

Wallerstein emphasises similarities in the attributes of successive hegemonic states, including being economically strong enough to champion free trade. From the world-system perspective, economic processes are ultimately determining of the hegemonic sequence. The world-economy is structurally differentiated into a hierarchy of strong core-states and weak peripheral states. Between them is a zone called the semi-periphery, a zone combining elements of core and periphery simultaneously. Like Gilpin, Wallerstein offers a concept of upward mobility by the semi-periphery. Industrialisation is implicitly the key to successful ascendance from (semi) periphery to core status.

A.G. Frank, a co-founder of the world-systems approach, developed a distinctive view of the process of "world accumulation," accompanied by a characteristic pattern of economic expansion and contraction at world scale. (37) This approach has recently been further developed by Gills and Frank. (38) They take the whole world economic system as the unit of analysis and focus on the locus of capital accumulation as the key to shifts in hegemonic power. Gills and Frank define hegemony as:

"...a hierarchical structure of accumulation between classes and states, mediated by force. A hierarchy of centres of accumulation and polities is established that apportions a privileged share of surplus, and the political economic power to this end, to the hegemonic centre/state and its ruling/propertied classes."

(Gills and Frank 1990:321, Gills and Frank 1991:94).

From this perspective the primary object and principal economic incentive of a bid for hegemony is the attempt to restructure the regional, if not the over-arching global, system of accumulation, in a way that privileges the hegemonic state and its elite for capital accumulation. The economic and military-political processes involved in hegemonic cycles are "so integral as to constitute a single process rather than two separate ones." (39)

According to Gills and Frank, hegemony is more than just a hierarchy of power among states. It is a complex pyramid of actors and social forces operating at many levels of social organisation. This interpretation owes something to the conception of social power

developed by Michael Mann (40) which shies away even from the notion of a single "society", in favour of complex over-lapping networks of social organisation. It also shares affinities to the neo-Gramscian perspective. (41)

In Gills and Frank's formulation, the apex of a hegemonic order is not occupied simply by "a state", but by the elite, organised in a ruling coalition. The classes in this ruling coalition are dispersed both in the centre, or core state(s), and in the periphery. Inter-elite relations within a hegemonic pyramid always combine elements of cooperation and subordination, competition and harmony, among contending interests. Therefore a hegemonic coalition is not necessarily stable over the long term. This instability in the hegemonic coalition is a source of dynamic change in the international system.

Much of the existing literature on hegemony defends a single-hegemon model, assuming hegemony can only be exercised by a single state over an entire international system. However, this single hegemon model is too much an "ideal type" and not a very accurate description of the normal situation, which is "non-hegemonic." This situation can be called "inter-linking hegemonies", i.e. where several hegemonic networks inter-act, over-lap, or inter-penetrate.

Only on rather rare historic occasions do we find that, among the inter-linked hegemonies, there is one single global hegemonic power. Such an exceptional case can be described as a "super-hegemon", which engages in "super-accumulation" in the world economy. Therefore, though a state can be said to be hegemonic, it does not control the entire international system, but rather only exercises influence, *primus inter pares*, vis a vis the other, inter-linked, hegemonic powers. The concept of inter-linking hegemonies stresses the limitations on hegemonic influence.

A general summary of long cycle theories (including Gilpin's) would include the idea that the international system is characterised by an incessant competitive struggle for capital accumulation/wealth creation and its concentration via a hierarchy of state power. As the locus of capital accumulation and wealth shifts, so does the locus of hegemonic power. Established hegemonic/centre states are challenged by ascending centres and would-be hegemons, seeking wealth and power. Periods of consolidated hegemonies normally correspond with periods of economic expansion and flourishing international exchange. Periods of the (simultaneous) decline of established hegemons and increasing inter-state rivalry are associated with economic contraction and dislocation, or at least slower growth. Peripheral and semi-peripheral states are very directly affected by these systemic rhythms. Industrialisation is the key to ascendance within the international hierarchy of wealth creation and power.

Gills and Frank, Modelski, Gilpin, and Wallerstein all share the view that "position" in the international division of labour and within the world accumulation process is the key to "position" within the hierarchy of states. For peripheral states and "late industrialisers", the role of the state in initiating or organising the industrialisation process is often of central importance.

Neo-realist interpretations of the hierarchy of power, when based on unequal distribution of power capabilities among states (42) employ a paradigm that treats states as if each were a completely separate, discrete entity, even in the economic sphere. But, as the literature on interdependence argues, no contemporary state is impermeable or discrete, as all participate increasingly in global processes of production, exchange, and global governance. (43) This is the case even for a hegemonic state, where, for instance, the relation of the United States to other states is one of "asymmetrical interdependence." (44)

All of the approaches above discuss the economic processes of power. Robert Cox, however, places less emphasis on the capital accumulation/wealth process and more on ideological, cultural and political factors in his innovative analysis of hegemony. Cox grounds his conception of hegemony, as opposed to domination, in the works of Antonio Gramsci. According to Cox, "To the extent that the consensual aspect of power is in the forefront, hegemony prevails. Coercion is always latent but is only applied in marginal, deviant cases." (45)

Following Gramsci, the key to understanding hegemony is through the concept of the "historic bloc" (Blocco storico), which in Cox's view "cannot exist without a hegemonic social class." Moreover, "Where the hegemonic class is the dominant class in a country or social formation, the state (in Gramsci's enlarged concept) maintains cohesion and identity within the bloc through the propagation of a common culture." (46) Within the historic bloc there is a "complex contradictory and discordant ensemble of the superstructures...the reflection of the ensemble of the social relations of production." (47)

In the Gramscian formulation, hegemony is not exercised by a single state or group of core states, but by a class or group of class fractions (48). "Capitalist hegemony" of the type Gramsci discussed on the national level, is most stable in the core states, and less so in the peripheral states, where more use of coercion is the norm. (49)

Hegemonic consciousness "brings the interests of the leading class into harmony with those of subordinate classes and incorporates these other interests into an ideology expressed in universal terms." (50) When applied at the international level, this concept provides an

interesting analytical tool for distinguishing forms of international order from one another, based on the role of coercion versus consensus, universal norms, and international organisations.

Following Cox, Gill and Law argue that effective hegemonic power consolidation requires a long-term strategy and a vision of "self-reproducing structural power, both economic and ideological." (51) Over time, the necessity for the use of coercion declines "as consensus builds up on the basis of shared values, ideas and material interests on the part of both ruling and subordinate classes." (52) The full consolidation of hegemony does not occur until "such ideas and institutions come to be seen as natural and legitimate...embedded in the frameworks of thought of the politically and economically significant parts of the population", to the extent that even conceiving of an alternative order becomes rather difficult. (53)

Gilpin's work on hegemony, discussed above, becomes all the more interesting when set alongside that of Cox. In Cox's analysis, "...those states which are powerful are precisely those which have undergone a profound social and economic revolution and have most fully worked out the consequences of this revolution in the form of the state and of social relations." (54) Cox notes that great powers "have relative freedom to determine their foreign policies in response to domestic interests", but that "the economic life of subordinate nations is penetrated by and intertwined with that of powerful nations." (Cox 1993:59)

Therefore, peripheral states experience domestic transformation quite differently than stronger states. Change in the peripheral states is less generated by endogenous factors, and more "a reflection of international developments which transmit their ideological currents to the periphery." (55) "World-time" and especially industrial sequencing, whereby some states are early industrialisers and others "late", plays an important role in determining the character of industrialisation and the role of the state in economic development. (56) It also brings about far-reaching change in the hierarchy in the international system.

Viewed via this approach, states that have undergone a prior industrialisation and concomitant development of the modern state have a distinct power advantage over those that have not yet undergone such a transformation. Different streams of socio-historical time exist among the different states. (57) These different streams of socio-historical time correspond to different national development trajectories and social formations. When the streams merge there is usually an important transformation.

Historically, once some states had undergone the fundamental transformation to industrial

modernity their presence in the international order transformed that order and impinged upon the "structure of opportunities" for other states. As William H. McNeill has shown (58), industrialisation enabled states to expand their capacities for war-making and thus had a profound effect on the conduct of international relations.

All states in the international system must adapt to the global currents of industrialisation or pay the penalties of relative backwardness. As Gautam Sen argues, in terms of military competition and security, industrialisation has penetrated the arena of economic policy and produced a special pattern of national economic development in certain industrial sectors. (59) Because industrialism is the ultimate basis for modern national independence and military power, it generates a desire on the part of states to promote industrialisation, even if based on importation of foreign technology. Thus, as explained by Gilpin, "The less developed economy attempts to acquire the most advanced technology from the hegemonic power and from other highly developed economies...The follower has the great advantage, moreover, of being able to skip economic stages and to overtake the industrial leader." (60)

However, this pattern gives rise to "highly homogeneous industrial structures" that may cause conflict in sectors with global over-capacity. According to Gilpin, "generation of surplus capacity in the world economy is intimately related to the process of the relative decline of the hegemon, intensified trade competition, and the onset of a global economic crisis." (61) The more rapid the rise of industrial challengers, in terms of the rate of capturing market share and thus surplus, the greater the potential dislocation and disruption in the established hegemonic order. For example, the rapid industrialisation of South Korea can be analyzed as part of the broader rise of the East Asian NICs and Japan in the world economy. According to Gilpin, this contributed to a disequilibrium that threatened to undermine the liberal trading system, accompanied by intensifying economic competition.

The potential for disruptive change is a problem for the relatively "backward" regimes as well. For example, Theda Skocpol has analyzed the relationship between international and domestic determinants of change. She focuses on the "relatively backward" or late developers and argues that those states which fail to adapt successfully to external military threats, international economic competition, and the adjustments needed in domestic class/political relations are most likely to experience a social revolution. (62) She explains both the modern Russian and Chinese revolutions in these terms. Peter Gourevitch likewise concentrates on analyzing how international competitive pressures affect domestic regime change. Failure to adapt successfully to these external pressures may result in social revolution or authoritarianisation of the state. (63)

From the discussion above, firstly we may conclude that each distinctive hegemonic order has a character and structure historically specific to it. This historical specificity extends to the prevailing forms of production, exchange, class relations, ideology, state formation, and importantly, to the forms, norms, and discourse of diplomacy and inter-state relations.

Hegemonic order is not merely a hierarchy among states, but implies much more. Hegemonic order affects the states and societies within it in profound ways, reaching even to the organisation of everyday life, and to the ethical and practical world-view of all its participants. As argued by the Gramscians, the ultimate source of the prevailing forms in a hegemonic order is the ruling class or dominant/hegemonic class of the hegemonic state.
(64)

Secondly, the processes of international order can be understood as a succession of hegemonies and/or hegemonic phases of order. (65) I argue that this whole world-historical process of change can be understood as "hegemonic transition". (66) The hegemonic transition reflects the underlying rhythm of competition in the international system, which encompasses economic, political, military, and ideological/cultural dimensions. Therefore, this concept is broader than the usual observations on the rise and fall of great powers or empires. (67) Change in the international system, over the "longue duree", and at the scale of the whole system, is essentially about hegemonic transitions.

This follows from the idea that hegemonic transitions are not merely positional, but entail profound socio-economic restructuring, not only for the hegemon(s) but for all the participants in the international system. Hegemonic transition is a historical process wherein the centres of power and the centres of (capital) accumulation/wealth shift location, bringing adjustments in the inter-state system, re-arrangement of centre-periphery structures, and concomitant transformations of domestic structures, both economic and socio-political.

Hegemonic transition entails a perpetual process of penetration and transformation among states and social formations. I argue that "This constant process of societal restructuring should be recognised as the real subject matter of the discipline of international relations." (68) This paradigm shift away from realism toward sociological perspectives in international political economy focuses on the processes of transformation themselves, rather than upon questions of relative power.

When these ideas are accepted, this generates a structural framework of international order which moves us away from the single centre-periphery hierarchy, or a single hegemonic centre state. This is a new model of a multi-centric or multi-core global

structure, with a complex map of over-lapping centre-periphery relationships and multiple "hegemonic" states.

Janet Abu-Lughod supports this position, that the world system is not always dominated by a single hegemon, but can be characterised by co-existing core powers (or inter-linked hegemonies). (69) Therefore, hegemonic transition should not be interpreted as a process of absolute rise and fall. Rather, over the course of change some nations, or groups of nations, gain relative power vis-a-vis others. They occasionally succeed in "setting the terms of their interactions with subordinates." This is a "rise". Conversely, the loss of such a (temporary) advantageous position is a "decline." (70)

Therefore, hegemonic transitions are not simply a repetitive cycle in the sense that the single hegemon succession models imply. Each distinct historical period has certain conditions and characteristics that make it different from preceding periods, despite other continuities. Hegemonic power is attained, consolidated, and exercised in different ways in different periods, with different kinds of effects on those incorporated into the hegemony.

Hegemony certainly implies more than a mere hierarchy among "power containers". Hegemonic order exists "within a world economy with a dominant mode of production which penetrates into all countries and links into other subordinate social relationships which connect the social classes of the different countries." (71) Furthermore, hegemony encompasses "a social structure, an economic structure, and a political structure..." (72)

Finally, hegemony is expressed in universal norms and institutions which "lay down general rules of behaviour for states and for those forces of civil society that act across national boundaries..." (73) To be universal in conception, it must not merely exploit other states or transparently express only a national interest. The states incorporated into the hegemonic order must find some aspect of it compatible with their own interests. (74)

Cox's periodisation of modern hegemonic phases (75) is very similar to Robert Gilpin's. (76) These schema associate British hegemony with the period of rapid growth from 1853 to 1873 and the expansion of free trade; followed by growing economic nationalism and protectionism, and finally war, depression, and war again. American hegemony coincided with rapid economic growth in the 1950s and 1960s, followed by a period of increasing competition and protectionism.

Most models imply that hegemonic order is "normal" and that non-hegemonic order is therefore a deviation from the norm. (77) Indeed, Hedley Bull argued that "...in the broad sweep of human history, indeed, the form of the states-system has been the exception rather

than the rule." (78) However, in reality there have been just as many periods of non-hegemonic order as of hegemonic. (79) The history of the past 150 years seems to bear this out, since the "fully" hegemonic periods are a mere four decades out of some fifteen decades. (1850s-1870s; and 1950s-1960s).

III. Hegemonic Order and Responses by Peripheral States

The point above has a bearing on how we view the opportunities of peripheral states to adapt to, and even to ascend in, the international hierarchy. Even hegemonic periods are marked by fluidity, and potential for change, innovation, emulation, and adaptation. During non-hegemonic periods, the international "structure of opportunities" may allow greater room for manoeuvre for more states than during hegemonic periods. However, even when relations are more asymmetrical, as in a hegemonic period, certain states will benefit disproportionately from the opportunities - particularly ascending industrial states.

As Cox argues, world orders are grounded in social relations, so that "A significant structural change in world order is accordingly, likely to be traceable to some fundamental change in social relations and in the national political orders which correspond to national structures of social relations." (80) States, both as local power containers and as the framework for development in its broadest sense, can be conceptualised as standing like a Janus-faced gate-keeper between the realms of the domestic socio-political order and the realms of transnational and international relations. (81)

States must manoeuvre for advantage, and even for survival, in relation to other states. It is this dialectic which gives rise to perpetual mutual penetration and transformative dynamics among states. As states are domestically transformed by participating in the transnational processes of world development, these changes in turn contribute to change in the character of the international order itself. In this way the seemingly opposed interpretations of international and domestic change represented by Cox and Skocpol could be reconciled.

Following Peter Taylor, we can posit a "double-Janus" model of the state, whereby it simultaneously looks inward to the domestic sphere and outward to the international sphere, looks backward to historical consciousness of the nation and forward to the future. In this sense, focus on any single "state-society" is inappropriate, since "We cannot understand social change by focusing on the dynamics of any one state-society, because such change can be adequately comprehended only as part of the larger whole." (82)

In world-system theory there are multiple states, but they exist as a superstructure resting on one single world-economy. Therefore, each national-state presides over only an "economy-fragment" of the world-economy. This should be modified to take account of the

drives for nationalistic development in states.

Thus, "Each economy-fragment is different from others, which results in different opportunities and constraints for state manoeuvrability over time that relate to the different state trajectories we observe in the world-system... The policies pursued by states are integral to the periodic restructuring of the world-economy." (83)

In pursuing their nationalistic goals, states reproduce similar industrial structures, and this contributes to global industrial restructuring. For example, the NIC first pursues "nationalist policies in order to protect its infant industries and overcome the advantages possessed by the earlier industrializers." Thereafter, "...it must attempt to break into world markets to achieve efficient economies of scale and to obtain foreign currency to finance imports of required resources and capital goods." As a consequence, "To the extent that this industrialization is successful, the developing economy... undercuts the industrial position of the more advanced economies." The result is global industrial over-capacity, intensifying economic competition, and global structural crisis. (84)

Periodic restructuring in the world economy can be conceptualised through two mutually co-determining cycles. These are: A) the expansion/contraction cycles of the world economy, (sometimes referred to as Kondratieff long waves, or alternatively as Schumpeterian clusters of innovations); and B) the hegemonic/leadership cycle. The extensive literature on the relationship between economic and hegemonic cycles has been comprehensively reviewed by Goldstein, and by Chase-Dunn. (85)

The problem with most of these approaches is that they continue to deploy a basically realist notion of the state. Alternatively, we can dis-aggregate our notion of the state. The transformative dynamic is mediated via a variety of social forces, elite interactions, and transnational class contacts. Political processes are not confined to or solely located at the level of the state, nor are international relations, by extension merely a matter of inter-governmental political relations. (86)

Though such a broad extension of political analysis is somewhat beyond the scope of the present enquiry, any extreme "over-realist reification" of the state which presents the state as a homogeneous bloc and obscures the social action "underneath" should be avoided. It is precisely these social forces within the state that account for much of its adaptive dynamism. Conversely, the blocking of these social forces by state elites can produce regime rigidities that inhibit adaptive dynamism. An excessive preoccupation with the state as a unitary actor hides a multitude of sins relevant to understanding why a state fails to adapt successfully to the challenges of a changing international order.

Furthermore, it is also necessary to correct realism's assumption on the power-efficacy of hegemonic states. The hegemonic state may be able, to some extent, to translate its own norms and transform conventions and forms at the international level according its own needs, but the ability of non-hegemonic or peripheral states to resist or to individually interpret the hegemonic "wind" in international change is also "real" and must be taken into account. The process of incorporation of weaker states into a hegemonic order should not be analyzed too deterministically, as if all interactions are merely "top-down" in nature. Options do exist. Policy choices are made, albeit within constraints. Social forces can and do sometimes make a significant "difference" in the course of these domestic adaptations to hegemonic influence.

Not only do the elite of non-hegemonic states have options concerning how to adapt to external hegemonic influences, but likewise, so do other social forces. The timing of the entry of social forces into the arena of regime change deserves special attention. Both North and South Korea underwent profound internal change prior to their subsequent rapid industrialisation. The role of social forces, particularly of the labour and peasant movements, should certainly not be ignored when analyzing how peripheral states adapt to international change.

Emulation and Imposition of Forms

The national manifestation of underlying competitive dynamics in the international system can be analyzed in two different forms. First, there is "emulation", whereby forms (either economic, social, political, or ideological) from one state are consciously and voluntarily imitated by another state in pursuit of anticipated advantages. Secondly, there is "imposition" of forms, which occurs through coercion or domination. In the case of emulation, the more powerful state acts as a model to be followed, whereas in the case of imposition the more powerful state forces the less powerful to develop in a particular way, usually in order to serve its own interests.

At certain moments in international history the role of force is overt and plays a crucial role in destroying old forms and making way for the reconstruction of state and society, and of international order itself. The direct source of this application of force may be external, i.e. emanating from the international arena, or internal, in the form of civil war, revolution, rebellion, etc. Indeed, emulation may be a preventative technique to avoid an otherwise predictable or inevitable imposition of forms, or a revolution from below.

The Structure of Opportunities and Regime Rigidities

I will employ two further concepts in my discussion of adaptation to hegemonic order(s) by peripheral states. These are: (A) "the structure of opportunities" and (B) "regime rigidities". The structure of opportunities refers to the manoeuvrability available to individual states, wherein economic and political choices are conditioned by the international environment. Each particular international order and each particular point in time provides a different structure of opportunities. These are not evenly distributed among all states (i.e. not equally available to all), but are differentially allocated according to pre-existing international position and other factors, such as selectivity on the part of global power holders when granting opportunities to less powerful states.

Regime rigidities is a concept that refers to how internal structures and institutions specific to each state and its socio-economic formation may constitute obstacles to adaptation within the international structure of opportunities. Every state has some regime rigidities. These constitute a force resistant to change, or holding back dynamism in development. If regime rigidities are too great, the result will be a failure to modernise or develop successfully, the consequences of which can be very severe in terms of international standing.

Many factors may prevent a state from overcoming regime rigidities and adapting successfully to the changing domestic and external environment. Among these factors are: bureaucratic inertia, ideological or other dogmatism, corruption among the power elite, functionally weak states, and domestic heterogeneity or excessive regional differentiation. In addition, and perhaps most strategically, any fetters on technological advance could constitute regime rigidities.

The character of elite power is worthy of particular attention. For instance, an entrenched elite may attempt to preserve its interests by preserving a specific socio-economic and political system which reproduces those interests. If the elite puts its own self-preservation ahead of the "national interest" of the state, the resultant regime rigidities will hinder its successful adaptation to key international trends.

When an entrenched elite can only preserve its interests by blocking social dynamism and adaptation, the result is stagnation and eventually "relative backwardness". In this process the state eventually suffers a decline, i.e. "descends" in the international hierarchy. It may also suffer a legitimacy crisis as a result. In such circumstances, a social revolution may be the factor which can restore adaptive dynamism.

By contrast, successful adaptation by the incumbent regime is an art of managing the reduction of regime rigidities so as to balance the tension between preserving elite interests and sustaining the conditions for dynamism and development. This is not easy. Tremendous difficulties present themselves in the course of social, economic, and political restructuring. The natural tendency to inertia by privileged interests and established institutions does not automatically, or easily, give way to the necessary or objective interests of adaptation in the national interest. Nor is it straightforward or automatic that any elite is capable of "correctly" perceiving the "objective" situation and making the "right" policy choices.

It is my working hypothesis that even peripheral states have the possibility of exploiting the structure of opportunities in ways that may be advantageous to their own interests. However, they must do so by continually managing change so as to reduce regime rigidities. Successful adaptation, and thus a good correspondence with the prevailing conditions of the international system, brings certain rewards in regard to enhancing international standing. Unsuccessful adaptation, and thus a poor correspondence with prevailing conditions in the international system, usually brings historical punishment, i.e. unfavourable outcomes in terms of international standing. In short, to the extent to which the state can create a congruence between domestic and foreign policy (a positive balance) it will be more successful both domestically and internationally.

IV. East Asian International Orders

East Asia has had a distinctive regional framework of political processes for millennia. Like virtually all other distinct regions it has demonstrated a tendency to alternate between periods of hegemonic/imperial order and periods of multi-polar states systems or multi-actor civilisations. (87) In this seemingly universal dialectic of alternating forms of international order, contradictions inherent in each form of order generate structural dynamics that eventually produce social-systemic transformation.

The concept of hegemonic order can be applied to East Asian history, with certain qualifications. Traditionally, imperial order was more common than hegemonic order, but neither were more common than non-hegemonic or non-imperial order. In the modern period, Sino-centric imperial order collapsed under pressure from predatory Western powers. It was replaced by a non-hegemonic and highly conflictual regional order.

The past century and a half in East Asia has been full of war, rivalry, revolution and conflict. The West, however, never established a unified imperial or hegemonic framework over all of East Asia. Yet a modernised Japan attempted to do so in the mid-twentieth century. Actually, Japan's attempt was imperial, in a modern form, rather than truly hegemonic, despite its overtures in the direction of attempting Gramscian hegemony, such

as propaganda appeals to Pan-Asianism and co-prosperity.

Japan's ascendance from the periphery was predicated on a profound revolutionary transformation. This successful adaptation by Japan occurred prior to adopting a new strategy of ascendance via industrialisation and imperial expansion. Japan's challenge to both the crumbling Sino-centric international order and to the rival Western colonial powers disrupted the regional status quo. It contributed to social upheaval and conflict throughout the region. The Japanese project ended in failure but left an important legacy of nascent industrialisation and strong states in some of the areas it had controlled, such as Korea.

The American-Soviet "bigemony" after 1945 could be interpreted as an attempt to create modern hegemonic frameworks in the region, though in this case dominated by superpowers which were both essentially external to the region and its culture. Both the US and the USSR attempted to present their project in terms of universal values. In post-war Asia, US geopolitical goals emphasised the security of capitalist states and capitalist relations of production, whereas Soviet goals promoted the expansion of communism in the region.

The US influence in the region contributed directly to the re-habilitation of the Japanese economy, the creation of capitalist states in Taiwan and South Korea, and subsequently to the re-integration of these capitalist economies on a regional basis. This reconstruction involved establishing a new relationship with class coalition partners in Asia, stressing anti-communism and security, while later tolerating the neo-mercantilism of East Asian NICs. This was more possible given the expansion of world trade and production under American hegemony. It was during this initial post-war US hegemony that Korea, like Taiwan, adopted an export oriented economic strategy and succeeded in achieving rapid and sustained economic growth under authoritarian government.

However, the Pax Americana was also characterised by Cold War alliance rigidities. Precisely because the US-USSR confrontation dominated the global political and strategic scene in the 1950s and 1960s, the rival Korean regimes had little choice but to initially emulate their patrons and cultivate ties of dependency. Later, however, as Cold War rigidities decreased, both turned to an active Third World diplomacy in search of new international support.

A shift in global industrial structure was part of the hegemonic transition beginning in the late 1960s. This transition caused very important changes in foreign policy, by both great powers and peripheral states. For instance, the communist sphere was largely closed to the

West until the early 1970s, when China accepted rapprochement with the US and Japan. At about the same time many other communist governments adopted a policy of economic opening to the West. This policy shift was symptomatic of the period of the gradual decline of US hegemony. It reflected the trend toward increasing multipolarity.

By the beginning of the 1980s this trend was accelerated and deeply entrenched. US hegemonic power concentration was reduced due to the full recovery of Western Europe and Japan, and the rise of the NICs. The hegemonic transition entailed a changed global industrial structure, marked by over-capacity in many sectors, widespread and often deep restructuring, and increased pressure on the liberal international trading system.

The period of American hegemony in Asia lasted until approximately the end of the Vietnam War, followed by increasing multipolarity in the region, as Soviet influence decreased, American military power retrenched, Japan and China re-emerged as important powers, and the combined economic impact of East Asian industrialisation elicited neo-protectionist responses by the US and Western Europe. Nevertheless, even in the period of increasing multipolarity, the United States retained some hegemonic influence in East Asia, most effectively deployed in bilateral relations. Such was the success of the East Asian NICs, that by the mid-1980s the US increasingly pressured its East Asian partners to open their markets. The US also pressed for structural reforms designed to reduce its chronic trade deficit with East Asia.

In summary, the modern era in East Asia may be represented schematically as follows:

- 1. Sino-centric imperial order (the Qing empire and its tributaries; in crisis from the middle of the 19th century)**
- 2. Non-hegemonic "dual" system (after the penetration by Western powers and co-existence of the Eastern and Western international systems)**
- 3. Nippono-centric imperial order (Japan as the primary great power and industrial centre of the region)**
- 4. Non-hegemonic interregnum (Soviet-American attempts to enter the power vacuum left by Japan's collapse, revolutionary upheavals throughout the continent)**
- 5. Soviet-American bigemony (Cold War alliance blocs and partition of East Asia, eroding with Sino-Soviet dispute and resurgence of China and Japan)**
- 6. Non-hegemonic multipolar order (Sino-American rapprochement, Sino-Japanese rapprochement, growing multipolarism, global shift in American hegemonic power, ascendance of Japan, NICs, and China)**

In the chapters to follow I will analyze the case study of Korea from the point of view of how the peripheral state adapts to changing phases of order in the international system. The analysis will entail discussion of changing hegemonic order and the domestic responses to change, following the schema of East Asian international order outlined above. This study focuses particularly on foreign policy behaviour, viewed as a reflection of domestic structure and the process of development, and as a key means of altering international standing.

Chapter Two: The Emergence of the Korean Question in the Modern International System

Introduction

This chapter provides historical background to the post 1953 competition between rival Koreas. It explains the historical emergence of the modern Korean Question and identifies its key aspects. It includes discussion of the loss of sovereignty by Yi dynasty Korea, the liberation and occupation of Korea, and the political/diplomatic stages of the Korean War. An attempt is made to demonstrate the applicability of the analytical framework elaborated in the previous chapter to such a long term history of international status.

Part One: The Failure of Reform and Loss of Sovereignty

I. Korea in the Sino-centric International System

In the traditional Sino-centric world order Korea occupied a special position in the tributary system. According to M. Frederick Nelson, "In her relationship to China, Korea stood for centuries as the most perfect example of the peculiar Confucian order of Far Eastern international relations which preceded the Western state system." (1)

So long as Korea's monarchy fulfilled ritual tributary obligations to the Chinese imperial throne, Korea was free to manage its own affairs. In return, China offered protection.

By the 19th century the power of China was fundamentally challenged by Western powers, eager for economic and imperial expansion. After China's humiliating defeat in the Opium War (1840-42), and the imposition by the West of "unequal treaties", the tributary system slowly collapsed. The West imposed its own system of international relations based on contractual treaty law and the doctrine of the sovereign equality of states. In practice, and paradoxically, this new system often imposed severe forms of subordination rather than equality. From 1860 onward Western powers began the active dismemberment of the Chinese imperium.

When the Western onslaught shattered the framework of the tributary system, the fate of each East Asian state was largely determined by two factors : A) the extent and direction of Western interests and B) the nature of the domestic response to the Western challenge. Of all the East Asian states, Japan responded most successfully. The Meiji restoration brought about far-reaching social, economic, political and military reorganisation along Western lines. In Korea, the last of the important East Asian states to be opened to the West, the domestic response failed to measure up to the international challenge. It is this failure which in itself largely determined the status of Korea for many decades to follow. Partly due to Chinese protection, Korea remained isolated from the West during the heyday of British hegemony and rapid global growth from 1853-1873. Unfortunately, it was "opened"

during the subsequent international period of waning British hegemony, slower economic growth, and increasing economic nationalism and imperial rivalry.

Many years were consumed, however, in an effort by the West, and later Japan, to clarify Korea's legal status under international law. The purpose was to "free" Korea from the tributary system in order to "open" it. Frederick Foo Chien defines Korea's international position in that period as one of a "dependent state" defined as one having almost complete control over domestic affairs, but subject to a degree of dependency upon another state in relations with third states. (2) Chien correctly points out the difference between this and the "suzerain-vassal" concept preferred by the West when describing the tributary relationship. Likewise, in Frederick Nelson's view, Korea's dependence on China actually allowed Korea more autonomy than the analogous Western concepts of protectorate or colony.

Korea's final chance for reform within the tributary system occurred during the reign of the Taewongun (1864-73). While sovereignty still existed the state might undertake modernising reform. The Taewongun attempted to strengthen the monarchy, the state, and the economy, but did so entirely within a traditional conservative framework (6), thus ensuring its failure.

This and subsequent failures led to tragic consequences with enduring historical legacy. Korea's regime rigidities, largely the consequence of the power of its landed elite, obstructed urgently necessary reform and weakened the state. Thereby, Korea's sovereignty was jeopardised and it became an object of great power rivalries. China's attempts to "protect" Korea eventually led to war for control of the peninsula.

For a time Korea's status was in limbo, a grey area of "dual status", simultaneously tributary and "sovereign". According to Martina Deuchler, China failed to comprehend that "the Confucian concept of suzerain-state vis a vis vassal-state could not be equated with state sovereignty as set forth by modern international law." (4) Rather than interpreting the Sino-Japanese treaty of 1871, the first modern treaty between Asian powers, as a sign that China was "oblivious to changing circumstances of the time" (5), it is equally plausible to conclude that China's actual intention was to use Western international law to protect its suzerainty over tributaries like Korea.

In 1876 Japanese envoy Mori Arinori declared that Korea was an independent state. (6) China replied that "Korea has always been a dependent state of China and the word dependent is synonymous with the word subordination." (7) Nevertheless, it was through China's auspices that Korea entered into its first modern treaty, the Treaty of Kangwha,

signed on 27 February, 1876. (8) This "unequal treaty" included provisions for extra-territoriality, opening three Korean ports, freedom to conduct commerce without restriction, and exchange of envoys, but did not include a most-favoured-nation clause. Martina Deuchler argues that the treaty: "revolutionized Korean-Japanese relations and ended Korea's centuries-old domination of this relationship....Japan initiated a reorientation of the traditional balance of power." (9)

The period between 1876 and 1895 was characterised by Sino-Japanese rivalry over Korea in the context of the widening of Korea's treaty relations with Western states. Paradoxically, the deeper was Korea's incorporation into the new system the more compromised its sovereignty became. As international rivalries intensified so did foreign interference. It became virtually impossible for Korea to manage its own affairs autonomously. From 1876 to 1882 King Kojong again undertook limited reform, but, given conservative intransigence and the monarchy's weakness, these reforms barely touched the basic social and economic structure.

To offset the growing influence of Japan, China "advised" Korea to enter into modern treaties with Western powers, a policy known as "Ch'in Chung Kuo, Chieh Jih-pen, Lien Mei-kuo" or "intimate ties with China, friendship with Japan, and alliance with the USA". (10) Ironically, once Korea was formally incorporated into the modern treaty system, China abandoned its traditional restraint and began to act more like a modern colonial power. Li Hung Chang, in charge of China's foreign affairs in this period, arrogantly declared in 1883: "I am King of Korea whenever I think the interests of China require me to assert that prerogative."

Whereas China allied itself to conservatism in Korea, Japan initially identified its interests with progressive liberal reformists. Japan hoped to reverse China's position in Korea through support for the Kapsin coup of 4 December, 1884, carried out by pro-Japanese reformers led by Kim, Ok-Kyun, a disciple of the Japanese liberal, Fukuzawa. (11) The Kapsin coup was decisively crushed by Chinese military intervention.

Japan and China reached an understanding on Korea on 18 April, 1885 in the Convention of Tientsin; essentially a co-protectorate. By establishing an equal right to intervene in Korea, Japan confirmed that China no longer had sole claim to suzerainty. According to Frederick Foo Chien, the year 1885 "witnessed the beginning of an international scramble for control" in East Asia (12). General Yuan Shih Kai was sent to Korea as the first "Director-General Resident in Korea of Diplomatic and Commercial Relations" (13), a title with transparent colonial overtones. Kim Dalchoong argues that China's overtly imperialist policies in Korea after 1885 were the definitive end to any hope of successful indigenous

Korean efforts at modernisation. (14)

During the period of the Sino-Japanese "co-protectorate" over Korea from 1885 to 1894, China and Japan were the two primary economic contenders in Korea. China engaged in a concerted effort to undermine Japan's commanding position in the Korean market. According to Andrew C. Nahm, from 1885 to 1892, China's share of Korea's imports increased from a mere 19 percent to 45 percent, while Japan's market share dropped from a high of 81 percent to 55 per cent. (15) By 1893, on the eve of war with Japan, China's share of the Korean market was almost equal to that of Japan.

Japanese policy in Korea underwent re-evaluation in 1893. The conciliatory policy toward China was seen as allowing too much Chinese ascendancy. Japan was also increasingly concerned over the expansion of Russian interests in the region. The impending completion of the trans-Siberian railway created a sense of urgency in Japan. (16) Thirdly, Japan was aware that a revolt by the peasant-based Tonghak sect was brewing in Korea, which might further destabilise the peninsula.

Japan issued an ultimatum to Korea on 28 June, 1894 demanding to know: "are you a tributary?" and seized control of Kyongbok palace in Seoul on 24 July, forcing Korea to sign an agreement authorising Japan to expel all Chinese forces. On 16 August, 1894 Korea was forced to unilaterally abrogate all agreements binding Korea to China, and on 26 August signed a new Treaty of Alliance with Japan, pledging Japan to "maintain the independence of Korea" and expel the Chinese. Under Japanese guidance, King Kojong promulgated sweeping measures in 1895 known since as the Kabo Reform. These measures were primarily designed to modernise and centralise the administration, but included the formal abolition of tributary relations to China.

The Sino-Japanese war was a decisive victory for Japan in every respect. (17) The full extent of Japanese ambitions were revealed in the Treaty of Shimonoseki, signed on 17 April, 1895. (18) Japan demanded and won huge concessions from China including: the independence of Korea, the cession of Formosa, the Pescadores, Liaotung peninsula, and most significantly, of Port Arthur. China agreed to pay a large war indemnity and grant Japan a new treaty of commerce giving Japan the right to open factories inside China for industrial production and open more ports.

II. Korea as an "Independent" Buffer State

The destruction of Korea's tributary relationship to China confirmed its independent status. However, this independence was more nominal than real, and dependent on the emerging power relations between Japan and Russia. With the sudden demise of Chinese power, a scramble for spheres of influence broke out among the contending powers in the

region. Globally, this was a period of high imperialism, but also rapid economic growth, unlike the preceding period 1872-1893; a downswing. Japan's rapid ascent via victory in the Sino-Japanese war set off a series of systemic power adjustments in the region. These developments can be summarised in three broad phases as follows:

Phase One: "Restraining Japanese Power"

Russia, France and Germany, in the Triple Intervention on 23 April, 1895, being alarmed by the possible consequences to the status quo of Japan's regional ascendance, acted to limit the gains Japan reaped from its victory over China. Japan was forced to return Liaotung and pledge to honour Korean independence. A pro-Russian government was installed in Seoul in February 1896, after the assassination of Queen Min by Japan and the flight of King Kojong to the Russian legation. Both China, which fell quickly under Russian protection, and Russia itself viewed Korea's independence, i.e. preventing Korea becoming a protectorate of Japan, as being vital to protecting Manchuria and thus to the very survival of the Qing dynasty. (19) As "compensation", Russia extracted lucrative economic concessions from Korea, and China as well.

Phase Two: "Bipolar Accommodation"

Japan and Russia entered into a series of negotiations to stabilise their spheres of influence, producing three agreements between 1896 and 1898. These were: the Komura-Waeber Memorandum (14 May 1896); the Lobanov-Yamagata agreement (9 June, 1896); and the Nishi-Rosen agreement (25 April, 1898). In preliminary discussions Russia and Japan agreed that Korea was "incapable of being independent". Therefore it was necessary to "find a modus vivendi for allowing Korea to exist". (20) The result was a tacit co-protectorate over Korea, preserving formal independence and establishing it as a buffer state. Russian imperial aims in Korea were primarily strategic, though Japan's were both strategic and economic. Contrary to the spirit of the tacit co-protectorate with Japan, Russia soon acquired the exclusive right to provide the Korean government with advisers.

Phase Three: "Restraining Russian Power"

Russia leased Port Arthur from China on 27 March, 1898, thus altering the regional balance of power in its favour. Partly to conciliate Japan, Russia withdrew all assistance and military advisers in Korea and closed the Russo-Korean Bank (21). Russia's "indispensable condition" for a new agreement with Japan remained the same, i.e., preservation of Korea's "full independence". The main theme of negotiations was a proposal for a trade-off of spheres between Japan and Russia, known as "Man Kan Kokan", essentially exchanging a recognised Russian sphere in Manchuria for an exclusive Japanese sphere in Korea. The Russian military vetoed acceptance of Man Kan Kokan because it regarded any exclusive Japanese strategic domination in Korea as a permanent

threat to the security of Russia's Maritime Province. (22) Korea itself attempted to revive a dormant proposal for an international guarantee of its neutrality, but this was not taken seriously by the powers concerned. (23) Following the Boxer rebellion in 1900, Japan, backed by Britain via the Anglo-Japanese alliance of 1902, and other Western powers, acted to check Russian expansion. Russian expansion in Manchuria was viewed as a threat to the status quo. In the Komura-Rosen talks of 1903 Japan decided to settle the matter of Korea's international status by pressing Russia for recognition of Japan's paramount rights in Korea. Russia's refusal to accept Japanese strategic rights in Korea led to the Russo-Japanese War in 1904-5.

III. The Fall of Yi Dynasty Korea

When the Russo-Japanese War broke out in February, 1904, with a Japanese pre-emptive strike against Port Arthur, the first casualty was Korea's neutrality. The good will of the "disinterested" powers proved to be ephemeral. In retrospect the previous thirty years of Korean diplomacy with the Western powers could thus be judged to have ended in complete failure. As in 1894, Japan instantly seized control of Seoul, and imposed a new protocol whereby Japan promised to guarantee the independence and territorial integrity of the "Korean empire". Once again, this was actually a writ to drive the rival power, this time Russia, out of Korea - in the name of Korean independence, and thereafter to dominate Korea rather than to liberate it.

This protocol allowed Japan to legally garrison the entire Korean peninsula and expel all Russians. All previous agreements with Russia were declared null and void. By August, 1904, Korea had agreed to accept Japanese appointed Finance and Foreign Affairs Ministers, and was required to consult with Japan prior to concluding any future treaties with other powers, including the granting of economic concessions or contracts. Thus a puppet government was created of "government by advisers". The envoys of the Korean emperor deployed abroad were recalled to Seoul permanently. This signalled to other powers that Korea was no longer in control of its own external affairs.

The defeat of Russia by Japan (24) resulted in a radically new configuration of power in the region. Japan emerged as the potential successor to China. Indicative of the diplomacy of the age, Japan's claim over Korea was consolidated via several secret agreements on the division of imperial spheres between Japan and the Western powers. In the Taft-Katsura Agreement of July, 1905, the USA accepted Japan's control over Korea as the quid pro quo for Japan's reciprocal recognition of US control over its new colony the Philippines, recently acquired through war with Spain. In the renewal of the Anglo-Japanese alliance in August, 1905, Britain recognised Japan's right to take measures for the "guidance, control and protection" of Korea, whereas Japan would respect Britain's

interests in China, Southeast Asia, and even India.

Taken together, these bilateral undertakings reveal a triangular entente between Japan, Britain, and the USA aimed at a new mutual accommodation of interests in Asia. The new power configuration is best understood in the context of the Treaty of Portsmouth between Japan and Russia, which provided a general settlement of the war. Japan's gains were considerable, including acquiring half of Sakhalin Island, possession of Port Arthur and Dairen, an equal right with Russia to economic penetration of Manchuria, and clear paramountcy in Korea.

These agreements cleared the way for a colonial administration in Korea. Between 1905 and 1910, imperial Japan inexorably dismantled the old Korean state through sweeping reforms, the manipulation of the monarchy, and the brutal suppression of a war of national resistance fought by Korean partisans. Korean sovereignty was formally surrendered in 1910 and Korea became a mere appendage of the Japanese empire. It did not have an opportunity to regain sovereignty until liberation from the Japanese in 1945.

IV. Conclusion

As the Sino-centric order collapsed under pressure from the Western states-system, the Korean elite failed to take advantage of opportunities for adaptation. In contrast to Japan, where a revolution created a modern centralised and industrialising state which thus protected Japan's sovereignty, Korea suffered from extreme regime rigidity. Given the high concentration of power in the hands of the landed elite and their hold over the state bureaucracy, reform was extremely difficult. The monarchy was essentially conservative and refused to confront the issue of expropriating and redistributing the wealth and property of the landed oligarchy. Progressive elements in the regime attempted to seize state power and carry out radical reforms but were blocked by an alliance of reactionaries and the Chinese. Popular impetus for revolutionary social change was also blocked by an alliance of reactionaries, the monarchy, and foreign powers. Korea's position as a tributary to China might have been the key factor blocking the possibilities of reform. China itself was under leadership that rejected modernisation except in an ad hoc fashion.

In response to Western intrusions into Asia, the Qing dynasty broke its long held policy of non-interference in Korea's internal affairs and adopted an essentially colonialist policy toward Korea. Thus the state remained essentially unchanged and extremely weak. Once penetrated by foreign powers, Korea endured a series of pathetic puppet cabinets and endless court intrigue. Next, it suffered two wars on its soil between the rival powers between 1894 and 1905. Finally, it became first a formal protectorate and then suffered annexation by imperial Japan.

Korean economic and political development were deeply affected by Japanese colonialism. On the positive side, the legacy was one of extensive infrastructural, industrial, and bureaucratic development. On the negative side, Korean political development was distorted or stunted, lacking experience with an autonomous civil society. When liberation came in 1945, the role of new social forces, such as the industrial working class, the nationalist and communists movements, peasant, youth, and women's organisations, were crucial to the politics of transition from a colonial to a post-colonial society. However, the transformative agency of these new social forces was constrained within a new power framework established by the US and USSR.

Part Two: Liberation, Partition, and War

I. Introduction

This section examines how the dramatic international change at the end of the Second World war affected Korea. It analyses the nature of political intervention by the occupying powers and its effects on the restoration of Korea's sovereignty. The period of occupation was characterised by the imposition of new social, economic, and political forms, leaving little room for autonomous development. National division weakened Korean sovereignty by creating a permanent source of political tension, ideological polarisation, and military confrontation between rival Korean regimes.

World economic crisis in the 1930s, and general war in the 1940s, led to global reorganisation at war's end. In East Asia the central features of this reorganisation were the sudden collapse of the Japanese imperium and the rush by the rival superpowers to fill the power vacuum. The new geopolitical framework in Asia emphasised self-determination and the use of hegemonic as opposed to imperial methods. This was, however, accompanied by revolutionary upheaval by nationalist and communist forces throughout the region, with China as the epicentre.

The position of Korea in the post-war international order was directly affected by these regional conditions. The defeat of Japan transformed Korea's international status from colony to occupied territory, divided between American and Soviet spheres. Like much of the Asian continent, Korea was convulsed by revolutionary upheaval, social and economic crisis, and eventually civil war. The shattered dream of immediate independence in a unified national state died hard among Korean nationalists and communists alike.

The political characteristics of this new period of hegemonic order were quite different than those of the preceding imperial period. Both the US and USSR were supporters of dismantling the Japanese empire and restoring Korean sovereignty. The Americans wanted two essential characteristics in regimes within their sphere: anti-communist forces in control of the state, and freedom for private capital. The Soviet Union, in contrast, required a communist or socialist party in power, and a nationalised economic base. These conflicting requirements made any national reunification of Korea extremely problematic.

The regional situation in Northeast Asia was only one aspect of a new global rivalry. The United States sought to restructure the world so that a liberal capitalist order could flourish and within it American interests on world scale. In order to fulfil the global designs of an emergent US hegemony, the US soon found itself committed to a scale of intervention that was truly formidable. Nevertheless, the reorganisation of Asia was as pivotal to America's global hegemonic project as was the reorganisation of Europe. The investment of resources the US made in post-war Asia was immense by any standard, including its involvement in occupation, reconstruction, and war, followed by a long-term commitment to economic and military assistance to client regimes.

II. Liberation and Occupation in Korea

The sudden collapse of the Japanese imperium created a situation of extreme social, economic and political disruption in Korea. Not only were the integrated direct linkages with the Japanese metropole severed, but the vital industrial, energy, and food transfers between North and South Korea were also ruptured, increasing the local chaos. US policies in South Korea tended at first to make a bad situation worse, whereas in North Korea there was a swifter and more successful reconstruction.

During the war the anti-Japanese powers had not recognised a Korean government-in-exile. US Secretary of State Cordell Hull advocated a policy of non-recognition of the Korean Provisional Government (KPG) or any other body making similar claims. President Roosevelt and Secretary of State Cordell Hull developed a proposal for a four power trusteeship over Korea, to be administered jointly by the US, USSR, Britain and China. (25)

In March, 1943 Roosevelt began discussions on the trusteeship with Britain and the USSR. At the Cairo Conference in November, 1943, at Chiang Kai-shek's initiative, (26) The Cairo Declaration specifically committed the allies to restore the independence of Korea. The phrase used was: "mindful of the enslavement of the people of Korea, (the allied powers) are determined that in due course Korea shall become free and independent." (emphasis added) (27) The KPG, and other Korean nationalists, responded with alarm to the phrase "in due course". (28)

The great powers met in a series of war-time conferences and discussed Korea's post-war fate at each of them. In Teheran in November, 1943, Roosevelt, Churchill and Stalin discussed the trusteeship together for the first time. The USSR tentatively agreed to the trusteeship, seeking a larger role for the USSR in post-war Asia. At Yalta in February, 1945, the allies reached tacit agreement that no foreign troops should be permanently stationed in Korea; therefore Korea's neutrality would be internationally guaranteed. Such an agreement presumably applied to either a joint foreign administration or an independent Korean state. (29) In talks between Stalin and Harry Hopkins in Moscow from 26 May to 6 June, 1945, the trusteeship was shortened to five years, with a four power administration based on equal representation among all four powers, with minimal occupation forces.

Unfortunately, the trusteeship plan was never formally approved in any written binding agreement, and this was its undoing. When President Roosevelt died and was succeeded by Harry Truman, US policy on Korea abruptly changed course, irrevocably damaging the trusteeship proposal. Truman jettisoned the US State Department's plans for joint occupation of Korea as a single zone. (30) Above all, it was probably the successful testing of the atomic bomb in July, 1945 that led Truman to advocate a "temporary" military occupation of Korea in separate occupation zones. (31)

According to Soo Sung Cho, "Although it was officially maintained that American troops entered Korea only to facilitate the surrender of the Japanese forces, the primary objective of the proposal was to prevent Soviet occupation of the entire peninsula", which was considered a threat to Japan's security. (32) Peter Lowe argues Truman was "strengthening American interests vis-a-vis Russia, which included restricting the amount of territory to be occupied by the Soviet Union". (33)

Though Korea was a de facto partitioned country, it was not a divided state in de jure terms until 1948. In principle, the possibility of reunification of the occupation zones into a single national government existed throughout 1945-48. The irony of this period is that the US re-introduced the trusteeship proposal soon after military occupation began, as a means of negotiating the conditions for restoring Korean sovereignty and establishing a unified national government.

The reason the US returned to the trusteeship idea had the same rationale as its earlier unilateral abandonment, i.e. to limit the scope for exclusive Soviet influence. For the USSR, returning to the trusteeship idea was a welcome diplomatic means of eliminating the exclusive zone of American influence in the South. Given these motives, the trusteeship

negotiations were doomed to failure from the outset.

The outcome of the Soviet-American negotiations can also be explained by the disparity in political advantages in the region. The Soviet Union had significant political advantage, due to the revolutionary tenor of the time and to the presence of trained Korean cadres in the Soviet occupation force. The colonial period had produced a dispossessed peasantry and a militant working class, social forces that tipped the domestic political balance to the left. The popular demands of the period were for independence in a unified republic, land for the peasantry, employment at a living wage for workers, and punishment of collaborators, many of whom were conservatives.

The United States, in contrast, was totally unprepared for the revolutionary situation that characterised post-colonial Korea. In effect, the US occupation in South Korea was an attempt to establish a strategic enclave in what amounted to hostile political territory. Given the advantage on the ground for the left, it was always likely that a unified Korea would tilt toward the Soviets, and thus be a threat to American interests. It was precisely because of the American political disadvantage in Korea, and this spectre of losing a zero sum game, that US policy in Korea developed as it did.

This situation also explains key differences in Soviet and American occupation policies. For the USSR, a socialist-led coalition government was both acceptable and feasible, requiring relatively little force to achieve, given the strength of popular forces. For the United States, a conservative-led coalition government, even with moderate socialist participation, was the only acceptable outcome. However, this would require significant use of force and intense intervention in the political process to achieve, since the conservatives were a tiny minority of the population and were extremely unpopular.

A conservative regime was unacceptable to the Soviets, since it was directly antagonistic to their strategic interests. A communist regime was equally unacceptable to the United States for exactly the same reasons. Both occupying powers therefore set about creating a regime in their zone of occupation that was precisely what the other power could not accept, thus making trusteeship and unification completely unworkable. This geopolitical logic led inexorably toward deeper ideological polarisation and intensified conflict in Korea.

III. The Question of Self-determination

The issue of self-determination is central to any analysis of Korea in the immediate post-war period. In turn, self-determination cannot be separated from the question of legitimacy. While both occupying powers sought to present their client regime as the sole legitimate representative of the Korean people, two mutually exclusive claims could not

both be legitimate. Therefore, the legitimacy issue immediately became a key axis of occupation politics.

Immediately upon Japan's surrender, there were two contending claims for national representation: the KPG, established in 1919 in Shanghai; and the Korean Peoples Republic (KPR) established on 6 September, 1945 in Seoul. Both claimed to be the sole legitimate national successor to the Japanese colonial Government General. These claims had nothing to do with any artificial North-South division of Korea. The politics of the KPG versus the KPR was a national political confrontation between the conservatives, backing the KPG (led by Kim Ku), and the broad left, backing the KPR (led by Yo Un-hyung). The occupying powers, however, recognised neither the KPG nor the KPR as the legitimate successor to the Government General.

Scholars remain deeply divided over the question of how to assess the legitimacy of the KPG and the KPR. Gregory Henderson argues that for both the KPR and the KPG "The Independence Movement was still the source of legitimacy." (34) J. Alexander Kim notes that "The new Peoples' Republic was formed with an eye to capturing an aura of legitimacy" which required that it willingly incorporate leading nationalists, including conservatives, with a "popular reputation earned in the struggle for independence." (35) According to Grant Meade, a former civil affairs officer in the American Military Government in South Korea, the KPR was in fact "apparently supported by a majority of the people" but "seemed to lean more towards Soviet ideology than toward American." (36)

While the social and political base of the KPR was a national convention of "peoples committees", i.e. Soviets, the KPG, in contrast, had the endorsement of the newly formed conservative Korean Democratic Party (KDP), which recognised the KPG as "the only legitimate government of Korea since 1919". Bruce Cumings argues that the KDP lacked any clear programmatic goals other than the protection of vested interests, and was "obsessed with opposing the Peoples' Republic and groups associated with it." (37)

The different political advantages of the US and USSR are reflected in the very different manner in which the two occupation powers dealt with the Peoples Committees, the basic organisational power behind the KPR. (38) The USSR accepted the existence of the Peoples Committees and used them as local organs of Korean administration. The United States, in contrast, suppressed the Peoples Committees, viewing them as part of an outlawed Korean administration and the popular arm of a communist conspiracy.

The US established a formal military government in the South which claimed to have

"exclusive control and authority in every phase of government" while explicitly singling out the KPR for condemnation and banning. (39) President Truman declared that "The assumption by the Koreans themselves of the responsibilities and functions of a free and independent nation...will of necessity require time and patience." (40)

Superpower rivalry created an atmosphere that fed extremism and ideological polarisation. Syngman Rhee, the most prominent nationalist in exile, returned to South Korea from the United States promising that he would "use the KPG as a focus of legitimacy to undermine the Peoples' Republic" and "isolate the communists". (41) Rhee and his rightwing allies rejected any cooperation with the left, despite the fact that the KPR offered Rhee its Chairmanship. The KPG rejected a KPR offer to join in a coalition government constituted on the basis of equal representation of left and right. Rhee consistently advocated exclusion of all leftwing forces from the Korean interim government.

The USA chose to ally itself to Southern conservatives against the KPR. According to Grant Meade, the US actually viewed the KPR as "an illegal attempt to usurp power on the part of a minority communistic element." (emphasis added) (42) Actually, the truth was the reverse. US policy was an attempt to assist a minority element to usurp power. Mr. Benninghof, the US political officer in Korea assisting General Hodge (the commander of US occupation forces), considered the KPR to be a "communist front", while regarding the KPG circle led by Kim Ku and Rhee to be "democratic forces". (43) In short, "The American authorities viewed the Peoples' Republic as a front organization for communist activity." (44)

As Soo Sung Cho argues, had the US recognised the KPR as a legitimate expression of self-determination, Korea could have been unified and independent. He explains the US non-recognition policy as a reflection of a fundamental US attitude toward Korea: "America was not necessarily ready to grant Korean independence at the expense of its own national interests. It was true she wanted the peninsula to be free, independent, and united, but not if it were to be governed along communist lines." (45) Thus, US policy during the occupation can be understood as a series of decisions that led inexorably to a hardening of national division. Young Whan Kihl argues that the partition of Korea occurred due to "considerations of political and military expediency among the great powers." (46)

Max Beloff contends that the US refusal to have any dealings with the KPR meant, in effect, that the "authority" of the KPR administration was limited only to the Soviet zone of occupation. (47) The contrast between Soviet utilisation of the KPR's Peoples Committees as the basis of a new administration and the American establishment of a military government that usurped all administrative authority from the KPR, resulted directly in

"North and South Korea...being made, by the two occupying powers, into two distinct political and economic entities." (48)

It would be inaccurate, however, to conclude that only the US intervened in the domestic affairs of Koreans to influence the outcome in its favour. Centralisation of the Korean interim administration in the North was imposed from the top down beginning from 1946, but not having full effect until 1947. (49) The US State Department's study of the "communist takeover" in North Korea acknowledges the "indirect" character of Soviet control (50). However, though the Soviet Union made the Peoples Committees "legitimate agencies of government", scholars such as David J. Dallin, have argued that the popular organs were eventually controlled by the Communist Party and Soviet Occupation authorities. (51) Scalapino and Lee likewise strongly emphasise the extent of Communist Party and Soviet manipulation of the Peoples Committees. (52) The USSR is widely considered to have systematically altered the balance of representation on Peoples Committees in favour of chosen communists.

This debate is anything but academic, since it goes straight to the heart of the issue of legitimacy and the question of self-determination in occupied Korea. The KPR had the strongest claim to national legitimacy, but was undermined by both the US and USSR. When US missionary Horace Underwood toured South Korea in December, 1945, he came to the conclusion that the "Republic (KPR) is the strongest and most active organization throughout the South." (53) Underwood ascribed KPR popularity to its programme of "free land and free factories"!

A US military intelligence report of the time warned that "Without military government intervention in its favour, no other party (than the KPR) would be allowed to flourish." (54) Likewise, Bruce Cumings argues that without foreign intervention "the Peoples' Republic and its committees would have won control of the peninsula in a matter of months". (55) Though he considers the KPR to have been a communist front, Charles M. Dobbs argues that "By suppressing the peoples' republic and identifying themselves with a minority group, the Americans distressed and antagonized the people." (56) Ironically, a US State Department study of the occupation completed in 1949 concluded that it was only after the outlawing of the KPR that it began to be dominated by communist elements. The mistake was made because "army circles" immediately concluded that the KPR was "Communist-dominated and controlled." (57) According to Matray, the KPR was communist led but enjoyed popularity and administrative efficiency. Therefore, if the US had been impartial this could have led to cooperation with the KPR, as in the North, (58) thus facilitating peaceful reunification. In the final analysis, "Neither power was willing to make concessions toward Korean independence and reunification if such concessions would dilute

their ability to control the outcome or to prevent domination by the opposing power." (59)

The Moscow Agreement of 27 December, 1945, through which the trusteeship idea was resurrected, emphasised arrangements for a provisional Korean government to be formed by consulting all "democratic parties and social organizations". (60) The definition of what constituted a "democratic" organisation was central to the political conflict. The total inability of the powers to agree a common definition of "democratic" was the key to the failure of the trusteeship negotiations. The US hoped to reduce the in-built majority of the left and buttress the position of the minority rightwing, whereas the Soviet Union hoped to exclude the far right altogether and ensure a communist led government.

The Joint Commission negotiations began and ended in complete impasse. The talks opened in Seoul on 20 March, 1946. The Soviet Union began the talks by rhetorically recognising the Peoples Committees as legitimate organs of self-government. By contrast, the US started with an effort to by-pass all Peoples Committees in favour of its sole candidate for consultation, the US appointed Representative Democratic Council in Seoul.

A series of formulae for consultation were nevertheless proposed and debated, all of which hinged on the criteria for eligibility. These criteria were a screening device designed to change the ratio of political representation. Whereas the Soviets wanted to disqualify all "undemocratic" forces who had opposed the trusteeship, the US demanded that "undemocratic" leftwing organisations be excluded from consultation. (61) The first round of twenty-four sessions adjourned, sine die, on 8 May 1946.

Bruce Cumings argues that the hardening of positions by both powers occurred even before the Joint Commission talks opened. (62) Carl Berger likewise maintains that as early as January, 1946, the US already assumed that Soviet strategy would be to push for the early establishment of a Korean provisional government, and thereby a "communistic state" in Korea, "by manipulating a subversive movement through loyal party members." (63) According to James Matray, "fears of sovietization dictated the behaviour of the American delegation." The end result "guaranteed that Korea would be a permanently divided nation." (64)

While the talks proceeded, both sides took decisive action to entrench their political allies and crush the opposition. In the North, this took the form of creating a new provisional regime openly led by communists. This regime decreed a series of sweeping revolutionary changes in the spring of 1946, including radical land redistribution and nationalisation of basic industries. The land reform, which confiscated land without compensation and redistributed title free to the peasantry, expropriated the Northern landlord class and

displaced it, as emigres, to the South, thus eliminating the political base for a conservative party in the North.

In the South the US carried out violent campaigns of suppression against the communist party and the Peoples Committees and established instead a provisional administration stacked with conservatives. (65) In one scholar's view, "American occupation officials were preoccupied with limiting leftist political power...Communist dominance in the north meant that maximum rightist representation in the American zone was crucial to the maintenance of some sort of balance." (66) In short, before and after the failure of the first round of talks "both commands began actively to foster the stabilisation of their political, economic, and social situations as separate entities. This could be done only through the elimination of hostile groups from their respective zones." (67)

Though conventional wisdom long argued that the Soviet Union was to blame for national division, Bruce Cumings challenges this view by contending that Soviet measures taken in the North were often in response to action taken first by the United States. There was a series of escalations through which the US, and then the USSR, moved inexorably toward a "separatist" solution to the crisis in Korea. (68)

When President Truman decided to re-open the stalled Joint Commission talks, the US issued an ultimatum to the Soviets - if no breakthrough occurred in the Joint Commission the US would unilaterally implement the Moscow Decision in the US zone, i.e. the US would move to formally establish a separate regime in the South. In February, 1947 the US government decided to provide an aid package to South Korea of several hundred million dollars over three years. James Matray interprets this as "in essence a decision to create a separate government south of the 38th parallel." (69)

The second round of the Joint Commission talks began more promisingly with a new formula for consultation with "democratic parties and social organisations" with both sides making limited concessions for the sake of progress. The Soviets allowed former, as opposed to active, opponents of the trusteeship to be consulted, while the US agreed to exclude all former collaborators from consultation. Both sides agreed to establish the first all-Korea national consultative body. However, when this body convened on 25 June, 1947, the proceedings were marred by intense controversy over what appeared to be gross disparity in the proportional representation of the South. The situation was no better outside, as the South was convulsed by serious riots and a general strike led by the leftwing Democratic National Front.

The Joint Commission talks again mired in impasse over the issue of the over-

representation of the South in the consultative procedure. The US was intransigent. The US State Department insisted that there could be "no compromise on this issue". (70) As in the first round, the US delegation concluded that to concede to the Soviet's consultation formula would "inevitably lead to a communist-dominated Korea." (71)

The US soon concluded that it was no longer possible to negotiate an agreement with the Soviets on Korea that would be acceptable to the US. The only alternative was to consolidate such a regime in the South alone. Therefore, the US proposed separate zonal consultative procedures and immediate elections for a National Assembly. The Soviets rejected this proposal. The US responded with unilateral action, including a punitive campaign against the southern left, active political assistance for the southern right, and moves toward establishing a separate southern government.

IV. The Role of the United Nations

The post-war world order was shaped in part by American-inspired international organisations, such as the UN. The UN can be seen as a mechanism through which US hegemony expressed universal norms. It embodied the rules of the world order and ideologically legitimated its norms. (72) When the problem of how to restore Korean sovereignty became unsolvable bilaterally, the US looked to the UN's multilateral framework as a way out of the impasse. The shift to the UN illustrates how the hegemonic power of the United States, in the international system as a whole, was brought to bear to legitimise US policy. The decision to take the Korean Question to the UN occurred in late June, 1947. The US State Department's plans called for elections in each zone, to be held under international supervision, but if this was not possible, then in the South alone. (73)

The only alternative to the UN was a US proposal to by-pass the Joint Commission and establish a new four power conference on Korea, with Britain and China joining. The Soviet Union rejected this plan, for fear of being placed in a minority of one. The Soviets also rejected another American proposal that separate zonal elections lead to separate zonal legislatures, that would subsequently be merged on the basis of the population ratio between North and South (favouring the South by a ratio of two-thirds). Thus, through separate zonal elections, the US could manipulate the political process in the South in order to produce a conservative majority, and then see this majority dominate a national legislature. The Soviet Union insisted on equal representation between North and South, thus neutralising the South's demographic advantage.

It was obviously impossible to reconcile US and Soviet interests in any such formula. Therefore, the US unilaterally submitted of the Korean Question to the UNGA on 17 September, 1947. The General Assembly was chosen rather than the Security Council

precisely in order to avoid a Soviet veto and maximise the legitimation of US policy. Soviet Ambassador to the UN, Andrei Gromyko, declared unequivocally that submission of the Korean Question to the UN was illegal, and a violation of the Moscow Agreement. He based this case on the UN Charter's stipulation that matters arising out of the settlement of the Second World War were not within the jurisdiction of the UN. However, the UNGA rejected the Soviet argument and voted on 23 September to include the "Question of the Independence of Korea" on its agenda.

This first vote in the UN on the Korean Question reflected the balance of political forces as they then existed in the UN. The vote was 41 to 6 with 7 abstentions. The six opposed were all Soviet bloc states, while those abstaining were Third World countries: Afghanistan, Egypt, Ethiopia, Iraq, Saudi Arabia and Syria. The US, West European, and Latin American bloc easily constituted a majority in the UNGA. This bloc was in effect the US hegemonic sphere. The Soviet Union had no power to overturn such a decision and was obliged to join in the UN debate or default to the US. As a direct result, the Soviet-American Joint Commission ceased to function on 23 October, 1947. The UNGA rejected a Soviet counterproposal calling for immediate simultaneous troop withdrawal, by an overwhelming margin. (74)

The US proposal called for UN supervised elections in each zone, to be followed by troop withdrawal after a Korean provisional government had been established. The implication of this policy was that the UN would take primary responsibility for establishing a Korean government and overseeing the process of restoring independence. Charles Dobbs observes that "the American governmentpushed the international organization to play a partisan role." (75)

The UN established the United Nations Temporary Commission on Korea (UNTCOK) in November, 1947 to implement the proposal on elections. The members were: Australia, Canada, China, El Salvador, France, India, the Philippines, Syria, and the Ukraine. UNTCOK had a mandate to observe National Assembly elections. Thereafter, it would consult with that body toward establishing a government, and concerning the assumption of authority from the occupying powers.

From the moment of its inception UNTCOK showed signs of disquiet with the US plan for elections in the South alone, given the (correct) assumption that the Soviets would not cooperate with UNTCOK in the North. Several UNTCOK members protested that separate elections in the South only would result in a separate Southern government, thus deepening national division, whereas it was the goal of UN intervention to facilitate reunification. In essence, some members concluded that UNTCOK's mission was not compatible with US

policy in Korea.

Separate elections, however, were a key element in US strategic policy, as confirmed by National Security Council Document 8 (NSC 8) of April, 1948, which set out global strategic goals. Therefore, the US was not easily reconciled to UNTCOK's objections. Its solution was to shift essential deliberations on the Korean Question to the Interim Committee, the so-called "Little Assembly", a smaller group of UNGA members in which US influence could be wielded more effectively. It was to the Interim Committee that the US submitted a draft proposal for separate southern elections. Within UNTCOK, Australia and Canada openly opposed the US proposal. Nevertheless, it was passed on 26 February, 1948 by a vote of 31 to 2, with 11 abstentions. The Soviet Union and its allies boycotted the vote. (76) Within UNTCOK, Australia, Canada, France, India and Syria made clear their opposition to separate Southern elections. Nationalist China, El Salvador, and the Philippines, all closely tied to US hegemonic influence, strongly supported the US proposal.

US policy met with stiff resistance in South Korea itself. Only Rhee and the extreme rightwing were willing to cooperate in a policy of separate Southern elections leading to a separate Southern government. Virtually all other Southern political forces chose to resist this policy. Even rightwing leaders chose to attend an emergency North-South conference held in Pyongyang, from 19-30 April, 1948 - a remarkable show of national unity across the ideological spectrum. Their joint communique called for withdrawal of all foreign troops and the convening of an all-Korea political consultative conference to make final arrangements for national elections for a National Assembly. (77)

Despite all this opposition both within UNTCOK and in Korea, separate UN supervised elections took place in South Korea on 10 May, 1948. Since most of the "opposition" boycotted the election, victory fell to Rhee and his conservative allies. As J. Alexander Kim concludes: "With the Communist leadership outlawed, the assassinated Yo Un-hyong's party of little significance, Kim Koo no longer participating, and most of the members of the American sponsored coalition committee boycotting the election, the well financed Korean Democratic Party...carried the largest number of seats." (78)

The outcome of the election was largely what the US had anticipated. However, the legitimacy of the new Southern regime was questioned from the outset. Australia, Canada and India registered official doubts about the fairness of the election. Despite such dissent, UNTCOK was officially satisfied with the formal conduct of the election. The new National Assembly was dominated by the rightwing, and Rhee was elected President by this body on 20 July, 1948. The US was the first to recognise the new Republic of Korea on 12 August, 1948, but delayed establishing full ambassadorial relations until after the UN had reviewed

the procedures. The new state officially assumed sovereignty from the American Military Government on 15 August, 1948, claiming to be the only legitimate government of Korea.

The establishment of a separate regime in the North soon followed that in the South. Elections for the Supreme Peoples Assembly were held in the North and it is claimed, clandestinely in the South, on 25 August, 1948. The North attempted to give the impression of a national election by utilising a joint committee of the North and South Korean Workers parties. The Northern regime later used this device to claim that since their's was the only national election, it was the only legitimate one. The North chose 212 delegates, and allotted 360 to the South, in a 572 seat assembly. The South's delegates were chosen through bloc votes cast by representatives of mass organisations. The Democratic Peoples Republic of Korea (DPRK) was proclaimed on 9 September, 1948, claiming to be the only legitimate national government.

In this manner the modern "Korean Question" was created, i.e. the question concerning recognition of the Korean state, and the problem of its reunification. Two regimes claimed exclusive legitimacy as the sole national government. The pattern of recognition and membership in international organisations that initially emerged from this situation was a near perfect reflection of Cold War dichotomies. Though the UN did not officially condemn the DPRK, it did not recognise it and therefore conferred no international legitimacy upon it. North Korea could only secure its international status by establishing relations with the communist states and other governments "outside" of the US hegemonic sphere. The UN officially threw its weight behind the legitimacy of the ROK, maintaining special commissions to assist and supervise it. The US and its allies recognised the ROK as the only legitimate government in Korea.

The de facto situation, however, was that there were two states, yet no government recognised two states. In practice they recognised one or the other. South Korea had the advantage of the support of the UN and the large US-led bloc's support and thus was far better placed to gain entry into various international organisations. However, it was impossible to join the UN for either regime so long as the US or the Soviet Union stood opposed.

The US/UN intervention, in the process of restoring sovereignty to an independent Korea, created a deep and lasting problem of contested international legitimacy and status. Neither the southern nor the northern regime were reconciled to permanent division and both espoused reunification, by force if necessary. Civil war was a virtual inevitability.

V. The Korean War: Politics by Other Means

The Korean War (1950-53) was a classic example of Clausewitz's dictum on the relation of war to politics. The initial issue was unification and the determination of the form of government and social system. But as the war expanded, it came to embody a global importance. It became the focal point of conflict between "capitalism" and "socialism". It stood at the centre of US policy of containing the advance of communism in Asia. It also gave the question of the role of the UN in the new international order a new urgency.

The outbreak of war in Korea created a situation of tension between the UN, engaged in multilateral arbitration of the conflict, and the role of the great powers in applying traditional bilateral methods of arbitration. This tension was central to the war's outcome. The war greatly increased the nominal role of the UN, but concomitantly led the US to assume a vastly increased level of responsibility for its conduct and to a permanent commitment of military resources to South Korea.

Despite the apparent primacy of the UN role, the war reinforced that bilateral diplomacy between the great powers in attempted arbitration of the Korean Question. The UN allowed itself to be involved in a major conflict on the basis of an overwhelming commitment by one member state, the US, acting in opposition to another member of the Security Council. This situation could have led to world war. The UN was in effect subject to US policy and was placed in the position of having to endorse an American act of war in Asia.

In the event, the UN was unable to devise a formula that could successfully resolve the Korean Question. Repeated attempts to make UN arbitration the dominant factor, pursued by Britain, India and others, failed throughout the course of the war. Ultimately, the role of force, and a bilateral negotiation process (the armistice) determined the inconclusive outcome of the conflict. The final attempt at multilateral arbitration at Geneva in 1954, a continuation of the armistice negotiations process, met with no better success to resolve the basic issues of national division and legitimacy. This failure left a legacy of continued conflict and a potential threat to the peace of Northeast Asia and the world.

From the outset of the war to its conclusion, there was a bitter irony to the role of the two Korean governments. What started as a local rivalry, in effect a civil war, ended by being fully internationalised, resulting in the subordination of both Korean governments to the great powers, and to the international community as represented by the UN. Both Korean governments were overthrown in their turn and then restored by a great power patron in the course of the war. Both were re-occupied by large foreign armies. Both were economically ruined and had to be supported by foreign assistance.

The question of who was the "aggressor" in the war left a bitter legacy that fueled the propaganda war between the two Koreas and their allies for decades after the fighting ended. The military situation transformed Korea into a potential flashpoint in the global Cold War, and both sides garrisoned the military demarcation line with vast permanent forces. North-South Dialogue was made nearly impossible for many years thereafter, given the political polarisation that the war had done so much to deepen.

The full account of the Korean War is outside the scope of the present enquiry. However, though the military events of that war are usually the main subject of attention, an intense political and diplomatic struggle was waged behind the scenes in an attempt to resolve the Korean Question. This diplomatic dimension of the war has unfortunately been given little systematic academic attention. (79) It is, however, the critical aspect of the conflict. Though I cannot, for lack of space, discuss in detail the rich account of this diplomatic struggle, the political phases of the war (which of course occurred in tandem with key military events) can be periodised as follows:

1. The DPRK offensive against the ROK to reunify Korea. This precipitated UN debate over "aggression" and the decision for UN intervention. The ROK government rapidly collapsed (liberated?) and most of South Korea was occupied by North Korean forces, joined by Southern partisans.
2. The US and UN decision to commit vast resources to a counter-offensive to restore the ROK government and the pre-war status quo. DPRK forces were compelled to withdraw behind the 38th parallel. The ROK government was restored (liberated?).
3. The US and UN decision to invade the DPRK in pursuit of the destruction of the KPA, dissolution of the DPRK, and reunification under UN supervision. Most of the DPRK was occupied by US, ROK, and other UN forces.
4. The decision by China to enter the war in order to secure its border and to restore the DPRK. US and UN forces were compelled to withdraw below the 38th parallel and the DPRK government was restored (liberated?).
5. The Chinese and DPRK decision to cross the 38th parallel in pursuit of the destruction of UN forces and reunification. UN neutralists attempt cease-fire arbitration.
6. The US and UN decision to defend the ROK and restore the status quo. US/UN counter-offensive. Decision to re-cross the 38th parallel in order to establish a defensible line of military demarcation. Continued UN neutralists effort at cease-fire arbitration.

7. After the failure of the PRC/DPRK spring offensive of 1951, intended to again drive the UN forces south of Seoul, the US definitive decision not to widen the war, the dismissal of General MacArthur, and the decision to begin armistice negotiations.

8. The decision by the great powers to accept a de facto military line of demarcation, a limited military armistice agreement (i.e. no political settlement) and abandon the goal of reunification by force. South Korea rejected this settlement, but its compliance was guaranteed by the UN.

Each stage of the war entailed a particular diplomatic situation and a set of political issues to be decided. At each stage the war could have been concluded, but decisions were made to continue or escalate, until the final stage. Thus, a series of key political decisions determined the course and outcome of the war. Phase One was the catalyst for the political dimension of the war. This section will conclude with an account of the main elements of the Phase One framework.

The DPRK attack on 25 June, 1950 was described as an "unprovoked aggression", implying attack by one state upon another state. (80) On 25 June, 1950, the Security Council (in the absence of the USSR), called for immediate cessation of hostilities and DPRK withdrawal behind the 38th parallel. It acknowledged the ROK as the "lawfully established government" of Korea and called upon UN member states to "render every assistance" to the UN and to "refrain from giving assistance to the North Korean authorities." (81) The DPRK offensive was described as a "breach of the peace", therefore Chapter VII of the UN Charter was invoked.

The US immediately viewed the DPRK offensive in a larger strategic context, including China and Indochina. (82) After frantic appeals for help from the ROK, President Truman ordered US naval and air forces to support the ROK on 27 June, 1950. (83) Acting on a report from UNCOK, the Security Council concluded that the DPRK was executing a "well-planned, concerted, and fullscale invasion of South Korea" (84) and advised member states to "furnish such assistance to the R.O.K. as may be necessary to repel the armed attack". (85) Yugoslavia tried twice from 25-27 June to invite the DPRK to explain its case, but failed. (86) Zhou Enlai, PRC Foreign Minister, denounced these decisions as illegal, "adopted with the aim of supporting the American armed aggression" and constituting interference in Korea's internal affairs. (87) The USSR argued that the conflict was a civil war (88), the result of ROK armed provocation, and insisted on seating the PRC in the Security Council and inviting DPRK representatives to the UN as the prerequisites for any legal UN deliberations on the Korean Question. India was sympathetic to this approach and

began to act as intermediary for the Chinese in particular. (89)

On 7 July, 1950, the Security Council approved a resolution creating the Unified Command, with a mandate to "repel the armed attack and to restore international peace and security". (90) The US appointed a Supreme Commander (MacArthur). Most importantly, the wording of this key resolution left open the option of later crossing the 38th parallel into North Korea. India, Egypt and Yugoslavia abstained. The USSR excoriated the UN for "cynicism", since the majority of Security Council members were "directly dependent on the USA." (91) While Britain already sought a negotiated settlement with the USSR, the ROK ambassador to the UN, Chang Myun, argued that the 38th parallel was now "meaningless" and that "liberation and unification of all Korea was essential, after which there should be UN supervised elections for the whole country". (92) John Foster Dulles concurred, seeing the Korean War as "the opportunity to obliterate the line (38th parallel) as a political division." (93)

From this context, therefore, the conditions were created for extension of the war, inevitably bringing Chinese intervention and involving the UN in an effort to achieve reunification by force. As a closing note, the CIA predicted the risks and responsibilities such a course of action would entail. On 18 August, 1950, the CIA submitted a report entitled " Factors Affecting the Desirability of a UN Military Conquest of all Korea". It viewed the likelihood of Soviet acceptance of the conquest of North Korea as being very slight, thus it would pose a "grave risk of general war". Even if the Soviets did acquiesce, however, due to the unpopularity of Rhee's regime, "to re-establish his (Rhee's) regime and extend its authority and its base of popular support to all of Korea would be difficult, if not impossible." Finally, even if this could be done, "The regime would be so unstable as to require continuing US or UN military and economic support." (94)

Chapter Three: Post-War Reconstruction: Breaking Out of Dependence?

Introduction

After the Korean War and the failure of the Geneva conference in mid 1954, national division was confirmed as the enduring status quo. Both Korean regimes were absorbed with urgent tasks of national reconstruction, again occupied by foreign forces, and dependent on foreign aid for their survival. Both also sought to establish their own foreign policy and increase their level of international support. This chapter examines the record of reconstruction in both Koreas and their attempt to realise independence. It asks the question: To what extent did they escape dependency?

Part One: North Korea: Self-Reliance and the Independent Line

I. Introduction

North Korea's membership in the "socialist community" was of a very specific character. Because of the contested nature of its international status, it was isolated from the mainstream international community, e.g. the UN, and therefore greatly dependent on the support of its communist allies. Despite this limitation, however, North Korea was relatively free to pursue bilateral diplomatic relations elsewhere in the world. This manoeuvrability was significantly enhanced by the policy of the "independent line" in foreign policy, based on a "self-reliant" national economic strategy.

Initially, as a small aid-dependent state, devastated by war, North Korea desperately needed reconstruction assistance. However, instead of finding itself in a clearly delineated Soviet sphere of influence, North Korea was occupied by Chinese forces and could therefore exploit the triangular relationship between itself and the two communist great powers. (1) Thus, North Korea chose to selectively emulate both the Soviet Union and China as it reconstructed (2) while simultaneously charting an independent course from both. (3)

Within the Cold War alliance system there was relatively little room for manoeuvre. Outside that strategic system, however, there were diplomatic opportunities. The Second World War and its aftermath significantly weakened the colonial system, and nationalist movements were active throughout Asia, Africa and the Middle East. The DPRK very early recognised the great significance of the emergence of this trend in international relations. North Korea's prospects of improving its international status depended on its acquiring as much support as possible from the emerging Third World. North Korea's new policies of national self-reliance and an independent foreign policy were well suited to this task. The anti-imperialist thrust of North Korean policies had resonance for many leaders of the

governments and movements in the Third World, especially their common desire for independence from colonial powers.

II. Economic Reconstruction

Most studies emphasise the great importance of foreign aid in the reconstruction period. (4) Nevertheless, North Korean economic policy was predicated on the concept of "Juche", first promulgated by Kim Il Sung on 28 December, 1955. (5) Initially, the DPRK's economic and military dependence was deepened after the war. However, the DPRK took advantage of its dependence by turning foreign assistance into a means of enhancing its long term economic autonomy. Juche was essentially the "orthodox Stalinist concept of comprehensive economic development", in which every socialist economy would develop a comprehensive set of heavy industries, with the machine-building sector at its core. (6) Indeed, between 1953 and 1960, North Korea's indigenous machine tool industry grew to become the largest single branch of industry. (7)

Kim Il Sung actively sought out reconstruction aid from the entire socialist community. In September, 1953, he led a delegation to Moscow, followed by a similar trip to China in November. Other DPRK delegations visited the Eastern European states in 1953, including Poland, Hungary, Germany, Czechoslovakia, Rumania and Bulgaria. (8)

The socialist states adopted a policy of rendering substantial assistance to the DPRK. For instance, the USSR offered one billion rubles in assistance in September, 1953, and the PRC offered eight trillion yuan over a ten year period. (9) In September, 1953, Hungary agreed to provide free grants for reconstruction. Rumania signed an agreement providing \$7.2 million in aid on 23 October, 1953, and the GDR signed an assistance treaty in October, 1953. Bulgaria and Poland signed similar agreements in November. Poland promised delivery of mining equipment and assistance in railway reconstruction. Czechoslovakia concentrated on machine tool industries and industrial factories. (10)

By consolidating such an aid-dependent relationship with the socialist states, the DPRK took the risk of becoming a true satellite. However, this risk was reduced by the fact that aid was received from several states. The DPRK was therefore not entirely dependent on any one government, as it had been prior to the war. In the eyes of the West and the UN, however, this aid relationship confirmed the DPRK's subordinate position in the socialist bloc.

However, the reconstruction assistance the DPRK sought in 1953 was absolutely essential and not a matter of choice. According to one source, 36 per cent of all industrial production capacity was destroyed in the Korean War, including 100 per cent in iron ore, pig iron,

crude lead, transformers, coke sulphuric acid, chemical fertilisers, cement, and carbide; 26 per cent of electric power capacity; and 22 per cent of the chemical industry. (11) Much of this destruction was the direct result of US bombing of industrial and infrastructural targets. (12)

Thus, much of the heavy industrial base inherited from Japanese colonialism and subsequently expanded from 1945-50 was destroyed. (13) As Aidan Foster-Carter argues, this heavy industrial base had not originally been part of an auto-centric industrialisation process, but rather "...clearly conformed to the classic model of colonial dependence." (14) Liberation from Japan in 1945 had provided the opportunity to nationalise an extensive industrial structure and re-direct it to national development goals. The total exclusion of the former colonial power after liberation eliminated many of the typical problems of "neo-colonialism" in North Korea. (15)

North Korea's industrial plant was concentrated in mining, metals, and chemicals and the country was well endowed with natural resources to support these basic industries. On this foundation, the DPRK had the opportunity to develop a viable military industrial complex. Thus, the state targeted the development of iron and steel and machine tools as the basis for expanding industrialisation.

The DPRK's post-war reconstruction plan was designed to occur in three stages. After a brief preparatory period, the three year plan for 1954-56 would restore pre-war levels of production. This would be followed by a five year plan for 1957-61, to consolidate the foundation for further industrialisation. (16) These plans were substantially underwritten by foreign assistance. For example, in 1954 foreign assistance accounted for a third of DPRK revenue. By 1957, however, this proportion had dropped to only 12.2 per cent. During the three year plan, some 75.1 per cent of capital investment in North Korea was financed from grants from other communist governments. (17)

Considerable economic expansion took place from 1954-57. For example, some 240 industrial plants were reconstructed or expanded, and some 800 medium and large plants were newly constructed. Thus the total share of industry in national investment in capital construction during 1954-56 was recorded as 49.6 per cent; increasing to 51.3 per cent during the subsequent five year plan, 1957-1960/61. Overall industry increased from 23.2 per cent of GVSP in 1946, to 40.1 per cent in 1956, and 57.1 per cent in 1960. (18)

Eastern European assistance was very important to reconstruction throughout this period. For instance, the DPRK signed a trade agreement with the GDR annually from 1954, until reaching a long-term agreement for 1958-61. The GDR provided machinery and equipment

for the chemical industry and synthetic textiles, in exchange for metals and agricultural and marine products. Czechoslovakia signed a long term agreement for 1954-60, providing \$12.6 million in credits, including technological assistance. Rumania agreed to non-commercial terms of payment in 1954, and Bulgaria provided medical assistance to the DPRK. (19) Poland signed an agreement on aid for 1954-57, and Bulgaria and Mongolia both agreed on non-commercial terms of payment in trade with the DPRK in 1955.

These economic relationships developed in parallel with a close diplomatic relationship, the "pioneer" of North Korea's independent foreign policy. For instance, diplomatic relations with Bulgaria and Albania were upgraded from consular to ambassadorial level in 1955. On 12 July, 1956, the DPRK and Mongolia issued a Joint Communiqué in which they confirmed the "Panchsheel", i.e. the five principles of mutual relations pioneered in Sino-Indian diplomacy, as the basis of their relationship. Mongolia promised aid for 1956-57 of large quantities of foodstuffs, including 50,000 sheep, 2000 cows, and 5000 tons of wheat.

The USSR signed an agreement with the DPRK in 1955 that provided for the sharing of technological information on a nearly free basis. As a result of this agreement, thereafter over forty new industrial plants were constructed in the DPRK with Soviet technical assistance. In addition the USSR provided economic aid of some 300 million rubles between 1956 and 1958. According to one source, the total amount of Soviet grants and credits to the DPRK between 1953 and 1959 was 2,800 million old roubles, equivalent to \$690 million. (20) The Eastern European states, however, seem to have specialised in providing assistance to particular industrial sectors. This approach proved to be highly successful in transferring technology and technical expertise to the DPRK, while apparently minimising the political strings attached.

Did Kim Il Sung bite the hand that fed him? A major policy debate was waged inside the DPRK between 1956-58 to decide the fundamental direction of national development. Kim Il Sung's faction rejected integration into the "socialist international division of labour", whereby North Korea would exchange its raw materials for industrial and consumer goods from the more developed socialist economies. They advocated further enhancement of national industrial self-reliance, especially strengthening heavy industry.

But this was not all. Kim Il Sung's new programme included the nationalisation of all industry and collectivisation of all agriculture. Kim Il Sung was opposed by the "Soviet" and "Yanan" factions, who advocated a less self-reliant industrial strategy, and less extreme nationalisation and collectivisation. Kim Il Sung himself, and particularly his style of leadership, came under direct criticism after the 20th Party Congress of the CPSU in

early 1956, and Khrushchev's open criticism of Stalin's cult of personality.

The economic debate and power struggle within the DPRK, which were inseparable, came to a head in the crisis of August, 1956, when Kim Il Sung faced a direct challenge to his authority. Kim Il Sung visited the USSR, GDR, Rumania, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Albania, Poland, and Mongolia between June and July, 1956, in another attempt to garner economic and political support (21). In his absence, his opponents tried to oust him, but failed. The USSR and the PRC intervened in the DPRK's political crisis and pressured Kim Il Sung not to purge his opponents from high positions. Ironically, such foreign intervention eventually served to strengthen the Kim Il Sung faction's ability to attack its opponents, on the grounds that they were less "nationalist" and more dependent on foreign support, thus undermining Korea's independence.

The legacy of Soviet political intervention in the August, 1956 crisis was the increasing departure of Kim Il Sung's line from that of the Soviet Union. Anastas Mikoyan's personal intervention in the 1956 crisis was accompanied by the recall of the Soviet Ambassador from Pyongyang (Ivanov), after a very hot exchange of words. The DPRK responded with a drastic reduction in coverage of Soviet news events. This marked a sharp break with the previous period of adulation of the Soviet Union and its culture. There were also ideological sources of tension. The Kim Il Sung, or "Kapsan" faction, had been critical of the "peaceful coexistence" line from the time of its initiation by Molotov in February, 1955. The DPRK later welcomed the purge of Molotov, Malenkov and Kaganovich in July, 1957. Most significantly, in December, 1957, the DPRK and USSR agreed that dual Soviet-DPRK citizenship for "Soviet Koreans" would be abolished. This forced Soviet Koreans to return to the USSR if they wanted to retain Soviet citizenship. The effect of this measure was to neutralise the power of the Soviet faction in the North Korean power structure, and establish the independent identity of the Kapsan faction.

Kim Il Sung's Kapsan faction emerged stronger than ever and launched the "second Korean revolution" in 1958. This included expropriation of all remaining private capital, total collectivisation of agriculture, the intensification of Kim Il Sung's cult of personality, the consolidation of the "Kapsan" faction's control of the KWP, the army, and government organs, and strengthening the "Juche" line for an independent economy and foreign policy.

The Chollima, or "Flying Horse" movement was launched in the countryside to accelerate the pace of collectivisation and mobilise agriculture in support of further industrialisation. North Korean policy diverged from the USSR's model and swerved toward Maoism and the Great Leap Forward. Kim Il Sung not only resisted the admonitions of the USSR to join COMECON, but also disagreed with the economic and political revisionism of the

Khrushchev leadership.

Despite the political difficulties for the Kim Il Sung leadership in this period, aid from Eastern Europe, as discussed above, remained substantial. For instance, the amount of aid given to the DPRK between 1956 and 1958 by Rumania was 25 million rubles, while Bulgaria provided 30 million rubles in aid and Hungary gave 7.5 million rubles. Even Albania provided 10,000 tons of pitch (22). According to Yoon T. Kuark, the East European socialist states remained very active in the reconstruction process inside the DPRK, rebuilding entire industries and cities. (23)

By 1961, through the generosity of the socialist community, North Korea had achieved an industrial "miracle." It was in fact the most industrialised economy in the Third World and became a "model" for many emerging countries. Through this economic reconstruction the DPRK improved its international standing, particularly in the Third World, and created capabilities that would enable it to undertake an expanded diplomacy.

III. Foundations of an Active Third World Diplomacy

As discussed above, for most of the 1950s the DPRK was pre-occupied with national reconstruction and did not have ample resources for a pro-active foreign policy. Its primary aim was to strengthen its position vis a vis the regime in South Korea, i.e., successful reconstruction put it in a better position to extend the revolution to the south.

The diplomatic relations of the DPRK were at first conducted within a narrow circle of sympathetic socialist governments. Its full diplomatic partnerships outside the circle of the Soviet Union, China and Eastern Europe were very few. For example, the DPRK established diplomatic relations with the Democratic Republic of Vietnam (DRV) on 31 January, 1950. North Vietnam remained the DPRK's only "Third World" diplomatic partner for several years. North Korea saw close parallels between its own situation and the partition of Vietnam (from July, 1954).

The DPRK was somewhat slow to widen its diplomatic partnerships to the Third World. The breakthrough followed the rise of Nasser in Egypt, the Suez crisis of 1956, and the challenge posed by Arab nationalism to Western power. However, it was not until 25 September, 1958, when the DPRK extended diplomatic recognition to the National Liberation Front of Algeria (not yet even in power) that the DPRK began to actively expand its Third World partnerships.

This does not mean, however, that North Korea was diplomatically passive. For instance, the UN Arab-Asian group, having lobbied for peaceful settlement of the Korean War,

represented a potential pool of partners. As early as 1954, the DPRK joined with Burma, Ceylon, China, Indonesia, Mongolia, Japan, and North Vietnam in a statement regretting the lack of participation by Asian states in the Geneva Conference. They issued a Joint Communique rejecting foreign military bases on their soil or attempts to divide and oppress them through military agreements.

North-South relations, however, remained a sterile arena in the 1950s. The policy line of strengthening the "democratic base" in the North was accompanied by a soft line on reunification. Between 1954-58, the DPRK made a series of proposals reflecting its line on peaceful reunification. These proposals included: a North-South conference, and/or a joint session of the SPA and the ROK National Assembly; a non-aggression pact and simultaneous troop reductions; converting the Korean Armistice into a peace agreement; an international conference for peaceful reunification; simultaneous withdrawal of PRC Volunteers and US forces; North-South negotiations on economic and cultural contacts; and national elections under the supervision of neutral nations. (24) The ROK rejected all these proposals.

In Asia, the DPRK began early on to dip its toe in the waters of international diplomacy. It attended the Asian Conference for the Relaxation of International Tension (ACRIT), held in New Delhi, 6-10 April, 1955. India, the host, was a key contact through which to expand Third World diplomacy. The DPRK courted India's favour and support.

At ACRIT, the DPRK spokeswoman, Pak, Jung-ae, asked the conference to confirm the principle that the question of Korean reunification should be dealt with by Koreans themselves without foreign interference and that all foreign military forces should be withdrawn. Another DPRK delegate, Kuak, Mal-yak, suggested that all Asian governments approve the five Panchsheel principles agreed between India and China (on Tibet) in 1954 and that they resist attempts to form alliance blocs such as SEATO.

These proposals illustrate the DPRK's early recognition that non-alignment would be an effective means of appealing to Third World governments. ACRIT established the Asian Solidarity Committee, under the auspices of the World Peace Organisation. However, it was quickly overshadowed by the historic meeting of Afro-Asian governments in Bandung, Indonesia, in 1955.

Prior to Bandung the only independent caucus of Afro-Asian governments had been the "Arabo-Asian" UN group. This group first met in 1950, with a quorum of twelve: Afghanistan, Burma, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Lebanon, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Syria, and Yemen. Later, the Colombo Powers (India, Indonesia, Burma, Ceylon, and Pakistan) worked toward the convocation of an Afro-Asian conference outside the UN, with

Indonesia playing a leading organisational role.

Ali Sastroamidjojo, of Indonesia, was particularly influential in the process of organising Bandung. Since the Bandung conference was a major watershed in the history of Third World solidarity movements, it may seem peculiar that the DPRK was not present. This was due to the decision by the organisers not to invite regimes whose presence might offer an opportunity for disruption or detract from the theme of unity. Amongst all the Asian and African states considered as eligible for participation, those excluded were Israel, South Africa, the ROK, and the DPRK. Alvin Rubenstein, commenting on this invitation formula, concludes that it "demonstrated the impotence of an Afro-Asian constellation encompassing all political outlooks." (25) Despite its exclusion from Bandung, however, the DPRK supported the new movement. The DPRK diplomatic yearbook reproduced Bandung conference documents with very favourable commentary. (26)

After Bandung, DPRK relations with the Third World accelerated. It is no coincidence that a more active foreign policy corresponded with a gradual reduction of foreign aid. By 1956, the percentage of foreign assistance in the budget had fallen to 16.5 percent, from a high of 31.4 percent in 1954. The proportion of foreign aid in the national budget continued to fall, reaching a mere 2 percent by 1960. (27)

After the Korean war, the DPRK expressed its international identity by seeking causes to support and enemies to denounce. It quickly discovered its leit motif in the independence struggles of the Third World. The first major international crisis that the DPRK took real note of was the Suez Crisis in 1956, when the radical nationalist regime of Gamal Abdul Nasser announced its intention to nationalise the Suez Canal. The DPRK Ministry of Foreign Affairs issued a statement on 14 August, 1956, supporting Egypt's policy. When Great Britain, France, and Israel used military force to attempt to regain full control over the Suez Canal, the DPRK responded with an official statement of support for Egypt on 3 November, 1956. (28) The DPRK sent financial aid of 60,000 won to Egypt in the aftermath of the invasion, a symbolic token of its support.

The DPRK was likewise keen to forge ties with radical nationalists in Asia. The DPRK regarded Indonesia as a prime mover in the Afro-Asian movement and therefore courted Indonesia and its nationalist leader Sukarno. Indonesia had one of the largest communist parties in the world, and the second largest in Asia: the PKI. From 1956 on, various Indonesian delegations visited the DPRK. The DPRK willingly supported Indonesia's claim for the return of West Irian to Indonesian sovereignty.

As the cases of Egypt and Indonesia illustrate, the DPRK established a policy of reciprocity with Third World diplomatic partners. The DPRK gave full, often unconditional, support

on their key interests in exchange for support for the DPRK's position on the Korean Question. In this way the DPRK canvassed widely in the Third World for support for its reunification proposals, and for diplomatic recognition as well.

In 1956 the DPRK established a national branch of the Afro-Asian Peoples' Solidarity Organisation (AAPSO) (29), the first major Third World Solidarity organisation outside the UN. AAPSO was led by prominent nationalists seeking to strengthen the independence of post-colonial states. The ideological orientation of AAPSO was compatible, though certainly not identical, with that of the DPRK.

The politics of the Third World solidarity movement were complicated by competition over its leadership. For instance, the Soviet Union wanted to challenge the Chinese and Indonesian bids to lead a "second Bandung", while Tito called for "non-alignment". The USSR cultivated ties with the leadership of AAPSO and promoted it as the rightful successor to Bandung. (30)

After making the decision to join the Afro-Asian movement, the DPRK's foreign relations further accelerated. In 1957 the first head of state from a major Third World country visited the DPRK: Ho Chi Minh (7-12 July, 1957). His visit coincided with the completion of several agreements, including the first material aid from North Korea to Vietnam. (31) They formed a close relationship based on common resistance to the interference of the US in their national reunification.

The DPRK's policy in the Third World soon began to bear tangible fruits. The DPRK signed new trade agreements with India, Egypt, Indonesia, Burma, and Mongolia in 1957. These trade agreements are significant because they mark the first substantial trade/diplomatic relations with states not within the socialist community (Mongolia being the exception).

The DPRK soon put priority on improving diplomatic and trade relations with India, Egypt, and Indonesia. They were perceived as being the most important countries in the Third World solidarity movement. The DPRK pioneered the "South-South" approach to economic development with these governments. The trade agreement with Egypt, negotiated from 6-10 December, 1957, illustrates this approach. Under the agreement, the DPRK would export commodities such as steel, magnesia clinker, naphthalene, and silk to Egypt, in exchange for crude cotton, textiles, viscose, dye, leather, and other products. It was an exchange of goods of similar composition; being primarily raw materials or manufactures in which the parties had a comparative advantage (e.g. steel for the DPRK, cotton textiles for Egypt), and at a similar level of economic development.

Egypt was particularly important, having emerged "victorious" from the Suez Crisis. It had defended the principle of the Third World's right to nationalise foreign assets. Nasser was the first President of AAPSO, and AAPSO headquarters were in Cairo. The first AAPSO conference was held in Cairo in December, 1957, with Nasser's protege Anwar Sadat in charge. Thus, only three years after Bandung, the DPRK attended its first AAPSO summit conference.

In India and Indonesia, the DPRK was particularly active in attempts to establish closer relations with worker and union movements. The DPRK sent a delegation to the Indian Labour Union Congress in December, 1957, and a delegation of Indonesian labour unions visited the DPRK in April, 1957. Party to Party relations were also targeted for improvement. A delegation of the Indonesian Communist Party (PKI) visited Pyongyang in December, 1957, issuing a Joint Communiqué between PKI and the KWP on 30 December, 1957.

The DPRK made one of its first forays into Latin America, where it was weakest diplomatically, by dispatching a delegation of Korean students to visit Argentina, Chile, and Cuba in October, 1957. Such people to people, worker to worker, and party to party diplomacy was a building bloc for diplomatic relations at the government to government level. In Latin America, it was a way of establishing relations with sympathetic socio-political forces where little prospect of formal diplomatic relations otherwise existed.

Every opportunity was taken to make symbolic gestures of support for anti-imperialist struggles. Non-intervention was a central principle in this diplomacy. A statement issued by the DPRK on 20 February, 1957, reflects this position. They supported the USSR's call for a Middle Eastern settlement on the principle of non-intervention, announced in reaction to the Eisenhower Doctrine. A Middle East crisis emerged when the US landed a contingent of marines in Beirut to support King Hussein of Jordan, who feared an Egyptian and Syrian-backed coup attempt. Through this crisis, the DPRK identified itself as a strong supporter of Arab nationalism.

The DPRK's careful preparatory diplomacy expanded to the granting of diplomatic recognition to new regimes in the Third World, particularly those that the DPRK hoped would be sympathetic to its own cause. On 5 March, 1958, the DPRK extended recognition to the United Arab Republic, which was created through the merger of Egypt and Syria in February, 1958. The DPRK was successful in opening an official trade mission in Cairo on 23 July, 1958. The creation of the UAR set off a chain of events in the Middle East that worked in the DPRK's favour. The US attempted to counterbalance the UAR by

encouraging a merger between Iraq and Jordan, known as the Arab Union. However, the sudden overthrow of King Faisal in Iraq on 14 July put an end to this plan. The DPRK immediately recognised the new radical Iraqi regime on 17 July, 1958.

This reversal from a conservative to a radical regime, and the DPRK's quick response, is an early example of a recurrent phenomenon. The DPRK exploited many such cases of reversal. It recognised and established diplomatic relations with new radical nationalist or socialist regimes replacing a conservative one with which the DPRK had poor relations. In December, 1958, an Iraqi delegation arrived in the DPRK and issued a Joint Communiqué declaring Iraq's intention to work toward the establishment of full diplomatic relations with the DPRK and closer economic and cultural ties. In 1959 the DPRK enhanced its new relationship with Iraq. A trade agreement was signed while a DPRK representative attended the first anniversary celebrations of the Iraqi revolution. This agreement included provision for the opening of a trade mission in Baghdad, with consular functions.

Similarly, when Guinea made the decision to break its ties with the French Community and become completely independent, the DPRK quickly succeeded in establishing diplomatic relations with Guinea on 8 October, 1958. In this type of relationship the DPRK could give active support to bolster the international legitimacy of a new state or government when that government needed it most. In return the DPRK hoped for reciprocal diplomatic support.

Another example of this strategy is the DPRK's recognition of national liberation movements even before they came to power. The first example of this is the DPRK's recognition of the Algerian provisional government of the National Liberation Front, and the establishment of diplomatic relations on 25 September, 1958, before Algerian independence from France was officially established. Algeria remained extremely grateful for this support thereafter.

The use of symbolic gestures of solidarity increased, reflecting ever greater interest by the DPRK in conflicts throughout the Third World. For example, on 17 May, 1958, the DPRK government issued a formal protest concerning US intervention in the internal affairs of Indonesia. The DPRK accused the US of giving military support to a rebel government then being organised in Sumatra. The CIA may have been involved in a military operation in Indonesia at that time, including various support roles by the US naval and air forces in the region (32). Sukarno's government successfully quelled the rebellion in the summer of 1958.

In another instance, the DPRK issued an official statement on 17 July, 1958, protesting US military intervention in the Lebanon. US intervention began on 15 July, the day after the

coup d'etat that toppled the conservative monarch of Iraq. Over 14,000 US troops landed in Lebanon, accompanied by some seventy naval vessels and hundreds of aircraft. They were there to support the pro-Western government of President Camille Chamoun, who invoked the Eisenhower Doctrine in order to suppress an armed rebellion by the domestic opposition. The DPRK called the US intervention an "invasion" and broadened its symbolic support to the struggle of "Lebanon, Jordan, and the Arab people" against US and British imperialism. When the UN held an Emergency Session on Lebanon and Jordan, the DPRK supported the USSR's proposal to end US-UK military intervention. US troops left the Lebanon by 25 October, 1958, without engaging in any combat.

The DPRK's diplomacy, particularly trade, with Asian states such as India, Indonesia, and Burma, and with Arab states, such as Egypt and Iraq, expanded rapidly in the late 1950s. In particular, the process of decolonisation, especially in Africa, not only changed the composition of the UNGA, but the character of Third World politics and its role in international relations. North Korea's diplomacy succeeded by closely shadowing the conflicts between the Third World and the West and building concrete solidarity with nationalist-oriented Third World movements and governments. It was a long term, and revolutionary, diplomatic strategy.

The DPRK early recognised the ample opportunities in Africa to expand its influence and gain diplomatic supporters. Decolonisation progressed rapidly in Africa and produced a number of radical nationalist regimes. In 1960 the DPRK congratulated Patrice Lumumba of the Congo on the attainment of independence, and Kwame Nkrumah upon his inauguration as President of Ghana. These two radical leaders were of particular interest to the DPRK. Other African leaders were also congratulated on attaining independence, e.g., A. Rashid Shemask of Somalia, Uber Maya of Dahomey, and Modeibo Keita of Mali. The DPRK granted diplomatic recognition to Togo, Dahomey and Nigeria and established full diplomatic relations with Mali, which was taking the radical nationalist road. The sheer number of new states emerging in Africa made it a key region in terms of the crucial vote on the Korean Question in the UNGA. North Korea soon established a stronghold in Africa, outpacing the ROK. North Korea's ability to emphasize a common anti-colonial heritage explains much of its early success.

However, the most significant single breakthrough in the Third World, at least in symbolic terms, was not in Africa, but in Latin America, long the stronghold of the US and thus the ROK. The revolution in Cuba led by Fidel Castro, which overthrew the Batista regime, offered an opportunity for diplomatic reversal. An agreement was reached on 29 October, 1960, for the promotion of diplomatic relations and cultural cooperation between Cuba and the DPRK.

Thus, on the first of December, 1960, Ernesto "Che" Guevara, as President of the National Bank of Cuba, led an economic delegation of the new Cuban revolutionary government to visit the DPRK. In a Joint Communique of 6 December, 1960, the DPRK enthusiastically welcomed the Cuban fight against imperialism and colonialism. North Korea praised Cuba as an example that "encourages all Latin America's spirit". The DPRK gave its endorsement to the Havana Declaration, praising its emphasis on land reform and the nationalisation of US "monopoly" corporate interests, policies which North Korea wanted to promote throughout the Third World. Cuba, in return, gave its full support to the DPRK's position on the reunification of Korea free from all foreign interference. Cuba and North Korea entered into a trade protocol on the same day and ratified the establishment of diplomatic relations. (33)

This was precisely the type of ideal relationship the DPRK sought. This marked the beginning of a very close and lasting relationship between the two countries. Cuba was the first government in Latin America to succeed in carrying out a socialist revolution and breaking out of the US sphere of influence. It was also the first to establish diplomatic relations with the DPRK, thus breaking North Korea's diplomatic isolation in the Western hemisphere. In the view of Robert Scalapino, "Cuba, more than any single country, is a symbol to the North Koreans of the future triumph of communism over the United States" (34). Cuba and the DPRK took a similar revolutionary view of the role of so-called "proletarian internationalism", i.e. active and militant Third World solidarity, particularly in opposition to US power around the world.

As in the Cuban case, the DPRK had special interest in supporting fellow revolutionary regimes in the Third World under threat from foreign intervention. For instance, in December, 1960, the DPRK released statements condemning imperialist intervention in the Congo, Laos, and Algeria (35). The DPRK condemned the US for intervention against the Lumumba regime in the Congo and insisted that Prime Minister Patrice Lumumba, who had been kidnapped (allegedly with CIA connivance), should be promptly released. North Korea also called for the punishment of the "criminals led by Mobutu", who were seizing the opportunity to usurp power in the Congo. (36) The death of Lumumba cost the DPRK an important new ally in central Africa.

In Laos, the DPRK condemned US support for Phoumi Nosavan and expansion of the civil war in Laos. North Korea claimed that the US was using a Thai mercenary forces in Laos in an effort to overthrow Souvanna Phouma and other neutralists, and suppress the Pathet Lao, including the paramount leader Souphanouvong. A coup d'etat in December ousted the "neutralist" regime of Kong Le, which had been established in August, 1960. In Algeria,

the DPRK protested the massacre of Algerians by French military police. These Algerians had been protesting a recent vote, which the DPRK characterised as a means of "perpetuating French colonialism" in Algeria. The DPRK also accused the US of supporting the massacre through supply of weapons to the French.

A nascent pan-Asian communist community took shape in the late 1950s, embodied in the triangular relations between the PRC, DPRK and the DRV. Relations between the USSR and the PRC were strained, as revealed in the Mao-Khrushchev summit in 1958. The DPRK adopted an increasingly pro-PRC and anti-Khrushchev line. The DPRK was closer politically to China than to Eastern Europe as well. The DPRK and China shared the problem of national division and both viewed the US as a primary obstacle to reunification. Both were reluctant to sacrifice their national interests for the sake of avoiding the risk of nuclear war with the US, which was what the USSR's policy of peaceful coexistence implied.

Kim Il Sung made a state visit to North Vietnam in late November, 1958. This choice of destination suggests that the DRV was the DPRK's closest Asian partner, next to the PRC. This was Kim Il Sung's first state visit to a Southeast Asian country. New agreements on trade and payment were signed between the DRV and DPRK, which accompanied an earlier agreement on scientific and technological cooperation. A Joint Communique was issued between Kim Il Sung and Ho Chi Minh on 1 December, 1958. In it the two pointed approvingly to the emergence of new nationalist regimes in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, and to the strengthening of national liberation movements aiming at independence from colonialism. They praised the "spirit of Bandung", noting that it was being supported by more and more Afro-Asians. Kim and Ho applauded the "victory" of the Lebanon and Jordan (presumably over the US and UK), and gave their full support to the new Republic of Iraq, the "Republic of Algeria", the Republic of Guinea, and to the PRC's struggle to liberate Taiwan. They urged the US to withdraw from Taiwan.

Relations with the PRC likewise greatly improved in this period. China, which had defended North Korea's very existence in the war, posed as a strict respecter of Korea's independence. On the request of the DPRK, all PRC troops left North Korea by October, 1958. In tandem, the Kim Il Sung faction succeeded in purging the leaders of the August 1956 rebellion and launching the "second revolution" based on Kim Il Sungism, as discussed above. Despite the fact that this move came directly at the expense of the Yanan faction, i.e. the leadership group with personal ties to China's leaders, the PRC did nothing to prevent it.

Kim Il Sung strengthened ties to the PRC by making a state visit there in the winter of 1958. Zhou Enlai led a PRC delegation to the DPRK in February, 1958. The DPRK and the

PRC both followed a militant anti-US line, based on driving US influence out of East Asia. They both put great emphasis on the principle of the autonomy of each communist party within the international socialist movement, took a hard-line Marxist-Leninist position on many issues, and were "anti-revisionist", meaning opposed to the brand of communist reformism promoted by Khrushchev, while espousing their own home-grown versions of communist ideology under the banner of their respective "great leaders".

Although the PRC, DRV, and DPRK had much in common, there was a limit to this type of communist pan-Asianism. The DPRK could not afford to lose the vital support of the USSR in the international community, vital to its international status. None of the three could truly afford to alienate the USSR in strategic or economic affairs either, where they benefited from the support of a more powerful and industrialised ally. Finally, a complete break with the USSR might have invited China to assert itself, thus exposing the DPRK and DRV to a new danger to their independence. The policy of "equidistance", i.e. relying for support on both the USSR and PRC and seeking not to alienate either while being independent from both, was decisively confirmed in the wake of the military coup d'etat in South Korea in May, 1961. The DPRK responded by affirming a ten year treaty of alliance with the USSR and a similar treaty of alliance with the PRC.

The DPRK's close relations with China also made its other relations in the Third World somewhat vulnerable. For example, relations with India came under stress because of the Sino-Indian conflict and the DPRK's close relationship with the PRC. The DPRK found it difficult to disguise its sympathy for the PRC in the dispute with India. One scholar has gone so far as to conclude that the DPRK "sided with Peking" (37). The DPRK hoped to wriggle out of this dilemma by blaming "American imperialists" for the Sino-Indian conflict in 1959. Nevertheless, economic relations with India were further consolidated, though India continued to postpone the establishment of full diplomatic relations with the DPRK. To be fair, India was even-handed in this policy, and likewise denied full diplomatic relations to the ROK.

IV. The Fall of the First Republic in South Korea: North Korean Reunification Proposals

The "student revolution" that toppled the authoritarian regime of President Syngman Rhee in South Korea in April, 1960, provided the DPRK with an opportunity to advance new proposals on the Korean Question (38). After many years of criticism, even by its allies, for its corruption, inefficiency and abuse of basic democratic rights, the Rhee regime fell on 26 April, in the wake of blatantly rigged presidential elections held on 15 March, 1960.

The fall of the Rhee regime opened an opportunity for the DPRK to make its case for change more widely heard. Indonesia, India, and Burma publicly supported the DPRK's

position, i.e. support for the student revolution and a call for the withdrawal of all US troops from South Korea. While attending the second Executive Committee meeting of AAPSO, in Accra, Ghana, in April, 1960, the DPRK won support from AAPSO for its new reunification proposals (39).

The KWP Central Committee issued an appeal to South Koreans to expel the US from the country. North Korea issued a call for a North - South negotiation process, but at non-governmental level, i.e. between political parties and social organisations, toward formation of a new national government. The DPRK proposed that an interim government for the South should be set up by the students, workers and peasants, eliminating all vestiges of the Rhee regime. (40)

However, the Rhee regime was replaced by an interim government led by Rhee's Foreign Minister, Ho Chong, who was denounced by the DPRK as an American "puppet". The "opening" to a democratic political system in South Korea offered the possibility of a more conducive atmosphere to North-South negotiations. However, North Korea's efforts to manipulate the unstable political situation in South Korea only contributed to fears by the South's military about communist resurgence and the threat posed by North Korea. The military coup d'etat in South Korea in May 1961 closed the door to any "people to people" diplomacy on the Korean peninsula. The conditions were still not right for inter-Korean dialogue.

V. The UNGA Debate on the Korean Question

From the outset of UN debate in 1947, the UNGA Political Committee consistently denied the DPRK the right to participate in UN debates on the Korean Question. In contrast, the ROK was allowed to participate as an observer - without a vote. The US and the ROK wanted to preserve the unilateral nature of Korean participation, since to grant the DPRK equal participation might undermine the ROK's claim to exclusive international legitimacy.

On substantive matters, the US and ROK proposed that Korea be reunified via national elections supervised by the UN, conducted on the basis of proportional representation in accordance with the population ratio between North and South Korea: a formula that gave a distinct electoral advantage to the South. The USSR and its allies, on the other hand, proposed that the Koreans be allowed to settle the Korean Question themselves without foreign interference: a policy designed to get US forces and influence out of South Korea and give the left a clear playing field. The Soviet Union and the DPRK also wanted UNCURK (The United Nations Commission for the Unification and Reconstruction of Korea) to be dissolved, since they had never accepted the legitimacy of that body or its competence to deal with the Korean Question.

From 1947 to 1958, the Western, pro-ROK majority clearly held sway in the UNGA. However, by 1958, the growing role of new Third World members began to alter the balance of forces in the Political Committee. The changing political composition of the UNGA reflected the process of de-colonisation, one of the most important processes of formal change in the international system at the time. As a direct result, the issue of whether or not to grant the DPRK the right to be represented in the UN debate on the Korean Question gained fresh impetus.

A growing number of Third World governments joined the socialist states in criticising the sole participation of the ROK. Among the states that publicly supported the call for the DPRK's right to participate in the UN debate were: India, Indonesia, the United Arab Republic, Burma, Ceylon, Cambodia, Afghanistan, Iraq, Ghana, Yugoslavia, Yemen, Morocco, and Saudi Arabia. They were joined by the USSR and the East European socialist states.

There were no Latin American states prepared to openly support the DPRK's right to be heard at the UN. This is a reflection of the conservative tenor of most of those regimes at that time, and the extent of US influence in Latin America.

Despite the support of many African, Asian, and socialist states however, the DPRK continued to be denied the right to participate and the Political Committee continued to grant the ROK the sole right to represent Korea in the annual debate. This allowed the ROK to present its own narrative of the historical development of the Korean Question without the threat of being contradicted by the DPRK.

It is often claimed that the DPRK rejected UN competence in the Korean Question. However, via the USSR, North Korea actually applied to join the UN. In 1956 and again in 1958, the Soviet Union proposed that both Korean governments simultaneously enter the UN -as full members. The US and its allies opposed this on the grounds that the DPRK was not a peace-loving state, but an aggressor, and that the DPRK had violated the Armistice and did not recognise the competence of the UN in the Korean Question. From 1958 onward the annual debate over DPRK participation grew more intense.

The Soviet proposal on simultaneous UN entry represented a significant change in approach, since it implied that divided nation status would be legally accepted and normalised, at least in the short term. The reasons that the US did not accept this proposal are not entirely clear, but its parallel action toward the NNSC provides some clues. The US acted to undermine the legitimacy of the Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission, as

established under the terms of the Korean Armistice. Why it did so involves strategic, geopolitical interests. During the Geneva Conference in 1954 the possibility of introducing nuclear weapons into South Korea had been discussed as a future contingency. This raised the issue of the desirability of undermining the NNSC's supervisory role. It was precisely at the time when the US acted to undermine the functions of the NNSC and introduce nuclear weapons into South Korea that the US chose not to accept dual UN membership as a solution to the Korean Question.

VI. Conclusion

The post-war reconstruction period was a considerable success for the DPRK. Having survived near annihilation in the Korean War, North Korea surpassed all expectations in the period of reconstruction. North Korea found a secure position within the arms of its socialist friends and allies, which cushioned it from the diplomatic isolation the West attempted to impose. From this position, North Korea quickly re-established itself as an industrial nation.

The key explanatory factor in the success of North Korea must however be its break with dependence, particularly vis a vis the USSR. While taking full advantage of the assistance provided by the socialist community, in effect an extraordinary transfer of industrial technology to a peripheral state, North Korea again defied easy predictions and succeeded in politically distancing itself from Soviet tutelage or domination. The presence of the Chinese army in North Korea up to late 1958 certainly contributed to this feat, but most of all it was Korean nationalism that determined the outcome. Kim Il Sung deliberately steered the nation away from complete integration into the Soviet camp and established a new Third World model of independent national development. The technical and financial assistance provided by the USSR and Eastern Europe was channelled into a national strategy of self-reliance with a clear emphasis on heavy industry. By the end of the 1950s the DPRK no longer needed such high levels of assistance.

The independent foreign policy of the DPRK was a successful strategy. It directly reflected the North's need to reach out to the largest constituency possible in the international community if it hoped to alter its international status, given the rigidity of Cold War alliance systems. The strategy of identifying closely with the anti-colonial, national liberation movements of the Third World was viewed as a long term revolutionary strategy. By laying the foundations of this policy in the 1950s the DPRK successfully established momentum that accelerated for the next twenty years. As the international system changed through the struggles for de-colonisation, the DPRK benefited from its record of solidarity. The main trends in the Third World were consistent with basic North Korean goals such as the removal of American forces from South Korea and the right to resolve the Korean

Question without any foreign interference. The result was a rapid emergence from the confines of the Soviet sphere and erosion of the isolation imposed by the US and its allies. Independence bred success and success brought increased international support. North Korea exploited the structure of opportunities and began an ascent from the periphery.

Part Two: South Korea: The Penalties of Dependence

I. Introduction

South Korea's participation in the international community after the Korean War was more secure than that of the DPRK, largely as a result of US and UN patronage. However, although the majority of UN member states recognised the ROK, they stopped short of affirming its claim to be the sole legitimate government of Korea.

The relative failure of ROK foreign policy in this period can be explained by the complacency that diplomatic security induced. Through its favourable reception by the West and the UNGA, the ROK had the opportunity to join mainstream international institutions. Nevertheless, to a considerable extent it simply defaulted on this opportunity. Surprisingly, South Korea maintained a narrow range of diplomatic partners during most of this period. Rhee followed a semi-isolationist, virulently anti-communist foreign policy which compounded the negative image of his domestic authoritarianism. The ROK locked itself into the Cold War system, fully embracing its alliance structure. Ideology in the ROK, however, was a mere caricature of Western liberalism, though Rhee ritually eulogised the virtues of "freedom" and espoused unflinching loyalty to the idealised "free world".

The foreign and domestic policies of Rhee were therefore largely counter-productive, even detrimental, to enhancing international support. As a result of its myopia and arrogance the ROK squandered initial advantages and allowed its rival, North Korea, to make significant gains in the Third World - almost unchallenged. In both strategic and economic terms, the extreme dependency of the ROK upon the United States during this period detracted from any ability or even desire to assert a more pragmatic, independent foreign policy. On the contrary, the ROK was "self-isolated" from much of the emerging Third World and did precious little to enhance its relationship with established supporters, even in the West. This self-isolation also extended to Japan. Rhee stubbornly refused to mend fences, despite the very considerable benefits this might have conferred on ROK reconstruction.

At the end of the Korean War the ROK was in a desperate economic and social situation.

What little progress that had been achieved economically since 1948 had largely been erased by the devastation of war. Much of the material wealth of the ROK had formerly been concentrated in Seoul, a city which was repeatedly destroyed during the fighting. Economic reconstruction was imperative to strengthen the ROK's international position, for without a strong economic base the ROK would remain a weak and dependent state, utterly reliant on the support and protection of foreign powers to sustain its existence.

During the course of the war the ROK had been weakened as a functioning government and in practice it was overshadowed by the United Nations Command. The relocation of the government to Pusan for much of the war was more of a "Babylonian captivity" than a necessary strategic precaution. The US simply preferred to keep Rhee out of the way. Both the organs of government and the political system itself were in great disarray at war's end. The strongest political institution was the armed forces, which however remained formally under UNC authority - under the terms of the Taejon agreement of July, 1950.

Even the foreign policy of the ROK had been virtually pre-empted by the UNC during the war. Thus, Rhee needed to re-capture the state and re-create a foreign policy. If Rhee could strengthen the international legitimacy of the ROK this would strengthen his otherwise vulnerable domestic legitimacy. However, Rhee adopted national reunification as his overriding aim, and assumed an uncompromising position toward the Korean left and the DPRK, thus promoting an international image of belligerency where one of peacefulness would have been far more constructive.

II. The Strategic Underpinning of Reconstruction

In order to make itself more secure from the threat of renewed aggression by the DPRK, the ROK strengthened its strategic bonds with the United States. Strategic ties to Japan were ruled out by anti-Japanese feeling, having the effect of reinforcing bilateral dependence on the US. In the immediate post Korean War period, President Rhee not only solicited a direct pledge of protection from the US, but also tried to convince the US to back him in a renewed attempt to reunify Korea by force.

The United States had assumed the role of a hegemon in the Pacific for the non-communist countries. In the bipolar Cold War power configuration, the US was the sole great power in the capitalist camp in Northeast Asia, with Japan clearly subordinate. It was only later that the ascendance of Japan, and communist China, led toward a quadripartite power configuration. Nevertheless, the US recognised the sovereignty of the states in its sphere of hegemony. The United States itself did not desire an extreme dependency of the ROK. It preferred to enhance the role of Japan as a supportive economic and strategic partner in the region. However, South Korea obstinantly blocked American desires in this regard.

As discussed above, the two pillars of ROK foreign policy were its strategic alliance with the US and its anti-communism. The principles of anti-communism were extended not merely to the DPRK and its allies, but even to neutralist regimes and "anti-Western" Third World governments. Rhee viewed himself and the ROK as being locked into a life and death struggle with Communism, which he portrayed simplistically and demagogically as an insidious global conspiracy. Rhee's conception of the Cold War had considerable resonance with that of John Foster Dulles, except that Rhee was even more willing than Dulles to assume a totally uncompromising belligerence in regard to all forms of socialism and radical nationalism. Rhee likewise viewed the ROK as a loyal member of the "Free World", and despised those who chose neutrality in the Cold War, depicting them as dangerous traitors to the cause of "freedom".

Rhee's strategic dependence on the US was inextricable from his persistent bellicism. He insisted that the US retain a military presence in the ROK - indefinitely. This commitment was the quid pro quo for his reluctant acquiescence to the Armistice in 1953. It was in the course of the Armistice negotiations that Rhee made the proposal, on 6 June, 1953, for a mutual defense pact with the US. (41) Rhee's irredentism was all too apparent. He threatened renewed war in the absence of such support. The ROK would "exercise our innate right of self-determination to decide the issue conclusively one way or the other. We can no longer survive a stalemate of division " (42). These statements were probably bluster, but Rhee was a master at bluster, and deployed it to force the Americans to give him what he wanted. To the Americans, Rhee was "the devil they knew", and he knew it. This was in fact his greatest advantage in dealing with the United States. South Korea was so vulnerable the Americans dared not risk the consequences of removing Rhee.

President Rhee was particularly concerned over the strategic threat that the presence of large numbers of Chinese troops in the DPRK posed to his regime. He insisted that these PRC forces should be "driven out of our territory, if in so doing we have to fight them ourselves." (43) According to one source, Rhee "did everything he could to prevent a truce" and even after stalemate was clear to everyone else he appealed in person to the US Congress to wage atomic war in order to win back control of North Korea. (44) Rhee argued that to accept an armistice which allowed Chinese forces to remain in Korea was tantamount to "an acceptance of a death sentence without protest." He insisted that the Korean conflict "Should be settled by punishing the aggressors, unifying Korea." (45) Rhee proposed the simultaneous withdrawal of US and PRC forces. The UNC and the United States, however, settled for acceptance of Chinese occupation of North Korea.

Rhee's identification of his strategic interests with the US was couched, for effect, in

melodramatic rhetoric. For instance, he assured President Eisenhower that "the defense of the United States is as dear to us as is that of our own, for the ultimate safety or security of the whole free world hangs upon that of the United States... we have lost already too many nations to the Soviets...To disappoint the Koreans is to disappoint most of the anti-communist elements everywhere. The United States will in the end find itself a democratic oasis in a communist desert." (46)

Even the United States was made uncomfortable by South Korean rhetoric and belligerency. For instance, President Eisenhower personally urged Rhee to renounce any intention to renew the attempt to reunify Korea by force. (47) At the same time, the United States accepted that divided nation status might have to be sustained for an indefinite period. In public, the US viewed a bilateral defense agreement with the ROK as an appropriate step toward "the development of a more comprehensive system of regional security in the Pacific area." (48) In private, it was understood that this was a useful means to keep Rhee and the ROK armed forces in check and under ultimate American command. Eisenhower committed the US to providing economic aid in order to reconstruct industry and agriculture, the real American priority.

Despite all these American assurances and largess, Rhee openly doubted that the reunification of Korea would be achieved by a political means. He told Eisenhower in a letter dated 19 June, 1953, "Personally, I do not believe that the Communists will agree, at a conference table, to what they have never been made to agree to on the battle field." (49) He played upon US fears of the "domino effect" by evoking the spectre of US collapse in East Asia, saying, "What is to follow for the rest of the far East? And to the rest of Asia? And the rest of the free world?" (50).

Rhee's strategic doctrine revolved around the constant repetition of the "threat from the North" scenario. He used this argument not only to insist on more military and economic aid from the Americans, but also to justify the imposition of a national security state in South Korea. The ROK was not a signatory to the Armistice, and its final terms were only shown to the ROK government a mere one hour before their presentation to the PRC and DPRK. According to the ROK, its concurrence in these final terms was "never solicited." By not signing the Armistice, however, Rhee made the compliance of the ROK conditional upon continued US influence in, and commitment to, his government. Yet, this apparent act of defiance was in fact an empty gesture which only deepened the dependence of the ROK on the United States. The US could not afford to risk allowing Rhee to have full control over the situation in South Korea, lest he act irresponsibly and precipitate another war. Rhee was "shocked" to find that the sovereignty of the ROK was compromised by UN involvement in the Korean Question, but this had been the case at least since June 1950.

Although Rhee had many enemies in Washington and raised the ire of the US President on several occasions, he also retained powerful friends. Ultimately, Rhee was acceptable to Washington, but not admired. His complete loyalty to the US and his total identification with the general strategic and political interests of the "Free World" were classic in their purity. However, such loyalty was not without its compensation. Nevertheless, his ideological eccentricity was such that he never had a true commonality of views with the US. Rather, his closest affinities were actually with other anti-communist regimes in Asia and particularly those in divided nation status, i.e., the Republic of China and the Republic of Vietnam. It was to these regimes that Rhee turned for additional strategic support, rather than to Japan or the European powers.

When the US government issued an official post Armistice clarification of Korea policy on 7 August, 1953, it stressed that "We recognize that the Republic of Korea possesses the inherent right of sovereignty to deal with its problems, but it has agreed to take no unilateral action to unite Korea by military means..." However, the US made equally clear that any renewed "unprovoked armed attack" from North Korea would be considered a "resumption by the Communist forces of the active belligerency which the armistice has halted" and constitute "a new war". (51)

This formula, though originally intended to be temporary, became the basic doctrine of the US in regard to Korean security. It represents a compromise between Rhee and Dulles, whereby the US did not commit itself to automatic war if the south initiated hostilities (as Rhee demanded), but kept open the option of renewing the war if the armistice broke down as a result of aggression from the North. Since the Korean Armistice is merely a truce and not a formal peace treaty, this American doctrine was compatible with the indefinite maintenance of a divided Korea.

In the same declaration of US Korea policy, the US announced a three to four year program for the rehabilitation of the Korean economy. This program was coordinated through the Combined Economic Board, under the joint chairmanship of Korean and American representatives. The total program contemplated "expenditure of approximately one billion dollars of funds...out of prospective defense savings" in the US budget (52). The manner in which the US economic aid was administered constituted a real restraint upon the exercise of South Korean sovereignty, since US officials had a direct say in its administration and the US could use the threat of suspension of aid to pressure the Rhee government into policy compliance. Thus, through insisting on an extreme dependence on US strategic and economic support, the Rhee regime openly circumscribed the sovereignty of Korea within the parameters set by American patronage.

The reluctance to settle the Korean Question in political negotiations with the communists was not only an ROK attitude, however. It was shared by US Secretary of State John Foster Dulles. The Geneva Conference, beginning in April, 1954, gave the USSR, PRC, and DPRK the opportunity to present new proposals for a political solution. This was the only occasion at which all the parties to the conflict have ever sat down together and discussed possible political solutions. The Communist side put forward proposals for internationally supervised national elections in Korea (as opposed to UN supervision). This constituted a significant concession on their part in relation to their earlier position. Nevertheless, these proposals were dismissed by the Americans as disingenuous. After being initially received by European allies as a basis for discussion, these proposals were rejected after the US exerted considerable behind-the-scenes pressure, emanating from Dulles. (53) The outcome of the Geneva conference, embodied in the Allied Sixteen Nation Declaration on 15 July, 1954, amounted to a recognition of complete impasse. (54)

In the wake of the Geneva Conference, President Rhee held personal consultations with President Eisenhower in Washington, from 27-30 July, 1954. Subsequent discussions followed these and by 17 November, 1954, a joint statement of US-ROK policy objectives was released. The ROK's stated policy was to "cooperate with the United States in its effort to reunify Korea", including efforts in the UN, and to "Retain Republic of Korea forces under the operational control of the United Nations Command" and to "Continue to encourage private ownership of investment projects". (55) The agreement by Rhee to perpetuate US operational control of ROK armed forces via the umbrella of the UNC was remarkable given its explicit foreign control over the armed forces of a supposedly sovereign state.

In return for this pivotal concession, the US pledged to provide the ROK with economic and military assistance during fiscal year 1955 of up to \$700 million, of which \$280 million was economic aid. In addition, the US government committed itself to "Support a strengthened Republic of Korea military establishment" and to employ its military power "in accordance with its constitutional processes" against any future aggression against the ROK. (56).

Having achieved a firm US commitment to its security, the ROK thereafter stridently rejected all communist initiated proposals on peaceful reunification. For instance, the ROK dismissed the PRC's proposal for national elections in Korea, under international supervision, as a mere "propaganda trick". It equally excoriated Molotov's "peaceful co-existence" proposal made in the UNGA in 1955, calling for the ROK to recognise the DPRK. The ROK categorically rejected this proposal on the grounds that South Korea was the "only legal government of Korea" and recognition of the DPRK would put it in an

"equal position" with the ROK. Indeed, the ROK derided Molotov's speech as a "repetition of the Geneva meeting proposal and a disguised invasion plan of the communists." (57)

In response to Molotov, Rhee's government insisted that the UN should demand the total withdrawal of the "Red Chinese armies from Korean soil" in accordance with the UN resolution of 1 February, 1951, "branding the Red Chinese invaders as aggressors." The ROK also called upon the UN to "declare the truce in Korea to have been ended in effect by the Communist violations of it" (58).

The ROK was most adamant that occupation by US and other foreign troops be continued in the South indefinitely. Shortly after Rhee returned to Seoul from Washington in July, 1954, the UNC announced that it would greatly reduce the number of UN forces stationed in the ROK, in tandem with the PRC's decision to substantially reduce its troop levels in the DPRK. The ROK leadership, in both the military and the government, condemned this UNC decision (59). The ROK response was an attempt to undermine the armistice, not only through criticism of the Neutral Repatriation Commission's work and the role of the Indian Custodian Force in particular, but most importantly, through concerted campaigns against the role of the Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission (NNSC).

The ROK launched a campaign of vilification against the communist members of the NNSC, Czechoslovakia and Poland, accusing them of obstructing proper supervision in the DPRK and thereby having allowed the DPRK and PRC to build up their military forces in the north in violation of the Armistice. This campaign accelerated when the ROK government demanded, on 29 September, 1954, the expulsion of the Polish and Czech members of the NNSC. On 29 January, 1955, the ROK Foreign Minister even demanded that the NNSC be disbanded (60). Demonstrations against the NNSC, reminiscent of those against the Soviet-American Joint Commission some years before, were staged by Rhee's political machine in the summer of 1955. The ROK responded to criticism of these demonstrations by explaining to UNCURK officials that they were "spontaneous." (61)

However, the US also considered the possibility of undermining the NNSC as early as the Geneva Conference in 1954. Nevertheless, when the ROK first publically attacked the NNSC in 1954 and 1955, the US remained aloof, and even lodged a protest in 1955. However, in 1956, the US and the UNC came around to the ROK position on the NNSC. In May, 1956, the UNC announced that it was unilaterally suspending its role in the operations of the NNSC. This meant that it would no longer cooperate in the supervision of compliance with the terms of the Armistice. In June, 1956, the NNSC relocated its headquarters to the demilitarised zone. (62)

Ostensibly, the US and the UNC unilaterally abrogated their role in the NNSC because it was manifestly impotent to perform its role. However, if the US and the UNC really wanted to strengthen the essential peacekeeping role of the NNSC they might have chosen to strengthen it, rather than abandon it, or at least try to negotiate a suitable replacement. In an alternative view, the key to the decision to undermine the NNSC, is summarised by Kim, Hak Joon. According to Kim, by unilaterally abrogating its functions in the supervisory role of the NNSC, "the United Nations Command could abrogate the provision of the armistice agreement as to the introduction of new arms and military personnel." (63) This, and not supposed "incompetence", is the real reason the US sought to undermine the NNSC's supervisory role.

This action undermined renewed efforts by the communist states to move beyond the armistice agreement, but most of all it allowed the US to introduce nuclear weapons into South Korea, by-passing the Armistice's restriction on introduction of new weaponry. The UNC announced to the DPRK and PRC in June, 1957, that it would "restore the military balance" in view of the "continued illegal introduction" into the north of new weapons and supplies. (64)

South Korean belligerency and paranoia persisted late into the reconstruction period. For example, Chinese troop withdrawal from the DPRK was imminent in early 1958. In this context, the ROK Ambassador to the US, Yang, You Chan, wrote to the US Secretary of State to say, "The fact that the Chinese Communists may withdraw from north Korea is deceptive because they will be poised just north of the Yalu ready to attack us as before." The ROK position on reunification was likewise unchanged. Yang declared that "the Government of the Republic of Korea will accept elections under the U.N. supervision only in the liberated northern part of Korea..." (65).

Given this attitude, progress toward a political solution via North-South dialogue was virtually impossible. For example, on 5 February, 1958, the DPRK formally proposed national all-Korea elections under the supervision of neutral nations. This was essentially the same proposal put forward at Geneva, designed to get round DPRK objections to UN supervision, given the UN's role as a "belligerent" in the Korean war. This proposal, like others, was not given serious consideration.

III. ROK Diplomacy: The Limits of Anti-Communist Foreign Policy

The official ROK Foreign Ministry interpretation of the post-war situation and the role of anti-communism merits quotation:

"The failure of the establishment of a united government, by the Soviet intervention, and the establishment of the communist regime in North Korea - against the will of the North

Korean people - inevitably led to the Korean government's policy of anti- communism. This tendency hardened through the North Korean invasion, supported by the USSR and China, on 25 June, 1950. During the three years of the war the main task of our diplomacy had to be unity for the repelling of the communist invasion. To achieve this task the Korean Government reinforced the relationship with Western nations. This pro-U.S., pro-Western tendency did not change after the truce in 1953. Under these circumstances, the First Republic, following the basic diplomatic strategy of anti-communism, and anti-North Korea, didn't have any contact with North Korea and other communist countries, as well as the non-aligned, neutralist, countries, even regarding some of these countries, which proposed unfavourable attitudes toward the Republic of Korea, with hostility" (66). (my translation).

It is clear that Rhee's hostility toward socialist and neutralist regimes was viewed as being consistent with the policies of national survival pursued during the Korean war. In the view of Park, Sang-Seek, the ROK has from the outset pursued three main diplomatic goals: 1) To secure a mutual defense system against the threat from North Korea; 2) To expand economic relations with other countries in support of economic growth; and 3) To enhance the superiority of the ROK's international status to that of North Korea and to gain international support for the ROK's reunification policy. (67)

The ROK relied on a small circle of intimate diplomatic partners to fulfill these goals. Prior to the outbreak of the Korean war, the ROK had established full diplomatic relations, in chronological order, only with the US, Nationalist China, the UK, France, the Philippines, and Spain. In the post Korean war situation, the first government to establish full diplomatic relations with the ROK was the Republic of Vietnam, on 2 May, 1956. The affinity of interests between the Asian anti-communist regimes mirrored the affinity between the communists discussed above. In Asia, the ROK had close diplomatic ties with Nationalist China, South Vietnam, and the Philippines, all closely tied to the US. Outside Asia, the ROK relied heavily on the good auspices of the US in conducting its foreign policy. According to one scholar, this diplomatic reliance on the US was due to the fact that "the U.S. could defend the Republic of Korea on the Korean peninsula militarily while supporting it at international forums diplomatically." (68)

Most of Latin America had recognised the ROK in 1949. However, the ROK relied especially heavily on US diplomatic channels to conduct relations with Latin America. It thus economised on expenditures for diplomacy, but in so doing compromised its independent conduct of foreign affairs. The ROK relied on the support of the Latin American governments in the UNGA to counterbalance the neutralist and Afro-Asian governments that were sympathetic to DPRK participation or to Northern reunification

proposals.

In fact, the ROK was so confident of Latin American support and the reliability of US diplomatic channels there that it did not even establish ambassadorial relations with a Latin American government until after the UN debates on the Korean Question began to show increasing support for the DPRK, i.e., post 1958. After this shock to its complacency, the ROK established diplomatic relations with Brazil on 31 October, 1959, its first real bilateral diplomatic partner in Latin America.

All the same, the Rhee government conducted relations with Latin America on a very low profile, making little effort to upgrade relations. Even trade between the ROK and Latin America was negligible. There were no Latin American diplomatic representatives in Seoul, nor any Korean diplomatic delegates in Latin America. The ROK only established its first such diplomatic mission in Latin America in Brazil, in July, 1962, after the military came to power in Seoul.

Compounding this complacency, the ROK's diplomacy in Asia and Africa was largely a "negative" one. According to one scholar of Korean-African affairs, the ROK "approached Asia and Africa mainly to prevent North Korea from contacting them", fearing that the Afro-Asian states would "support North Korea's demand for the withdrawal of the U.S. troops from South Korea and would recognize North Korea as the sole legitimate government on the Korean peninsula." (69) In the view of Suh, Jae-Mahn, "Korea took the same view of the non-aligned bloc as the Dullesian view of immorality or uselessness. Further, the neutralism of the non-aligned bloc was regarded among Koreans as pro-communist." (70)

The anti-imperialist overtones of the Afro-Asian movement after Bandung in 1955 were neither appreciated nor accepted in Seoul during Rhee's tenure. The ROK made no real effort to identify any common interests with these regimes, despite the fact that the ROK could have done so by stressing its own experiences under Japanese colonialism. The ROK simply defaulted to the DPRK, to its own disadvantage. By 1958, as previously mentioned, this complacency began to have a real impact on the course of the UNGA debate on the Korean Question.

The First Republic's Middle East policy was similarly passive or even "virtually non-existent" in the 1950s. The ROK maintained full diplomatic relations only with Turkey (from 17 June, 1957), which had contributed forces to the UNC in the Korean war. Of all Middle Eastern states, only Turkey was a member of NATO. It was only in 1957 that the ROK sent its first significant goodwill mission to the Middle East, led by General Kim,

Jung-Ryul. He visited Iran, Iraq, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, and Sudan. (71) The choice of regimes to be visited clearly reflects the ROK's emphasis on courting conservative pro-Western governments and those interested in anti-communist or pro-Western security alliances, such as CENTO.

Surprisingly, the ROK was even relatively isolated in Asia. For example, although the Colombo Plan was launched in 1950, the ROK was long excluded from participation, only gaining admission in 1965, through the sponsorship of Malaysia. Diplomatic relations with Malaysia were not established until 2 February, 1960. The ROK was able to break out of relative isolation in Asia vis a vis the Colombo powers only when the Colombo Plan itself expanded beyond the South and Southeast Asian region and the Commonwealth sphere, to encompass more of Asia and the Pacific.

According to Michael Haas, the ROK was particularly interested in joining the prospective "Asian and Pacific Treaty Organisation" (APATO), conceived of as a kind of Asian counterpart to NATO. However, APATO was shelved for fear of its being "too provocative." After the French defeat at Dienbienphu, the focus of the US and Western powers turned to Southeast Asia, where SEATO was established. However, the US resisted the idea of a pan-Asian, pan-Pacific, anti-communist alliance. Instead, the US preferred to build up a system of bilateral security arrangements in Asia, including bilateral agreements with Japan, the ROK, the Philippines, Nationalist China, and South Vietnam. Therefore, in the view of one observer, "Korea could be said to be part of a pseudo-APATO organisation." (72) The ROK favoured a larger pan-Asian organisation including both Southeast and Northeast Asian governments, and attempted to foster such an organisation. This is one area where the ROK did in fact try to take some diplomatic initiative, though unsuccessfully.

The ROK first established diplomatic relations with a Southeast Asian government - the Philippines - on 3 March, 1948, followed by Thailand on 1 October, 1953 and South Vietnam on 2 May, 1956. Relations with Malaya were established only in February, 1960. In 1953 the ROK did send a goodwill mission to Burma and Indonesia, but this gesture to neutralist leaning governments was only attempted out of a sense of political exigencies, i.e. the anticipation that the DPRK would approach these governments for support. The official ROK Foreign Ministry diplomatic history of this period comments on this situation as follows: "It was unavoidable for our government to be interested in the movement of the Afro-Asian bloc since this bloc developed as a new power within the U.N. after the Bandung conference in April, 1955." (my translation) (73) The ROK, like the DPRK, was excluded from Bandung, due to its involvement in Cold War alliances.

It was the emergence of a large number of newly independent African states that eventually led the ROK, even under Rhee, to recognise the importance of developing ties with these regimes, if only out of consideration for their impact upon the annual UNGA debate. (74) The year 1960 was therefore a turning point in ROK policy toward Africa. In January, 1960, the ROK Ambassador to France, Chung, Il Kwan, was despatched on an extended goodwill mission to Africa. His mission visited Liberia, Libya, Tunisia, Ghana, Ethiopia, and Sudan. The inclusion of Ghana on the itinerary, it should be noted, was rather "exceptional", since Ghana was one of the leaders in the Pan-African and Afro-Asian movements.

This mission was followed by another, which took place after President Rhee's resignation, in June and July, 1960. It was headed by the ROK Ambassador to West Germany, Son, Won Il. It visited the Congo (Leopoldville), Cameroon, Nigeria, Togo, Guinea, Mali, and Morocco, while another mission led by the ROK Ambassador to Italy, Kim, Young Ka, was sent to visit Madagascar, Somalia, Sudan, and the United Arab Republic. (75) The inclusion of Guinea, Mali, and the UAR in the missions' destinations suggests that by this time the ROK was becoming more aware of the need to compete with the DPRK for support among radical or neutralist governments in Africa.

The ROK's relations with the Afro-Asian "bloc" in the 1950s were considerably hampered by its extremely hostile attitude toward India, which was then a key leader in the Afro-Asian movement. As mentioned earlier, Rhee nurtured a vendetta against Nehru and India as a result of India's role in the POW repatriation issue. Indian troops were allowed onto ROK soil to supervise POWs against the expressed opposition of Rhee. In addition, India had been instrumental in working out a reasonable compromise between the hostile parties over the POW issue in the Armistice talks, which had had the effect of undermining Rhee's intransigent position, i.e., no repatriation of any kind against the so-called "free will" of the POWs. After the signing of the Armistice, some POWs had been allowed to seek assylum under India's neutral jurisdiction. Rhee was enraged.

This continued to poison relations with India even after the Geneva conference. For instance, in a letter to the UN Secretary General dated 8 June, 1955, Y.T. Pyun, the ROK Foreign Minister, lodged a formal protest concerning "India exercising a casting vote in the Repatriation Commission, whose membership evenly divided between two communist and two neutrals beside the Indian Chairman, knowing as we did that India, with its propensities to curry favour with the communist countries would side with the communist members on crucial question. This Government's fears were fully substantiated by the Indian Chairman's pro-communist actions within the Neutral Nations Repatriation Commission." (76)

The ROK government opposed the presence of the Indian Custodian Force in Korea, viewing it as "a threat to the anti-communist prisoners of War because of their (India) known pro-communist bias." The ROK actually accused India of forcing POWs to "change minds and wish to go back to the communist countries." (77) India's decision to allow several ex-POWs to return voluntarily to the DPRK was a particular source of ROK resentment. India reciprocated with public and private criticism of the Rhee regime, including Rhee's negative attitude toward the armistice, his reluctance to abandon the policy of reunification through force, and "undemocratic aspects" of the Government of the Republic of Korea.

There were other aspects of India's diplomatic role in the Korean Question that annoyed, and occasionally infuriated the Rhee regime. For instance, in late 1955 the ROK strongly disapproved of India's mediation in the UN on the Korean Question. The ROK protested comments made by Mr. Menon, India's Ambassador to the UN, who had said that the PRC would accept a UN sponsored vote in Korea. This was part of a follow-up attempt to pursue the similar communist proposal made at Geneva in 1954. i.e. to accept the principle of internationally supervised elections throughout Korea, which had earlier fallen flat. The fact that India continued to act as a liaison for the PRC infuriated the ROK. The Rhee regime made its position very clear, calling the proposal "a device to fool the free nations of Asia." According to the ROK, a "free vote in North Korea is not possible until the entrance of U.N. armed forces is allowed and makes possible withdrawal by the Chinese army." (78) Calling India a communist dupe was not a very constructive policy, to say the least.

But relations were not this frosty with all other Asian regimes.

As discussed above, President Rhee's strident anti-communism and the situation of national division made him the "natural ally" of two other anti-communist, irredentist regimes in East Asia, i.e. Nationalist China and South Vietnam. These three regimes shared a common interest in overcoming communist power in Asia. The influence of the Soviet Union in Asia and the existence of the Peoples Republic of China had drastically altered the regional balance of power. Only the countervailing force of the United States, in close strategic cooperation with these three anti-communist regimes, could prevent reunification of all three under communist auspices. The ROK, ROC, and ROV understood this basic geopolitical situation but were often dismayed at the seemingly contradictory policies of the US, which did not wholeheartedly give them domestic support nor did the US automatically favour their strategic initiatives. However, they were not capable of an independent alliance. Instead, they sought to promote their own interests by pooling their influence with the United States in order to persuade Washington to increase its support.

In the case of Vietnam, ROK emphasis on this regime began with the partition of Vietnam after the Geneva conference and the emergence of the ROV as a major client of the US. Rhee paid an official visit to the ROV in November, 1958. In his arrival statement in Saigon, Rhee succinctly summarised his view of South Korea's common interests with South Vietnam. Rhee said "Vietnam and Korea both have suffered under alien colonial rule. Both are divided countries fighting for survival against the cruel and brutal aggression of Communism. Yes, our countries are divided, but divided only for the moment. Both will persevere to victory and the unification of our lands and our peoples in liberty and peace." (79) President Rhee and President Diem of the ROV issued a Joint Communique as a consequence of their summit meeting on 7 November, 1958, expressing very similar sentiments.

The ROK took the initiative in 1959 to further strengthen ties with its anti-communist partners in Asia. It proposed the formation of an "Asian Anti-Communist Countries Conference". The ROK put particular emphasis on recruiting the ROV and ROC to participate in this conference at the level of Head of State. The initiative was greeted with only a lukewarm response. The US did not favour such an approach and the Rhee regime was not able to exercise independent leadership on the matter in the face of American disapproval.

IV. ROK Relations with Japan: A Lost Opportunity?

The defeat of Japan in 1945 brought about an abrupt termination of relations between Korea and Japan and utterly transformed their relationship. Korea regained sovereignty before Japan did. The Korean War, however, provided an opportunity for the rehabilitation of Japan - by American design. A peace treaty with Japan was signed by 48 states in San Francisco, on 8 September, 1951 (excluding the USSR and PRC). The Korean War "produced a big American demand for Japanese goods and services, and a sudden spurt in the whole economy resulted." (80) By some estimates US procurements in Japan during the course of the Korean War totalled some five billion US dollars. (81)

The natural periphery of the Japanese economy was in such places as Korea, Taiwan, and Southeast Asia. US hegemony in Asia, after the communist revolution in China, was not secure without a strong Japan. A strong Japan needed an economic periphery in Asia. Therefore, the US envisioned rehabilitating the Japanese economic centre within the region, which would strengthen the security of Japan and reduce the burden on the US treasury of huge aid subsidies to client regimes in Asia. (82)

The Japan with which the ROK government had to deal in the 1950s was a very different regime than the one that had governed colonial Korea. Nevertheless, the economic power

of Japanese industry and Japanese capital remained very considerable. The historical bitterness of the Korean nation against Japan gave rise to fear that any re-integration with Japan would inevitably bring renewed Japanese exploitation or even domination of Korea. (83) Rhee understood the popular sentiment toward Japan and dared not antagonise the nation by "betraying" it to the Japanese. He could not afford the political risks this would have entailed. (84)

By the terms of the peace treaty signed at San Francisco, Japan formally acknowledged the liquidation of its entire empire, including Korea and accepted the existence of an independent state in Korea. Japan was obliged through agreements with the US to abide by the US position concerning the national division of Korea and China. Japan compliantly recognised the ROK and the ROC and rejected recognition of the DPRK and the PRC. This made Japan, in a new sense, the "natural ally" of the ROK.

As early as the autumn of 1951, the United States began to put pressure on Japan to initiate talks with the ROK concerning restoration of diplomatic relations. Japan complied. However, Rhee's anti-Japanese attitude soon created serious obstacles to progress. Rhee consented that talks begin in early 1952, but insisted on Japanese reparation payments of two billion US dollars. The San Francisco Treaty did not specifically regulate the question of reparations with former parts of the Japanese empire. Rhee hoped to force Japan into providing massive assistance as the price for diplomatic normalisation. Alternatively, he deliberately set the "price" too high in order to create an impasse.

The ROK-Japan talks quickly entered an acrimonious stalemate. The situation deteriorated into armed hostilities on 21 November, 1954, when two Japanese ships of the Maritime Safety Agency (the *Doki* and the *Hekura*) were fired upon in waters off Takeshima, an island occupied by the ROK but which Japan claimed as its national territory. The government of Japan protested Korea's claim to this island on 30 November, 1954, demanding "the immediate withdrawal of the Korean authorities from the island in question, and removal of all the equipment, including the guns, and a formal apology of the Korean government." (85) The ROK government responded on 13 December, 1954 with an unabashed defense of its right to exercise territorial jurisdiction over "Dok-do" as "an integral part of the Korean territory." (86) The Korea-Japan territorial dispute was further compounded by friction over the rights to marine resources in the waters between Korea and Japan.

The most sensitive issue of all was the ill-treatment of the Korean minority in Japan. Most Koreans then in Japan had been conscripted as forced labour during the Pacific War and therefore in some sense were a kind of hostage community. Furthermore, Japan's attitude toward Korean emigration from Japan to North Korea, which was liberal, was an

extremely sensitive issue for the Rhee regime.

Japan also disputed unresolved issues of property rights in Korea; regarding Japanese property "left in Korea" at the end of the Pacific War. This property rights dispute involved the fundamental issues of colonialism and the legality of the US military occupation's dispensation of former Japanese property in Korea. After several years of difficult discussions, the issue was finally resolved on 31 December, 1957, when the government of Japan informed the Korean Mission in Japan that remarks made by the Chief Japanese delegate to the talks, Kanichiro Kubota, on 15 October, 1953, were withdrawn, and that Japan's property claims made in the Korea - Japan talks on 6 March, 1953, were likewise being withdrawn (87). Japan and Korea issued a Memorandum of Understanding regarding Measures on Koreans detained in Japan and on Japanese Fishermen detained in Korea, on 31 December, 1957. Both sides thereby agreed to release certain nationals of the other side who had been held in "Alien Detention" camps. Korea agreed to resume overall talks with Japan from 1 March, 1958.

South Korea agreed that the same five key issues would be discussed in the new round of talks as had been discussed in the previous three Korea-Japan Conferences. These issues included discussion of basic relations; in order to clarify, and confirm, that "the treaties and agreements concluded in and before 1910 are null and void " and that furthermore "respect for non-intervention in sovereign rights" would henceforth be observed. Korea insisted that Japan formally admit that all international treaties of the protectorate and colonial period were repudiated by Japan. This would further confirm the sovereign independent status of Korea. Other issues to be discussed included the status of Koreans resident in Japan, including the property claims of Korean residents and repatriation of Koreans to the ROK. The issue of a "Peace Line" to demark the fishery zones of Korea and Japan was on the agenda, and the conclusion of a formal fishery agreement. (88)

Korea hoped that at the re-newed talks Japan would agree to return "Korean art treasures, ancient books, the gold reserve, shipping tonnage, and other properties taken from this country." In the event, however, the ROK was greatly disappointed by Japan's response, which in the ROK government's view "seemed to reflect some idea that Korea wronged Japan instead of the reverse." (89) Rhee complained of Japan's "insincerity", referring specifically to Prime Minister Nobusuke Kishi. Rhee warned that "the talks themselves are jeopardized by Japan's threats to send Koreans into Communist slavery, and to do so unilaterally, and in violation of agreements previously made with us." This was a reference to Japan's plan to repatriate some 100,000 Korean residents to the DPRK. This was within the legal rights of Japan but was total anathema to the ROK government, locked as it was in a struggle for legitimacy with the DPRK. Thus repatriating any Koreans to the "illegal"

regime in the north could be interpreted as an act hostile to the ROK.

Unfortunately for the Rhee government, however, a majority of Korean residents in Japan actually preferred repatriation to the DPRK over the ROK. Rhee hoped that Japan would cooperate with his government on this issue in order to reduce the embarrassment of such a lopsided exodus. On the whole, Rhee concluded that "We are compelled to say, regretfully, that as yet there are too many reasons for distrust of Japan and not enough reason for trust." (90)

Japan did attempt, however, to overcome the obstacle of the repatriation issue. On 4 March, 1959, Prime Minister Kishi clarified and explained Japan's position on the repatriation issue to ROK Foreign Minister Chung W. Cho. Japan defended its policy on the basis of adherence to the principle of freedom to choose one's place of residence, therefore it would not support forcible repatriation to the ROK of residents in Japan against their will. However, Japan assured the ROK that "The Japanese Government's decision does not mean any change whatsoever in its established policy of non-recognition and non-assistance toward north Korea." (91)

In nearly a decade of abortive talks with Japan the ROK achieved no progress toward reinforcing its own international position through closer links with a resurgent, democratic Japan. Pressure from the United States was perhaps alone responsible for the re-convening of the stalled talks on several occasions in the 1950s. In the same manner that Rhee "complied" with US insistence, but simply went through the motions of talking with Japan, without signing a new treaty on basic relations. His ability to assert his own policies was circumscribed by American influence over his government, but not dictated by it.

V. ROK Adjustment to International Realities

By the end of the Rhee era in 1960, the ROK was not much stronger either economically, politically, or diplomatically than it had been a decade before. The Rhee regime was marked by increasing corruption and autocratic tendencies that continued to alienate it even from many Western governments. It relied excessively on the United States for economic assistance. UNKRA (United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency) played a modest economic role in Korea after the war. This multilateral assistance was more symbolic than substantive, in comparison to the vast sums the US provided in bilateral assistance, some two billion US dollars in economic assistance alone. (92) The ROK opted for an economic policy of import-substitution, with virtually nil exports. Domestic consumption was very heavily subsidised by US aid flows, while government administration was inefficient and corrupt. The one area where some progress was made was in the construction of basic infrastructure and the provision of mass education. The ROK

economy was only linked to the international economy through inflows of aid funds and was therefore entirely uncompetitive, safe behind its protectionist barriers.

In the last years of the Rhee regime, 1958-1960, policy began to take a new direction. Three changes occurred which prompted the ROK out of its complacency. First, the United States made a decision to drastically reduce grant aid to the ROK, preferring to shift assistance to loans. Thus the ROK's fundamental economic policies were affected. (93) It was also at this time that the Rhee government, under heavy US pressure for more efficient economic management, began to move toward indicative economic planning, and accepted the Nathan Consultancy on economic planning. A process was being set in motion that would totally transform the Korean economic system in the next few years. (94)

Secondly, the pace of anti-colonialism and decolonisation was quickening in the international system. The membership of the UNGA was soon affected by this trend. The US and its close allies no longer had an automatic majority in the UNGA. The ROK government, even under Rhee, eventually recognised the implications of this trend and began active diplomatic outreach to Third World governments. However, this was limited in scope, particularly because of the strict anti-communism of the Rhee regime.

The third change was in the balance of power on the Korean peninsula itself. While the ROK had a fairly stagnant and still agricultural economy, the DPRK had successfully re-industrialised. By 1960 the DPRK had strengthened itself to a degree that was potentially dangerous to ROK national security, given the weak state of the ROK economy, its enormous aid dependency, and its endemic political instability. North Korea was politically stable and militarily powerful. The Kim Il Sung faction had completed the process of eliminating all rivals to power. The withdrawal of Chinese forces from the DPRK in late 1958 meant there was no occupying force to act as a constraint on DPRK adventurism.

Nevertheless, the balance of forces in the UNGA remained overwhelmingly in favour of the ROK as late as 1958 and 1959. When the PRC announced the final withdrawal of its forces from the DPRK, Great Britain engaged in a diplomatic correspondence with the PRC on behalf of all those countries that had contributed forces to the UNC in Korea. The UNC nations declined to accept that all UNC forces should withdraw from South Korea. The response of the UNC was encapsulated in a resolution of the UNGA on 14 November, 1958, passed by an overwhelming vote of 54 to 9. The resolution reaffirmed the UNGA resolutions concerning Korea of 14 November, 1947, 12 December 1948, 21 October 1949, 7 October 1950, 11 January 1954, 29 November 1955, 11 January 1957, and 29 November 1957. (95)

The new resolution of 14 November, 1958 spoke directly on behalf of the UNC nations.

Noting the correspondence on their behalf by Great Britain with the "communist authorities", it reiterated that the UNC nations wished to see "a genuine settlement of the Korean question in accordance with United Nations resolutions" and were "prepared to withdraw their forces from Korea when the conditions for a lasting settlement laid down by the General Assembly have been fulfilled." They argued that the greater part of UNC forces had already been withdrawn from Korea, therefore they welcomed the decision by China to withdraw its forces from North Korea.

The importance of the resolution is that it specifically called to the attention of the communist authorities the determination of the UN "to bring about by peaceful means establishment of a unified independent and democratic Korea under a representative form of government, and the full restoration of international peace and security in the area." It called upon the communist authorities to accept the UN's objectives in Korea and to achieve unification "based on the fundamental principles for unification set forth by the nations participating on behalf of the United Nations in the Korean Political Conference held at Geneva in 1954." (96)

It is clear from this resolution that the international status of the two Koreas had not changed from 1954 to 1958. Little progress had been made to advance the debate in the UNGA, given the exclusive participation of the ROK and the exclusion of the DPRK. The UNC group was still a coherent voice and still commanded overwhelming support in the UNGA. In this sense, the ROK still maintained clear advantages over the DPRK.

VI. Conclusion

South Korea entered the post Korean war period as an extremely dependent regime. Rather than actively seeking to reduce this dependency, the Rhee regime converted it into the cornerstone of all policy, both domestic and foreign. This dependency therefore "distorted" South Korean policy in a number of important ways. First it produced an extremely skewed domestic economic structure, reliant on foreign financed imports and having no internationally competitive exports. Second, it produced a foreign policy that was self-damaging precisely because of its anti-communist zealotry. The opportunities lost were of several types, e.g. the self-isolation from much of the emerging Third World and the rejection of re-integration with an expanding Japanese economy.

The conclusion to be drawn from this period is that extreme dependency carried with it significant penalties for the ROK in terms of its long term development. Rhee squandered initial advantages in the competition with North Korea and allowed the ROK to lag behind while its rival developed dynamic new policies designed for a rapidly changing international environment. The ROK developed regime rigidities that were a mirror of

international Cold War ideology. This policy undermined ROK legitimacy with a growing number of emerging Third World and socialist regimes and to some extent damaged its standing even in Western diplomatic circles. Domestically, the effect of these policies constituted a fetter on dynamic modernisation and economic development.

Chapter Four: DPRK Diplomacy 1960-1975: The Success of Third World Solidarity

I. Introduction

North Korea's foreign policy was most successful in the Third World. This can be explained by the correspondence between its policies and international trends such as anti-colonialism, anti-imperialism, national liberation, and non-alignment. The peak in international support for the DPRK coincided almost exactly with the peak of the Third World solidarity movements in the mid 1970s.

The principal goal of DPRK diplomacy was to gain support for the withdrawal of US forces from South Korea. The United States was presented as the primary obstacle to peaceful reunification and the common enemy of all Third World forces seeking real independence. US military presence in South Korea was portrayed as a colonial occupation via a puppet regime, to be used as a base for aggression against other Asian peoples.

Several factors explain the effectiveness of DPRK diplomacy in this period. First and foremost is the consistent line on Third World independence: i.e. a militant anti-colonial and anti-imperialist line. Thus, the DPRK was able to identify its vital interests with other Third World movements. In particular cases it was able to identify the Korean situation with other "divided nations" or those with territorial disputes, e.g. Vietnam, China, Yemen, Congo, Somalia, Palestine, Indonesia, Mauritania, and Cuba; or major conflicts such as the Vietnam and Indochina wars, the Arab-Israeli conflict, and the liberation wars of Africa.

II. Initiation of Active Third World Diplomacy

There are four principal reasons why the DPRK launched an active diplomacy in the Third World in the early 1960s. First, the period of domestic reconstruction was successfully completed. A strong industrial and political base enabled the DPRK to redirect resources to diplomacy. Secondly, North Korea's room for manoeuvre was enhanced by the Sino-Soviet split, and the withdrawal of Chinese troops in 1958. The "second revolution", Juche, and the Kapsan faction's control of the KWP enabled Kim Il Sung to launch and sustain an independent foreign policy. (1)

Thirdly, the emergence of new organisations and movements such as AAPSO, the Non-aligned Movement (NAM), the Tricontinental Solidarity Conference, the Afro-Asian conferences, the "New Emerging Forces", and many national liberation movements provided a ready forum in which to operate, and the DPRK tended to endorse them all. The success of many national liberation movements changed the composition of international organisations. The political composition of the UNGA was altered, with direct effects on the UN debate on the Korean Question.

Fourthly, the DPRK had to respond to changes in South Korea. The military coup in the South in May, 1961, closed the door to "people to people" diplomacy on the Korean peninsula. The new military regime in the South simultaneously launched an active Third World diplomacy. North Korea could not afford to default to the South in the competition to win over the regimes of the Third World.

North Korea had good credentials as a post-colonial government that had experienced a war of liberation from a colonial power, (Japan), and then a war of resistance against a Western great power,(US). Its industrial reconstruction was a marvel in its time, and admired. It was an avid advocate of independence and had no foreign bases on its soil. It was an adamant opponent of any form of colonial domination or imperialist exploitation of the Third World. Its line was compatible with almost any form of Third World solidarity and it did not take a doctrinaire position in Third World leadership contests. Its basic demands for US withdrawal and no foreign interference in Korean reunification were broadly acceptable to the spirit of the Third World movement.

During the decade of the 1960s the DPRK established full diplomatic relations with over twenty states, the majority of which were African and Middle Eastern. The launching of the active Third World policy coincided with the sudden emergence of many newly independent states, particularly African (in 1961), and the founding of the Non-aligned Movement in Belgrade in the same year, led by India, Egypt, and Yugoslavia.

This Third World diplomacy was directly aimed at the UN's annual Korea debate. The UN became a new target of DPRK proposals on reunification. This was partly a response to the ROK's reunification policy under Park Chung Hee, which endorsed UN supervised all-Korea elections on the principle of proportional representation between North and South. In response, North Korea devised a campaign calling for: DPRK participation in the UNGA Korea debate, without preconditions; dissolution of UNCURK and the UNC; withdrawal of all foreign forces from Korea; and, paradoxically, an end to the UN debate on the Korean Question.

By the end of the 1950s the DPRK had already established a good base for expanding economic and political relations. Early contacts with Third World regimes focused on trade issues and opening consular or diplomatic relations. Indonesia agreed to open consular relations with the DPRK during a visit by DPRK Vice Premier and Trade Minister Lee Ju-yun, 4-17 June, 1961. In the same tour, India agreed to allow the DPRK to open a trade office after talks between Lee and Nehru. Burma agreed to open consular and trade relations; Burma to export raw materials including cotton, rubber, wood, rice, and

minerals. in exchange for North Korean machinery, tools, chemicals, and cement. (2)

The DPRK joined AAPS0 in 1957, but was not very active in Africa before the 1960s. Africa quickly emerged as a key region, given its impact on the UNGA debate. Initially, the DPRK targeted radical nationalist and socialist orientated regimes and movements. Among the first to be approached was Mali, which signed an agreement on trade and cultural relations in July, 1961, after talks with President Keita. On 30 September, 1961, Mali and the DPRK announced their decision to establish full diplomatic relations. A similar agreement on trade was signed in June, 1961 with Guinea after talks with President Sekou Toure. Guinea was important because it had opted out of the French Community, unlike most other Francophone African governments. Guinea agreed to export raw materials such as coffee, coconut, pineapple, perfume and iron ore in return for North Korean textiles, cement, fish and canned goods. (3) The same tour was received by President Kwame Nkrumah in Ghana, one of the most prominent anti-imperialist and Pan-Africanist leaders.

In the Middle East, DPRK delegations likewise focused initially on radical nationalist regimes. Nasser agreed that the United Arab Republic and the DPRK would establish consular relations during a DPRK visit from 22 July - 1 August, 1961. Nasser pointedly thanked the DPRK for its support during the Suez crisis in 1956. A trade agreement was also signed with the Yemen Arab Republic in September, 1961, and an agreement on economic and cultural cooperation was reached with Morocco, even though it was a conservative regime. The DPRK exchanged visiting delegations with Iraq and Algeria.

In fact, the DPRK sent 17 government delegations abroad in 1961, and received 28 foreign delegations. Some 78 new agreements were signed. The DPRK joined six international organisations, mostly of a scientific or cultural nature. Party to Party relations were also robust, including communist parties from Ceylon, China, Cuba, Indonesia, Malaya, Syria, Venezuela, and Vietnam. In addition, Pyongyang hosted an international conference of labour organisations from Asia, Africa and Latin America in May, 1962.

DPRK trade and goodwill missions soon broadened their scope. In 1962 they travelled to Algeria, Cambodia, Ceylon, Cuba, Iraq, Nepal, Somalia, Sudan, Togo, and Tunisia, among others. Consular relations were opened with India, and Cambodia in 1962, both neutralist governments. A reciprocal opening of trade offices was agreed with Ceylon, Togo, and Somalia. The DPRK also signed new trade or other agreements with Guinea, Mali, the UAR, India, Cuba, Vietnam, and Ceylon.

Nevertheless, the DPRK had full diplomatic relations with only a few Third World partners, including Algeria, Cuba, Guinea, Mali, and North Vietnam, all radical nationalist

or socialist regimes. By 1963 this was already increasing, as full ambassadorial relations were established with Uganda (2 March), the Yemen Arab Republic (9 March), the United Arab Republic (24 August), and Indonesia (16 April). A trade office was opened in Uruguay in May, 1963, and Bolivia sent a goodwill delegation to the DPRK, indicating modest progress with Latin America. In Africa, the DPRK approached Kenya for the first time in 1963, reinforcing its interest in regimes outside the radical circle. New trade agreements were signed with Mali, Cambodia, Indonesia, and Ceylon. In all, over fifty Afro-Asian delegations visited the DPRK in 1963 alone. The DPRK participated in AAPSO events and thereby further expanded its range of contacts.

By the time of the 15th anniversary celebrations of the founding of the DPRK, delegations from 22 countries were in attendance, including such leading Afro-Asian governments as Indonesia, Cuba, Guinea, Mali, Algeria, UAR, Yemen Arab Republic, Cambodia, Iraq, and Ghana. In 1964, the DPRK joined ten international organisations, most scientific or sporting. A goodwill mission to Africa expanded contacts to include Senegal, Niger, and Zanzibar.

The evidence reviewed above suggests that the Third World diplomacy was already a success by 1964. Relations were consolidated or elevated to a higher level. For example, Kim Il Sung played host that year to state visits by President Sukarno of Indonesia and President Keita of Mali, key contacts in their respective regions. Such visits by prominent Afro-Asian heads of state elevated the prestige of the DPRK, and set a precedent for many such summits that followed.

The Joint Communiqués and speeches of these two leaders (Sukarno and Keita) during their respective visits illustrate the themes of solidarity. Kim Il Sung emphasised the "common past, ideals, and enemy" between Mali and North Korea and praised Keita for establishing a strong independent country. (4) Keita endorsed the DPRK's reunification policy. They jointly demanded withdrawal of all foreign military forces and bases from Asia, Africa, and Latin America, and condemned colonialism and imperialism. They explicitly stressed the importance of cooperation and solidarity among the new Afro-Asian states as a means of strengthening their independence and self-reliant economies. (5)

The joint statements during Sukarno's visit in November, 1964, called for withdrawal of all foreign military forces from Asia and invoked the "spirit of Bandung." Kim and Sukarno hailed their summit as a contribution to Afro-Asian and Latin American solidarity. The DPRK was careful not only to back Indonesia against Malaysia in its territorial dispute (6) but also to endorse Sukarno's proposals for a Conference of Newly Emerging Powers. (7)

Another significant diplomatic event in 1964 is evidence for the early success of Third World diplomacy. The Asian Economic Conference held in Pyongyang, was attended by delegations from 34 countries: 13 from Asia, 19 from Africa, and 2 from Oceania. Kim Il Sung took the opportunity to promote North Korea's model, declaring that all the liberated countries should establish a self-reliant economy and struggle against imperialism - old and new (neo). He said that the cooperation and solidarity of Asian, African and Latin American countries could break down imperialist attempts at intervention and he reaffirmed the DPRK's support for liberation and anti-imperialist struggles. (8) The final declaration of the Asian Economic Conference endorsed independent and self-reliant national economies. Kim Il Sung had good timing, since 1964 was also the year UNCTAD took up the banner of advancing Third World interests in the international trading system.

At this critical juncture, DPRK relations with key Afro-Asian allies were consolidated, including the UAR, Algeria, Indonesia, Mali, Guinea, Cambodia, Congo (Brazzaville) and Mauritania. Full diplomatic relations were established with five Afro-Asian states: Indonesia (16 April), Mauritania (11 November), Cambodia (20 December), Congo (Brazzaville) (24 December), and Ghana (28 December). Statements from Joint Communiqués with these governments, summarised below, illustrate the successful use of Third World solidarity:

President Nasser and Choi, Yong-gun, head of the DPRK's delegation to Egypt, exchanged endorsements of non-alignment, Korea's reunification policies, the liberation struggles of Africa, and condemned Western use of Israel for interference in Arab affairs. (9) With Algeria's leader, Ben Bella, the DPRK endorsed OAU and NAM decisions on maintaining present borders in Africa, rather than pursuit of radical revision of political geography as demanded by some Pan-Africanists. The DPRK-Algerian solidarity statements extended to liberation struggles in Africa, Indochina, and even Cuba, while condemning Israeli attacks on Syria. In joint statements with President Keita in Mali, the DPRK condemned Belgian intervention in Stanleyville, endorsed African liberation movements, Indonesia's struggle and the North Kalimantan peoples' liberation movement. Sekou Toure's statements (Guinea) were similar. (10) Choi and Prince Sihanouk found common ground in opposition to the US and expansion of the war in Indochina, support for Cambodia's neutrality, and the tri-continental struggle. (11)

A major diplomatic landmark in the competition with South Korea occurred in 1964. Two states that had previously had diplomatic relations with the ROK only agreed to establish relations with North Korea. First, the Congo (Brazzaville), after the August 1963 revolution, and under the leadership of Massamba-Debat, decided to open diplomatic relations with Pyongyang. When it did so the ROK invoked the Hallstein Doctrine (i.e. the

doctrine of no relations with any state having relations with North Korea). This was repeated when Mauritania established diplomatic relations with the DPRK. Thus the DPRK had made a net gain of two supporters at the ROK's expense. This was an extremely important precedent. The shift in allegiance reflected the importance of Third World solidarity. For instance, Mauritania and the DPRK issued a Joint Communiqué on 4 November, 1964, calling for withdrawal of all foreign military forces from Asia, Africa, and Latin America and endorsing the second Afro-Asian conference. (12)

The culminating achievement of the early 1960s was Kim Il Sung's official state visit to Indonesia, 10-15 April, 1965, and his summit with Sukarno, to celebrate the tenth anniversary of the Bandung conference. The visit was Kim Il Sung's first to a non-communist Afro-Asian country. It was officially described in the DPRK as being due to Sukarno's leading role in the Afro-Asian and anti-colonial movements of the time. (13)

Kim Il Sung made his debut in Third World summitry by delivering a speech on North Korean socialist construction, stressing the self-reliant national economy. Sukarno called for all foreign troops to leave Korea and endorsed reunification free from foreign interference. (14) Kim Il Sung endorsed Sukarno's decision to withdraw Indonesia from the UN, depicted as a tool of imperialists for maintaining the old international order. (15) They jointly called for a strengthened anti-imperialist movement among the tri-continental forces.

III. The DPRK and Third World Conflicts: The Vietnam War Era

The DPRK made use of its anti-imperialist credentials in the Third World. In the period 1960-1975 international conditions were particularly ripe for "declaratory solidarity", given the number of conflicts in the Third World, especially Indochina.

For instance, in mid-February, 1961 the DPRK protested the assassination of Patrice Lumumba in the newly independent Congo, accusing Belgian colonialists, Congolese traitors, the US, and UN Secretary General Dag Hammerskjold of complicity in the crime. (16) Another example is Cuba. The DPRK supported the Cuban struggle against the US, especially in the wake of the aborted Bay of Pigs invasion. Cuba was regarded as a "divided nation" because of the US naval base at Guantanamo Bay, therefore sharing a common interest in expelling US forces. In a Joint Communiqué in August, 1961, Cuba and the DPRK supported the right of Vietnam and Laos to resolve their unification issues free from foreign interference, and the struggle of the tri-continental solidarity movement against colonialism and imperialism. (17) In October, 1962 the DPRK condemned the US military blockade of Cuba and later sent material aid, including tractors, medicine, rice and concrete mixers, in November, 1963.

The DPRK supported India when it annexed Goa from Portuguese colonial control in 1961. However, during the Sino-Indian border conflict, the DPRK essentially chose China. The DPRK issued a statement in November, 1962 characterising the Sino-Indian border conflict as one arising from the heritage of imperialism in India, but condemned India for its actions, calling upon it to accept China's proposals. (18)

There was no such ambiguity on the Vietnam and Indochina conflicts. As early as April, 1961, the DPRK Foreign Ministry began to accuse the US of expanding its intervention in Vietnam. (19) The DPRK identified its own situation very closely with that of Vietnam and made the conflict a priority. Analogies between the Korean and Vietnam Question were directly exploited to strengthen DPRK diplomacy.

Ho Chi Minh paid a state visit to the DPRK from 16-22 June, 1961. In their Joint Communique, Ho and Kim Il Sung demanded US troop withdrawal from all of Asia, depicting the US as the primary obstacle to reunification of China, Vietnam, and Korea. They emphasised the importance of cooperation among Asian, African and Latin American peoples in the fight for peace, national independence, and social development. (20) Later, in March, 1962, the DPRK endorsed a North Vietnamese statement condemning the US invasion of South Vietnam. (21)

With the coming Vietnam conflict in view, and in response to the military coup in South Korea, North Korea launched an internal debate on military policy. The DPRK adopted a more militant confrontational stance vis a vis Seoul and Washington. The Kapsan faction, having consolidated control at the Fourth KWP conference in 1961, pressed for greater military expenditure. The policy of "equal emphasis" on economic and military development was approved in 1962. This policy included increased material assistance for other struggles, particularly that of the Vietnamese. Accordingly, in December, 1963, the DPRK established a committee to support the South Vietnamese struggle. However, the policy of equal emphasis put ever greater strain on North Korea's economic development. (22)

The year 1965 was a definite turning point in North-South competition. When the ROK normalised relations with Japan in 1965, signing what North Korea considered to be a "separate peace", this raised fears in Pyongyang of resurgent Japanese economic and political influence on the Korean peninsula. With Japanese assistance, South Korea began a transition to an export-oriented, rapid growth economy, thus better able to compete with industrialised North Korea. South Korean intervention in the Vietnam War provoked the DPRK.

Another significant factor causing a shift in policy was the diplomatic setback to the DPRK resulting from the 1965 coup in Indonesia, the overthrow of Sukarno and the liquidation of the PKI. The DPRK responded to this crisis by shifting more resources to diplomatic activity in Africa and the Middle East, and exploiting conflicts such as the Arab-Israeli wars and African liberation struggles.

The DPRK launched a worldwide propaganda offensive against the ROK as a result of its combat involvement in South Vietnam. The DPRK successfully exploited the mood of the Third World against US intervention in Vietnam by making analogies to the Korean situation. The result was a dramatic shift in the mood of the UNGA, where the debate on the Korean Question entered a new phase marked by rapid DPRK advances.

The intensification of US military intervention in Vietnam and despatch of ROK combat divisions to South Vietnam in 1965 precipitated renewed debate in Pyongyang on defense policy. On the model of the Vietnamese conflict, Kim Il Sungists advocated a "war of national liberation" to be waged from South Korea via a Marxist-Leninist revolutionary party and national front.

This debate culminated in the special KWP Representatives Conference in October, 1966. The seven year plan had to be extended to ten years and defense spending officially increased to one third of the national budget. (23) At the same time, the DPRK adopted the "Three Revolutions" policy: revolution in the North, revolution in South Korea, and world revolution, regarded as mutually interdependent. The socialist base in the North would be militarily and politically strengthened. Third World diplomacy would be aimed at facilitating conditions for the completion of the revolution in the South. Strengthening the forces of world revolution would weaken the US. (24)

Kim Il Sung viewed material support for the Vietnamese struggle in the context of the three revolutions strategy. He told an international solidarity committee in June, 1965 that "...the heroic war of resistance of the Vietnamese people against the US imperialists is... a sacred struggle which contributes to the common cause of all the progressive peoples of the world... The Korean people, the Asian, African, and Latin American peoples, and all the progressive peoples of the world have the due right and obligation to support the just struggle of the Vietnamese people..." (25)

The DPRK sent material aid to Hanoi in 1965, including textiles, medicines and daily necessities to use in the struggle in South Vietnam. This support was acknowledged by the South Vietnamese National Liberation Front (SVNLF), whose leader Nguyen Huu Tho

pledged to "side with the brotherly Korean people in the struggle against the US imperialist aggressors and the Pak Chung Hi clique..." (26) In June, 1965 the North Korean Supreme Peoples Assembly (SPA) approved a pledge to "give the Vietnamese people all forms of assistance, moral and material, including arms and would take when requested by the South Vietnam National Front for Liberation, actions to send volunteers to South Vietnam." (27)

On 8 July, 1965, the DPRK declared it would "supply arms and equipment to SVNFL" and would "equip as many men of the South Vietnamese liberation armed forces as the reinforcing South Korean troops". Kim Il Sung telegraphed Nguyen Huu Tho directly after South Korea announced despatch of a whole combat division to South Vietnam, pledging to "give to the end every possible support." (28) On 17 January, 1966 the DPRK and DRV signed the "Korea-Vietnam Economic Agreement on Free Aid" providing free material assistance to Vietnam. Such an agreement was renewed every year during this period.

Kim Il Sung pressed the Vietnamese to accept North Korean combat forces. For instance, Premier Kim Il Sung cabled Ho Chi Minh on 21 July, 1966 to pledge willingness "to give the Vietnamese people more active support in all possible ways including the dispatch of volunteers..." When the US submitted the Vietnamese Question to the UN Security Council, the DPRK denounced this act as "illegal" and claimed that "The UN has no right whatsoever to interfere in the Vietnam Question." (29) Kim Il Sung defended the extension of the equal emphasis policy by arguing that this was necessary "to cope with the enemy's aggressive manoeuvres." (30)

In October, 1966, Kim Il Sung characterised the international situation as "a bitter struggle...between socialism and imperialism, between the forces of revolution and the forces of counter-revolution". He emphasised the world-wide growth of socialist forces and national liberation movements, which had "markedly weakened the forces of imperialism." Therefore, he concluded that "Victory of socialism and downfall of imperialism are the main trend of our times that no force can check." (31)

Echoing Che Guevara, Kim Il Sung concluded that "In the present situation, the US imperialists should be dealt blows and their forces dispersed to the maximum in all parts and on every front in the world - in Asia and Europe, Africa and Latin America." He called on all socialist countries to pool their strength to aid the Vietnamese and the Cuban revolution. (32)

North Korea's confrontational stance was not mere rhetoric. For example, a US Guard

Boat was sunk off the DPRK coast on 19 January, 1967. The US estimated that there were 25-50 DPRK combat pilots in Vietnam in 1968. (33) The Tet offensive in January 1968 was praised by Kim Il Sung as a "fatal blow" to the US and South Vietnam. (34) A special commando unit was sent to Seoul on 21-22 January, 1968, attempting to assassinate President Park Chung Hee. The DPRK seized the USS Pueblo, a naval intelligence vessel, and its entire crew on 23 January, 1968.

The DPRK greatly stepped up the infiltration of commando units into the South on missions intended to foment communist partisan uprisings, reported in Northern media as "spontaneous" guerrilla activity. Pyongyang claimed that a "Peoples Committees" and a "revolutionary party" had been established in South Korea. At the 20th anniversary celebrations of the DPRK in 1968, Kim Il Sung called openly for armed struggle in South Korea. Reeling from Tet and fearing a second war in Asia, the US secretly negotiated with the DPRK for release of the Pueblo's crew and accepted the DPRK's demand for an apology on the affair.

The danger of war in Korea persisted into 1969. On 15 April, 1969 the DPRK shot down a US reconnaissance plane and on 17 August a US helicopter. In June, 1969, the DPRK provocatively established diplomatic relations with the newly proclaimed "Provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of South Vietnam."

III. B. Anti-ROK Propaganda

The DPRK took full advantage of the general unpopularity of the Vietnam war to launch an effective anti-ROK propaganda campaign. South Korea's decision to despatch combat troops to South Vietnam on 4 June, 1965, was denounced from the outset and presented as the act of a pathetic puppet of US imperialism. Every subsequent escalation by the ROK was denounced.

Not only was Park Chung Hee criticised for fighting in Vietnam but was also on a range of other Third World conflicts. For example, the ROK was condemned for establishing diplomatic relations with Israel and South Africa, for allegedly offering to send "volunteers" to Malaysia in its conflict with Indonesia, and for opposing Indonesian control of West Irian.

The DPRK ridiculed President Park's new outreach policy to Africa and Asia, painting Seoul as an "enemy" of the African people. In 1966 the DPRK ridiculed an ROK special mission to the Middle East and Africa by decrying Seoul's "unbearable mockery and contempt for neutral nations in Asia and Africa", resulting from ROK allegiance to the US. ROK "goodwill" diplomacy toward neutral Afro-Asian states and Latin America was condemned as a cynical attempt at "softening up the neutral nations opposition to the Seoul

regime for its troop dispatch to South Vietnam, persuading them into establishing friendly relations with South Korea, and then winning their support at the 21st UN General Assembly." (35) Similarly, the DPRK lambasted ROK plans to send a goodwill mission to 11 states in Africa in 1967, explicitly targeted because they had not voted in favour of the ROK in the 21st UNGA session. This was dubbed "Soap and Match diplomacy", and ROK policy was depicted as patronising and racist.

DPRK propaganda specifically exploited the ROK's anti-communist policy. South Korea's efforts to organise a pan-Asian collective security organisation were especially condemned. The "South East Asian Foreign Ministers Conference", better known as ASPAC, (discussed in the next chapter) was presented as evidence of the ROK's aggressive and reactionary character. ASPAC was denounced as a "challenge to Asian, African, and Latin American peoples...who are fighting for liberation, national independence, peace, and social progress." This was effective. For example, the Tricontinental Peoples Solidarity Organisation accepted this line and condemned ASPAC. (36)

DPRK propaganda was supported by efforts to translate opposition to the Vietnam war into concrete demonstrations of criticism of the ROK. For instance, on 16 June, 1965 a meeting of liberation movements in Cairo issued a statement appealing to the Foreign Ministers of the second Afro-Asian conference to prevent the admission of the "puppet regimes of South Korea, Tshombe, Israel, Malaysia and Saigon" into the Afro-Asian conference. South Korea came first on the list of "enemies who have been entrusted by the imperialists with the infamous task of sabotaging Afro-Asian solidarity from within our ranks." (37) Later, SWAPO's leader Sam Nujoma visited Pyongyang (summer, 1965) and referred to SWAPO-DPRK relations as a symbol of the "indestructible friendship of Afro-Asian peoples" in the face of imperialism, colonialism, and neo-colonialism.

The AAPSO secretariat called for US troop withdrawal from South Korea on 24 June, 1965. A particular triumph for the DPRK was AAPSO's decision in 1965 to declare August the annual "month of struggle for withdrawal of US troops from South Korea", observed annually for the next several years. Similarly, the Havana Tricontinental Solidarity Conference in January, 1966, passed a resolution on Korea denouncing US occupation and demanding its withdrawal. It designated 25 June-25 July the "month of solidarity with the Korean people" and condemned the ROK-Japan treaty, associated with the intervention in Vietnam. The AAPSO permanent secretariat issued a demand for US withdrawal from South Korea on 25 June, 1966. Later in 1966 both AAPSO and the Tricontinental Solidarity Organisation condemned the US for alleged provocations intended to start a new war in Korea.

Liberation movements in Africa were particularly supportive of the DPRK, reciprocating its consistent support for them. For instance, on 24 June, 1966, African liberation movements meeting in Cairo again issued a joint demand for US withdrawal from Korea. (38)

Kim Il Sung felt the Tricontinental organisation in Havana was important enough to merit a theoretical piece in the first issue of its journal. Kim Il Sung's treatise, published on 12 August, 1967, was entitled "Let Us Intensify the Anti-Imperialist, Anti-US Struggle", in which he attacked the idea of putting peaceful relations with the Western powers before the needs of the struggle against colonialism and imperialism in the Third World.

The Tricontinental organisation called a week of international solidarity for national liberation struggles in 1968. Kim Il Sung took the opportunity to emphasise the interrelatedness of the Third World's anti-colonial struggle and the struggle of the international working class for socialism, which according to Kim would "carry imperialism to its grave." (39)

Before his fall from power, Sukarno declared that Indonesia did not recognise the ROK nor the ROK-Japan treaty. Sukarno depicted the Korean war as a turning point in history: "since then there has been no holding back the decline of the imperialists. The Asian, African, and Latin American people take the Korean peoples' heroism as an example...the victory of the Korean people indeed constituted one of the bases for the success of the first Asian-African Conference." (40)

On the 8th anniversary of the death of Che Guevara, Kim Il Sung again published a major treatise on world revolution in "Tricontinental", based in Havana. In Kim's analysis it was a period in which proletarian regimes that had seized power were still not free from imperialist aggression and attempts to restore capitalism. The success of each revolution, therefore, depended on the support of "other detachments of the world socialist revolution." He advocated a grand strategy in which "revolutions should take place consecutively in the majority of countries of the world, in several adjacent countries at the least, to replace imperialist encirclement with socialist encirclement." (41)

Nevertheless, the relatively non-dogmatic approach of North Korea's policy on Third World solidarity is illustrated in Kim Il Sung's statement that: "In Asia, Africa, and Latin America there are socialist and neutral countries, big and small countries. All of these countries, except the puppet regime of the imperialists and their satellite states, constitute anti-imperialist anti-US forces. Despite the differences of state socio-political systems, political views, and religious beliefs, the peoples of the countries in these areas, as the

oppressed nations who were suppressed and exploited by the imperialists and colonialists, have the common goal and aspiration to achieve national independence and national prosperity against imperialism and old and new colonialism. The differences of state socio-political systems, political views or religious beliefs can by no means be an obstacle in the way of joint struggle against US imperialism." (42)

Kim Il Sung's support for a broad coalition was in harmony with the main political trend of the time. The NAM had made the transition from a small group of radical and socialist regimes in 1961, to a broad inclusive membership by the late 1960s, with a platform resembling the Group of 77. Kim Il Sung directly related the role of the Korean revolution to the greater aims of the Third World movement. He maintained that "The revolutionary struggle of the Korean people is developing amid the joint struggle of the peoples of the whole world for peace and democracy for national independence and socialism... Our people unite with all the forces opposing US imperialism... We regard it as an important factor in bringing victory to the Korean Revolution." (43)

As the Vietnam war expanded into an Indochinese war, North Korea maintained a consistent line in support of the revolutionary forces in the region, pledging to "do everything necessary to assist the fraternal Vietnamese, Laotian, and Cambodian people," demanding US withdrawal from the entire region. (44)

After the overthrow of Prince Sihanouk and US invasion of Cambodia in 1970, the DPRK gave full support to Sihanouk's Royal Government of National Union as the "only legitimate government" of Cambodia. It severed relations with the new Lon Nol regime and provided military assistance to Sihanouk's National Liberation Peoples Armed Forces. Sihanouk began a series of trips to Pyongyang. Under Lon Nol, Cambodia established diplomatic relations with the ROK.

In October, 1971, President Ton Duc Thang, First Secretary Le Duan and Premier Pham Van Dong headed the annual DRV delegation to the DPRK to sign the agreement on free aid for 1972. They fully backed the North Korean SPA's new 8 Point programme for reunification. (45)

The DPRK fully supported Egypt and Syria during the war with Israel in late 1973 and was delighted with the Arab oil embargo. North Korea viewed the breaking of diplomatic relations with Israel by 19 African states as a sign of the rising tide of anti-imperialist forces. When the ROK suddenly reversed its line on the Middle East, to a pro-Arab position, in December, 1973, the DPRK denounced this as a "ridiculous farce"; a device to extricate itself "from the economic crisis into which they have been driven deeper by the

just oil embargo of the Arab peoples." (46)

The DPRK benefited by the new revolutionary wave in Africa and Indochina. For instance, the revolution in Portugal in 1974 and the victory of liberation forces in Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique and Angola brought new regimes into power, friendly to North Korea. The victory of the communist forces in Indochina in 1975 brought about a dramatic change in the regional balance of forces and caused even moderate regimes to consider establishing diplomatic relations with North Korea.

III. C. Widening Diplomacy Outside Asia

The fall of Sukarno and the escalation of the Indochina war contributed to a shift in DPRK policy, toward widening relations outside Asia. Pyongyang denounced the "outrages of Indonesian reactionary forces" and the death of tens of thousands in pogroms against the PKI. The DPRK saw these events as part of a US strategy in the region "to turn the Indonesian revolution to the right and undermine the anti-imperialist forces of Asia." (47) Nevertheless, the new government of Indonesia, led by General Suharto, did not break off diplomatic relations with the DPRK and even continued to be sympathetic in the UNGA; but it did establish consular relations with South Korea in 1967.

Summit diplomacy was important in image building, to present the DPRK as a model and enhance its prestige. For example, Massamba-Debat, leader of Congo(Brazzaville) visited Pyongyang in 1965 and was greeted by a crowd of 200,000 cheering North Koreans along the route from the airport. This "star treatment" of visiting Third World leaders was repeated many times over the years to follow. Congo(B)-DPRK solidarity stressed the mutual "divided nation" problem and opposition to US interference. Massamba-Debat accused the US of erecting a "curtain of hatred" between Brazzaville and Leopoldville. (48)

The Third World solidarity movement itself went through something of a watershed in 1965. The holding of the GANEFO games in Pyongyang in August, initiated by Sukarno for the New Emerging Forces, was one of the last fruits of DPRK-Indonesian ties. The fall of Sukarno ended the role of the New Emerging Forces as an organising focus. In the autumn of 1965 there was a decision to postpone to second Afro-Asian conference originally planned for Algiers. The DPRK supported this postponement and advised waiting until a new consensus could be reached, reflecting its broad approach to Third World solidarity. Thereafter, the NAM and the G-77 eventually emerged as the key organisations.

The DPRK had particularly fertile conditions for a new focus on the Middle East, given pan-Arabism and the struggle with Israel. The strengthening of ties began with

consolidation of trade relations. For instance, in 1966 a trade mission visited Iraq, Kuwait, Jordan and the UAR, opening trade with the first three and signing a new accord with UAR. Another trade agreement was reached with the Syrian Arab Republic. The DPRK promoted an image of the ROK as pro-Israel and anti-Arab, whereas North Korea was a militant supporter of the Arab revolution and the struggle for Palestinian self-determination. The PLO was allowed diplomatic representation in Pyongyang in 1966. In the summer of 1966, Kang Ryang-uk and Ho Dam went on a tour of the Middle East. They met Nasser on 10 July, agreed to open consular relations with Iraq, and full diplomatic relations with Syria. (49)

In mid-1967 a DPRK tour with Kang and Ho Dam went to both Africa and the Middle East. Tanzania had recently promulgated the Arusha Declaration and nationalised its banks. Kim Il Sung applauded these acts as adhering to the principle of self-reliance and anti-imperialism. Kang and Ho Dam met with President Nyerere in Dar-es-Salaam on 23 March, 1967. In the same tour they established diplomatic relations with Burundi, under President Michel Micombero, met President Kenneth Kaunda in Zambia, established diplomatic relations with Somalia, and visited the Yemen Arab Republic. In their report on the tour to the SPA, Kang and Ho Dam stressed that Somalia and Yemen were "divided nations" and claimed that the DPRK's *juche* philosophy was inspiring Afro-Asians to emulate North Korea. (50)

The Arab-Israeli war in 1967 was seized upon by the DPRK as an opportunity to promote its ties of solidarity with Arab governments. As the war opened, mass solidarity rallies were held in Pyongyang. The DPRK took an unequivocal position on the war: "All actions of the Arab countries against the aggression of the American imperialists and Israeli Zionists are entirely just." The DPRK grouped together "The Israeli Zionists, South Korea's Pak Jung Hi clique, and South Vietnam's Cao Ky clique" as "US lackeys". (51) Kim Il Sung contacted all Arab heads of state, and the PLO, saying that the Korean people regarded US aggression against the Arab people as aggression against themselves. The DPRK sent food aid to the UAR and free military aid to Syria.

DPRK follow-up diplomacy after the Arab-Israeli war was very effective. At the end of 1967 the DPRK recognised the new Republic of South Yemen and hosted a visit by President Moktar Ould Daddah of the Islamic Republic of Mauritania, who had broken off relations with the US and UK. In early 1968, Kang Ryang-uk again led a mission to the Middle East. Full diplomatic relations were established with Iraq, which the DPRK praised for leaving the Baghdad Pact and breaking off relations with the US. Consular relations were opened with Pakistan, and trade offices in Beirut and Kuwait. (52)

Diplomatic relations were opened with Yemen (Aden). Yemen's leader, President Al Shaabi, pledged "mutual support in the struggle against imperialism and colonialism." An economic agreement was signed providing DPRK technical assistance to Yemen, mainly farm machinery and training. President Al-Shaabi made a state visit to the DPRK 27 May-6 June, 1969 and proclaimed that "the entire Arab working people are standing foresquare behind the people of the DPRK." The DPRK signed an agreement to provide free financial and economic aid to South Yemen. Al-Shaabi reciprocated with a call for US withdrawal from Korea. (53)

Iraq and Syria became important North Korean diplomatic partners in the Middle East. President Nureddin Attassi of the Syrian Arab Republic visited Pyongyang in September, 1969 and pledged "absolute support" to the DPRK in its struggle against the US and for the liberation of South Korea. Kim Il Sung set a new precedent by conferring the DPRK Order of National Flag First Class on President Al-Attassi. Kim Il Sung pointedly praised the socio-economic reforms in Syria since the revolution of 8 March, 1963 and pledged DPRK support for Syria's resistance to Israel and the US. Finally, the DPRK was one of the first states to recognise the new Libyan Arab Republic established by the Revolutionary Command Council in 1969, soon to play a pivotal role in changing the region's relationship with the major oil companies. The theme of land reform and nationalisation of industry, mines, and foreign assets figures very prominently in DPRK diplomacy in this period, during which nationalisation became a major trend in Third World politics.

Africa likewise became more prominent in DPRK diplomacy. On 13 January, 1965, the DPRK established full diplomatic relations with Tanzania. This relationship became an important asset of the DPRK's diplomacy in Africa. President Nyerere was an open admirer of the policy of self-reliance, and this fact enhanced the DPRK's image. Tanzania's position as a leader of the group of Frontline States and its links to southern African liberation movements was another key reason for the DPRK's keen interest.

Nyerere visited Pyongyang 22-25 June, 1968, and praised the DPRK as a model of economic development which Tanzania could follow. Nyerere said Tanzania's pursuit of self-reliance was "paralleled in Korea." He also made an analogy between Korea's struggle for unification free from foreign interference and the struggle of African liberation movements. Kim Il Sung praised the Arusha Declaration and the policy of building an independent national economy as the way to transform a poor and backward country into a fully sovereign and independent state. (54)

DPRK diplomacy in Africa made steady gains in this period, expanding beyond the radical regimes. In 1969 a delegation lead by Kim, Gyong Ryon, Chairman of the Committee for

Foreign Economic Relations, toured Africa. Diplomatic relations were established with Equatorial Guinea, Chad, Zambia, Sudan, and the Central African Republic. During the tour Kim, Gyong Ryon met with a series of heads of state, e.g. President Francois Tombalbaye of Chad, President Hamani Diori of Niger, President Sangoule Lamizana of Upper Volta, President Sekou Toure in Guinea, Prime Minister Siaka Stevens in Sierra Leone, and the President of Sudan, Numieri. (55) Kim Il Sung welcomed the new Revolutionary Council of Sudan, which reciprocated by a call for US withdrawal from Korea and dissolution of UNCURK. The relationship established with the C.A.R. and President Jean Bokassa is particularly interesting, since it indicates that relations could encompass even the "idiosyncratic".

In its own region, Asia, the DPRK's main relationship after the fall of Sukarno was with North Vietnam, but Cambodia under Prince Sihanouk became increasingly important. The DPRK consistently supported Cambodian neutrality and Sihanouk's resistance to US pressure. Cambodia broke off diplomatic relations with the ROK in 1966, expelling its consulate from Phnom Penh.

Likewise, Burma moved closer to the DPRK in the "common anti-imperialist and anti-colonial struggle." A channel was opened to capitalist Singapore, and Kang met Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew on 29 June, 1968. Consular relations were established with Singapore on 28 November, 1969, and also with Nepal in 1969. (56)

Relations with Latin America were, as previously, the weakest of any region. The primary relationship was with Cuba, which was further strengthened. For instance, President Osvaldo Torrado visited the DPRK 26-29 October, 1966, pledging Cuba's willingness to "shed blood" for the Korean people. Cuba and the DPRK called for a global anti-imperialist front among tri-continental peoples.

Outside Cuba, however, progress in Latin America was very slow. The main exception was Chile, a democracy in which the left had considerable and growing influence. Salvador Allende Gossens, as President of the Senate, visited Pyongyang in April-May 1969, and met with Kim Il Sung. Chilean and Korean delegations were regularly exchanged for several years and relations became very close, especially after Allende was inaugurated as President of Chile.

IV. North-South Dialogue

The period from the end of the 1960s into the mid 1970s was one in which dramatic changes took place both in the international system and in North Korea's international standing. The international context was one of hegemonic transition, as bipolarity gave way to

multipolarity and as US power underwent a relative decline. There were profound changes in global relations of power, both between the great powers and between them and the Third World. The United States finally embraced communist China, leading to China's membership in the UN Security Council. Detente was initiated with the Soviet Union.

This new atmosphere among the great powers facilitated an understanding that the Koreans themselves should take the initiative to resolve their differences, without foreign interference. This was extended to the UN and the way was cleared for a North-South dialogue on the Korean peninsula. This opening also facilitated a shift by the majority of UN member states toward recognition of both Korean regimes, and the acceptance of the DPRK into a wide range of international organisations.

The DPRK adapted its policy to exploit these trends. It cultivated a new image of a peace-loving state seeking international cooperation. The ultra-militancy of the preceding period was toned down. The expansion of DPRK diplomacy in the Third World not only continued, but was broadened to include moderate and conservative regimes, and even some Western European countries. Most importantly, the DPRK won the full support of the Non-aligned Movement. Together they campaigned for DPRK reunification proposals in the UNGA.

These systematic global campaigns were made at a time of rapidly accelerating Third World political activism in world politics. The end of the Vietnam War, and the victory of communist movements throughout Indochina, coincided with the victory of a number of African liberation movements. The NAM and the G-77 championed the New International Economic Order via special sessions of the UNGA and a new agenda of "North-South" relations.

The change in China's situation in 1971 was a major breakthrough for North Korea. In 1970 Premier Zhou Enlai visited Pyongyang from 5-7 April and put Sino-Korean relations back on a friendly footing, ending a period of strain during the Cultural Revolution. China renewed its call for US troop withdrawal from South Korea, denounced ROK "fascist suppression", and pledged support to the DPRK's "struggle against aggression by US imperialism and its accomplices." (57)

The DPRK was exultant over the "great Victory of Chinese People" in the vote on 25 October, 1971 at the 26th UNGA session (76 to 35) restoring China's rights in the UN. Pyongyang described this precedent as a "bolt from the blue for the Pak Jung Hi clique." (57) The entry of China into the UN, and the expulsion of Nationalist China, changed the atmosphere on the Korean Question dramatically.

Kim Il Sung, in an interview with Harrison Salisbury for the New York Times on 26 May, 1972, revealed his readiness to adapt to the new international conditions. He renounced any intention to "impose our socialist system on South Korea" or to militarily attack South Korea. (59) He implied that the two social systems of North and South could co-exist and Korean unification would be peaceful.

One DPRK historian sums up this transitional period as follows: "Entering the 1970s the internal and external situations changed more favourably for the cause of national reunification of the Korean people." (60) This was due to the following factors: the success of Northern industrialisation; the increase in the prestige of the DPRK and its international dignity - due to its independent foreign policy and the *juche* idea; growing international support for the independent peaceful reunification of Korea; a "string of defeats" of the US in Asia; the anti-war movement and economic contradictions; and intensifying "fascist repression" by Park Chung Hee in South Korea. (61)

In August, 1971, Kim Il Sung offered to establish personal contact at any time with any political party, organisation, or personage in South Korea. He responded to similar peace feelers by Park Chung Hee in early 1972, leading to a series of secret meetings between Kim Yong-ju, Director of the Organisation and Guidance Department of the KWP (Kim Il Sung's brother), and Lee Hu-rak, Director of the KCIA in South Korea. This was followed by a visit by DPRK Vice-Premier Park Sung Chul to Seoul 29 May-1 June, 1972.

The result was the path-breaking Joint Statement on the North-South Dialogue on 4 July, 1972. This statement embodied the basic principles of reunification: to solve the problem independently without foreign interference; to achieve reunification peacefully without use of armed force; and to put the principle of "grand national unity" above differences in social system and ideology.

The North-South Coordination Commission was established a vehicle for future negotiations, with Lee Hu Rak and Kim Yong-ju its chairmen. A series of commission meetings were held until the tenth meeting in March, 1975. Parallel Red Cross talks began on 20 August, 1971, but ended in deadlock in July, 1973 on the issue of reuniting separated families.

Unfortunately, the North-South Dialogue fell victim to political events on the Korean peninsula. In particular, the imposition of a new personal dictatorship in South Korea in October, 1972, spoiled the atmosphere of the negotiations. Park Chung Hee declared Martial Law, dissolved the National Assembly, and banned all political activity from 17

October, 1972, inaugurating the authoritarian era known as "Yushin."

Nevertheless, even in the absence of Yushin, Korean reunification might not have been achieved at this time. The general atmosphere favoured detente and reconciliation, but enormous difficulties remained over the issue of concrete steps to reunification.

As a result of the dissipation of good faith there was a hiatus in North-South talks until March, 1973. The DPRK used the impasse to launch a global diplomatic campaign to outflank the ROK in the UN. The atmosphere was ripe for such a campaign, given US defeat in Vietnam. On 27 January, 1973 the Paris Peace Agreement on Vietnam was signed, providing for the final withdrawal of remaining US forces in South Vietnam.

The DPRK saw US withdrawal from Vietnam as a great victory for its own cause; a clear precedent for Korea. The US had admitted that Vietnam was one country, but had two governments. The political future of Vietnam was to be decided by national elections. Unification would be step by step without foreign interference. Furthermore, the US had pledged to cease all military intervention.

North Korea's global campaign included an effort to enter as many international organisations as possible. This campaign was very successful. On 5 May, 1973, the DPRK was admitted to the Inter-Parliamentary Union in a vote of 57 to 28, and to the World Health Organisation later that month by a vote of 66 to 41 with 22 abstentions. The resolution supporting DPRK admission to WHO was co-sponsored by 35 states. This was a significant breakthrough because it allowed the DPRK for the first time to establish a Permanent Observer Mission at UN headquarters in New York, and thus to take part in the UNGA debate on the Korean Question - for the first time since it began in 1947. This success was followed by admittance to UNCTAD, where the DPRK avidly supported the NIEO.

While this campaign proceeded the DPRK pressed the ROK to accept mutual troop reductions, a moratorium on the introduction of new weapons into Korea, withdrawal of all foreign forces, and a mutual guarantee of the non-use of force. South Korea responded with a proposal for simultaneous entry into the UN. North Korea rejected this proposal as a "Two Koreas Plot", designed to perpetuate national division, and accused the US of being its true author. (62) The US proposal of "cross-recognition" that accompanied the UN membership proposal called for recognition of both Koreas by the major powers, as well as their simultaneous UN membership, modeled on the German situation. (63)

The kidnapping by the KCIA of Southern opposition leader Kim, Dae Jung in Tokyo on 8

August, 1973, gave the DPRK the opportunity to launch a propaganda offensive. Kim, Yong-ju declared on 28 August, 1973, that the "anti-communist fascist policy" in the South totally contravened the spirit of the 4 July Joint Statement, as did the new "Two Korea" policy. The DPRK demanded that Lee, Hu Rak and other KCIA personnel no longer be allowed to participate in the talks, but did not call for suspending the talks themselves. (64)

Despite bitterness in Korea itself, the great powers moved ahead with a framework for Korean reconciliation. In November, 1973, US Secretary of State Henry Kissinger and Zhou Enlai, meeting in Beijing, reached a new understanding on the Korean Question. The US agreed that UNCURK would be dissolved, in exchange for moderation on the demand for immediate dissolution of the UNC. This was a refinement of the basic agreement in the Shanghai Communique of 27 February, 1972, in which the US and China agreed that the Korean Question should be settled by the Koreans themselves. As in the past, the great powers could negotiate "over the heads" of the Koreans.

North Korea itself decided in 1974 to negotiate "over the head" of the ROK. The SPA addressed a letter directly to the US Congress on 25 March, seeking a direct dialogue to replace the Korean Armistice with a Peace treaty, including withdrawal of foreign troops. (65) At the same time, the DPRK intensified propaganda against the ROK, denouncing the Park regime for repression intended to "check the trend toward democratization of society and national reunification....by resorting to fascist tyranny..." (66)

The fall of the Saigon regime in 1975 produced final impasse in the North-South dialogue. Kim, Yong-ju announced conditions under which the aborted talks could be resumed: the ROK must reject US influence and all US troops must be withdrawn. The anti-communist and fascist policy of the ROK had to stop. The state of military tension must cease and both regimes return to the policy of great national unity. Kim, Yong-ju said that, "Only when a patriotic, democratic figure who truly aspires after national reunification comes to power, is it possible to hold genuine dialogue between the north and the south." (67)

V. Achievement of Diplomatic Parity with South Korea

The new international environment in the 1970s, with its acceptance of the principle of settlement of the Korean Question by the Koreans themselves, facilitated a spectacular increase in the DPRK's international support. The DPRK increased the number of its diplomatic partners more substantially in the early 1970s than any other period in its history. In total, from January 1972 to July, 1973, 21 countries opened diplomatic relations with the DPRK. In 1974, a further 15 states opened diplomatic relations with Pyongyang. Altogether, during the three year period preceding the crucial vote on the Korean Question at the 30th session of the UNGA in 1975, over 40 countries established diplomatic relations

with the DPRK. The DPRK also consolidated a decisive advantage over the ROK in the NAM. In 1973-1974 alone, 20 non-aligned states opened relations with North Korea, compared to only 7 with South Korea.

Thus, the ratio of diplomatic partners between the ROK and DPRK steadily approached parity. For example, in 1970 the ROK had 82 full diplomatic partners compared to the DPRK's mere 34. This gap narrowed to 84 to 36 in 1971; 85 to 45 in 1972; 90 to 60 in 1974; and 92 to 87 in 1975. By the end of 1974 the regional distribution of partners (outside of the Soviet sphere in Europe) was as follows: 28 in Africa, 14 in Asia, 10 in the Middle East, 8 in Latin America, 7 in Europe, and 1 in Oceania, clearly demonstrating the significance of Third World support.

These advances were achieved through extensive diplomacy.

In early 1970, Kang, Ryang-uk, Vice President of the Presidium of the SPA, led a mission touring Africa and the Middle East. He met Chairman Numieri in Sudan, President Nasser in the UAR, President Daddah in Mauritania and President Helou in Lebanon. (68) The DPRK campaigned for dissolution of UNCURK and US withdrawal from South Korea. Leaders were encouraged to express explicit support for these proposals.

At one point, the inauguration of Salvador Allende as President of Chile in 1970 seemed to open a new era in Latin America. On 10 November, 1970 the DPRK opened a trade mission in Santiago. The DPRK was an enthusiastic supporter of the reforms undertaken under Allende by 1971, such as nationalisation of banks, coal companies and US interests, the land reform, and Chile's establishment of diplomatic relations with Cuba. Chile's Socialist Party fully supported the DPRK's reunification proposals and condemned Park Chung Hee for "fascist repression" in South Korea. (69) Full diplomatic relations were established with Chile on 1 June, 1972.

However, it was a short-lived victory. By November of the same year the DPRK was denouncing the US for organising rightists to destabilise Allende, and for aiding the crippling Chilean truckers strike. Nevertheless, the DPRK hailed the victory of the Popular Unity movement in parliamentary elections in March, 1973 and Allende endorsed the SPA's stand on Korean reunification.

In mid-1973, with full diplomatic relations with Cuba, Chile, and Argentina, the DPRK seemed to be breaking out of its relative isolation in Latin America. However, the death of Allende and the overthrow of his government in the bloody military coup d'etat in September, 1973, was a tremendous set-back to the DPRK. The DPRK cut off all diplomatic relations with the military junta led by General Pinochet that replaced Allende's

government.

Steady progress was made initially with President Juan Velasco Alvarado in Peru, who the DPRK praised for nationalisation and land reform policies. Trade relations with Peru were opened in April, 1974. The victory of Hector Campora and the Peronists in Argentina's presidential elections in March, 1973, was followed by establishment of diplomatic relations with the DPRK after a visit by Isabel Peron to Pyongyang. However, by late 1974, following the death of Juan Peron, there were rumours of an impending coup in Argentina. Newly independent Guyana, under Prime Minister Forbes Burnham, established relations with North Korea in 1974, as did Jamaica under Michael Manley's leadership. Diplomatic relations were also established with Venezuela, an important moderate regime, late in 1974.

DPRK partners increasingly included moderate non-aligned regimes. For example, in 1972 the DPRK won the endorsement of the Arab Republic of Yemen for US withdrawal from Korea and dissolution of UNCURK, in exchange for DPRK condemnation of "Israeli aggression". (70) North Korea thus accepted relations with both Yemens, rather than supporting only one regime. Another breakthrough in the Islamic world occurred by achieving diplomatic relations with Pakistan on 9 November, 1972. President Bhutto withdrew Pakistan from UNCURK, following Chile's withdrawal. This was a considerable boost to the DPRK's campaign to delegitimise UNCURK.

More curious was the opening of diplomatic relations with Zaire in November, 1972, since the DPRK had previously denounced President Mobutu. The ROK reacted badly, and Zaire decided to expel the ROK ambassador for interference in internal affairs! In late 1974 Mobutu made a state visit to Pyongyang and pledged support for North Korea in the UN. Mobutu stressed the importance of the advance of the anti-colonial movement in Africa and the collapse of the Portuguese empire. Perhaps this trend explains his decision to open relations with the DPRK.

Among other key breakthroughs in 1974 was the re-establishment of close relations with Indonesia. In July, Foreign Minister Adam Malik met Kim Il Sung and Ho Dam in Pyongyang. Even more significantly, Australia established diplomatic relations on 31 July; hailed by the DPRK as a "momentous event". Yet another reversal in the DPRK's favour was that by Togo. President Eyadema visited Pyongyang and thereafter broke off diplomatic relations with the ROK on 17 September, 1974. Eyadema defended the expulsion of the ROK embassy from Togo by saying he would not maintain relations with South Korea while foreign troops remained there as an obstacle to a peaceful settlement.

(71)

Undoubtedly, however, the breakthroughs in Europe were the most spectacular. In 1973 a Foreign Ministers conference of five North European governments reached a joint decision to open diplomatic relations with North Korea, thus ending its diplomatic isolation in Western Europe. Sweden, Finland, Denmark, Iceland, and Norway established diplomatic relations with the DPRK between April and November, 1973. They thereby reinforced the trend to a non-partisan position on the Korean Question. In December, 1974, Austria and Switzerland also established diplomatic relations with the DPRK, and Portugal did so in 1975.

In the same year another significant breakthrough occurred with the opening of diplomatic relations with Iran. The Shah, a close ally of the United States, had previously recognised only the ROK. Malaysia was another significant success, which established diplomatic relations with the DPRK after leaving ASPAC. The DPRK even recognised the regime of Idi Amin in Uganda, which was made easier by his anti-imperialist rhetoric and the fact that Amin condemned US military involvement in Korea. (72) India at last established full diplomatic relations with the DPRK on 10 December, 1973.

The success of several African liberation movements in 1974-75 was very significant. North Korea quickly recognised Angola, Mozambique, Cape Verde, and Sao Tome and Principe. Samora Machel of Mozambique visited Pyongyang in March, 1975, and was given the Order of National Flag First Class. Mozambique and North Korea established diplomatic relations on 25 June, 1975. Machel denounced the "Two Korea's Plot" and called for US withdrawal from South Korea. The DPRK praised Mozambique's "people's democratic power". (73) In Dahomey, the new Peoples Republic of Benin, was immediately recognised by the DPRK. President Mathieu Kerekou severed diplomatic relations with the ROK in 1975.

An even greater impact was made by the victories of the communist forces in Indochina. As a result, Thailand opened relations with the DPRK on 8 May, 1975, followed by Burma on 16 May, both to the dismay of South Korea. Relations were re-established with Cambodia, and Prince Sihanouk visited Pyongyang on 19 May, 1975, as head of state. Given the close personal friendship between Sihanouk and Kim Il Sung, Cambodia took a strong pro-DPRK position in both the UN and the NAM. Laos, under the regime of Premier Souvanna Phouma, broke off relations with the ROK, denouncing it as a "fascist dictatorial regime" and endorsed the DPRK's reunification proposals. Later in 1975, Thailand decided to withdraw its contingent of troops from South Korea, thus adding momentum to the DPRK's campaign for dissolution of the UNC.

All the examples reviewed above attest to the rapid "rehabilitation" of North Korea in the

international community. North Korea benefited far more from the new international atmosphere than did South Korea. The new consensus in the international community was for a non-partisan approach to the problem of Korean reunification. As early as January, 1966, the ROK decided to officially announce a "retreat" from the Hallstein Doctrine. Its new position was to maintain economic and cultural relations with governments that established diplomatic relations with the DPRK. In May, 1969, when Chad and the C.A.R. established diplomatic relations with the DPRK, having previously had relations only with the ROK, South Korea did not break off full diplomatic relations with either of them. This precedent allowed many governments to opt for a non-partisan approach, greatly benefiting North Korea.

At the Fifth Congress of the KWP in November, 1970, Kim Il Sung reaffirmed the importance of Third World solidarity in North Korea's foreign policy. He argued that "solidarity with the international revolutionary forces is one of the important factors at present in forcing the US imperialist aggressors out of South Korea" and thus for accomplishing the "national liberation revolution" and reunification. (74)

The DPRK shifted diplomatic emphasis to the NAM. The Korean Question was discussed at the Third NAM summit conference in Lusaka in 1970. Article six of the final declaration of the Lusaka conference described the presence of US troops in South Korea as a threat to national independence and to international peace.

In April, 1971, the SPA released an 8 Point proposal for peaceful reunification, at the centre of which was a demand for US forces to withdraw from South Korea. DPRK missions toured the Third World to garner endorsements. Pak, Sung Chul's delegation to Africa and the Middle East in May, 1971, collected Sudanese President Nimeri's endorsement (in exchange for DPRK support for resolving the conflict in southern Sudan without foreign interference); (75) President Assad of Syria's on 23 May (for DPRK support for Syria's efforts to restore the occupied Arab territories); and Iraq's Hassan Al-Bakr and Saddam Hussein (for support for Iraq in its territorial dispute with Iran). (76)

Other endorsements for the SPA 8 point proposal included Nicolae Ceausescu of Rumania, and Ieng Sary of Cambodia. Augustino Neto, Chairman of the Angolan Peoples Liberation Movement, Samora Michel, leader of the Liberation Front of Mozambique, and Algerian Foreign Minister Abdelaziz Bouteflika all visited Pyongyang in 1971 and endorsed the 8 point proposal.

In early 1972 the DPRK launched a campaign for a North-South peace treaty and North-South political negotiations. Foreign Minister Ho Dam went to Romania and Yugoslavia,

receiving the coveted endorsements. Pak, Sung Chul went to Cuba, while Vice Premier Chong, Jun Taek toured Sudan and Syria, garnering the personal endorsement of Presidents Nimeri and Assad, respectively. Kim, Gyong Ryun led a delegation to the Peoples Democratic Republic of Yemen and won endorsement from Chairman Salem Rubaya Ali, while the DPRK supported the Yemen's struggle against "Saudi Arabian reactionaries and mercenaries". (77) President Al-Bakr of Iraq endorsed the new proposals in October. President Barre of Somalia endorsed both the 8 point proposal and the new proposals. When Barre later visited Pyongyang, Kim Il Sung called for Somalia's unification.

Chong, Jun Taek visited Egypt in March and met President Sadat. They exchanged calls for US troop withdrawal from Korea and Israeli withdrawal from occupied Arab lands. Kang, Ryang-uk went to Sierra Leone, where President Siaka Stevens endorsed all the DPRK proposals. Kang also visited Mali, Guinea and Mauritania. Kim, Gyong Ryon, Finance Minister, met President Kenneth Kaunda in Zambia and received his endorsement. He also visited Tanzania and Burundi and met Presidents Nyerere and Micombero, respectively. Kim, Ryong Taek toured Burma, Indonesia, Singapore, and Nepal; meeting President Suharto in Indonesia, Prime Minister Lee Kwan Yew in Singapore, and Prime Minister Birta in Nepal.

This frenetic high level diplomacy paid handsome dividends in the NAM. The NAM Foreign Ministers Conference in Georgetown, Guyana, in September, 1972, again took up the question of Korea. In Article 26 of the Georgetown Declaration the conference called for the withdrawal of all foreign forces from Korea and an end to all foreign intervention in Korea's affairs.

These campaigns accelerated in 1973, by which time the DPRK felt the tide had turned in its favour. The SPA released a Letter to Parliaments and Governments of all Countries of the World on 6 April, 1973, calling for termination of all foreign intervention in the internal affairs of Korea. This letter made mention of all recent DPRK reunification proposals, including the new 5 Point proposal (including a halt to the arms race in Korea, withdrawal of all foreign forces, reduction of each side's armed forces to 100,000 men, no introduction of new weapons from abroad, and a peace treaty to replace the armistice). The new 5 Point proposal called for creation of a North-South Korean confederation, under the name of a single country, "many-sided exchanges", reduction of military tension, and convocation of a "Great National Congress" representing all social groups from both sides, to discuss reunification. This was North Korea's counter-proposal to the idea of "two Koreas" joining the UN. (78)

The SPA declared that "...this year the UNGA should take steps to take the cap of the "UN forces" off the heads of US troops stationed in south Korea, make them withdraw and disband "UNCURK", and that the representative of the DPRK must certainly be invited to the UN when a question on Korea is discussed there." (79) A similar letter was sent to the US Congress on the same day.

On 9 September, 1973, a watershed in the DPRK's campaigns on the Korean Question was reached in the Fourth NAM summit conference in Algiers, representing over 100 Third World governments. Algeria emerged as a champion of the DPRK's reunification proposals. A resolution was passed on the Korean Question characterising the division of Korea as a threat to Asian and world peace and demanding an end to foreign intervention in Korea. NAM went on record to oppose the simultaneous admission of two Koreas into the UN, on the grounds that this might perpetuate national division. NAM declared that Korea should only enter the UN under the name of a single state, after a confederal form of unification had taken place. They called for withdrawal of all foreign forces. Finally, NAM called directly upon the UNGA to consider the Korean Question at the upcoming 28th session and to decide on withdrawal of US troops and dissolution of UNCURK. (80) The Algiers Political Declaration called for withdrawal of all foreign forces from South Korea and settlement of the Korean Question without foreign interference.

Algeria continued to press for support of DPRK proposals. Thus, the DPRK reaped a huge benefit from its friendship. For example, Houari Boumedienne, Premier of Algeria and Chairman of the NAM, sent messages on behalf of the NAM to the heads of state of all non-aligned countries on 12 November, 1973, appealing to them to take efforts to settle the Korean Question in the UNGA. Algeria's foreign minister, Abdelaziz Bouteflika sent a similar message to the NAM foreign ministers throughout the world.

In 1974, Boumedienne and Bouteflika visited Pyongyang from 2-5 March, and met with Kim Il Sung. Kim Il Sung praised Boumedienne's recent call for a Special Session of the UNGA on the international economic order. In their Joint Communique of 5 March, 1974, Kim and Boumedienne noted that there had been "a change in the balance of forces in the world arena...reflected in the UN where big powers had dominated." Algeria reaffirmed its support for DPRK reunification proposals and expressed solidarity with the struggle against "fascist dictatorship" in South Korea. (81) Boumedienne and Bouteflika again sent out letters to the NAM heads of state and government, and to foreign ministers, in late 1974, calling upon non-aligned governments to support the withdrawal of foreign forces in the "southern half of Korea."

The DPRK enthusiastically greeted new initiatives in Third World solidarity, for instance

the Sixth Special Session of the UNGA convened from 9 April to 2 May 1974, and the adoption of the "Declaration on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order" and Action Programme. Kim Il Sung held that these events reflected the growing "struggle to destroy the economic foothold of the imperialist monopolies and regain the usurped natural resources of their countries..." (82) The DPRK scathingly denounced the role of US Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, who argued for cooperation between the rich and poor countries, but in practice sharpened the conflict and formulated a policy of dividing the ranks of the Third World coalition to prevent "bloc voting" on the NIEO. (83)

North Korea enthusiastically supported the Conference on Raw Materials of Developing Countries held in Dakar, Senegal, in February, 1975. North Korea happily postured as a champion of increased economic and technical ties among developing countries, as a guarantee of national independence and *juche*. Similarly, the DPRK applauded OPEC's summit in Algiers in March as a contribution to the Third World peoples' struggle against imperialism and for independence. Finally, it endorsed the Panama Declaration of Central American leaders in March, 1975, calling for US withdrawal from the Canal Zone.

When the DPRK at last applied for NAM membership, its support was overwhelming. A motion to recommend DPRK admission was approved unanimously at the third meeting of the NAM Coordinating Committee in March, 1975. Pyongyang hailed this as a "brilliant victory of the anti-imperialist independent foreign policy" of North Korea. Entry into NAM was indeed "an epochal turn in the development of (DPRK) relations with foreign countries." (84)

The highest ranking tour of this entire period was that by Kim Il Sung himself, in 1975, launched to consolidate support for DPRK entry into NAM and for North Korean proposals at the decisive 30th UNGA session. Kim Il Sung also went to China, where he met Mao and Deng Xiaoping on 18 April, 1975, the day after Phnom Penh was captured by Khmer Rouge forces, while the Thieu regime in South Vietnam teetered on the brink of collapse as Danang and Hue fell to revolutionary forces. China made clear its position by declaring that the DPRK was "the sole legitimate sovereign state of the Korean nation". (85) China backed the dissolution of the UNC and withdrawal of all foreign troops from South Korea.

With China's support secured, Kim Il Sung left Korea to gather endorsements from heads of governments for the 5 Point proposal, opposition to the "two Koreas" proposal, and withdrawal of all foreign forces from South Korea under the UN flag. The tour began in Romania, continued in Algeria (where Kim reminded them that the DPRK was the first government to have officially recognised the Algerian Provisional Government),

Mauritania on 30 May, 1975, (Daddah's endorsement was reciprocated by DPRK support for the decolonisation of Western Sahara), Bulgaria, and the crowning achievement, a summit with Josip Broz Tito in Yugoslavia, from 6-7 June. Tito's stature in the NAM was enormous and therefore his strongly worded statements of support for North Korean reunification policy were very valuable. Tito characterised the Korean situation as one in which the country had been divided by imperialism and was still fighting, thirty years later, for national reunification. Tito promised full support for North Korea, internationally. Their Joint Communique explicitly referred to the harmony between North Korea's independent foreign policy and the principle of non-alignment. (86)

With Tito's blessing, the entry of North Korea into the NAM was unanimously approved at the Foreign Ministers meeting in Lima, Peru, August, 1975. In Article 60 of the Lima Declaration the NAM called for withdrawal of all foreign forces from South Korea under the UN flag and replacement of the armistice with a peace treaty. DPRK Foreign Minister Ho Dam's speech at Lima reflected the fundamentals of DPRK policy, i.e. the theme of achieving complete economic independence, south-south cooperation, collective self-reliance, and the NIEO. (87)

The ROK's simultaneous application for admission to NAM failed, and was attacked by Algeria, Yugoslavia, Cuba, Cambodia, Laos, Vietnam and other governments that had fought bitter anti-colonial wars. The DPRK hailed NAM's rejection of the ROK's membership application as a great victory, and an indication of South Korea's international isolation.

The DPRK then achieved its long sought victory in the 30th UNGA session (discussed below). Immediately thereafter, Kim Il Sung published a treatise entitled "The Non-aligned Movement Is A Mighty Anti-Imperialist Revolutionary Force of Our Times". He argued that NAM had "decisively strengthened the revolutionary forces of the world and greatly weakened the reactionary forces of imperialism." (88) Kim reiterated fundamental themes of DPRK foreign policy: anti-imperialist struggle was the main trend in world politics; NAM should intensify its struggle against imperialism and colonialism; self-reliance was the basis of independence; non-aligned countries should cooperate economically and unite politically. (89)

VI. DPRK Success in the UNGA

The final fruit of DPRK Third World diplomacy was the steady improvement in its position in the UN debate on the Korean Question. The UNGA debate originated from the decision of the Fifth UNGA session to require an annual report from UNCURK. With the changes in the UNGA from 1961 onward, the US and ROK found it increasingly difficult to exclude

the DPRK. Between 1961, when Indonesia proposed to invite North Korea to participate (90), and 1975, when the UNGA passed a resolution fully endorsing standard DPRK reunification proposals, support for the DPRK steadily increased.

Table 1. UNGA Voting Patterns on the Korean Question 1965-75

1965	61 yes 13 no 34 abstentions (pro ROK resolution)*
	28 yes 39 no 22 abstentions (invite the DPRK)
1966	67 yes 19 no 32 abstentions (pro-ROK resolution)
	34 yes 53 no (invite the DPRK)
1967	68 yes 23 no 26 abstentions (pro ROK resolution)
	40 yes 55 no (invite the DPRK)
	50 yes 37 no 24 abstentions (invite DPRK unconditional)
	24 yes 60 no 29 abstentions (dissolve UNCURK)
1968	72 yes 23 no 26 abstentions (pro ROK resolution)
	40 yes 55 no 28 abstentions (invite DPRK unconditional)
	67 yes 28 no 28 abstentions (invite DPRK conditional) **
	25 yes 67 no 29 abstentions (dissolve UNCURK)
	24 yes 70 no 28 abstentions (cancel UN Korea debate)
1969	70 yes 26 no 21 abstentions (pro ROK resolution)
	40 yes 55 no 27 abstentions (invite DPRK unconditional)
	30 yes 65 no 27 abstentions (dissolve UNCURK)
	29 yes 61 no 32 abstentions (UNC/US withdrawal)
1970	67 yes 28 no 22 abstentions (pro ROK resolution)
	40 yes 54 no 25 abstentions (invite DPRK unconditional)
	32 yes 64 no 26 abstentions (dissolve UNCURK)
	32 yes 60 no 30 abstentions (withdraw UNC/US troops)
1971	68 yes 28 no 22 abstentions (postpone Korea debate)
1972	70 yes 35 no 21 abstentions (postpone Korea debate)
1973	Unanimous Decision (1st Committee) (Invite DPRK)
	Unanimous Decision (UNGA) (dissolve UNCURK)
1974	61 yes 43 no 31 abstentions (pro-ROK resolution)
	48 yes 48 no 38 abstentions (dissolve UNC)
1975	59 yes 51 no 29 abstentions (pro ROK resolution)
	54 yes 43 no 42 abstentions (dissolve UNC)

Source: United Nations Records, 1965-1975.

* Standard pro ROK resolutions called for the intensification of UNCURK's role, free elections in North Korea, and reiterated the UN position on the ROK as the legitimate government of Korea.

** The US response to Indonesia in 1961 was the Stephenson amendment, requiring the DPRK to unequivocally accept the authority of the UN. In 1962 the DPRK responded to the Stephenson amendment by issuing a strident statement rejecting UN competence. (91)

The steady increase in support for the DPRK led to several significant watersheds. First, the UNGA unanimously endorsed the agreed to remove the Korean Question from the UNGA agenda (1971, 1972). Secondly, the DPRK was finally admitted to the UNGA debate in 1973 with unanimous approval in the First Committee. Thirdly, the UNGA unanimously decided to dissolve UNCURK, which the DPRK had attacked for being biased in favour of the ROK. Finally, the UNGA passed a resolution endorsing DPRK reunification proposals, calling for withdrawal of all foreign troops and dissolution of the UNC.

The table reveals a steady increase in the number of votes against the annual pro ROK resolution, i.e. approval of UNCURK's annual report. The number of votes against the standard pro-ROK resolution on the Korean Question was only 9 in 1959, increasing to 11 in 1961, 1962, and 1963. Radical and socialist regimes made up most of the DPRK's overt supporters, casting No votes on the pro-ROK resolutions. The number of abstentions on these same resolutions also steadily increased. Many of those who regularly abstained were non-aligned governments in the Third World.

In 1959, only 17 states abstained on the pro ROK resolution. In 1961 this rose to 27. The table reveals the sharp increase in no votes and abstentions up to 1975.

Chile's withdrawal from UNCURK in August, 1966, was a crucial watershed, damaging the image of UNCURK's impartiality. In 1968, after consultations with supportive governments, the ROK recommended that UNCURK's annual report not automatically be submitted to the UNGA. This decision "reflected the awareness by the Western nations that efforts to adopt the report at the General Assembly would be increasingly difficult, would outweigh the benefits, and would prove divisive for Western unity." (92)

The DPRK, which had long argued that the Korean Question should not be discussed at the UN, was actually angry at the decision to delete the Korean Question in 1971. This is because the situation had changed. The DPRK sensed that its own victory in the debate was approaching. The US and ROK, however, preferred to avoid the debate altogether, thus minimising public damage to the ROK. When this was again approved in 1972, the DPRK Foreign Ministry denounced the decision as "illegal". The breakdown of the North-South dialogue in 1973 resulted in a resumption of the UN debate. The DPRK's entry into WHO

and the opening of its permanent mission to the UN in New York guaranteed that North Korea could participate in the debate on the Korean Question for the first time.

On 14 November, 1973, Lee, Yong Mok, Vice Minister of Foreign Affairs, made the DPRK's maiden speech in the UN. He reviewed the entire course of the Korean Question since the Second World War. This historic speech includes the charges that the US was responsible for the original division of the country; the US had unleashed a war of aggression in 1950; and that the "root cause" of the failure of reunification was the "occupation of South Korea by the foreign troops and continued interference in our internal affairs by the foreign countries." (93)

Lee argued that the original US submission of the Korean Question to the UN in 1947 violated Article 107, Chapter 17 of the UN Charter which excludes debate on questions of postwar settlement and prohibits discussion of the internal affairs of any country. US troop occupation was in violation of the Armistice Agreement and the 4 July Joint Statement. UN forces were not under the jurisdiction of the Secretary General, acted without any relation to the UN, and no other country kept troop contingents under the UN flag any longer except the US. Finally, the US resolution proposing simultaneous entry of both Koreas into the UN was an "abnormal question" which if implemented would result in Korea being "recognised internationally as two states and its division be perpetuated." (94)

There were two rival draft resolutions on the Korean Question submitted to the 28th UNGA. The DPRK backed the resolution submitted by Algeria and 34 other countries, which Lee, Yong Muk said "coincides with the resolution of the Summit Conference of the Nonaligned States", whereas the pro-ROK resolution was backed by "past and present colonialist powers." Lee rejected the rival draft as one which called for continuation of an unstable armistice, foreign troops in South Korea, and continued national division. He argued that the UNGA debate on Korea was "characterised by the struggle between the newly-emerging forces...and the old forces of colonial domination which attempt to block the former." (95) The DPRK regarded the 28th UNGA session as being the first "fair debate" in 25 years, a "shameful defeat" for the US and its "separatist" line, and a demonstration of the growing power of the Third World and socialist states in world politics.

The DPRK was careful to express gratitude that so many states would be willing to support its entry into the UN. However, it insisted that entry into the UN should not take place before the reunification of Korea, or at least a North-South confederation. Lee concluded that simultaneous UN entry was a tactic of "divide and rule". His final argument was based on invoking the Fourth NAM summit declaration: calling for withdrawal of all foreign

troops, an end to all forms of foreign interference in Korea's domestic affairs, the dissolution of UNCURK, and Korean membership in the UN under the name of a single state.

According to one source, the ROK, in consultation with its allies, "decided voluntarily to dissolve UNCURK, thereby avoiding another round of unnecessary and perhaps counterproductive battles for competitive legitimacy." (96) The ultimate source of this decision was not the ROK, however, but understandings reached between Zhou Enlai and Henry Kissinger, particularly in November, 1973, where the US accepted dissolution of UNCURK if the demand for dissolution of the UNC could be dropped.

In the 1974 UNGA debate on foreign troop withdrawal and dissolution of the UNC (the resolution being co-sponsored by 40 Third World and socialist states), of some 73 speeches delivered on Korea at the 29th UNGA session, the DPRK regarded 42 as supportive, 25 were adversaries, and 6 neutral. (97) In comparison to 1970, the DPRK had gained 16 more solid supporters, and 12 fewer states voted openly against the DPRK. (98)

On 8 August, 1975, a resolution co-sponsored by 35 states (later increased to 42) calling for dissolution of the UN Command, withdrawal of all foreign forces under the UN flag, and replacement of the armistice by a peace treaty, was submitted to the UNGA. The resolution also called upon both Korean regimes to observe the principles of the 4 July Joint Statement, to take practical measures to reduce armed forces, cease military reinforcement, and make guarantees against the use of force against each other.

The US and supporters of the ROK again submitted a rival resolution; a defensive, compromise device whereby the UNC would officially be dissolved, but officers of the US and ROK would be allowed to ensure enforcement of the armistice. The DPRK denounced this proposal as one intended to perpetuate US occupation of South Korea under the US-ROK Mutual Defense Pact. However, if the UNC was dissolved, a signatory to the armistice, then the armistice too would cease to exist. A US effort to propose ROK entry into the UN (1975) was defeated in the Security Council.

In the course of this debate the DPRK Ministry of Foreign Affairs defended the need for replacing the armistice with a peace treaty by implying there was a danger of nuclear war in Korea. The DPRK cited retired US Admiral Gene Laroque of the Centre for Defence Information in Washington, D.C., claiming that there were nuclear weapons in South Korea, including missiles, guns and mines. The DPRK accused the US of having unilaterally suspended the activities of the Neutral Nations Inspection Teams (of the NNSC) in June 1956 and unilaterally abrogating Sub-paragraph 13-D of the Armistice in June 1957, which

banned the introduction of new weapons and combat materials into Korea.

In addition to these charges, the DPRK implied that the higher level political conference called for by Paragraph 60, Article 4 of the Armistice had not taken place. North Korea argued that the perpetuation of the state of armistice for so long was itself a violation of its basic spirit and "extremely abnormal". It reminded governments that all Chinese troops had left North Korea by the end of 1958. The DPRK thereby defended its argument for a new peace treaty to be signed by the US, DPRK and other "real parties concerned", pointedly not mentioning the UNC.

On 21 October, Lee, Yong Mok delivered a speech to the First Committee in which he argued that "The key to the solution of the question of Korea is to withdraw the US troops from south Korea." He accused the US of attempting to shore up the Park, Chung Hee regime in the wake of the collapse of the Lon Nol and Thieu regimes in Indochina. He pointed out that the US draft made no mention of troop withdrawal. He contrasted the rival drafts as one "to completely liquidate the root causes of national division" while the other was designed "to maintain the division of Korea and dangerous tension indefinitely." (99)

In the 30th UNGA debate from 21-29 October, 1975, a very large number of Third World governments made speeches supporting the pro-DPRK proposals. On 29 October the First Committee passed the pro-DPRK draft resolution by 51 to 38. Immediately thereafter the DPRK reiterated its readiness to sign a peace agreement with the US at any time, provided all foreign troops withdrew from South Korea. The DPRK refers to this vote as an "epochal event which put an end to the old mechanism of the United Nations that had allowed the United States to arbitrarily fabricate illegal resolutions on the Korean Question every year by setting its voting machine in motion, and which made this resolution the first fair one ever adopted on the Korean issue." (100) When the issue was voted on in the plenary session the DPRK picked up 3 more votes, making the total 54 in favour, to 43 opposed, with 42 abstentions. (101) Among NAM members, 41 voted in favour of the pro-DPRK resolution, 10 opposed it and 25 abstained. On the pro-ROK resolution, only 14 NAM members voted for it, with 39 opposed, and 24 abstaining. DPRK support was strongest in Africa where 26 states voted in favour of the pro-DPRK resolution and 25 African states voted against the pro-ROK resolution.

This was truly a historic vote, since a majority of UN member states supported DPRK reunification proposals. However, in reality, the "victory" of the DPRK at the 30th UNGA session was far from clear-cut. This is because the pro-ROK resolution also passed. The anomaly of two contradictory resolutions both passing in the same session illustrated the reality of the situation, i.e. parity in diplomatic support, and the inherent limitations of the

UN forum to bring about change. This unprecedented passage of two contrary resolutions led the DPRK to suggest afterwards that "It was high time for the UN to put an end to the debate of the Korean Question at its sessions." (102)

VII. Conclusion

As discussed in the introduction, the advantages that North Korea had developed during the reconstruction period, in terms of its ability to appeal to the emerging Third World for diplomatic support, were further amplified and expanded throughout this period. On this basis, the DPRK developed a powerful diplomatic momentum that accelerated in tandem with the increasing importance of the Third World in international relations. As a consequence, North Korea significantly improved its international support during this period, eventually reaching diplomatic parity with South Korea.

North Korea's domestic policies were an asset to its Third World diplomacy. There was clear symmetry between its self-reliant economic policies and its independent line in foreign affairs. These policies were extremely well suited to a period of transformation in the international system marked by decolonisation, national liberation, and Third World solidarity. US and ROK involvement in the Vietnam war also worked to North Korea's advantage. The DPRK benefited from the mood of international solidarity extended to the Vietnamese resistance. Finally, mounting challenges to global US hegemony created a new atmosphere of revolutionary momentum that aided North Korea to advance its own cause. North Korea had a ready audience for its militant anti-imperialist message. Third World governments, socialist states, and national liberation movements seemed to be challenging the power structure of US hegemony on many fronts.

North Korea was never "isolated" internationally during the period 1960-1975, as has sometimes been claimed. On the contrary, North Korea very successfully cultivated the support of the majority of Third World governments and mounted a successful challenge to US hegemonic influence in the UN on the Korean Question. In fact, the period culminated in the almost full international "rehabilitation" of North Korea. But its momentum was not great enough to overturn the international status of South Korea.

Chapter Five: South Korea's Outward Orientation 1960-1975: Economic Development and the Retreat from Anti-Communism

I. Introduction

The Republic of Korea concluded the reconstruction period with a foreign policy still largely defined by its anti-communism, and an economic policy emphasising dependence on the United States. However, the ROK gradually retreated from anti-communism as the cardinal principle of foreign policy and adopted a new outward-looking economic policy.

As time passed, the new economic policy significantly influenced the adjustment of foreign policy. New found pragmatism reflected South Korea's recognition of the need for flexibility in order to increase international support and expand its economic interests. It proved to be a successful policy in the long term, but in the medium term South Korea's diplomacy was on the defensive, being out of tune with the radical political tenor of the era in much of the Third World.

Major changes in the international system in the early 1970s again precipitated adjustment in ROK policy - toward increased domestic repression, increased military and industrial self-reliance, and even greater flexibility in foreign policy. As the international system moved from a bipolar to a multipolar configuration, the ideological rigidities of early Cold War geopolitics were eroded. As challenges to US hegemony brought US retrenchment in Asia, the ROK sought self-reliance as a guarantee of security in an uncertain world. Nevertheless, the close identification of ROK policy with US interests in this period, and especially its combat involvement in the Vietnam War, seriously undermined its diplomacy in the Third World.

Nevertheless, the consistent expansion of South Korean industry and exports led it to seek diversification of markets and secure sources of raw materials. This in turn encouraged South Korea to gradually abandon anti-communism in its foreign policy and seek economic ties first, and expanded diplomatic contacts, regardless of ideology.

II. Origins of the Outward Oriented Policy

The transition toward an outward oriented economic policy and a more flexible foreign policy was accompanied by several regime (government) changes. These occurred in 1960, 1961, 1964, and 1972. The regime changed from a strong Presidential system (1948-60), to a parliamentary system (1960-61), to a military junta (1961-64), back to a strong Presidential system (1964-71), and finally to an authoritarian dictatorship (1972-79).

Three key factors in the regional and global constellation of forces conditioned the early shift toward more pragmatism. First, there was a change in the balance of power on the Korean peninsula itself. North Korea's industrial and political strength contrasted sharply in 1960 with South Korea's economic and political weakness. Secondly, there was a change in the nature of dependence on the US, reflecting the US desire to reduce the direct cost of subsidising the ROK. Thirdly, there was a change in the political composition of the UNGA, reflecting the process of decolonisation.

The adjustment began as early as 1958. Therefore, it is not accurate to portray the policy shift merely as a product of the establishment of a military regime in 1961. The salience of deeper international trends can be demonstrated by the continuity of the ROK's adjustment policies across all three regimes from 1958-1964. The broadening of relations with the (non-aligned) Third World began in the late 1950s under Rhee, was promoted by the Democratic Party government in 1960-61, and continued by the military regime thereafter. Likewise, economic policy change, i.e. toward stable macro-economic management, re-integration with Japan, economic planning, and an export orientation, began in the late 1950s, was supported by the Democratic Party regime, and continued and consolidated by the military regime.

Massive fraud in the 1960 Presidential election led to Rhee's downfall (1), but the underlying cause was mal-administration. For this reason, the US facilitated Rhee's removal. As his American adviser Robert Oliver put it "The time had come for "Operation Ever-ready" to be put into effect." (2) Rhee had obstructed American guidelines on fiscal policy and ignored American fears of inflation. US Ambassador Walter P. McCaughy demanded from Rhee the resumption of "full democratic practices", removal of the army and police from politics, and repeal of the controversial draconian articles of the National Security Law passed in December, 1958. (3)

The opposition Democratic party formed a new government after winning parliamentary elections on 29 July, 1960. The new Prime Minister, Chang Myun, recognised the ROK's weaknesses and promoted new policies to redress the situation. First, the new government took an important step in relations with the Third World by announcing a policy of "Friendly Relations with the Neutralist Camp." (4)

Reunification policy was also immediately affected by a retreat from strident anti-communism. On 24 August, 1960, the ROK issued a statement stressing the role of UN supervised elections and abandoning the "reckless policy of trying to reunify Korea by force as advocated by the past Liberal Government." (5) The new Foreign Minister, Chung, Il-hyung, declared that the ROK would "strive to elevate Korea's international status

through reinforced diplomatic activities within the UN and its various organizations", thus repudiating Rhee's isolationism. (6)

Nevertheless, Chang Myun sought to combine diplomacy with neutralist governments with a policy of "strengthening of ties among anti-communist allies." (7) The ROK participated in consultations with Nationalist China, South Vietnam, and the Philippines in Quezon City, 18-19 January, 1961 (8), seeking closer economic ties. South Korea was supportive of a North East Asian Treaty Organisation for collective security. Finally, the ROK favoured closer ties to the US and completion of a status of forces agreement.

President Eisenhower visited Korea in June, 1960, to demonstrate US support for the democratic revolution. US economic assistance to the ROK, which had been decreasing for each of the three years prior to this, was increased, and the ROK pledged itself to economic reform and normalisation with Japan, both long standing US demands. A new agreement on economic assistance was signed on 8 February, 1961, giving the US unilateral powers of supervision over the uses of US aid. This agreement caused a storm of protest in South Korea. In fact, the ROK National Assembly passed a resolution on 13 March, 1961, urging the US to respect Korea's independence in the implementation of US aid programmes.

The Chang Myun regime was under domestic pressure to move toward a political settlement with the North. Left wing forces in South Korea called for national elections supervised by neutral nations. (9) The Chang Myun government, however, opposed cross-contacts between North and South at non-governmental level prior to any elections. (10) In this regard, the Chang Myun government's policy on reunification differed little from Rhee's. (11)

The Democratic government did not survive to implement its new policies. It was overthrown in a military coup d'etat on 16 May, 1961 and replaced by the Supreme Council for National Reconstruction (SCNR), a military junta led by Park Chung Hee. According to Han, Sung-joo, the fall of the Democratic government was caused by acute ideological and political polarisation between pro-Rhee and anti-Rhee social forces, and between radicals and conservatives in general. (12) The first principle of the new regime was anti-communism, and it swiftly suppressed the popular movement for reunification.

However, in terms of economic policy and foreign policy the new military regime was remarkably consistent with its predecessor.

For example, the military junta immediately set about expanding the ROK's diplomatic contacts. It explicitly abandoned isolationism, based on consideration "of the effect of the non-aligned, neutralist camp on our diplomacy in the United Nations." (13) Nor did it

revert to Rhee's bellicose reunification policy. On the contrary, it adopted Chang Myun's policy of upholding the Geneva principles and eschewing violence.

Nor did the military regime revert to Rhee's economic policies, which had emphasised aid dependence. They accepted the Chang Myun government's commitment to stabilisation measures, expanding exports, and normalisation of relations with Japan. However, there was a very significant shift within the policy of export orientation. The Chang Myun government, dominated as it was mainly by landed interests, had advocated exports of primary materials and agricultural products. The military regime, in contrast, came to favour a clear emphasis on export of labour-intensive manufactures over primary products.

The Chang Myun regime's commitment to economic planning was accepted as a central aspect of economic management. The role of the state in guiding national economic development was greatly increased. This implied a new relationship between government and business, or state and private capital, in which the state was clearly in a position of dominance over private business. This was later dubbed "guided capitalism" by the new regime. (14)

South Korea's adoption of an export oriented economic policy, tied to both Japan and the United States, set it on a path of rapid economic growth and industrialisation. This crucial policy shift reflected a special structural opportunity that was "made available" to South Korea by Japan and the United States, and reflected a restructuring process of the regional and global international division of labour, as well as unique geopolitical considerations. (15)

The commitment to normalise relations with Japan was very unpopular (16), but an integral part of American designs for the economic future of South Korea. (17) Despite US approval of the junta, US aid to the ROK decreased from 1961 to 1964, dropping from \$154 million in 1961 to \$88 million in 1964, excluding agricultural surplus under Public Law 480. Even aid under the Military Assistance Program (MAP) decreased in this period. Higher aid levels were restored only when the ROK completed normalisation with Japan and entered the Vietnam War in 1965. (18)

The junta laid the foundation for a subsequent period of rapid economic growth by undertaking basic stabilisation measures on the one hand, such as a realistic exchange rate, anti-inflationary policy, and sound fiscal responsibility, and by creating new institutions for economic management on the other, such as the pivotal Economic Planning Board (EPB). Park Chung Hee personally supervised the national export promotion campaign. Economic growth was subordinated to the overriding goal of "victory over communism"

and national reunification.

III. Third World Diplomacy in the 1960s

Cold War rigidities applied to South Korea's relations with the West, which were secure, and any relations with North Korea. Park Chung Hee refused to talk with the Northern authorities throughout the 1960s, until a change of policy in August, 1970. The DPRK was categorised as an "anti-state organisation", illegally occupying territory of the ROK. Outside this box, however, the ROK actively sought to expand diplomatic contacts.

The "revolutionary" SCNR immediately dispatched goodwill missions, from July to September, 1961, to various parts of the Third World, including Latin America, where ROK support was traditionally strong but where Rhee had been inactive. This was done specifically in order to "achieve the votes for our resolution at the UNGA." (19) The ROK ambassador to Turkey, Yoon, Jee Chang, led a mission to seven countries in the Middle East including Lebanon, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Republic, Morocco, Libya, and Iraq. In Southeast Asia, the ambassador to the ROV, Choi, Duk Shin, led a mission to seven countries including India, Ceylon, Pakistan, Nepal, Cambodia, Laos, and Burma. In Africa, the ROK ambassador to France, Paik, Sun Hwa, led a mission to 16 countries including Senegal, Mauritania, Sierra Leone, Liberia, Ivory Coast, Upper Volta, Niger, Togo, Dahomey, Nigeria, Chad, the Central African Republic, Cameroon, Gabon, Congo (Brazzaville), and Madagascar. (20)

In total, these missions visited over thirty Third World governments, many of them neutralist or non-aligned. The mission to Francophone Africa was considered a particular success, winning support for the ROK in the 1961 UNGA debate from thirteen former French colonies. With only a few exceptions, the choice of destinations for these missions reflected targeting of moderate, conservative, pro-Western governments, still a contrast to the earlier blinkered rejection of all neutralism. The ROK continued to resist relations with radical regimes. Via the Hallstein Doctrine, it rejected any regime having diplomatic relations with North Korea.

Much of the activity during the first two years of the junta was simply to establish diplomatic relations with governments already friendly to the ROK. In this way the junta capitalised on latent support that Rhee had left unexploited. For instance, in 1961 the ROK established diplomatic relations with eleven countries. After the coup, the ROK established diplomatic relations with five African countries: Ivory Coast, Niger, Benin, Chad and Cameroon.

In 1962 the ROK achieved a spectacular one-off gain in diplomacy, establishing relations with over thirty governments, thereby more than doubling the number of its diplomatic partners in one stroke. Of these, seventeen were in Latin America, and seven in Africa: Upper Volta, Sierra Leone, Madagascar, Morocco, Gabon, Senegal, and Congo (Brazzaville). In the Middle East, relations were established with Jordan, Saudi Arabia, and Iran, each of which was ruled by a conservative, pro-Western monarchy. However, a consulate was set up in Cairo, capital of the radical nationalist UAR. In Asia, relations were established with Cambodia, the Federation of Malaya, and Laos, and consular relations were agreed upon with India and Burma. The ROK's rapprochement with India was quite significant, though it took many years to complete. The ROK supported India's cause in the conflict with China in October, 1962, and condemned Chinese aggression. Other states with which the ROK established relations in 1962 include Spain (under Franco), Israel, New Zealand, Iceland, and Switzerland. (21)

According to the official ROK Foreign Ministry diplomatic history of this period, the ROK continued to stress its policy of friendly relations toward neutral and non-aligned countries, particularly in the Third World. The official history explains that this was done for a dual purpose: that of strengthening the position of the ROK in the UNGA debates on the Korean Question, and to enhance the new economic policy of export orientation and economic profit. (22) For example, the goodwill missions sent to every region of the Third World in 1962 had the dual purpose of canvassing support before the UNGA session and to establish new economic ties and conduct market research. (23)

However, the gains of diplomacy in 1961-1963 did not continue throughout the decade. On the contrary, the pace of diplomacy fell off sharply and reached a nadir in 1966-72, discussed further below. The pace was already tapering off in 1963, when new relations were established with several African states, including Rwanda, Uganda, Zaire, CAR, and Ethiopia, as well as Peru in South America. In the face of this slow-down, the ROK redoubled efforts to win new friends in the Third World in 1964. (24) The number of goodwill missions was increased, more foreign delegations were invited to South Korea, more non-aligned governments were recognised by the ROK, and trade and technological cooperation were expanded with the Third World.

In 1964, as the ROK returned to a "civilian" regime, though still dominated by Park Chung Hee and the military, the ROK launched its first development assistance programme, particularly in Africa. The first African state to receive such assistance was Uganda, to which the ROK sent a medical team. This was soon followed by doctors and medical supplies and other equipment to a number of African countries. The small size of this programme limited its effectiveness, but it had some symbolic value. (25)

Strain on the Hallstein Doctrine was already apparent by 1964. As discussed in the previous chapter, Mauritania and Congo (Brazzaville), having previously maintained relations exclusively with the ROK, also established diplomatic relations with North Korea. The ROK was outraged, invoked the Hallstein Doctrine, and cut off all relations. In 1964-1965 the pace of establishing new diplomatic relationships slowed considerably. Kenya and Liberia established relations with the ROK in 1964, and in 1965 two Latin American and two African states (Gambia and Malawi) established relations. The distribution of ROK embassies in 1965 is a good indicator of its strong areas of priority. Latin America and Southeast Asia were clearly the strong points in ROK Third World diplomacy, corresponding to the prevalence of conservative and pro-Western regimes in these regions at the time.

When the Non-aligned Movement was established at Belgrade in 1961 the DPRK had an initial advantage. However, the NAM broadened its membership criteria by the time of its second summit in Cairo in 1964. At this time the ROK actually succeeded in getting more diplomatic partners in the NAM than the DPRK, reversing the situation as of 1961. However, this trend is somewhat deceptive, since most of those states established diplomatic relations with the ROK before actually joining the NAM. The ROK established diplomatic relations with some 20 members of the NAM in the 1960s, but of these only five established relations with the ROK after they had joined the NAM. These five were Saudi Arabia, Morocco, Ethiopia, Malawi, and Tunisia, primarily conservative pro-Western regimes.

In the second half of the 1960s the ROK increasingly emphasised economic cooperation as a theme of Third World diplomacy, but it had little to offer many non-aligned governments in political terms, since its close alliance with the US undermined its credibility. Despite careful ROK attention to Africa, the DPRK established a bloc of supporters there that rejected diplomatic relations with South Korean, including Algeria, Mali, Egypt, Congo(Brazzaville), Mauritania, Tanzania, Burundi, Somalia, and Zambia. Despite ROK successes in the Middle East among conservative regimes, even in that region many governments were reluctant to allow the ROK to establish an embassy because "In some cases there was clearly a fear that non-aligned status might be questioned by so blatantly choosing sides in the Korean conflict". (26)

The ROK's diplomatic weakness in the Middle East was mainly a result of its friendly relationship with Israel, and its generally anti-Arab positions in regard to the Arab-Israeli conflict. The 1967 war was particularly costly for the ROK. Most Arab governments severed diplomatic relations with the US, while the ROK had close military and diplomatic ties with both the US and Israel. According to one analysis of ROK diplomacy in the Middle

East, the ROK's diplomatic defeats in the region were "a function of Seoul's insensitivity to Middle East regional political dynamics. The political costs South Korea has paid for its pro-Israel policy have been substantial." (27)

Following the 1967 war it was difficult for the ROK to muster political support from Middle Eastern regimes. Therefore, the ROK reconsidered its Middle East policy in light of more pragmatic criteria and in August, 1970, announced that it supported implementation of UN Resolution 242, i.e. urging Israeli withdrawal from territories occupied in the 1967 war.

However, one should not over-exaggerate the negative aspects of the diplomatic predicament of the ROK in this period. For instance, the balance sheet of diplomatic supporters between the ROK and DPRK in the 1960s reveals that the ROK remained predominant in overall, despite the gains made by North Korea. The following chart illustrates the total number of governments having relations exclusively with one side 'as opposed to the other:

	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969
ROK	27	57	67	69	74	75	76	79	80
DPRK	15	15	18	22	23	23	25	27	32

Nevertheless, the ROK was increasingly on the defensive.

The first clear indication that the ROK was aware of the danger is a statement by the Foreign Ministry on 13 January, 1966, announcing that, with a view to "countering north Korea's intensified diplomatic and commercial activities directed at nonaligned nations" the ROK would, if necessary, entertain commercial and cultural relations with countries which maintained diplomatic relations with North Korea. (28) This had in fact already been the case in practice, particularly with Egypt, where the ROK had a consulate. Nevertheless, it was not a repudiation of the Hallstein Doctrine.

By the late 1960s the ROK realised that it could not sustain the Hallstein Doctrine even in this diluted form, particularly in Africa. In 1967 the ROK cut off all economic ties with Southern Rhodesia, an attempt to establish new credentials as a supporter of the cause of Black African liberation. More significantly, Chad and the CAR were allowed to establish diplomatic relations with the DPRK in May, 1969, with impunity, having previously had such relations only with the ROK. This established a very important precedent, allowing governments to choose to recognise both Koreas. Paradoxically, for the ROK, this opened the door to a massive increase in DPRK diplomatic partners between 1970 and 1975, while

they themselves made relatively little progress.

Even earlier, between 1966 and 1972, the ROK had a very lean season in terms of finding new diplomatic partners. To illustrate: in 1966 only Lesotho established diplomatic relations with the ROK; in 1967, only the Maldives; in 1968 Swaziland, Guyana, and Botswana; in 1969 only Tunisia; in 1970 only Tonga; in 1971 Fiji, and Mauritius; in 1972 only Western Samoa. While the ROK relied mainly on micro-states for fresh support, the DPRK surged ahead on the tide of anti-colonialism in the Third World.

Nevertheless, the ROK was able to take advantage of its standing in the West to participate in important international organisations and fora, among them the Colombo plan, the ADB, the ECAFE conferences on Asian Economic Cooperation, and the GATT, which the ROK joined in 1967. Most importantly, in terms of the long term prospects of its Third World diplomacy, the ROK joined UNCTAD and the Group of 77, and attended the Algiers G-77 ministerial meeting. The ROK said that "Korea believes in international cooperation among developing countries". (29)

As a Newly Industrialising Country, the ROK had a self interest in Third World solidarity of this specific kind. The ROK's approach to Third World solidarity was based on economic common interests among less developed countries vis a vis the advanced OECD countries. The ROK became a standard bearer of better terms of trade, particularly of the general system of preferences, aimed at improving market access for manufactures from less developed countries. This contributed to the ROK's effort to convince its Third World partners in the G-77 that it was serious about Third World solidarity.

It was bilateral relations, however, that were a central in ROK foreign economic policy. This was assisted by promotion of South Korea as a model of Third World economic development. In the late 1960s the World Bank rated the ROK as being first among all developing countries in the rate of export growth. Even UNCTAD chose the ROK as a model of successful diversification of the economy and the development of overseas markets.

South Korea put a brave face on the unfavourable international trends of this period. President Park Chung Hee summarised the achievements of ROK policy in the 1960s by confidently asserting that "I believe that the Republic of Korea's position in the international community has incomparably improved since the 1950s, or early in the 1960s", citing an increase in diplomatic partners from 22 to 93, membership in international organisations from 26 to 40, treaties and agreements from 127 to 365, and an increase in trade partners from 30 to 105. He even said that "I think because of the

Republic of Korea's despatch of troops to Vietnam, the position of this country in the international community has been greatly improved, especially in Southeast Asia and the Far East." (30)

The ROK tried to appropriate the vocabulary of Third World solidarity. For instance, it began to refer regularly to "Afro-Asian solidarity" in a positive way. In 1970 Foreign Minister Choi, Kyu-Hah, for instance, used this phrase in the context of talks with the Gambia, and Liberia. (31) More significantly, the ROK began to use phrases such as "developing nations should strengthen their ties" in official communiques with Third World governments. In 1971, this phrase appeared in communiques with Trinidad and Tobago, and with Jamaica. (31)

From 1971, mirroring DPRK tactics, the ROK systematically canvassed Third World governments for explicit statements of support for Southern reunification proposals, or support in the UNGA. Parallel to this, the ROK began to make its own proposals on common Third World economic interests, and do so in the name of Third World solidarity. For example, at a G-77 Ministerial Conference in Lima, Peru, on 2 November, 1971, ROK Foreign Minister Kim, Yong-Shik outlined a 4 Point proposal, designed for the upcoming third UNCTAD conference. This proposal included support for a General Agreement on Commodity Arrangements, new terms of ODA, special measures for LLDCs, full implementation of the General System of Preferences (GSP), elimination of non-tariff barriers by developed countries, and reform of the international monetary system.

Kim's rhetoric reproduced the language of Third World solidarity. For instance, he said - in the name of the Third World - that "We cannot afford to falter in our solidarity...We must formulate a common platform consonant with the aspirations of the people of the Group of 77 developing countries". (32) In another instance, Ambassador Park, Tong Jin, at the GATT's 27th session of contracting parties in Geneva in late November, 1971, lodged a protest over the unilateral imposition by President Nixon of US surcharges on imports, expressed concern over special trading groups like the EEC, and supported the formation of special trade arrangements among developing countries (i.e. South-South cooperation). (34)

In 1972, at the UNCTAD meeting in Santiago, Chile (where the host was a diplomatic supporter of the DPRK) Kim, Yong Shik stressed the adverse effects on developing countries of the current economic and monetary situation in the world, and said the ROK supported the Lima Declaration and a Special Drawing Rights link for LDCs. When Kim, Yong Shik was in Mexico in August, 1973, he publicly endorsed President Luis Echeverria Alvarez's proposal for a Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States. Kim said that

Mexico and Korea should "coordinate their efforts with a view to strengthening the precarious legal basis of the international economic relations between the developed and developing countries" (35) This line on "close cooperation among developing countries" was consistently pursued throughout this period, including the UNIDO conference in Lima, 15 March, 1975.

The shift of ROK diplomacy toward more openness that accompanied the North-South Dialogue facilitated a more positive atmosphere in Third World diplomacy. For example, the President of the Republic of Cameroon, shortly after the 4 July, 1972 Joint Communique, told the new ROK ambassador that, since Cameroon's foreign policy was guided by the principle of non-alignment, "it is within the framework of ...this policy of non-alignment that we have decided to maintain diplomatic relations with the two states which represent the Korean people, the division of which we nonetheless deplore." (36) This formula became ever more common in the non-aligned Third World, and it strengthened the trend in the 1970s towards dual recognition of both Koreas by a growing number of governments.

It was not for want of trying that the ROK did not reap a full diplomatic harvest during this period. In fact, the ROK responded to the new situation by very energetic diplomatic campaigning. In 1973 alone, the ROK sent 23 missions to 82 non-aligned countries. Of this total, 3 missions went to 12 Asian countries; 6 missions went to 19 Central and South American countries; 9 missions went to 34 African countries; and 5 missions went to 17 Middle Eastern countries. In 1974 this pace was sustained: 23 missions went to 88 non-aligned countries. Of this total, 3 missions went to 6 Asian states; 7 missions visited a total of 22 American states; 10 missions covered 47 African countries; and 3 missions visited a total of 13 Middle Eastern countries (37).

All were characterised by extensive briefing on the ROK's new policies toward the Third World, canvassing of support in the UNGA, and keen emphasis on economic agreements.

There were some diplomatic gains from this energetic outreach. Indonesia established full diplomatic relations with the ROK in September, 1973, and India in December of the same year. This achievement was partly due to the personal diplomacy of the ROK ambassador to India, Lho, Shin Yong. Nevertheless, the breakthrough with India did not constitute a breakthrough with the NAM. In the same year (1973) diplomatic relations were established with Afghanistan, Bangladesh, and Finland. Taken together, these gains represented an escape from the diplomatic doldrums of the preceding period 1969-72.

This new momentum was sustained in the Middle East. Indeed, the ROK's policy changes in the early 1970s led to a virtual diplomatic reversal in the Middle East. The immediate

stimulus was the Arab-Israeli War and the oil embargo imposed on supporters of Israel. This crisis served as a catalyst for a reversal of the ROK's line on the Arab-Israeli conflict; a reversal clearly dictated by South Korea's national interests.

On 15 December, 1973, the ROK Foreign Ministry issued a statement on the Middle Eastern situation in which it recognised that "The legitimate claims of the people of Palestine should be recognized and respected." (38) Seoul also called for Israeli withdrawal from the occupied territories.

South Korea's new domestic economic policies, based on oil-dependent Heavy and Chemical Industrialisation (HCI), made this policy an imperative. The reversal cleared the way for Seoul to enjoy expanded diplomatic relations with the region. For instance, Oman and Qatar established full diplomatic relations early in 1974. It also led to greatly expanded South Korean economic presence in the region, particularly in engineering and construction.

Saudi Arabia played a key role in brokering South Korea's entry into the Middle East. When the Foreign Minister of Saudi Arabia visited Seoul in July, 1974, ROK Foreign Minister Kim, Dong Jo thanked him for Saudi Arabia's support during the recent oil crisis of 1973. He appealed to Saudi Arabia to use its "great influence in the Arab world" to "convey ROK goodwill to Arab people" in order to counter "DPRK slander" that had been designed to "obstruct our establishment of friendly relations with the Arab countries" (39).

Though Saudi Arabia, given its pivotal weight in regional oil politics, played the key role, other moderate regimes were also enlisted to assist. Tunisia helped convey the goodwill of the ROK to Arab countries and assisted in establishing friendly relations with them. (40) Similarly, when the Moroccan Foreign Minister visited the ROK in September, 1974, ROK Foreign Minister Kim, Dong Jo thanked Morocco for helping to inform Arab countries of the ROK's support for the Arab cause. (41)

In Africa, the ROK suddenly embraced national liberation. President Park sent a message to the 11th OAU Heads of State meeting in June, 1974, asserting that the ROK had "given its firm support to and expressed its solidarity with Africa striving for national independence, freedom, justice and economic prosperity...and will continue to do its utmost effort in helping the African liberation movements and in strengthening cooperation with African countries" (42).

It was precisely at this time that the international tide of events was turning in favour of national liberation movements in much of southern Africa, particularly in the wake of the revolution in Portugal in 1974. Seoul recognised the new radical Portuguese government led

by President Antonio de Spínola on 16 May, 1974. Previously the ROK had conducted cordial relations with both fascist Spain and Portugal, sharing an anti-communist ideology.

South Korea likewise went out of its way to welcome the new marxist regimes of southern Africa. On 6 June, 1974, the ROK recognised the new Democratic Republic of Guinea-Bissau, declaring that the ROK had "always been sympathetic with and given support to the total liberation of African continent from colonial rule, and in particular to the independence of Guinea-Bissau." (43) Nevertheless, in this case the ROK's "solidarity" was too little too late. Guinea-Bissau chose to open diplomatic relations exclusively with North Korea, long a supporter of its revolutionary cause. Other ex-Portuguese colonial possessions, similarly approached by South Korea, such as Angola, Mozambique, and Sao Tome and Principe, all chose to open diplomatic relations exclusively with North Korea.

There were, however, some successes in Africa to compensate for such disappointments among the Lusophone group. For example, Liberia's ambassador said that the ROK and Liberia shared similar views on issues ranging from decolonisation, consolidation of economic and political independence, human rights, racial discrimination, and Southern Africa. (44) The ROK despatched a special envoy of President Park to Africa in 1974, Kim, Se Ryun, to give extensive briefings on the upcoming UNGA session and canvass support for postponing the Korea debate. His briefing of Liberia's President William R. Tolbert illustrates the new tactics. While giving very detailed accounts of the Korean Question, the ROK promised Liberia increased technical assistance. ROK sincerity was demonstrated through superseding mere medical assistance with more substantial economic assistance. (45) The Gambia similarly couched its friendship with the ROK, and search for economic assistance, in terms of "promoting the Afro-Asian solidarity". (46)

Despite economic advances, ROK diplomacy suffered from momentous political setbacks, especially in Asia. South Korea had long maintained a close relationship with the anti-communist regimes of Southeast Asia. The fall of the anti-communist regimes of South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia in 1975 was therefore a great blow to the ROK. The resultant trend in the region to seek accommodation with communist regimes, was met by strong ROK protests, but to no avail.

For instance, Thailand moved toward establishing diplomatic relations with the DPRK. The ROK issued an Aide Memoire to Thailand on 30 April, 1975, urging it to reconsider. In it, South Korea bemoaned the fact that since the 23 June, 1973 statement, (renouncing the Hallstein doctrine) the friends of the ROK had been establishing relations with North Korea, but the friends of the DPRK had not been doing so with South Korea. It was therefore a one-sided opening process. (47)

Anti-communism still played a role in ROK foreign policy. For instance, visiting President Fidel Sanchez Hernandez, of El Salvador, expressed support for the ROK's stand against communism in September, 1970. (48) Diplomatic contact with Spain prompted President Park to remark that both shared "agonizing sufferings of civil strife provoked by the enemy of peace and freedom", thus identifying the Korean and Spanish civil wars as struggles against communism. When the socialist government of Allende was overthrown in Chile in 1973, the ROK immediately established friendly relations with the Pinochet regime. In his welcoming speech to the new Chilean ambassador, President Park said that their common ties were based on common ideals, antagonistic to international communism. Chile's ambassador spoke of the "common enemy," as "International Marxism". Finally, throughout this period the ROK maintained close relations with the nationalists on Taiwan, despite their expulsion from the UN. When President Chiang Kai Shek died in early 1975, President Park issued a special statement eulogising Chiang and his historic role against communism.

Another important aspect of ROK anti-communist policy was the propaganda campaign it launched against DPRK assistance to guerillas or other subversive forces in the Third World. In 1971, ROK Foreign Minister Choi, Kyu Hah, while in Washington D.C., referred to a "terrorist group trained and supported by the north Korean communists for guerrilla warfare to overthrow the Mexican Government" and to similar incidents in Ceylon and even in Rumania. Choi claimed that "The prime objective of the north Korea-trained guerrilla and terrorist elements is to overthrow legitimate governments in developing countries in Asia, Africa, and Latin America." (49)

The states that were directly targeted in this campaign were often those abstaining in the UNGA Korea debate, or potential swing votes. The ROK published a document entitled "North Korea's Export of Guerrilla Warfare", in English, French, and Spanish, in which it detailed alleged DPRK subversive activities in states including: Mexico, Ceylon, India, Indonesia, Pakistan, Chad, the CAR, Lebanon, and Rumania. It accused the DPRK of giving military training to subversives or terrorists in 9 Latin American, 8 African, 7 Arab, and 4 Asian countries. This was an attempt to reverse the positive image of the DPRK as a supporter of national liberation struggles in the Third World, toward one of a subversive threat to established governments. (50)

However, the problems posed by such an anti-communist approach were apparent when the ROK decided to apply for membership in the NAM on 7 June, 1975, for decision at the Lima Foreign Ministers Conference in August. (51) This decision, in hindsight, was rather unwise, since it was always unlikely to succeed. ROK missions were sent across the Third

World to canvass support for NAM membership, and for ROK membership in the UN, for which an application was made on 29 July, 1975.

Despite the best efforts of the ROK to convince NAM governments that its policy was truly non-aligned, the application of the ROK was rejected and that of North Korea was accepted. This rebuff reflected the recentness of the ROK's policy shift on Third World liberation movements. The ROK Foreign Ministry lodged an official protest concerning the NAM decision, complaining that the Lima statement on the Korean Question referred only to North Korea on the question of reunification, thus demonstrating an "apparent lack of fairness and objectivity." The ROK noted that its application was rejected, "despite strong support by a great number of the members of the group." (52) This referred to a group of moderate governments, many of them Middle Eastern.

IV. The Vietnam War and Anti-Communist Policy

The ROK's normalisation of relations with Japan on 22 June, 1965 and its commitment to send combat troops to Vietnam, together inaugurated a new role for South Korea in the region and in the international system. South Korean economic "take-off in the late 1960s cannot properly be understood without taking into account the very great importance of its involvement in the Vietnam War, and the new economic ties to Japan. There was, however, a diplomatic cost to South Korea for involvement in the Vietnam War as well, i.e. isolation from the mainstream Third World solidarity movement.

ROK involvement in the Vietnam War reflected the continued importance of anti-communism in determining policy. South Korea maintained close economic and security relations with fellow anti-communist governments, particularly the ROC and ROV, which were also divided nations. Even before entry into the Vietnam War, the founder of the KCIA and Chairman of the ruling Democratic Republican Party, Kim, Jong-pil, visited the ROC and ROV as President Park's Special Envoy, in March, 1964. (53)

Preparations for collaboration in the fight against communism were always a key concern. In 1965, Prime Minister Ky of South Vietnam paid a state visit to Seoul to discuss a new "Treaty of Amity" in the face of "communist aggression". (54) A treaty of amity was negotiated with the ROC as well. (55) In 1966 President Park embarked on summit diplomacy in the region to consolidate support for the ROK's role in the Vietnam war. (56) Park and Chiang Kai-shek issued a Joint Communiqué on 18 February, 1966 recognising communist China as the "source of all the troubles in Asia," and pledged full support to South Vietnam. (57)

The ROK, ROC, and ROV also discussed mutual assistance to improve their international status, including a bid for executive positions in the IMF, IBRD, and ADB. In addition, the ROK and ROC discussed a "common market" plan in 1966. (58) They also agreed to obstruct trade between communist China and Southeast Asia, by diplomatic means and through trade competition.

The deployment of large numbers of ROK forces to South Vietnam, peaking at some 50,000 troops by 1968, benefited the South Korean economy, (59) but associated the ROK with an American policy of interventionism that became increasingly unpopular in the Third World. Non-aligned Afro-Asian states were particularly critical of the US intervention in Vietnam, and thus also of the ROK's involvement.

The agreement in 1966 to send even more ROK more troops to Vietnam pledged the US to buy as much as possible from South Korea for the Vietnam war, modernise the ROK forces, pay for all costs of sending ROK troops to Vietnam, extend \$150 million in new loans in addition to \$150 million agreed in 1965, and temporarily cancel the MAP programme in order to assist the ROK to preserve its foreign exchange. (60)

The US was grateful for ROK support in the war. In 1966 both Secretary of State Dean Rusk and President Johnson praised the ROK for its role in Vietnam, normalisation of relations with Japan, its initiative on ASPAC, its new economic successes, and the new Status of forces agreement with the US. (61) Dependence on the US in the Vietnam war era brought positive results for economic development and in some ways enhanced the ROK's international standing.

The ROK took the initiative to found an anti-communist security organisation in Asia. This took the form of ASPAC, the Asian and Pacific Cooperation Conference, which held its first ministerial meeting in Seoul, 14-16 June, 1966. It was attended by Australia, the ROK, ROV, ROC, the Philippines, Thailand, and Japan (at Foreign Minister level), and also by Malaysia, New Zealand, and Laos. The common denominator was their support for the ROV in the Vietnam war. (62) This was followed by the Summit of Seven Asian Nations, in Manila, 24-25 October, 1966, again focused on support for the ROV in the war. The seven were: the US, ROK, ROV, the Philippines, Thailand, Australia, and New Zealand. ROK Foreign Minister Choi, Kyu Ha, remarked in September, 1967 that the ASPAC conference was "the crowning point of Korea's efforts for positive, multi-dimensional diplomacy toward the world" and referred to the war in Vietnam as "our second front". (63)

The ROK believed that its involvement in anti-communist diplomacy and the war in Vietnam actually won it lasting prestige in Asia and the world, and enhanced its national

security. However, the Tet offensive in 1968, the simultaneous North Korean attacks on the South, and the seizure of the USS Pueblo, reminded South Korea of the dangers that accompanied the policy. The ROK considered these events in Korea and Vietnam to be "intimately related with one another". (64)

In the aftermath of Tet, the ROK's regional anti-communist policy brought ever diminishing returns. For instance, at the third ASPAC ministerial conference in Canberra, the ROK was forced to admit that the other nations were reluctant to go further down the path of an overt anti-communist alliance. The Joint Communique of 1 August, 1968 stated unequivocally that "ASPAC was not intended to be a body directed against any state or group of states." (65) Furthermore, with the demise of SEATO and the founding of ASEAN, the pan-Asian initiative passed from the ROK to other leadership.

The period after the Tet offensive produced other shock waves for the ROK. For example: the Paris Peace talks on the Vietnam war; President Nixon's Eight Point Peace Proposal of 14 May, 1969; the coming rapprochement between the US and communist China; and plans for unilateral withdrawal of US forces from Vietnam; all of which alarmed the ROK. These events constituted a turning point which produced a sharp change in ROK policy, discussed below.

Nevertheless, anti-communism was not easily relinquished as the cornerstone of foreign policy. For instance, when President Nguyen Van Thieu of the ROV paid a state visit to Seoul in spring 1969, following the Seven Nation Summit in Bangkok, President Park introduced him as "the great leader of our closest ally". (66) They agreed in a joint communique that any unilateral withdrawal of Allied forces from Vietnam would do "great prejudice to the security of the Allied forces." They rejected any coalition government with communists in Vietnam. The ROK pledged close economic cooperation with the ROV. (67)

The full extent of the changes occurring in the international arena was brought home to President Park when he met President Nixon in San Francisco in August, 1969. Nixon explained his policy of "Asia for the Asians" to Park, who then had 50,000 troops in Vietnam. US allies would be expected to rely more on their own capabilities as the US gradually reduced its Asian commitments. President Park reacted by publicly appealing to the US not to "abandon Asia", and he warned of the "communist threat in Asia." He predicted that if the US reneged on its commitments in the region, then "new disturbances and threats will inevitably recur in this region." (68)

The announcement of the Nixon Doctrine brought the realisation in the ROK that a period of profound changes in international relations was beginning. One of the first

manifestations of the ROK response was the decision to recognise the new radical governments of the Libyan Arab Republic on 13 September, 1969, and of Bolivia in October, 1969. These decisions represent further acceleration of the retreat from strict anti-communism in ROK Third World Diplomacy.

V. South Korea's Turn to Nationalistic Policies

The period between 1968 and 1972 was a watershed for South Korea, during which it made profound changes in its domestic and foreign policies in order to adapt to a rapidly changing international situation. The certainties of the 1960s were breaking down as US leadership seemed to falter. Not only was the US retreating from Vietnam and reducing its forward deployment in Asia, but it was increasingly challenged by the rising Third World bloc and perceived to be losing the ability to effectively manage world affairs and the world economy.

The Pueblo incident in 1968, and especially the secret US-DPRK talks on the release of the Pueblo's crew, was particularly catalytic in terms of the ROK's reassessment of its alliances. The National Assembly passed a special resolution on 6 February, 1968, which stated unequivocally: "The National Assembly urges the Government to reconsider treaties and agreements concluded between the Republic of Korea and other nations so as to protect national security permanently as well as to take automatic action in case of future emergencies". (69)

The decision by the US to seek detente with both China and the Soviet Union confused the ROK as to the ideological consistency of US policy. Under the guidance of US Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, a period dominated by the dictates of realpolitik, rather than ideology, was commencing. (70) However, the US certainly did not abandon commitments to the ROK.

The ROK decided to follow somewhat contradictory policies, i.e. greater flexibility and openness in foreign affairs, particularly vis a vis the Third World; while simultaneously pursuing a domestic program of increasing repressiveness. This solution had a diplomatic cost. The legitimacy of the Park regime was increasingly undermined, as its repressive policies were criticised even by its friends.

The "Nixon shocks" of 1971, i.e. the announcement of the withdrawal of 20,000 US troops from South Korea, Nixon's impending state visit to China, the unilateral abrogation of dollar-gold convertibility underpinning the Bretton Woods system, and the concomitant use of protectionist measures in the West, all convinced the ROK that a sea-change in international affairs was indeed occurring.

This was followed by the Shanghai Communique between the US and PRC on 28 February, 1972, in which an entente was established that implied the Korean Question should be decided by the Koreans themselves. Then came Sino-Japanese rapprochement in September, 1972, followed by impending US withdrawal from Vietnam as the Paris Peace talks progressed. At US behest the ROK reluctantly withdrew most of its troops from Vietnam in the course of 1972, as "Vietnamisation" of that conflict proceeded.

In tandem with these dramatic international changes, the ROK underwent drastic political change. This process began in 1969 with the adoption by the ROK National Assembly of a controversial bill on constitutional amendments and another on national referendums. These were passed by the ruling party without the participation of the official opposition New Democratic Party. A national referendum was then held on 17 October, 1969, on a new constitution, allowing the President to serve three consecutive terms. It was approved by 65.09% of the vote, with 31.34 % opposed.

President Park set the new foreign policy tone in 1969 by stating that, in order to "pursue our national interest in the changing world situation, the Government will develop and implement flexible diplomacy towards foreign countries" including "the possibility of establishing trade relations with some of the East European Communist countries in view of our capability and international trends." (71) On 31 December, 1969, the ROK Foreign Minister announced that the government would "expand its diplomatic ties with non-aligned nations and, in particular, among the developing countries."

The "regime crisis" of the Third Republic came to a head in the Presidential election of 1971, when President Park narrowly defeated Kim Dae Jung, the charismatic leader of the New Democratic Party. (72) In the National Assembly elections of May, 1971 the ruling party retained its overall majority with 113 seats, but the opposition New Democratic Party won 89 seats, carrying the main cities. These results alerted the ruling party to the increased difficulty of maintaining power by electoral means under the existing constitution.

The closure of the political system began with a proclamation of a national "state of emergency" on 6 December, 1971. On 26 December, 1971, the National Assembly granted President Park special Emergency Powers, despite a parliamentary opposition boycott. On 17 October, 1972 Park declared martial law and the period of the so-called "October revitalising reforms", otherwise known as "Yushin", began.

President Park declared that Yushin was necessary to adapt to the new conditions of North-

South dialogue, and to changes in the international situation that threatened the existing security order in Asia. In his Special Declaration of 17 October, 1972, he began his remarks by saying, "There is now taking place a significant change in the balance of power among the big powers around the Korean peninsula" and he invoked the spectre that "the interests of the third or smaller countries might be sacrificed for the relaxation of tension between big powers." (73) The "Special Declaration" announced the dissolution of parliament, the suspension of all political activities, and the suspension of the Constitution pending its revision and re-approval by national referendum.

The new constitution was put to a referendum on 21 November, 1972 and received 91.4% approval. It allowed the President an indefinite number of terms in office, i.e. a "President for Life". There was no Vice-President, and the President was not to be chosen by direct popular election, but through a new electoral college, the National Conference for Unification, chaired by the President himself. No debate was allowed in its chamber. The President gained wide new emergency powers over internal and external affairs, including the unimpeded power to suspend constitutional rights and to dissolve the National Assembly, already weakened by the strengthening of unchecked Presidential powers and the abolition of the right of parliamentary inspection. There followed a period of rule by Presidential decree. Emergency Measure No. 1, on 9 January, 1974, made all opposition to the Yushin constitution illegal, offenders subject to arrest without warrant and to trial by Court Martial.

It is somewhat of a paradox that one feature of this transition period was the strong desire by South Korea to reaffirm its bilateral security arrangements with the US, as well as to win American support for increased military self-reliance. The ROK succeeded in winning US support for building a new national defense industry in South Korea. This was conditional on the guarantee, given to UNCURK on 11 May, 1970, that the ROK would "never resort to the use of arms in order to achieve unification" (74).

The new world view of the ROK is perhaps most clearly expressed in President Park's annual Liberation Day address on 15 August, 1971. President Park warned that if "the major world powers attempt to bargain over our destiny as they once did, we will take a firm stand based on national self-reliance, and resolutely reject such maneuvers." Furthermore, he declared that the ROK would "guard against any unwarranted assumption that outside powers or international trends will bring about solutions to problems relating to the future of the Korean peninsula...Under these circumstances, we must preserve and strengthen our national self-reliance at all costs, and adjust ourselves actively and flexibly to changing international trends." (75)

In the same speech, President Park announced a new step in the retreat from anti-communism in foreign policy. He offered to encourage relations of cooperation with "any nation that respects our national integrity and does not engage in acts of hostility against us, irrespective of political system or ideology". (76)

This opened the door to relations with non-hostile communist governments, including direct talks with North Korea. On 23 June, 1971, the ROK Foreign Minister announced that South Korea was lifting the ban in Korean ports on shipping from communist Eastern European countries. However, the shipping ban was retained with the DPRK, PRC, DRV and Cuba.

VI. North-South Dialogue

To break the ice with the DPRK, President Park personally endorsed a call by the Red Cross for an inter-Korea meeting on humanitarian problems, i.e. on the issue of separated families. In exchange for DPRK pledges to desist from armed provocations; make an "unequivocal expression" of its non-belligerent attitude; renounce the goal of communization of all Korea or the overthrow of the ROK government through violent revolution; and the unequivocal acceptance of the competence and authority of the UN and its efforts for Korean reunification; the ROK "would not be opposed to the north Korean communists' presence in the United Nations deliberation of the Korean Question at the UN." (77)

The "dialogue", however, did not begin well or easily. On 12 April, 1971, the DPRK rejected President Park's proposals of 15 August, 1970. In response, the ROK rejected Northern prerequisite for reunification: e.g. abrogation of the US-ROK Mutual Defense Treaty; abrogation of the treaty on basic relations with Japan; and withdrawal of all foreign troops; saying these demands were "utterly impractical and unreasonable." (78)

On 12 February, 1972, the ROK announced a Four Point Plan for peace in Korea, including a renunciation of force by both sides, peaceful use of the DMZ, cessation of armed infiltration into the ROK, and return of a high-jacked ROK airliner then being held in the North, along with its crew and passengers. Through these proposals the ROK was engaging in a new effort to satisfy the international community that it was serious about peace and wanted negotiation with the North. This was also necessary to counteract the increasing effectiveness of DPRK diplomacy and propaganda, depicting the ROK as intransigent and essentially uninterested in peaceful solutions.

The ROK and DPRK eventually began a series of direct discussions. Secret talks between Lee, Hu Rak, chief of the KCIA, and Kim, Young Joo, the younger brother of Kim Il Sung, prepared the way for a visit to Seoul by DPRK Vice Premier Park, Sung Chul (29 May -1

June, 1972). On 4 July, 1972 the two Korean governments announced their agreement to a common set of principles for peaceful reunification discussed in the previous chapter.

At the same time, a statement was issued to the UN by the ROK that made it clear the ROK continued to support a very significant role by the UN in the resolution of the Korean Question, and that it did not expect to see the North-South Dialogue yield instant results. (79)

Despite the accommodation by the ROK to the new international attitude on the Korean Question, South Korea's performance in the international competition to establish diplomatic partnerships faltered badly in the early 1970s. As detailed above, in 1970, 1971, and 1972 the ROK established new diplomatic relationships only with the micro-island states of Tonga, Fiji, Mauritius and Western Samoa. It was with this disappointing result in mind that the decision to allow even greater flexibility in diplomatic relations was taken.

On 23 June, 1973, South Korea formally renounced the Hallstein Doctrine. This represented the beginning of a new phase of extremely active diplomacy, especially in the Third World. This new phase of foreign policy was explicitly aimed at capitalising on the opportunities to increase the ROK's support in the UNGA, discussed in the section below. Paradoxically, just as the ROK adopted this more flexible foreign policy stance, the North-South Dialogue entered an impasse. North Korea unilaterally suspended the North-South Dialogue on 24 August, 1973.

After the 23 June, 1973 statement, and confirmation of a cease-fire in Vietnam, US Secretary of State William Rogers visited Seoul in mid-July. Rogers publicly announced new initiatives on the settlement of the Korean Question, including simultaneous membership by both Korean governments in the United Nations. He defended this policy as "an acceptance of reality...there are two governments in being, and there are countries that have diplomatic relations with North Korea and South Korea." (80) Rogers alluded to the German solution, whereby both German governments entered the UN and recognised each other, as being "a very logical step", and he acknowledged the trend for northern European governments to recognise the DPRK. He advocated "cross recognition" by expressing the hope that Eastern European and other socialist governments would reciprocate by establishing diplomatic relations with the ROK. (81) US policy on the Korean Question was undergoing an important shift. This change was illustrated in the decision by the US to agree to the dissolution of UNCURK.

To regain the initiative in the North-South Dialogue, President Park proposed a non-aggression treaty with the DPRK on 18 January, 1974. Both sides were to pledge not to attack the other, not to meddle in internal affairs, and to respect the Armistice Agreement.

(82) Thereafter, the ROK and US were careful to continue to invoke the need for progress in the North-South Dialogue. However, the centre of activity on the Korean Question shifted back to the UNGA in 1973-75, despite US and ROK objections.

The resignation of President Richard Nixon in August, 1974, did not bring a significant change in US policy toward Korea. Secretary of State Henry Kissinger and President Gerald Ford continued to emphasise US strategic commitment to the ROK. Indeed, Ford chose the ROK as his first Presidential trip abroad, in November, 1974. In the Joint Communique between Presidents Park and Ford, the US denied any intention of withdrawing additional US forces from South Korea and promised further support for the modernisation of the ROK's armed forces and for development of Korean defense industries. (83)

After the US debacle in Indochina in the spring of 1975, the ROK needed further reassurances. US Secretary of Defense James Schlesinger, in Seoul during annual bilateral defense consultations, reaffirmed President Ford's security pledges. After reviewing the strategic situation in Korea in the wake of events in Indochina, the US and ROK concluded that the "military capabilities of North Korea continue to pose a serious threat to the security of the Republic of Korea." (84) Moreover, the US unequivocally pledged its "readiness and determination...to render prompt and effective assistance to the Republic of Korea in accordance with the Mutual Defense Treaty of 1954 in the event of an armed attack against the Republic of Korea." (85) With this security relationship in view, it is not difficult to understand why the majority of the NAM membership continued to perceive South Korea as ineligible for membership. South Korea remained incapable of completely breaking out of its dependent security relationship with the United States, and this fact clearly hampered the progress of ROK foreign policy in the Third World.

VII. The Debate in the UN

In 1961 the composition of the UNGA began to change with the entry of numerous newly independent countries. Indonesia's proposal in 1961 to invite the DPRK to UNGA discussions on Korea prompted US Ambassador Adlai Stephenson to propose an amendment requiring the DPRK to first recognise UN competence to deal with the Korean Question. The Stephenson amendment passed by a vote of 59 to 14, with 23 abstentions. (86) However, the ROK actually refused to accept the Stephenson amendment.

The ROK was immediately aware of the significance of the entry of 17 new members to the UNGA in 1961. The ROK Foreign Minister's speech to the First Committee, on 21 April, 1961 specifically congratulated these 17 states, and noted that immediately upon coming to power, the new democratic government sent a goodwill mission to Africa and declared a

policy of friendly relations, "particularly (with) the Afro-Asian countries with whom Korea shares many social and economic similarities." (87) The ROK's position on its international status remained the same as previously, i.e. that there was "no doubt that there is, and can be, no other government in Korea save that of the Republic of Korea". (88)

Prior to the 15th session in 1960 there were 21 non-communist European member states, 20 Latin American, 22 Asian, 9 African, and 10 communist members of the UNGA. According to one South Korean scholar, this meant that until the 15th Session "the United States could muster a simple majority almost automatically by securing the votes of European and Latin American countries, and could easily muster a two-thirds majority by securing additional votes from Asian countries." (89) However, from 1961 onward it became difficult for the US to muster even a simple majority "because the US was no longer assured of African votes." (90)

The ROK was therefore compelled by circumstances to cultivate African support. Indeed, in the 1960s the ROK established diplomatic relations with 25 African states. Nevertheless, ROK support was still weakest in Africa of all the regions of the Third World. (91) This weakness can be explained partly as the result of the alliance with the US and involvement in Vietnam. In one specialist's view, "the closer Korea moved to the United States to achieve its security goal, the more difficult it was to gain the support of African states in the international arena." (92)

The non-aligned members of the UNGA increasingly took initiative on the Korean Question, as well as often abstaining on resolutions submitted by the US or USSR. For instance, they proposed reconstituting the membership of UNCURK in a manner acceptable to both sides, which would facilitate a change in attitude to the role of the UN by North Korea. They suggested convening a special conference on Korea to be attended by both Korean regimes, the great powers, and selected non-aligned members. It was even desirable, from the nonaligned perspective, to withdraw UN forces from Korea, but preferably as part of a larger political settlement, not merely a prerequisite to one. The non-aligned members supported strengthening the armistice, perhaps even with nonaligned troops stationed on the territory of both Koreas.

UNCURK continued to be primarily pro-ROK, and as such eventually came under increasing Third World criticism. UNCURK monitored South Korea's transition from civilian to military rule and back again from 1961-1963, including the national referendum on constitutional amendments in December, 1962, and the National Assembly and Presidential elections of 1963. UNCURK concluded that these elections were conducted, on the whole, "in a free atmosphere, in an orderly manner, and in accordance with the law."

(93)

To outside critics UNCURK appeared to be an instrument for the international legitimisation of the ROK. UNCURK seemed to be partisan. For instance, one UNCURK report contrasted the competitive character of the ROK elections in 1963, to elections in the DPRK in 1962 and 1963, in which only a single slate of approved candidates stood, reportedly receiving 100% approval from the electorate. This contrast was meant to increase the credibility of the ROK's commitment to UN supervised elections in North and South Korea as a viable method of reunification. North Korea's refusal to accept UN supervised elections was made more suspect in light of its own electoral practices. (94)

The Third Republic National Assembly approved a resolution on 29 November, 1964, unanimously endorsing UN resolutions on the Korean Question and UN supervised elections throughout Korea on the basis of population proportion. (95) By contrast, the DPRK announced in January, 1965 that it continued to reject UN supervised elections and demanded withdrawal of all foreign forces as a basic prerequisite to progress.

Throughout the 1960s the UNGA overwhelmingly approved of resolutions inviting the ROK to participate in UNGA discussions on the Korean Question, as reviewed in the previous chapter. (Table 1) In 1965, pro-Western Saudi Arabia submitted a proposal to invite the DPRK, based on the principle of non-alignment, whereby "both parties would be treated equally and without recrimination" and that was "compatible with its (DPRK) dignity." (96) Guinea submitted a similar resolution. The vote to reject the Guinean resolution was much closer than previous contests. (97)

The annual pro-ROK resolution passed in 1966 noted that free elections were the proper solution to national division, and that as the majority of UN forces had already been withdrawn from Korea, the remaining forces should not leave until conditions for a lasting settlement, as formulated by the UNGA, had been fulfilled. It also called for the role of UNCURK to be "intensified". (98)

In his State of the Union Address to the ROK National Assembly in January, 1967, Park Chung Hee revealed his concern over the trend in the UN debate on the Korean Question, i.e. the rising level of support for North Korean proposals. President Park stated that "the fluid situation within the United Nations surrounding the Korean issue and any future contingencies that may arise in this regard" would be met by the ROK with "flexibility". (99) In response, the ROK established the Ministry of National Reunification.

President Park's concern was not unfounded. The debate on the Korean Question at the

22nd UNGA session in autumn 1967 was even more hotly contested than previous sessions, as the supporters of the DPRK's position grew in strength. A ten-power resolution to invite both Koreas without any preconditions was rather narrowly defeated by 50 to 37, with 24 abstentions. (100)

The problem for the ROK was not securing passage of pro-ROK resolutions, but rather how to stave off passage of pro-DPRK resolutions, especially those that would lead to a diminished UN role in Korea.

The military incidents of 1968 in Korea, such as the Pueblo affair, the North's raid on the Presidential Palace in Seoul, and infiltration by other special northern commando units, were much discussed throughout the subsequent UNGA debate that year. (101) The speeches on the Korean Question in this session were more polarised than ever before, reflecting deep Cold War divisions and divisions over the Vietnam war, as well as on the division of Korea. Allies of the US and ROK argued that the DPRK was an aggressor and in violation of the Armistice. The Philippines, for instance, interpreted the commando raids as an "attempt to start Viet-Cong style guerrilla warfare in the south", whereas Cambodia, a friend of the DPRK, denounced UN resolutions on Korea as an attempt to "perpetuate the division of Korea and to set the seal of United Nations approval on the imperialistic policy of the United States Government." (102) ROK Foreign Minister Choi, Kyu-Ha, and US Ambassador Symington stressed the recent attacks on the South by northern commandos as being the "most massive and serious military provocation...since the Armistice of 1953" and designed to promote revolution in the South. (103)

The Soviet delegate, J. Malik, made a direct appeal to the non-aligned Third World to intensify support for DPRK participation, arguing that those who abstained seemed to "condone this injustice", and therefore should "decide to take a new line on this question." (104) Malik called upon those "which only recently themselves experienced all the burdens and miseries of colonial and imperialist domination and attained their independence" as well as those who "so far followed the line set in this matter by the United States and its closest military partners" to support DPRK participation in the UN debate. (105)

The USSR's appeal was partially effective. The seventeen-power resolution to invite both Koreas simultaneously was only narrowly defeated by 55 to 40 with 28 abstentions. Among the Third World states voting in favour were some having diplomatic relations with the ROK, such as Kenya, or friendly to it, including Indonesia, Jordan, Ceylon, Nigeria, and Pakistan. (106)

The General Assembly was sharply divided over the character of the military situation in Korea and Vietnam. The Soviet Union and its allies attacked the ROK's role in Vietnam

and ASPAC, along with recent US moves to send warships and more troops to Korea. (107) DPRK supporters argued that without withdrawal of US forces and dissolution of UNCURK, war might erupt in Korea. Supporters of the ROK argued that in light of recent aggressive acts by the DPRK, if US forces were withdrawn - war might result. The pro-DPRK side condemned the ROK's role in Vietnam as aggressive, the pro-ROK side defended it as an indication of the ROK's commitments to the international community! (108)

The voting results on the substantive issues in the 1968 UNGA session did not produce the breakthrough the USSR and pro-DPRK forces hoped for, but definitely convinced the US and ROK of the growing strength of the opposition. (109) The same held true for the outcome of voting in 1969, in a context still marked by extreme tension on the Korean peninsula. (110) Pro-DPRK governments described the US troop presence in Korea as a military occupation in violation of the UN principle of non-intervention, and which increased the threat of war. Pro-ROK governments argued that dissolution of UNCURK and withdrawal of UN/US forces could result in "disastrous consequences" including the overthrow of the ROK government. Some non-aligned countries argued for transforming the UN into a non-partisan mediator acceptable to both sides, and relying more on direct North-South Korean negotiations. (111)

The international system underwent important changes in the early 1970s that had direct bearing on the UN and its role in resolving the Korean Question. In particular, the entry of the PRC into the Security Council, and the entry of two German states into the General Assembly, changed the tone in the UN debate on Korea. China's entry represented a zero-sum type victory in the competition for international legitimacy, while the German precedent provided an example of "cross-recognition" and simultaneous UN entry.

In this new atmosphere, an international consensus emerged on the Korean Question, calling for the two Korean governments to solve the problem of reunification peacefully and without foreign interference. There was in fact a recognition that the role of the great powers should be changed as well as the role of the UN. It implicitly recognised that Korea was sovereign and had the right to self-determination, i.e. to determine its own future.

In formal terms, up to the end of the 1960s South Korea retained clear advantages over North Korea in the international competition for legitimacy. The majority of governments in the UN would still support South Korea's claims to be the "only lawful government" on the Korean peninsula, and also support resolutions in the UNGA that perpetuated a UN supervisory role. However, the "partisan" role of the UN came increasingly under attack by the DPRK's supporters throughout the 1960s and especially in the early 1970s.

The early 1970s can be described as a period in which the ROK was constantly on the defensive in the UN. South Korea relied, as a result, more openly and unambiguously on its bilateral strategic ties with the United States. Nowhere is this better illustrated than in the fate of the UNC after 1975, and South Korea's response to its effective dissolution, discussed in the next chapter.

In the 1970 UNGA debate was again closely fought, even on the procedural, invitation motion. (112) Those who supported the ROK argued that no action should be taken to weaken the effect of past UN resolutions on Korea, since this would undermine the prestige of the UN and increase DPRK belligerency. If both parties were to be heard, both should assume equal rights and equal obligations. This meant the DPRK must first acknowledge the competence and authority of the UN on the Korean reunification issue. DPRK supporters suggested that the appropriate way to deal with the Korean Question was via direct North-South negotiations, since it was strictly a domestic issue. The usual pro-DPRK resolution calling for the dropping of the Korean Question from the UN agenda was not submitted. The DPRK reiterated its respect for the UN Charter, thus differentiating this broader issue from the more specific one of recognising UN competence over the Korean Question. The ROK stressed that it totally accepted UN competence and authority to deal with the Korean Question, whereas the DPRK refused to do so.

UNCURK was becoming distinctly vulnerable. Chile decided to withdraw from the organisation and informed the UN of this on 14 November, 1970. The reason, as Chile stated it, was that Chile desired to explore other possibilities of worthwhile and disinterested action that would contribute to peace in that region. Chile's decision implied that the legitimacy and the worth of UNCURK was questionable. It should be noted that a few non-aligned governments called for a genuinely non-partisan approach to the Korean issue, on the part of the UN, to be facilitated by the great powers and inter-Korean conciliation. (113)

Extraordinary changes in the UN debate took place in 1971, indeed there was no debate at all! It was agreed to postpone debate until the 26th UNGA session. This was brought about by consent on both sides. It was time to advocate inter-Korean talks. In these circumstances, an acrimonious debate in the UN would spoil the atmosphere for progress in North-South talks. It could be argued, however, that the ROK and the US preferred to avoid another head-on confrontation in the UN in 1971 in response to the previous years of increasing support for the pro-DPRK coalition.

The initiative on the Korean Question therefore temporarily moved outside the UN to the

inter-Korean dialogue. The DPRK issued an 8 point proposal in April, 1971, including the demand for complete freedom of all political parties to operate in either North or South. On 12 February, 1972 the ROK responded with a 4 point proposal, primarily designed to ease military tensions. Secret, and then open North-South talks, produced the 4 July Joint Communique, discussed previously.

With the imposition of the Yushin dictatorship in 1972, the DPRK and its supporters decided to flush the ROK back out into the open - in the UN. Algeria, on behalf of the NAM, led an effort in late 1972 to re-instate the Korean issue on the UN agenda. ROK Foreign Minister Kim, Yong Shik, issued a statement on 24 July, 1972, to reject this suggestion, arguing that although some UN members were supporting this proposal in order to create favourable conditions for the success of the inter-Korean dialogue, the "hidden intention" of the proposal was to weaken the ROK's defense. He argued that a renewed debate would "revive the Cold War polemics of the past, poisoning the atmosphere, and hamper a smooth and successful progress of the South-North dialogue". (114)

The ROK campaigned vigorously for further deferral of the UN debate. On 6 September, 1972, the ROK issued a memorandum to the UN calling for postponement of the debate on the grounds that the South-North Dialogue was making progress and a debate would revive Cold War confrontational polemics and spoil the atmosphere for dialogue. (115)

The North-South Dialogue had an inevitable influence on the course of the Korean Question in the UN. The commencement of meetings of the South-North Coordinating Committee from 30 November, 1972, led UNCURK to review its role, and subsequently to recommend its own dissolution. This was suggested in UNCURK's annual report, submitted on 30 August, 1973. (116) UNCURK concluded unequivocally that its presence in Korea was "no longer required". (117)

South Korea was unsuccessful in resisting mounting international pressure to resume the debate on Korea in the UNGA or to block the DPRK's participation at the 28th UNGA session in 1973.

However, a remarkable spirit of compromise prevailed in the 28th session, beginning in the First Committee's deliberations. Both sides seemed eager to draft compromise proposals that would be acceptable to the other side. Both sides agreed that UNCURK should be dissolved and even agreed not to put the matter to a formal vote. Instead, a consensus statement was agreed with the Chairman of the First Committee and was subsequently recommended to the General Assembly. (118)

This remarkable consensus document was unanimously approved by the General Assembly on 28 November, 1973. Noting the 4 July, 1972 Joint Communique between North and South Korea and its three principles of peaceful reunification, the UNGA consensus was the following: "It is the general hope that the South and the North of Korea will be urged to continue their dialogue and widen their many-sided exchanges and cooperation in the above spirit so as to expedite the independent peaceful reunification of the country." (119) Paradoxically, North Korea had already unilaterally suspended the dialogue on 28 August, 1973.

Ostensibly, the lack of progress in the North-South dialogue was due to fundamental differences in approach. The ROK favoured cautious gradualism, beginning with limited steps such as relaxation of the state of military tension, cultural and non-political exchanges. In contrast, the DPRK viewed the talks as negotiations on substantive strategic and political issues leading directly to reunification.

The acrimony between the two Korean governments was quite visible in the 28th UNGA session. For instance, ROK Foreign Minister Kim, Yong Shik, attacked the DPRK by claiming that its appeals to remove foreign interference, dissolve the UNC, withdraw all foreign forces, and replace the Armistice with a peace treaty, were merely deceptions. The DPRK's "ulterior motive" was to "rattle the security framework of the Republic of Korea." (120) While the ROK accepted the dissolution of UNCURK, it categorically rejected the call for dissolution of the UNC, claiming this would in effect nullify the Armistice.

The ROK adroitly identified the contradiction in North Korea's position on UN membership, pointing out that in practice the DPRK had in fact been pursuing a "two Koreas policy". North Korea had established full diplomatic relations with governments that had previously had such relations only with the ROK, and it had joined important IGO's such as WHO, UNCTAD and the IPU, in which the ROK had long been the sole government for Korea. The DPRK had itself applied for UN membership in 1949 and 1952 and had not opposed the proposal before the Security Council in 1957 to admit both Koreas into the UN.

President Park went on the diplomatic offensive in January, 1974, by proposing a non-aggression treaty. This proposal was designed to counter DPRK propaganda depicting the ROK as being opposed to reducing military tension. However, ROK strategic reliance on the US and the policy of expanding ROK defense industries continued unchanged. (121) In August, 1974, even lower level meetings of the South-North Coordinating Committee were suspended. In the same month President Park proposed peace via the non-aggression treaty, rapid progress in the Dialogue, many-sided exchanges and cooperation, and free

general elections under fair management and supervision in direct proportion to the population.

In late 1974, Algeria and 36 other states submitted a draft resolution to the UNGA arguing that the elimination of foreign interference was imperative in order to successfully promote the Dialogue and reunification according to the three principles of the 4 July, 1972 Joint Communique. (122). The ROK's response was to re-emphasise the belligerence of the DPRK and the threat of war should UN forces be removed.

On the 29th anniversary of the founding of the UN, in October, 1974, President Park called upon the DPRK immediately to accept his proposal for a non-aggression treaty. He said that "it is only too clear that any disturbance of the balance of power between the South and the North will...invite a north Korean invasion of the South." At the same time he pledged to normalise the Dialogue and accept DPRK admission into the UN. (123)

Receiving no reply from the DPRK, the ROK went over to the offensive in the UN to call for resumption of the suspended Dialogue, blaming the DPRK for all lack of progress. The spectre of communist revolution and violent overthrow of the ROK government was deployed as a device to discredit the DPRK. In a detailed memorandum to the UN on 1 November, 1974, the ROK claimed that the DPRK's principal reason for suspending the Dialogue was the fact that it "realized that the dialogue would be unlikely to contribute to a creation of favourable conditions for the achievement of a violent revolution in South Korea or the unification of the country under communist leadership." (124)

The ROK struck an alarmist note by accusing the DPRK of constructing tunnels into the southern zone of the DMZ. (125) A stern warning was issued to the DPRK on 16 November, 1974, accusing it of constructing the tunnel "for the purpose of despatching armed agents en masse and to stage a full-scale armed aggression when acute social unrest occurs in the South." (126) According to South Korea this proved that the DPRK, "while outwardly engaged in peace offensives is actually in the midst of a meticulous planning to overthrow the Government of the Republic of Korea under their sinister scheme of unifying through violent means." (127)

This crisis reflected the mood in South Korea in the wake of the assassination attempt on President Park on 15 August, 1974, in which his wife was killed by a gunman the ROK connected to the pro-DPRK Korean Residents Association in Japan (Chochongryun). In a similar vein, therefore, Kim Il Sung's call for foreign troop withdrawal was depicted as a "calculated scheme to unify Korea eventually under a communist government, by means of violence, whether internally or externally applied, against South Korea." (128)

The ROK and its supporters in the UNGA called for unconditional resumption of the Dialogue, whereas the DPRK and its supporters made resumption contingent on withdrawal of all foreign forces from Korea. The ROK deployed skilful legal arguments against dissolution of the UNC, e.g. that it was a matter for the Security Council, rather than the General Assembly, to decide. The ROK argued that "the delicate division of the functions and powers between the Security Council and the General Assembly for the maintenance of peace and security" should not be jeopardised "by calling on the General Assembly to alter a Security Council decision." (129)

The ROK's view was almost perfectly expressed in the draft resolution submitted by Bolivia and 23 other states on 4 December, 1974. This draft reaffirmed the consensus decision of the 28th UNGA on the need to continue the Dialogue and called upon the Security Council, rather than the General Assembly, to deliberate the future of the UNC and alternative arrangements to assure the maintenance of the Armistice. (130) Saudi Arabia led an effort to refine the wording of this resolution so that the precise nature of such deliberations by the UNC and the status of the Armistice would become clearer. (131) This amended version was approved by the First Committee on 9 December, 1974.

However, the pro-DPRK resolution, calling for dissolution of the UNC and withdrawal of all foreign forces, received an equal number of votes for and against, an unprecedentedly close vote on a pro-DPRK proposal. The PRC delegate to the UNGA, Huang Hua, accused the US of having "resorted to such despicable means as the exertion of pressure" in order to salvage the situation with a tie vote. (132) China said the resolution was designed solely to provide the US "with an excuse for usurping the name of the United Nations to continue its interference in the internal affairs of Korea... Its purpose is to delay a settlement of the Korean Question, perpetuate the division of Korea and obstruct the independent and peaceful reunification of Korea." (133)

The USSR criticised those Third World governments, such as the Philippines and Colombia (which Malik mentioned by name), which still voted with the Western powers on the Korean Question and against the coalition of socialist and non-aligned states supporting North Korea. (134)

Despite these great power protests, the pro-ROK resolution was approved by the UNGA on 17 December, 1974. (135) The resolution directed the Security Council to take measures to assure that the Armistice was maintained, while deliberating on the possible dissolution of the UNC as well.

The debate on the Korean Question in the UN culminated in the 30th session in 1975, at

which time the ROK and the US felt it was finally "politic" to make a timely concession on the dissolution of the UNC, as they had previously done on UNCURK. This concession can be interpreted as a recognition of the unfavourable trend in the General Assembly and the possibility that a majority might vote for North Korean proposals, thus lending these proposals international legitimacy.

Therefore, on 27 June, 1975 the US government wrote to the President of the UN Security Council to affirm US and ROK preparedness to terminate the UNC as of 1 January, 1976. This affirmation of intent was timed to support the application of the ROK to join the NAM. Under its conditions, the Armistice would be maintained while the US and ROK designated officers to take over the functions formerly performed by the UNC. In this manner, the US and ROK would together implement UNGA resolution 3333 adopted on 17 December, 1974. This arrangement would be subject to the prior agreement of the Korean Peoples Army (DPRK) and the Chinese People's Volunteers (PRC), as signatories to the Armistice Agreement. (136) The US submitted a draft resolution to the 30th UNGA session containing this proposal, and the ROK re-applied for membership to the UN on 29 July, 1975, requesting consideration of its application by the Security Council.

The rejection of the ROK's application for full NAM membership and the acceptance of the DPRK's application directly preceded the final UN debate on the Korean Question in 1975. This defeat for the ROK contributed to a greater sense of urgency in the US that further concessions on the UNC would have to be forthcoming soon. The Permanent Representative of the US to the UN, Daniel Patrick Moynihan, wrote to the President of the Security Council on 22 September, 1975, to further clarify US willingness to take measures to "reduce manifestations" of the UNC in Korea. Moynihan unilaterally announced that as of 25 August, 1975 the flag of the UN no longer flew over military installations in South Korea. The only exception to this was at certain UNC facilities in Panmunjom, directly associated with implementation of the Armistice Agreement, and involving only some 300 non-Korean personnel. All other armed forces in South Korea, whether ROK or US, would no longer fly the UN flag. Ambassador Moynihan reiterated the willingness of the US and ROK to sit down with other concerned parties to discuss the question of terminating the UNC altogether, subject to the continuation of the Armistice in the absence of other agreements between North and South Korea. (137)

To buttress this proposal, the ROK Ministry of Foreign Affairs simultaneously issued a statement supporting the proposals of US Secretary of State Henry Kissinger to the 30th UNGA. Kissinger's proposal included a reiteration of US willingness to convene an international conference at any time and place to discuss with the parties directly concerned the proposed termination of the UNC, in accordance with UNGA resolution 3333

of 1974, and to convene a conference to discuss ways and means of preserving the Armistice, pending new arrangements. Kissinger likewise called for simultaneous entry into the UN by both Korean governments. (138)

The Chair of the Security Council at this time was Sweden, a member of the Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission in Korea. Sweden took the position, as it made very clear to the ROK, that it would work for a consensus similar to that of 1973. It regretted the situation whereby two irreconcilable draft resolutions could both conceivably be approved in the 30th UNGA session, which would of course render the situation unclear in terms of international legality. Sweden's position was to support the North-South Dialogue and support the ROK's application for UN membership, on the grounds of the principle of universal membership. (139)

Two "irreconcilable drafts" were indeed submitted to the 30th UNGA, one by Algeria and 41 other socialist and non-aligned states on 8 August, and one by Bolivia and 27 other states on 13 October, 1975. The pro-ROK draft resolution took note of the letter from the US to the UN of 27 June and ROK acceptance of this policy. It reaffirmed the UN consensus of 28 November, 1973 and urged continuation of the Dialogue. Most importantly, it called upon all the parties directly concerned to enter into negotiations on new arrangements to replace the Armistice. This was accompanied by an appeal to hold talks as soon as possible so that the UNC could be dissolved concurrently with arrangements for maintaining the Armistice, pending other arrangements. The stroke of brilliance in this strategy was that by preemptively having taken the UN flag away from US forces in Korea, the issue of termination of the UNC was effectively neutralised.

The pro-DPRK resolution was likewise framed within a context of promoting the Dialogue, but it called for the complete dissolution of the UNC and withdrawal of all foreign forces in Korea under the UN flag. It called upon the "real parties" to the Armistice to replace it with a peace agreement.

The First Committee approved both of these "irreconcilable" draft resolutions on 30 October, 1975. This reflected the situation of parity between the two Koreas and their respective supporters in the General Assembly. It was in fact the culminating event in the period of defensive diplomacy by the ROK in the UN. South Korea was forced to recognise that it no longer had a clear majority support for an exclusive claim to international legitimacy. (140)

The ROK responded to this watershed by flatly rejecting the UN's approval of a pro-DPRK resolution. The ROK Ministry of Foreign Affairs immediately issued a statement declaring that the ROK "will never accept such a Communist draft resolution." (emphasis added)

(141) In the ROK's view, the call for immediate dissolution of the UNC without prior arrangements to preserve the Armistice was a threat to peace, "fraught with the danger of a recurrence of war." The ROK therefore called upon the DPRK to "desist from unnecessary confrontation and political propaganda at the United Nations and to return to the table of dialogue". (142) South Korea also called upon all the parties to the Armistice Agreement to accept the its proposal for an international conference to discuss maintenance of the Armistice, and specifically thanked members of NAM that had shown support for the South Korean position in the UN debate on the Korean Question. (143)

Despite such protests the General Assembly again approved both contending draft resolutions on 18 November, 1975. The ROK responded with an official protest statement. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs announced that the ROK was "deeply regretful that an anomalous situation was created" by the simultaneous adoption of two opposed resolutions. The ROK characterised the pro-DPRK resolution as having been "adopted by the maneuvers of North Korea and its allies, who scheme to unify the Korean peninsula by force under Communism, and to exploit the forum of the United Nations for their political propaganda." The ROK repeated that it would never accept this "Communist resolution", which carried with it the danger of invalidating the Armistice and destroying peace in Korea. (144)

The passage of two irreconcilable resolutions in the same UNGA session did indeed create a situation of legal ambiguity. Moreover, it contributed to a heightening of tension between the two Korean governments, rather than to resumption of the Dialogue. Finally, it exposed the ultimate limitations of UN diplomacy as a means to alter international status in the Korean case.

VIII. Conclusion

South Korea's exclusive claim to international legitimacy was buttressed for many years by its special relationship with the US and the UN, both denied to North Korea. This special international status was a product of the formative period of the Cold War system. South Korea's international status was therefore closely tied to the power and influence of the United States in the international system. Therefore, as the international system underwent profound changes in the 1960s and early 1970s, and the US hegemonic position was challenged, these undercurrents inevitably had an impact on South Korea's position.

The most influential forces working to reduce US hegemonic influence in the international system were the growth of Soviet and communist power, the recovery and growth of Western Europe and Japan, decolonisation accompanied by national liberation or revolution, and the rise of Third World solidarity as a challenge to the international status

quo. As North Korea benefited by all the above trends in its effort to win international support, so South Korea was placed on the defensive by these same trends.

South Korea was by no means powerless to respond to these trends. The most significant responses made by the Park regime were the vigorous pursuit of an export oriented strategy of rapid industrialisation on the one hand, and a concomitant pragmatism in foreign policy, especially the emphasis on "economic diplomacy" and the gradual retreat from anti-communism on the other. These policies established the basis not only for long-term economic strength, but also long term diplomatic success in the period that followed, discussed in the next chapter.

Nevertheless, in the short to medium term i.e. 1960-1975, these policies were not capable of reversing the effects on South Korean standing of the main trends in the international system. Most significantly, South Korea's residual anti-communism constituted a persistent regime rigidity and this rigidity directly hampered the full success of its foreign policy, particularly in the Third World.

Therefore, the parity achieved by the DPRK in the UNGA by 1975 was a deceptive and only temporary "victory". It is true that South Korea's exclusive claim to international legitimacy was essentially destroyed, the result of its own diplomatic failures and the strength of the DPRK's successes. However, the real international "consensus" was simply for a recognition of the status quo, i.e. the existence of two Koreas, and their right to determine their own future without foreign interference. The "dissolution" of the UNC was a tempest in a teapot. The ROK simply fell back on the bilateral strategic tie to the US. A Mexican stand-off was the result.

UN diplomacy had run its course. The future of the Korean Question would be determined by the long-term strengths of economic and diplomatic policy and their appropriateness to prevailing international conditions. In this situation, regime rigidities would play a fairly decisive role in determining the ultimate outcome of inter-Korean competition.

Chapter Six: Diplomatic Reversal: The Triumph of "Economic Diplomacy"

I. Introduction

With diplomatic parity in the UNGA, North Korea tried unsuccessfully to mobilise its support, then rapidly lost ground in the 1980s. South Korean diplomacy, however, revived spectacularly. This "diplomatic reversal" is best understood as a consequence of the interaction of domestic and international circumstances. The changing international situation provided new opportunities for South Korean "economic diplomacy". South Korea's foreign policy pragmatism and economic dynamism demonstrated its greater adaptability to international change. In contrast, North Korea's dogged commitment to established policies, ideology, and leadership resulted in a great increase in regime rigidities, a loss of international support, and damage to its international standing, culminating in isolation and crisis in the early 1990s. This chapter analyses the factors that produced this dramatic diplomatic reversal of fortunes.

II. The Great Powers and the Transition Period

During the era from the late 1960s to the early 1990s, the political and strategic rigidities of the former bipolar order inexorably gave way to a new period. The hegemonic stability theorists analyze it as a period of the decline or weakening of US hegemony. (1) The concentration of capabilities under US control decreased, resulting in a more diffuse distribution of power. The "complex interdependence" perspective (2) characterises the profound underlying change in international relations as a process of transnationalisation and the growing functional interdependence of states and economies. The world-system theorists view the period as a Kondratief B phase, or downswing in the long economic cycle of the capitalist world-economy, accompanied by the decline of US hegemony. (3) The Gramscian theorists of international relations see the period as one characterised by transnationalisation of class relations and the hegemony of internationally mobile capital. (4)

There is little doubt that a profound shift was taking place in the international political economy from the late 1970s onward, as the US attempted to reorganise its global hegemony. The "Second Cold War" was launched to check the growth of Soviet power and reverse revolutionary Third World trends. (5) The NIEO was declared dead as the US suspended the North-South Dialogue, and hopes of a "Global Round" therefore disappeared. (6) The debt crisis dominated the early 1980s and crippled many Third World governments. (7)

The new global economic and political agenda of the 1980s was dominated by liberalisation, marketisation, privatisation, and above all -political pragmatism, calling for new strategies

by the two Koreas. The ability of the ROK to successfully adapt to these trends was given greater impetus by a regime change in 1979-80. In contrast, North Korea's "succession" politics in 1980 had the opposite effect, i.e. of deepening its regime rigidities.

In strategic terms, the ROK-US-Japan triangle and the DPRK-USSR-PRC triangle roughly balanced one another. Changes in relations between the great powers brought about a new quadripolar power configuration in Asia, among the US, USSR, China, and Japan. This transition in East Asia forced both Koreas to re-examine their foreign policy.

The Shanghai Communique of 27 February, 1972, contained a tacit understanding that the US needed a negotiated peace in Asia and China needed Western capital and technology. This led to a re-entry of China into mainstream international relations. China and Japan established diplomatic relations on 29 September, 1972. Japan's role in the region was already being expanded, since the Nixon-Sato Communique on 21 November, 1969, pledging Japan to assume more strategic responsibilities. Japanese economic power in the region rapidly increased, as Japanese trade and investment overtook that of the US or any other power. (8) The superpowers opened a new era of detente and arms control negotiations, intended to radically reduce global and regional tensions.

In this new situation, it was in the interests of all the major powers to reduce tensions on the Korean peninsula and seek a long term formula of peaceful coexistence. American hegemonic influence in Asia certainly underwent transformation after the defeat in Indochina in 1975.

III. The Aftermath of the 30th UNGA Decision

The decision by the UNGA in 1975 to approve two contradictory resolutions left the central question of the UNC's future undecided. The impasse surrounded the issue of which of the two contradictory resolutions should be implemented. Was the UNC to be immediately abolished, or "renegotiated"? Without consensus among the permanent members of the Security Council, the UN lacked enforcement capabilities.

The transition period was therefore a tug of war between the two Koreas and their allies over implementation of the disputed UN resolutions. The DPRK launched a diplomatic campaign for implementation of the pro-DPRK resolution, i.e. dissolution of the UNC and withdrawal of all foreign troops. The ROK and the US fell back to the line on reunification developed in the Moynihan letter to the UN Secretary General, discussed earlier.

The result was that the role of the UN in Korea was minimised, including the UNC. However, US forces remained in South Korea under the conditions of the Mutual Defense Treaty of 1954, at the invitation of the ROK government. US policy stressed the bilateral

strategic tie to the ROK. This commitment was symbolised in the new annual military exercises known as "Team Spirit". In the wake of the American debacle in Indochina, Team Spirit demonstrated US resolve to prevent the reunification of Korea by force.

President Ford and Secretary of State Henry Kissinger reaffirmed their trust in President Park as a "stable element". The US clearly opted for legitimising the status quo. The Vietnamese and Chinese models of reunification were rejected, while the German precedent was accepted as a model for the Korean situation.

The US policy of "cross recognition" would confer full UN membership on both Koreas.

In contrast, the DPRK argued that legitimising the status quo and accepting the existence of two sovereign states in Korea would obstruct reunification indefinitely. Nevertheless, in practice the DPRK tried to expand relations with Western states or friends of the ROK. Indeed, as discussed earlier, the DPRK had previously been much more successful in this regard than the ROK.

In pressing for implementation of the pro-DPRK resolution, the DPRK continued to rely on NAM's support, and joined its sister organisation, the Group of 77, in 1976. North Korea assumed the pose of standard bearer of the NIEO in both organisations, though South Korea had already been a member of the G-77 and an advocate of better trade terms for developing countries.

Kim Il Sung renewed the emphasis on the NAM in DPRK foreign policy. He published a treatise in December, 1975, entitled "The Non-Aligned Movement Is A Mighty Anti-Imperialist Revolutionary Force of Our Times." Kim Il Sung still viewed the NAM's importance in the context of "world revolution". Kim argued that "The emergence of the NAM has decisively strengthened the revolutionary forces of the world and greatly weakened the reactionary forces of imperialism." (9)

Kissinger, however, launched a counter-offensive against the Third World NIEO coalition. On 29 January, 1976, Kissinger told the US Senate Foreign Relations Committee that the US would use aid to influence Third World political choice, increasing it to those who abandoned "bloc voting". In future, the US relationship with the Third World would be determined by the attitude of each Third World government to the US in international meetings. Kissinger intended to drive wedges into the Third World coalition, splitting the pro-Western "moderates" from the anti-Western "radicals".

Thus, the DPRK's call for NAM governments to lend support pitted them against the new US policy. On 4 March, 1976, the SPA addressed an open letter to the Parliaments and

Governments of the world calling for the withdrawal of US troops from South Korea. This followed a statement from the DPRK Foreign Ministry on 27 February demanding that the US comply with the decision of the 30th UNGA. In this campaign, the DPRK portrayed the US as a potential aggressor and played upon fears of a new war in Korea.

Bouteflika, Algeria's Foreign Minister, sent a letter to all NAM governments early in 1976, informing them of the "gravest situation" in Korea "due to acts of provocation committed by US aggressive forces after their defeat in Indochina" and warned of the imminent danger of a showdown in Korea. Boumedienne, NAM chairman, also sent a letter on 22 May, 1976, warning of the build up of military forces near the DMZ. The DPRK heightened the atmosphere of alarm by announcing on 5 August, 1976 that the US and ROK were preparing to invade North Korea.

North Korea's appeal had an impact on Third World governments. On 16 August, 1976, 31 co-sponsors submitted a new draft resolution to the 31st UNGA, entitled "On Removing Danger of War and Maintaining and Consolidating Peace in Korea and Accelerating Independent and Peaceful Reunification of Korea." It expressed concern over the "critical situation", explicitly depicted as a threat of aggression against the DPRK. They demanded the immediate cessation of foreign military involvement in Korea and any aggression against Korea, and withdrawal of new (especially nuclear) weapons. It reaffirmed that the UNC should be dissolved, UN forces withdrawn, and the Armistice be replaced by a peace treaty. (10)

DPRK diplomatic momentum was virtually undiminished at this time. The NAM summit in Colombo, Sri Lanka, 16-19 August, 1976, adopted a statement on Korea clearly supporting the DPRK's line on reunification. In response, the ROK Foreign Ministry accused the DPRK of deliberately instigating "pro-communist countries", especially Algeria and Cuba, to get the Fifth NAM Summit in Colombo to adopt a "one-sided pro-North Korea declaration on the delicate Korean Question." The ROK worked with moderates within NAM to block any unanimous passage of such one-sided declarations.

The "axe murder incident" in August, 1976, coincided with NAM's deliberations on the Korean Question. Two UNC personnel were killed in a clash along the military demarcation line. Both sides claimed the other provoked the incident. By so directly exposing the acute danger of war in Korea, the incident precipitated a dramatic shift in events. On 6 September, 1976, Kim Il Sung expressed personal regret for the incident. The US and DPRK agreed to "partition" the UNC site at Panmunjom in order to prevent any such incident in the future. Through intensive behind-the-scenes discussions, an understanding was reached whereby both sides would withdraw their draft resolutions

from the 31st UNGA session. The UNGA debate was dead. North Korea did not publicly address the UNGA on the Korean Question again between 1975 and October, 1988.

Thereafter, the character of competition for international support underwent an important change. In the previous period this primarily took the form of attempts to win new diplomatic partners in the Third World and deploy this support in the UNGA. In the following period most of the governments in the world had already been "canvassed". Therefore, relations with the major powers, and economic diplomacy, became the keys to the new phase of competition.

The competition for partners did continue, however, into the 1980s, however, even in the absence of a UNGA debate. In 1980 the ROK had 112 full diplomatic partners, compared to 100 for the DPRK. By late 1985, the figure was 118 for the ROK and 101 for the DPRK. The most significant figure is that for governments having diplomatic relations with both Koreas. In 1980, this was 61, increasing to 67 by late 1985. (11)

A similar rough parity continued in terms of membership in IGOs. Between 1973 and 1979, the DPRK joined WHO, FAO, IAEA, ICAO, ITU, UNCTAD, UPU, and UNESCO. By 1984 the DPRK belonged to 9 UN affiliated international organisation, compared to 14 for the ROK. In 1986 the DPRK total increased to 10, after joining the IMO. In April, 1986, both Koreas were admitted as members of the UN Asia Group. (12)

Given this situation, the key area for manoeuvrability lay in making inroads into the rival's "core" support. South Korea did this most effectively by progressively eliminating anti-communism as a principle of its foreign policy and energetically pursuing economic relations. North Korea's increasing regime rigidities, by contrast, reduced its appeal. The already existing trend toward a "non-partisan" stance toward the Korean Question was thus intensified, which in practice, this time, worked more in favour of South Korea.

Nevertheless, NAM support for the DPRK remained high for a few years. The NAM Coordinating Bureau, meeting in New Delhi in April, 1977, endorsed DPRK demands, including dismantling of all foreign bases, withdrawal of all foreign troops, dissolution of the UNC, and a new peace treaty. Tito made an official visit to the DPRK in August, 1977, lending his personal endorsement to the demand that all foreign troops withdraw from Korea. He condemned the "two Koreas plot", i.e. cross recognition and simultaneous UN entry. Kim Il Sung reciprocated by reiterating his full support for the NAM and the indispensability of the NIEO.

Nevertheless, there were cross currents in the international system that worked against the

long-term strength of the DPRK's diplomacy. Though the DPRK reaped the benefit in the late 1970s of its previous diplomacy in Africa, as national liberation movements came to power, the rise of economic and political pragmatism in Africa began to undermine the DPRK's advantages. For instance, on 7 June, 1977, Mauritania broke off all diplomatic relations with the DPRK. The immediate cause was the DPRK's support for the Saharan Arab Democratic Republic (Polisario). Thus, DPRK militancy in support of Third World liberation movements could conflict with its interests in maintaining good relations with established friendly governments. The ROK offered a constant temptation through the alternative of attractive economic relations. Mauritania had gradually improved ties with the ROK prior to this abrupt severance with the DPRK. The return to military authoritarianism in several Latin American countries also undermined DPRK progress. For example, when a new anti-communist military regime in Argentina came to power it broke off relations with North Korea on 14 June, 1977.

The later part of the 1970s saw important leadership changes in both the US and China. Jimmy Carter was inaugurated President in January, 1977. Mao died in September, 1976 and was succeeded by Hua Guo Feng. Carter introduced new policy initiatives toward South Korea, including public pressure on its human rights record and a call for further withdrawal of US forces, announced in July, 1977. These policy shifts, and the ROK reaction, led to extremely poor political relations between the US and the ROK for several years to follow. North Korea, however, failed to take full advantage of the strain in US-ROK relations.

On 18 November, 1977, the DPRK's Permanent Observer at the UN issued an assessment of the two year interval since the 30th UNGA decision. A special Memorandum was issued on 1 February, 1978, categorically rejecting the "two Koreas" approach and cross recognition. This was followed by a worldwide campaign to garner denunciations of the "Two Koreas Plot". DPRK Foreign Minister Ho Dam requested the NAM summit host, Sri Lanka, to issue a letter to all NAM Foreign Ministers on the "danger of war" in Korea resulting from the Team Spirit exercises.

The Carter administration, however, sent signals to the DPRK indicating an interest in a new approach. Unfortunately, the DPRK met these overtures with suspicion. The DPRK Foreign Ministry issued a memorandum on 1 July, 1978 attacking President Carter's proposed US troop withdrawal as a "deceptive scheme." The DPRK also rejected President Park's offer in June, 1978 for a new North-South Economic Cooperation Plan, potentially a way of re-opening the deadlocked North-South Dialogue. These responses mark the beginning of a new intransigence in the DPRK, intimating its increasing regime rigidities.

Premier Hua Guo Feng visited the DPRK in May, 1978, following the defeat of the Gang of Four, and reaffirmed China's rejection of the "Two Koreas Plot." Vice Premier Deng Xiaoping visited Pyongyang on 8 September, 1978. Kim Il Sung used this occasion to denounce "dominationism" and to announce a new DPRK reunification policy based on the formula of "one state-two systems." He renounced any intention to "impose our socialist system and communist ideology on south Korea."

Kim Il Sung's call for a "broad united front" by emerging countries to resist all forms of "dominationism" should be understood within the context of a key debate within the NAM, concerning a proposal championed by Cuba to differentiate among members according to their ideological and political orientation. It was an attempt to reassert the importance of the radical/ socialist orientation of the NAM, as it was originally constituted in 1961. (13) The DPRK's position in this debate was consistent, i.e. support for the broadest basis of solidarity. But the debate was symptomatic of increasing disunity inside the NAM as it entered the new era.

Kim Il Sung personally sent a letter to the NAM Foreign Ministers' Conference in Belgrade on 25 July, 1978, arguing that "imperialist and dominationist forces are initiating artificially antagonism and enmity and causing conflicts and disputes among the non-aligned countries." Kim saw this as a strategy designed to draw Third World countries into spheres of influence and wreck their solidarity. Kim Il Sung's position was that "The Non-aligned countries should not classify the member countries into opposing groups. Arguing which nation is progressive and which is not." In his speech before the NAM Foreign Ministers, Ho Dam blamed imperialists for deliberately "driving wedges" into the NAM to exploit the differences in social system, religion, etc. (14)

The Belgrade NAM Foreign Ministers meeting unanimously approved a declaration including a paragraph on the Korean Question. It gave support to the Three Principles of 4 July, 1972, called for withdrawal of all foreign troops, dissolution of the UNC, dismantling of all foreign bases, and replacement of the Armistice with a peace treaty. Havana was chosen as the site of the Sixth NAM summit, placing the DPRK in an advantageous position. However, there was a clear divergence between the position of Cuba and that of the DPRK on the political future of the NAM.

The Sixth NAM summit in Havana was a critical turning point in the movement's history. The attempt by Cuba to re-introduce ideological and political criteria into internal NAM affairs was perceived as a step that would undermine non-alignment and introduce Cold War categories of confrontation. Cuba's attempt to identify the Soviet Union as the "natural ally" of the Third World in its struggle against imperialism was met with strong

resistance.

Tito led the moderates, including India, in the counter-attack against the Cuban bid for leadership. The result was a victory for the moderates. Leadership passed to India. This moderate leadership had stewardship of the NAM during the critical period of the next global recession, oil crisis, the debt crisis, and the Second Cold War. This proved to be disadvantageous to North Korean diplomacy.

North Korea did however make some progress at the Havana Summit, despite its disagreements with the host country. For instance, the DPRK was elected to serve on the 35 nation Coordinating Bureau of the NAM. In the summit's final documents, the NAM called for the withdrawal of all foreign forces from Korea, dismantling of foreign bases, and the replacement of the Armistice with a peace treaty.

The Havana summit revealed a growing sense of frustration over the "negligible progress" that had been made to date on the NIEO. Statements called for continued struggle for the NIEO in the context of the "peoples struggle against colonialism and imperialism." The divisions that had been opened during the Havana summit were indicative of the underlying weakness of the Third World coalition. North Korea's reliance on NAM's international support meant a parallel decline in North Korea's international standing as the NAM's global influence waned.

Parallel to the debates inside NAM, the US-ROK relationship improved. The US-ROK Combined Forces Command was established in November, 1978 and the US Congress approved \$1.2 billion for the Military Assistance Program. President Carter retracted his proposal for US troop withdrawal from Korea, responding to intense lobbying pressure. Carter paid an official visit to Seoul on 30 June, 1979. President Park's greeting remarks reflected his awareness of international flux. He referred to new directions in Sino-American, Sino-Japanese and Sino-Soviet relations, and the regional repercussions of the recent war in Indochina. However, Park reaffirmed that the alliance with the US remained the bedrock of ROK foreign policy. Carter proposed tri-partite talks between the US, ROK, and DPRK. The DPRK unwisely chose to reject this proposal, preferring bilateral talks with the US, thus excluding the ROK.

The establishment of full diplomatic relations between the US and China in 1979, however, and the concomitant US de-recognition of Taiwan, was a step of much greater significance. It could not be wholeheartedly welcomed in Seoul, since it set a precedent of delegitimising an anti-communist regime and embracing a communist one. Nevertheless, it did open an avenue for ROK rapprochement with China. In 1979, Park Chung Hee approached Deng

Xiaoping's government for the improvement of economic, cultural and athletic ties.

ROK rapprochement with the USSR progressed even faster than that with China, having begun earlier. From the opening of the North-South Dialogue in 1972 the USSR ceased to refer to the DPRK as the sole sovereign government in Korea. From 1973, the USSR granted visas to ROK citizens for sport and educational purposes and in 1974 indirect trade began. Relations improved again when in 1978 the USSR returned a KAL airliner that had strayed off course and landed in Nurmansk. (15) Indeed, the improvement in USSR-ROK relations was so marked that it led the PRC to accuse the Soviets of collusion with the West in support of the Two Koreas Plot! Officially, however, the USSR was as opposed to cross recognition as was China.

However, the ROK was not alone in improving its relations with the USSR. The DPRK likewise improved relations with the USSR during the late 1970s, following an earlier period of strain. The improvement in DPRK-Soviet relations took place particularly in the sphere of military cooperation. Soviet aid was provided in 1978 for improvements in the North Korean naval port of Najin.

Along with increasing disarray in the NAM, however, increasing disarray among socialist states also undermined DPRK diplomacy. The problem of conflict between socialist states emerged as an acute problem, and placed the DPRK in a very difficult position. For example, the DPRK condemned Vietnam for its use of force against the Pol Pot regime in Kampuchea. However, Pol Pot had been feted in Pyongyang in October, 1977 as a "Hero of the DPRK." In contrast, North Korea remained silent concerning the subsequent punitive use of force by China against Vietnam, after the overthrow of Pol Pot. Similarly, when the USSR intervened in Afghanistan in late 1979, the DPRK criticism was muted, but it refused to sign a pro-Soviet statement by communist parties in Sofia, in February, 1980.

These incidents illustrate that the DPRK was in a state of indecision. These conflicts were symptomatic of a crisis of ideology in the communist world. The DPRK had consistently been anti-reformist and anti-revisionist since the early 1950s. It supported the USSR's interventions in Hungary in 1956 and Czechoslovakia in 1968, and sided with the Maoists anti-revisionist stance during 1956-64. The fall of Khrushchev, an arch revisionist, had restored close relations with the USSR, while relations with China became strained during the Cultural Revolution. As the 1980s dawned, North Korean ideology was threatened by Chinese "revisionism," i.e de-Maoisation, the peace treaty with Japan, and the "separation of economics from politics".

IV. Regime Rigidities and Adjustment to International Change

In the emergent quadripolar power configuration in East Asia

the two Koreas diverged on very separate paths. In North Korea, Kim Il Sung opted for a conservative succession strategy that put his own son, Kim Jong Il, in positions of prominence. This was accompanied by increasing ideological, political, economic, and diplomatic inflexibility. The resulting ossification of the regime contributed significantly to the loss of previous diplomatic momentum.

In contrast, South Korea underwent a regime change that eliminated some elements of the Yushin dictatorship and introduced economic liberalisation policies under a successor authoritarian government led by Chun Doo Hwan. Regime rigidities were reduced through internationalisation of the economy, extensive industrial restructuring, greater tolerance of the political opposition, and most of all- greatly expanding economic diplomacy through contacts with as many regimes as possible, including communist countries.

A. South Korea: The Fifth Republic

The second oil crisis of 1978, world recession, the preceding years of over-investment in heavy industry, over-concentration by the giant business combines, the "chaebol", (16) and harsh and systematic domestic repression, all combined in 1979 to bring Park's undoing. On 27 October, 1979 President Park was assassinated by the Chief of the KCIA. Due to the brittle nature of the political system he had created, his fall threatened to destabilise South Korea.

A new military coup, led by Chun Doo Hwan, closed the democratic option, imposing a new authoritarian regime. The coup took place in two stages, first on 12 December, 1979, and the second stage on 17 May, 1980, when the popular uprising in the city of Kwangju was put down in blood. Under Martial Law a new junta, the Military-Civilian Standing Committee, was established. Though a new ruling party, the Democratic Justice Party, was created, the so-called "T-K clique" remained at the centre of political power. (17)

One of the central political aims of the Fifth Republic was to rehabilitate the international image of South Korea, which had reached a nadir toward the end of Park's tenure. Newly inaugurated US President Ronald Reagan lent the ROK his assistance in this undertaking. The Fifth Republic's most important reforms, however, concerned the economy, i.e. regaining international competitiveness and growth. In 1980 the GNP of the ROK declined by 5 percent. Chun Doo Hwan set out to correct structural imbalances in the economy (essentially over-capacity in heavy industries), restore export growth, diversify production and markets, and to reduce inflation and the acute debt service burden. The Fifth Five Year

Plan, launched in 1982, was assisted by massive new injections of capital from Japan (negotiated at some \$4 billion). Prime Minister Nakasone visited Seoul in 1983 and Chun visited Japan in 1984. These "historic" reconciliation visits cemented a new relationship of cooperation between South Korea and Japan, though under Yushin investment by Japan had already been increasing. (18)

The general strategy included reducing the interventionist role of the state, allowing market forces more scope. The privatisation of state industries was accelerated and industrial policy changed, reducing statutory controls by government. The trade regime was liberalised, while laying plans for gradual liberalisation of the financial sector. Conditions for foreign investors were also liberalised. Industrial restructuring was undertaken with a heavy hand, including forced bankruptcies, mergers and acquisitions, at government direction. New industrial sectors were targeted for growth, especially automobiles, electronics, and the already established steel, shipbuilding, petrochemical, and construction and heavy engineering industries. Labour was disciplined with new laws to control union formation and collective bargaining. (19) Ambitious new export promotion policies were put in place to diversify markets around the globe and win new contracts assuring cheap and reliable raw materials, particularly in Southeast Asia and the Middle East.

The net effect of the restructuring policies was a dramatic economic turnaround. This recovery placed the ROK in an excellent position to take advantage of the new international climate in the second half of the 1980s. The economic diplomacy and diplomatic pragmatism launched in the preceding period became the defining characteristics of ROK foreign policy in the late 1980s.

B. North Korea: Consolidating the Succession of Kim Jong Il

North Korea's transition into the 1980s was marked by a regime change that obstructed innovation and flexibility, resulting in stagnation and isolation. Thereafter, the DPRK was affected by three key weaknesses: (A) The nature of the political system, and succession based on the hereditary principle (B) structural imbalances in the economy and lack of capital, technology, export capacity, and foreign exchange (C) ideological rigidity and an antiquated foreign policy.

The failures of North Korea in the 1980s are largely the result of the nature of Kim Il Sung's power. Kim Il Sung's ascendance took place over a period of some fifteen years, from 1945-1960. (20) However, in the 1980s ossification of the regime turned strengths into weaknesses. The root cause was the inseparability of the political, economic, and foreign policy aspects of the Juche system as embodied in the Kim "dynasty". Therefore, preservation of the regime required strict adherence to established dogma in all areas of

policy. Fundamental change in any element might undermine the stability of the regime.

In foreign policy terms, the new "Kim Jong Il regime" (21) was thrown immediately onto the defensive by new reunification initiatives from the Chun Doo Hwan government; was weakened by the trend toward moderation in the NAM; and was out-flanked by the greater interest of its communist allies in expanding economic relations with South Korea.

As the 1980s opened, a different political atmosphere began to grip the Third World movement. New political currents of "moderation" surfaced strongly at the NAM Foreign Ministers Conference in New Delhi in 1981, where the Korean Question was removed from the NAM agenda. At the NAM summit in New Delhi, in 1983, the conference adopted a strictly non-partisan position on the Korean Question, simply calling for withdrawal of all foreign forces from Korea. The new trend in the NAM was reluctantly acknowledged by the DPRK, at the Harare Summit in 1986, in a statement delivered by DPRK Vice President Park, Sung Chul.

As relations with the Third World entered a period of coolness, the DPRK turned to its communist allies for succour. An accommodation was reached with the new leadership of the PRC in 1981-82 in a series of meetings with Premier Zhao Ziyang, Deng Xiaoping, and Hu Yaobang, with both Kim Il Sung and Kim Jong Il. The DPRK offered China use of the east coast port of Chongjin.

After the disastrous Rangoon incident in 1983, discussed below, Kim Il Sung made a series of visits to China seeking support for North Korea's foreign policy. This situation revealed the limits of Chinese support. While the DPRK still held a "veto" on the normalisation of China's relations with the ROK, the DPRK was unsuccessful in getting China to make the Korean Question a question of principle in China's relations with the United States. The PRC likewise no longer advocated total US withdrawal from Korea. China, however, was equally unsuccessful in persuading the Kim Il Sung/Kim Jong Il regime to emulate China's modernisation and liberalisation policies.

Soviet military support for the DPRK increased in the early 1980s. In the wake of the Rangoon incident, Kim Il Sung held talks with Chernenko, seeking advice on North Korea's new proposal for "tripartite" talks between the DPRK, ROK, and the US (actually two sets of bilateral talks running simultaneously). The USSR did not in fact fully endorse this idea. In the event, North-South Korea talks resumed in 1984-86, but with little concrete result.

The rise of Gorbachev from 1985 did not at first adversely affect Soviet-North Korean relations. On the contrary, relations initially improved. For instance, in 1985 an agreement

was reached to supply the DPRK with the Soviet MIG-23 and to allow the USSR access to North Korea's air space. Joint naval exercises were conducted and the Soviet navy enjoyed rights of port of call at several DPRK ports. Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze visited Pyongyang in January, 1986.

The increasingly unfavourable international atmosphere was grossly compounded by the Rangoon bombing in late 1983. This bombing attack, while ROK President Chun Doo Hwan was on the first leg of a tour of Asian capitals, killed several members of the South Korean cabinet. In response, the US reversed its policy of considering a lessening of restrictions on contacts with the DPRK. Japan imposed economic sanctions, which were not lifted until 1 January, 1985. The timing of the incident was extremely unfavourable, coming as it did just before a meeting of the Interparliamentary Union in Seoul. The global image of the DPRK was severely damaged. For the first several months after this incident Pyongyang was in near total diplomatic isolation. (22) North Korea was in danger of becoming an international pariah.

The mis-management of DPRK foreign policy was further compounded by later errors such as intransigence over negotiations for sports cooperation with South Korea, which had won the right to host the Asian Games for 1986 and the 24th Olympiad in 1988. Unreasonable demands were made as prerequisites for normalisation with Japan, such as nullification of Japan's basic treaty (1965) with the ROK. These incidents illustrate the degree to which the Kim Jong Il regime misjudged international reality and made a bad situation even worse, setting off a self-defeating spiral.

V. Diplomatic Reversal: The Triumph of Economic Diplomacy

This section is based primarily on extensive interviews conducted in the Foreign Ministry of the Republic of Korea in 1985-1986. The information presented concerns the South Korean strategy of economic diplomacy in the 1980s, as a means of diplomatic competition with the DPRK.

The interviews reveal a very consistent theme: i.e. that the ROK's greatest asset was its economic capabilities, compared to the DPRK's perceived economic weakness. The ROK Foreign Ministry had developed a new elan of self-confidence. The DPRK was perceived to be on the defensive and the ROK felt sure of eventual victory. Thus, economic diplomacy played a decisive role in the diplomatic reversal of the 1980s, reflecting the congruence of ROK domestic and foreign policy with key trends in the international political economy.

A: Latin America

Latin America was traditionally the ROK's stronghold, as previously discussed. According

to the then Director of the South American Division of the ROK Foreign Ministry, the DPRK was "expelled" from Latin America by the mid-1980s. (23) DPRK isolation in Latin America was explained partly by continental political trends, e.g. the militarisation of civilian regimes. For instance, in Argentina in 1974, with the overthrow of civilian government by a military regime, the DPRK embassy was burned down and its diplomatic staff fled. Similarly, DPRK embassy personnel fled Uruguay after the military came to power.

These diplomatic "routes" are rather extraordinary. Nevertheless, the general political climate in Latin America confined the DPRK's contacts to cultural, economic, or academic missions, as the only visa categories available. These missions were therefore used to attempt contact with the host Foreign Ministry, in the hopes of establishing a relationship.

In 1986, following the tide of re-democratisation, the DPRK sent a number of delegations to such destinations as Argentina, Brazil, Uruguay, Venezuela, Bolivia, and Colombia. Anti-communist regimes such as Paraguay and Chile were avoided. According to the then Director of the South American Division, North Korea targeted re-democratised regimes. He said that, in general, North Korea did "not have contact with the ruling party, but with the opposition party(s)." (24) That is, during the period of military rule, the DPRK concentrated on cultivating party to party relations with opposition forces in Latin America. Therefore, the return to democracy should have been very much to North Korea's advantage.

The prototype of this strategy was the DPRK's relationship with APRA, in Peru. The DPRK cultivated party to party ties with APRA, and party leader Alan Garcia visited the DPRK several times. When Alan Garcia became President of Peru the DPRK succeeded in establishing full diplomatic relations. However, the Peruvian case also illuminates the reasons that the DPRK could not automatically capitalise on Latin America's re-democratisation. North Korea made various economic promises, particularly to purchase Peruvian goods (e.g. one million tons of ore) but could not honour these promises. According to the ROK Foreign Ministry, although some Latin American governments had taken this sort of promise seriously, the DPRK lacked the foreign exchange to meet its obligations, and was therefore forced to fall back on attempting to negotiate a barter deal, or a sale of military equipment. (25)

The intensifying trend toward "dual recognition" reflected the perceived interest of Third World governments to seek economic advantage at the least political cost. South Korea was increasingly attractive as an economic partner, even to radical or socialist regimes. In contrast, North Korea was increasingly unattractive as an economic partner. Any limited

economic benefit of relations with North Korea was not usually sufficient compensation for the political costs of association with it. Major arms purchasers, like Iran, were an exception to this rule.

According to the then Director of the South America Division, (formerly First Secretary for Economic Affairs in the ROK embassy in Mexico), the case of Mexico is an interesting illustration of this point. Mexico opted for a policy of "equidistance" between the two Korean governments. However, it had no resident embassy in Pyongyang, for fear of breaking the diplomatic equilibrium. Nevertheless, the ROK assumed that Mexico accepted its cross-recognition formula.

The Director of the South American Division maintained that South Korea's relationship with Mexico was typical of ROK relations with Latin America in the 1980s. According to this view, the main reason for DPRK weakness in Latin America during this period was not political, but economic, i.e. the DPRK's lack of external economic capabilities. Therefore, "If their economy was stronger, perhaps the DPRK would make progress in Latin America." (26)

The ROK played upon North Korea's economic weakness to win advantage in the diplomatic competition. For example, the ROK provided Latin American governments with statistics on DPRK economic promises and the lack of actual purchases. These statistics were "very persuasive." (27) Their effect is illustrated by the fact that between 1982 and 1985 the DPRK refrained from sending delegations into the region. However, in 1986 they again despatched a wave of delegations, as noted above. Nevertheless, in the same year, the DPRK was refused visas to enter Ecuador. Ecuador annually sold the ROK some 54,000 barrels of oil per day, almost half of Ecuador's export and one quarter of its total production. (28)

The Ecuadorean case illustrates the ROK's policy of "bilateral compensation". The ROK purchased goods from a country as a "reward" or compensation for voting in favour of the ROK position in international fora. (29) Mexico's support for the ROK in such fora, for example, was an expression, not of its friendship for the ROK or opposition to the DPRK, but rather of its own self-interest. On the other hand, Mexico did not immediately support the ROK's position "right away" after the Rangoon and KAL 007 incidents in 1983, being wary of the attitude of other states. (30)

All this notwithstanding, the ROK government continued to "take for granted" that Latin America was its stronghold. However, the fear was expressed that Latin American governments might attempt to use the "North Korea card" in future to manipulate the

ROK's weak spot. That is, because of the diplomatic competition between the two Korean regimes, Latin American governments might be tempted to try to "get more out of the ROK" (in economic terms) by manipulating the competition. A case cited was Peru, where the ROK was outwardly tolerant of Peru's relations with North Korea, but actually quite unhappy. Peru reportedly said to the ROK "North Korea gave us this - how much will you give us?" (31)

Latin America constituted something of a special case, given traditional US influence in that region. Political factors remained very prominent in determining relations, though economic factors were increasingly important. In the mid-1980s the ROK was primarily worried that Cuban influence on guerrilla movements in the region was expanding. One case cited was Colombia. Similarly, Seoul's view was that the DPRK had "very great" influence in the Sandinista government in Nicaragua. (32) It is certainly true that President Daniel Ortega made several official visits to Pyongyang in the 1980s and discussed requests for aid with North Korea.

The ROK's political approach in Latin America contrasted sharply with that of the DPRK. Officially, the ROK supported the Contadora peace process in Central America, but privately was probably sympathetic to the Contras in the Nicaraguan conflict and unsympathetic to the FMLN in El Salvador, whereas the DPRK was a supporter of both the Sandinista and the FMLN cause. In short, "Rather than match the DPRK's policy of involvement in conflicts in the Third World in the same manner, the ROK tries to maintain neutrality in accord with the policy of peaceful reunification and dialogue." (33) Two examples cited were the Malvinas (Falklands) conflict and the Nicaraguan conflict.

However, mindful of its "world image", the ROK did not want any Presidential visit to Seoul by either President Pinochet of Chile or President Stroessner of Paraguay, and certainly not ahead of other Latin American leaders. This was despite the fact that both regimes were "anti-communist states" and that relations with them were considered to be good. (34) This last point illustrates the extent to which the ROK toned down its anti-communism in the 1980s, eschewing too close an identification with such regimes.

B: Africa

Traditionally, Africa was the region in which the ROK's position was weakest. In contrast to its confidence in Latin America, the ROK Foreign Ministry was very mindful of its continuing weaknesses in Africa. In Africa most of the regimes were newly independent, not as stable, and required more aid. However, the economic needs of Africa provided the ROK with a perceived opportunity to improve its diplomatic position.

The then Director of the East African Affairs Division stressed the ROK's emphasis on economic cooperation with Africa, whereas the DPRK emphasised political and military cooperation. The ROK strategy was gradually having an effect. According to the Director, the "DPRK has seen the success of the ROK aid policy (in Africa) and is now emulating it." (35) For example, as of March, 1986, the DPRK had supplied some 200 technicians to Ethiopia, 8 to Uganda, 13 to the Central African Republic, 10 to Nigeria, and 12 to Burkina Faso. Furthermore, "The main purpose of the DPRK providing technicians to those countries is to counter ROK aid to those countries." (36) South Korea had a financial advantage, however, in the quest to win influence in Africa. For instance, the ROK was a member of the African Development Bank, with a subscription of \$40 million in 1986, whereas the DPRK was not even a member.

The new ROK strategy in Africa was a focus on "people to people diplomacy." (37) In addition, the ROK followed a policy of never supplying arms to any party in Africa. This policy is similar to the approach in Latin America, i.e. avoiding involvement in local conflicts. By contrast, the DPRK's strategy focused on cultivating ties between heads of state, and providing military assistance. The strength of the ROK's people to people diplomacy was believed to lie in the strength of the ROK as an "economic model" that attracted African interest. Zimbabwe was cited as an example of a case where, even at the grassroots level, the ROK was popularly perceived as an economic model.

Nevertheless, the ROK Foreign Ministry was acutely aware of the considerable strength of the political ties between the DPRK and many African governments, and the real obstacles these ties presented to ROK diplomacy. For example, Tanzania's President Julius Nyerere and President Kim Il Sung shared a "common ideology", i.e. Juche, or "ujamaa" in Tanzania, and socialism. (38) The DPRK's ties to African liberation movements also remained strong. For instance, even while Zimbabwe was still in the midst of its war of national liberation, Kim Il Sung hosted Robert Mugabe in the DPRK - as a head of state. Thus, when Mugabe became Prime Minister he remained a supporter of North Korea. A similar close relationship existed with the head of state of Zambia, Kenneth Kaunda, an advocate of "African socialism".

Although "African socialism" created a favourable political climate for the DPRK, capitalist states, such as Kenya, were pro-Western and friendly to the ROK. After twenty years of socialism in Africa, however, many African leaders were beginning to realise that African socialism was "not working." (39) The economic performance of Kenya was contrasted to the failures of Tanzania and Uganda from 1982-1986. This supports the view that the change in economic orientation, from the 1970s' militancy to the "free market" orthodoxy of the 1980s, was an international trend favourable to ROK diplomacy and

deleterious to that of the DPRK.

Interestingly, the ROK Foreign Ministry identified a potential political weakness of the DPRK in Africa, i.e. "the Kim Il Sung dynasty". DPRK diplomats in Africa "hate to discuss that" and "pretended not to hear" when they were questioned about the succession to Kim Jong Il in North Korea. (40) This reveals that the DPRK was vulnerable, even in the region of its greatest traditional strength, to the negative image created by the political ossification of the Kim Il Sung/Kim Jong Il regime.

The ROK's "Open Door Policy" in Africa was designed to avoid conflict and enhance peace. (41) The ROK was very proud of its transition from recipient to donor of aid, albeit it was not yet a large donor. The ROK's relationship with the Third World was characterised by complementarity or "compatibility" between the ROK's intermediate, labour-intensive technology and the needs of most Third World economies. The ROK also stressed assistance to the Third World in the form of loans, consultancy, and voluntary service.

The central focus of ROK aid policy was assisting the private sector. Though "handing out automobiles, medical equipment, etc. may have a short-term effect", the emphasis was on aid to small scale enterprises and on technology transfe, to speed up technical capabilities, create employment, and to some extent support import substitution. (42) This aid policy was in broad alignment with similar emphases by such major aid donors as the US, IMF and World Bank.

The ROK's approach, i.e. giving free assistance to African countries, contrasted to the political strings attached to DPRK aid. The ROK made "no direct linkage in its aid to support for the ROK on the unification issue", whereas the DPRK was "very mindful of keeping continuous influence by providing economic assistance." (43) In the 1980s, African states were realising that they needed economic assistance more than they needed military assistance. (44) This trend was therefore favourable to the ROK, possessing as it did superior economic capabilities.

After the Rangoon incident more Third World states began moving toward a better understanding of the ROK's position on reunification. (45) Furthermore, the DPRK's traditional policy of inviting Third World leaders to Pyongyang was becoming counter-productive, as most of these leaders could directly compare the economic development of the North with that of the South. It was predicted that the 24th Olympiad in Seoul would allow leaders from all over the world to see South Korea's achievements for themselves. Therefore, DPRK influence would decline, and even communist states would reconsider the

need for economic relations with the ROK. The DPRK's dis-information about the ROK would thereby lose its effectiveness. (46) This prediction turned out to be fairly accurate.

Even in Southern Africa, where the socialist orientation of the Frontline States was an obstacle to better relations with the ROK, "economic reality moves them toward the West for economic aid." (47) This was certainly true of Mozambique and Zimbabwe, which despite their marxist ideology, were pragmatic about approaching the West for assistance. Though these regimes held to the principle of "the friend of your enemy is your enemy", nevertheless it was believed that "now perhaps their image of the ROK will change because of the economic development success of the ROK...If they give first priority to economic development they may open up to the ROK..." (48) The ROK was "keeping the door open to socialist Africa." The ROK viewed relations with "moderate" Zambia as the key to future improved relations with the Frontline States.

The Director of the Maghreb Division, responsible for Libya, Tunisia, Algeria, Morocco, Mauritania, and Sudan, explained the basic policy view of the ROK as being that "substantial economic relations are much more important than formal aid." (49) In his view, the DPRK's influence in the Maghreb region had been weakening. The DPRK had achieved influence in the region before the ROK, but in the 1980s the region was much more favourably inclined toward the ROK than before. The reason for ROK progress was its economic relations with countries in the region and the weakness of the DPRK's economic capabilities in comparison. (50)

One example cited was the case of Libya, where the ROK had established economic relations in the 1980s, despite Libya's radical political policies. Libya established diplomatic relations with the ROK in tandem with its economic relationship. So strong were these ROK-Libya economic ties, most spectacularly in the field of construction industries, that the DPRK was powerless to obstruct their diplomatic relationship. (51)

By the mid-1980s, only Algeria still refused to establish diplomatic relations with the ROK. This was explained as being due to Algeria being a "rigid socialist regime" with long standing historical ties with the DPRK. (52) However, even Algeria had begun to change direction toward being "more pragmatic." Algeria's position on the Korean Question changed from being extremely supportive of the DPRK, to adopting a position of "silence."

In contrast, Morocco, a pro-Western regime, had never established relations with the DPRK. It was the ROK's policy to avoid involvement in conflicts in Africa, and this was carefully applied to the situation between Morocco and Polisario, so as not to alienate this important supporter. In contrast, the DPRK openly supported Polisario. Therefore if

Polisario came to power it would almost certainly become a supporter of North Korea.

In the case of Tunisia and Sudan, these countries had diplomatic relations with the DPRK but maintained important economic ties to the ROK, and became more supportive of the ROK politically. In the case of Tunisia, it initially maintained a neutral stance on the Korean Question. However, by 1986, Tunisia "understood our (ROK) position much more than the DPRK's." (53)

The most dramatic case of diplomatic reversal in favour of the ROK was Mauritania, discussed earlier. Mauritania's sudden switch to having diplomatic relations exclusively with the ROK was explained as due to a domestic change of regime, disappointment with mere "verbal assistance" from the DPRK, and the expectation of economic assistance from the ROK. (54) Many African countries were becoming disappointed with the lack of "real DPRK assistance" and were therefore becoming more friendly to the ROK.

In summation, the ROK's position of strict non-interference in regional or domestic conflicts, providing aid without political strings attached, and its ability to be an important economic partner, combined to enhance its influence in the region. These policies indicate much greater flexibility and sophistication, as well as capabilities, on the part of the ROK, than in the previous decades.

Nevertheless, ROK economic diplomacy did suffer from at least two weaknesses. Firstly, it was becoming increasingly difficult for the ROK government to intervene in the private economic sphere inside Korea itself. Therefore, if Korean companies decided that they did not want to invest in a particular country there was "very little the ROK government can do about it." (55) In the past, state control over ROK companies and their investment decisions was an important aspect of economic diplomacy. Secondly, the size of the ROK aid budget was small, therefore such promises had to be selective.

The Director of the West Africa Division had responsibility for fifteen countries in the region, including Nigeria and the Ivory Coast. (56) In 1986 the pattern of ROK relations in this region was rather mixed. Several states had no diplomatic relations at all with the ROK, among them Togo, Mali, Benin, Cape Verde, and Guinea, due to the fact that they were close to the "communist bloc", particularly to the USSR and DPRK, and had "similar political systems." Nevertheless, the ROK hoped to establish diplomatic relations with all five.

Several countries in the region had already established diplomatic relations with both Koreas, including Nigeria, Liberia, Burkina Faso, Sierra Leone, Ghana, Senegal, Ivory Coast, and Niger. Among these, the ROK placed the greatest importance on relations with

Nigeria, Ivory Coast, and Senegal, mainly on the basis of their economic and political importance. (57)

The Ivory Coast is particularly indicative of the situation the ROK faced. The Ivory Coast had considerable interest in economic relations with the ROK. However, in January, 1985, the Ivory Coast opened diplomatic relations with the DPRK. This policy shift actually began as early as 1979, when the Ivory Coast decided to adopt an "even-handed" policy on the Korean Question, as advocated by the NAM. The non-radical states were taking the view that reunification should be solved by direct dialogue between the two Koreas.

Nigeria was also important and was "interested in economic relations with the ROK." (58) Relations with Senegal, however, were improved by emphasising ties between leaders, a North Korean method. Chun Doo Hwan visited Senegal in 1982, and President Diouf of Senegal returned the visit to Seoul in 1983. The strongest political relationship in the region, however, was with President Samuel Doe of Liberia, a country with a special relationship with the US, something rather rare in Africa.

C. Asia

In South East Asia the ROK clearly stressed the importance of economic relations, especially with ASEAN countries. (59) President Chun made this a priority from the outset of his term of office. In 1981 Chun conducted a personal tour of the region and was quite successful in cementing new relationships with heads of governments, including Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew of Singapore, the Sultan of Brunei, President Suharto of Indonesia, and Prime Minister Mahathir of Malaysia. These leaders all made return visits to Seoul following Chun's 1981 tour.

The main theme in this ASEAN diplomacy was the strengthening of mutual economic relations. The ROK needed the natural resources of ASEAN countries, for instance oil, rubber, and palm oil, and hoped to make this relationship a "model for South-South cooperation." (60) The ROK had already established regular bilateral consultative mechanisms with countries in the region, including annual trade meetings. The main aim of the new economic diplomacy was to secure long term supply contracts on favourable terms, and to explore new markets in the region for South Korean companies, through both trade and investment.

On the other hand, the DPRK had also made diplomatic progress within ASEAN, having established diplomatic relations with all the ASEAN member countries except Brunei and the Philippines by 1986. In addition, the USSR had improved relations with Pacific island states, such as Vanuatu (June, 1986) and Kiribati, thus raising fears in Seoul that the DPRK

would be able to take advantage of this trend. The ROK placed confidence in Australia as the regional power best placed to deter the further expansion of communists in the South Pacific. By 1985 the ROK was already Australia's fourth largest export market.

As in other regions of the Third World already discussed above, the policy of the ROK in South East Asia was to avoid involvement in political and other conflicts. For example, the ROK made no official statements on the New Caledonia, Kanak liberation, or the various independence movements in Micronesia, Palau, etc. On the issue of Kampuchea the ROK lent its "moral support" to ASEAN's position, supporting the call for Vietnamese withdrawal. Nevertheless, the ROK made no effort to prevent Indochinese communist countries from attending international events in the ROK, and kept the door open to establishing diplomatic relations. It is therefore apparent how far the policy of the 1980s had departed from that of the Vietnam war era. The ROK had abandoned anti-communist criteria in its relations with Indochina in favour of pragmatism and openness.

This ROK policy of "silence" was essentially a cautious damage limitation. The ROK's previous policy of taking sides in various Third World conflicts had been politically disastrous, especially its identification with South Vietnam, Israel, and South Africa. The ROK did not jeopardise good relations with an established partner by supporting a national liberation movement. In contrast, the DPRK's policy on national liberation movements remained unchanged, i.e. general endorsement of most liberation struggles, despite the possible political or diplomatic cost such a position might entail. (61)

As elsewhere, the same trends toward interest in economic relations and a non-partisan position on the Korean Question were happening in South West Asia (India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Burma, Nepal, Bhutan, Sri Lanka, and the Maldives). The DPRK enjoyed a stronger position than the ROK from the 1950s through to the 1970s. (62) However, after the Rangoon bombing the trend was reversed. Individual countries in the region were eager to improve relations with the ROK "especially in economic terms." (63)

In the mid-1980s the ROK succeeded in South West Asia using high level diplomacy methods. Between 1984-85, President Jawardene of Sri Lanka, the President of the Maldives, President Zia ul Haq of Pakistan, and President Ershad of Bangladesh visited Seoul. All four heads of state were supporters of the moderate position on Korean reunification. None of them made any clear mention of the presence of US troops in the South or even of the issue of outside interference. Nevertheless, none of these governments downgraded relations with the DPRK. Despite this, the ROK had the impression that all four were more sympathetic to the ROK's position. (64)

ROK success can be explained as a consequence of those countries' desire for economic cooperation. In particular, it was the desire to acquire technology from the ROK that was of central interest to these governments. Therefore, they began to "recognise the ROK's position in international society." (65) This relationship was politically beneficial to the ROK as a means to strengthen relations with NAM and counter-balance the influence of the DPRK. The ROK also desired "economic advance into South West Asia's market", and was attracted by the region's large population and economic potential. (66)

In summation, the respondents articulated a very consistent view, across all the regional bureaux, of the efficacy of economic diplomacy and the weaknesses of DPRK policy during the 1980s. Therefore, the diplomatic reversal was already in motion well before the end of the Cold War and the fall of European communism. South Korea's domestic and foreign policies were very congruent with main trends in the international political economy. This was translated into increasing international support. The retreat from anti-communism and the adoption of neutrality on political conflicts proved to be extremely effective.

VI. Juche in Crisis: The Decline of DPRK Diplomacy

North Korea's regime rigidities greatly increased in the late 1970s and throughout the 1980s, bringing a concomitant decline in its diplomacy. The origins of North Korea's crisis are embedded in "Juche" itself, which led to resisting fundamental economic and political reform. The regime justified such resistance by arguing that "If ideological liberalisation is permitted in socialist society...it will entail grave consequences of destroying the ideological and political unity of the masses and disrupting the socialist society itself." (67)

The roots of the crisis in the 1980s go back to the "second revolution" in North Korea, discussed earlier. The failure of national reunification and the rise of the Kim Il Sung faction reinforced the logic of "separate development" of North Korean socialism. (68) Kim Il Sung himself is credited with having invented the two most characteristic management systems of Juche, both of which emerged in the early 1960s. These are the "Tae'an" work system, applied to industry, and the "Chongsanri" method, applied in agriculture.

These same methods remain unchanged and at the centre of economic management. When North Korea celebrated the 30th anniversary of the Chongsanri method on 8 February, 1990, Vice President Pak, Sung Chul praised it as "the best way to effectively administer society and successfully accelerate socialist construction." (69) Prime Minister Yon, Hyong Muk described the Tae'an work system as "the most superior socialist economic management system of our own way which was created by President Kim Il Sung." (70) Its essence is identical to the Chongsanri method, i.e. party officials (committees) at every factory and workplace help solve problems at the "lower" level in "direct contact with the

masses", i.e. consulting the workers.

The Juche management system, stripped to bare essentials, is nothing more nor less than ubiquitous party management of production, even at the lowest levels. Thus, bureaucratism is its hallmark, despite its credo of anti-bureaucratism. Accompanying this style of management, Stakhanovite methods of "heroic" mass mobilisation have been used to promote increases in production. This began with the Chollima campaign in the late 1950s, whose icon was Pegasus - Speed incarnate! North Korean workers have perpetually been cajoled to over-fulfil production quotas ahead of schedule. Even the 1990s began with a "Speed of the 1990s" campaign.

The techniques that rapidly transformed North Korea into a Third World industrial "miracle" (71) later turned out to be one-off gains followed by mounting structural difficulties. They were accompanied by a political system described as "monolithic". (72) Kim Il Sung's "Dual line" of economic construction in parallel with National Defense adopted in October, 1966, hampered economic development. The seven year plan (1961-67) had to be extended by three years. Structural imbalances resulting from dual line policy were openly admitted at the Fifth Congress of the KWP in November, 1970. A new six year plan was approved for 1971-76, in which the "Three Technical Revolutions" were promoted in order to redress imbalances between heavy and light industry and between industry and agriculture.

From about 1969 North Korea accepted the necessity of opening economic links with the wider capitalist world economy. The reintegration of the socialist economies into the capitalist world economy generally began in the early 1970s. (73) North Korea decided to establish limited economic ties with Japan and West Europe in particular, since the US continued to impose an embargo on trade and investment. North Korea needed to import capital, and especially technology, from the capitalist countries in order to increase its lagging productivity and keep up with technological advances in South Korea. These increased imports were to be paid for by the revenue earned from the export of raw materials and manufactured goods; a familiar strategy.

This opening had a short-term positive effect on the North Korean economy. The six year plan was completed sixteen months early in September, 1975. The rate of industrial growth during the six year plan for 1971-76 was 16.3%. However, what began as a mere search for technology through trade led rapidly to financial difficulties. (74)

Ironically, just as North Korea and other the socialist economies re-integrated with the world economy, it went into a severe recession in 1973-75. The prices on the world market

for North Korea's exports, mainly primary products such as minerals, fell considerably, as the terms of trade for less advanced economies deteriorated. By 1976, the DPRK, like many other socialist economies and Third World countries, experienced great difficulty servicing its mounting foreign debt. (75) Thereafter, North Korea temporarily recoiled from involvement in the capitalist world economy.

An even more severe world recession in 1979-82 intensified the problems. The DPRK was unable to obtain credit and continued to suffer from the US trade embargo and high defense spending. Kim, Jong Il led mobilisation campaigns to increase production, such as the "Three Revolution Teams" and various "Speed Battle" programmes. The general aim was to overcome the technology gap by increasing the technical proficiency of cadres, workers, and the economy as a whole. The economic plan for 1978-84 called for increased production, but in the established sectors, such as steel, electricity, cement, coal, fertilisers, grain, minerals and ores, and marine and fisheries products. In 1980, ambitious ten year production targets were set in these sectors. Industrial production still grew at an officially estimated annual rate of 12.2% during the Second Seven Year Plan of 1978-84. (76)

Under Kim Jong Il, renewed emphasis has been placed on ideological work, (77) but there have been no political reforms that enhanced worker self-management, nor economic reforms that encouraged decentralisation. On the contrary, Kim, Jong Il consolidated his power through a new purge, which reportedly required the establishment of a new tier in the prison system, built for opponents of Kim Jong Il's succession. (78)

The DPRK had little choice but to again attempt to re-integrate with the world economy. In 1984, North Korea enacted a new law on foreign investment allowing joint ventures on favourable terms. However, given the lack of internal reform, there were very few takers. At the completion of the 2nd Seven Year Plan in 1984, there followed a very difficult period of adjustment in 1985-6, without a formal economic plan. This difficulty is officially explained as due to "dispersion in the level and speed of economic growth...relative delays in the development of some economic fields... and...the heavy burden of military spending." (79) The ambitious ten year targets set in 1980 were revised downward by Kim Il Sung himself in April, 1987, in the new Seven Year Plan for 1987-93, to reflect more modest, and realistic goals.

In the post 1989 period, Kim, Jong Il led a drive towards so-called "flexible production systems" and "flexible production cells". Despite the sophisticated "post-fordist" title, this programme seemed to consist of little more than the introduction of rather primitive computerisation and robotisation. The general goal was to upgrade machine tool industries, a key element in North Korea's economy, as well as electronics, while enhancing

automation and the application of science and technology to industry.

The government aimed to fulfil the 3rd Seven Year Plan ahead of schedule, under the slogan "Let us increase production and make economies and make the existing economic foundations pay off!" Kim, Jong Il advocated a "powerful drive" to "quickly introduce automation devices, gauges, appliances, electronic goods", as well as computerisation and robotisation. Yet with all this technical emphasis, the economy as a whole was essentially unreformed.

North Korea's structural problems deepened considerably following the collapse of the Soviet Union and the communist regimes of Eastern Europe. In 1990, GNP declined nearly 4 % and per capita GNP by 5.25 %. External trade declined by 4%, while the trade deficit stood at some \$600 million, and external debt grew to \$7.86 billion. Significant reductions in aid from the USSR and Eastern Europe began to hurt the economy.

The demand for payment in hard currency, at world market prices, for energy imports from the USSR, made in November, 1990, hit North Korea particularly hard. North Korea has no oil of its own, though it is rich in coal and hydroelectricity. Coal production has not been able to adequately fill the gap, and the economy reportedly suffers from a shortage of coal due to decreased domestic output, (80) contributing to an increase in idle industrial capacity to as high as 30-50 per cent.

Official North Korean statements on the economy spoke of plans being fulfilled ahead of schedule, with production increases over the previous year. (81) In 1993 however, there was a conspicuous silence over fulfilment of plan objectives and the government did not release figures for industrial and agricultural production growth. This was widely interpreted as a sign that North Korea's economy was performing far below the planned targets for the Third Seven Year Plan (1987-93). (82)

1991 was apparently a disastrous year for the North Korean economy, in which industrial and agricultural production declined, state revenues were stagnant, and shortages of energy sources and raw materials exacerbated bottlenecks already inherent in the inefficient transport and supply infrastructure, all combining to produce falling capacity throughout industry. (83) Trade volume fell catastrophically from the US \$5.42 billion of 1988 to US \$2.72 billion in 1991. (84)

By some estimates North Korea's economy experienced negative growth of 5 % in 1992 - the fourth consecutive year of contraction. Income in North Korea fell by 7.6 per cent in 1992, the third successive annual decrease. Manufacturing output also fell, more

catastrophically, by 17.8 per cent, mining production by 6.1 per cent and agricultural output by 2.7 per cent. There were further reports of declining coal production and energy shortages. Factories were operating far below capacity. (85) Other reports spoke of a breakdown in infrastructure, and basic amenities such as water and sewage, and electricity. Overall trade fell from an estimated US \$1.85 billion in 1990 to approximately US \$1 billion in 1992.

Whereas North Korea was formerly self-sufficient in grain production, by 1991 it was in chronic deficit in July, 1991, imported rice from South Korea, in the first-ever official bilateral trade. (86) In 1992 the food ration was reportedly reduced from 700 grams per day to 550 grams per day. By mid 1993 there were unconfirmed reports of "food riots", following a very diminished 1992 harvest. The pro-North Korean residents community in Japan was reportedly pressured by Pyongyang to increase the transfer of wealth to the DPRK, even by selling off assets. (87)

As North Korea's crisis unfolded, South Korean trade and investment emerged as perhaps the best hope of rapidly increasing its supply of foreign exchange. The South Korean chaebol are eager to invest in North Korea, taking advantage of cheap raw materials and labour. Total two-way trade was only \$1 million in 1988, but reached \$190 million by 1991. Seoul bought zinc, fishery products, steel, coal, and gold. (88) The North was able to run a modest surplus on this bilateral trade account. Further economic progress depended on progress in the North-South Dialogue, and to general improvement in relations with the West, to which we now turn.

VII. North Korea's Foreign Policy in the Post-Cold War Era

As in the period 1969-74, North Korea responded to dramatic changes in the international system by attempting to make a limited opening to the capitalist world, enter dialogue with the South, but simultaneously reinforce Juche. As in the past, North Korea experienced great difficulty in squaring this circle, and progress has been very slow.

After a decade on the economic and diplomatic defensive, North Korea finally found itself outflanked on two accounts. First, South Korea's successful economic diplomacy had made it a more important partner than North Korea for most governments. Secondly, South Korea's "Nordpolitik" (89), a policy of expanding economic and diplomatic relations with communist states, was spectacularly successful in the wake of the revolutions in Eastern Europe and the demise of the Soviet Union.

Thus, North Korea was placed in a position that compelled it either to accept isolation, or to make the best of the situation by demonstrating some flexibility. This situation led, most

importantly, to the complete reversal of North Korean policy on UN membership, after North Korea's allies decided not to block South Korean membership in the UN. North Korea therefore had little choice but to enter the UN or allow the South to enjoy sole representation, which would have meant the de-legitimisation of the DPRK.

Thus, after two decades of opposing "two Koreas", North Korea capitulated and both Korean governments were admitted into the UN in the autumn of 1991. Joint UN entry implied a de facto recognition of the status quo, i.e. two Korean governments existed and were recognised by most countries in the world. Both attained international legitimacy, and their respective claims to represent all the Korean people were quietly dropped. In formal, international legal terms, both achieved the same international status. Only reunification could now alter this status.

However, UN membership proved to be an anti-climax. The continuing crisis in North Korea undermines its international standing and blocks progress towards full international rehabilitation, or peaceful coexistence, much less reunification, with South Korea. North Korea's use of the "nuclear card" between 1992-95, discussed briefly below, was a clear sign of its desperation.

Above all, it was the loss of support from key communist allies that determined North Korea would make capitulations. Here too, the logic of economic self-interest prevailed. China informed North Korea in the summer of 1991 that it would not veto a South Korean decision to enter the UN. Then China dealt North Korea a further stunning blow by normalising diplomatic relations with South Korea during August-September, 1992, to facilitate the enormous increase in their bilateral trade.

In the case of the USSR, the Gorbachev administration had no particular love for the conservative Kim Il Sung regime. From as early as Gorbachev's landmark policy address in Vladivostok in July, 1986, it was apparent the USSR would place emphasis on economic development in the East, to be accompanied by new diplomatic initiatives for normalisation with the ROK, PRC and Japan.

Gorbachev dealt North Korea a heavy blow when he met ROK President Noh Tae Woo in San Francisco in June, 1990. Full diplomatic relations between South Korea and the USSR were agreed in September, 1990. In the Moscow Declaration on 14 December, 1990, Gorbachev announced his support for the South's "step by step" approach to reunification, and for a nuclear free zone in Korea. Noh assured Gorbachev that he did not want an isolated North Korea and supported continued close relations between the USSR and the DPRK. The USSR would use its influence in Pyongyang to push North Korea along the

desired road of "opening up". South Korea was willing to offer the USSR \$3 billion in assistance to cement the new relationship. This opened the way to extensive joint ventures and South Korean investments inside the USSR, and later its successor Russia, particularly in Siberia.

The Soviet rapprochement with South Korea confirmed that it would not veto a South Korean application to join the UN, and that its very real economic interest in the South would over-ride its weakening political ties to North Korea. The USSR cut aid given to the DPRK, as did the Eastern European governments. China, however, continued a modest aid programme to North Korea of some \$150 million, stretched over a five year period. Russia, under President Yeltsin's leadership, further distanced itself from the alliance with the DPRK. Russia decided to reconsider the terms of the Soviet Union's 1961 security treaty with the DPRK, which requires automatic response should the DPRK be attacked.

These sudden changes in relations led some commentators to predict that North Korea would react by retreating to isolationism and playing on the impression that it could develop nuclear weapons capability. (90) However, the US and South Korean governments believed that enhancing South Korea's relationship with China would force North Korea into more flexible policies, including more economic openness, if only to prevent North Korea being bypassed by South Korean investors otherwise headed for China. Indeed, DPRK Deputy Premier Kim, Dal Hyon, visiting Seoul in July, 1992, pointedly appealed to South Korean companies to invest in North Korea rather than go "abroad".

China remained North Korea's ally, but also acted as a liaison for the West. President Noh, Tae Woo held a summit meeting in China in October, 1992 with Premier Li Peng and President Yang Shangkun, the focus of which was an agreement by China to use its good offices to persuade the DPRK to agree to IAEA and South Korean inspection of the North's nuclear facilities. (91) Washington and Tokyo also backed the ROK's demand for such inspections, making this a precondition for normalisation of relations with North Korea. President Kim Young Sam sought much the same commitment from China in early 1994 while in Beijing.

There was, however, a new willingness by Western powers to initiate contacts with North Korea. There was a danger that too rapid an improvement in relations between South Korea and its communist neighbours would isolate North Korea and increase its desperation. The US and Japan initiated contact with the DPRK to balance the equation, while all the powers encouraged direct North-South Korean contacts.

The US began meeting North Korean diplomats in Beijing from December, 1988, to discuss the conditions for an improvement in relations. The first high level meeting between North Korea and the US, since the Geneva Conference in 1954, was held in New York in January, 1992. However, the US made the issue of nuclear safeguards the key to all progress, while also requiring progress in North-South talks and improvements in human rights in North Korea.

Though beyond the scope of the present discussion, the nuclear crisis overshadowed all other issues in Korea during 1992-94.

The US strongly suspected that North Korea was buying time to clandestinely develop its own nuclear weapons capability. (92)

North Korea opted for a strategy of nuclear brinkmanship, threatening to withdraw from the NPT and refuse sensitive IAEA inspections of the suspect nuclear facilities at Yongbyon. The US responded with a campaign to approve UN sanctions against North Korea. The crisis intensified and fears were kindled of a possible war. Former US President Jimmy Carter interceded in mid June, 1994 and achieved a breakthrough with Kim Il Sung, leading rapidly to new negotiations and a settlement, despite Kim Il Sung's untimely death on 8 July, 1994. (93)

The evidence seems to support the thesis that the DPRK played the nuclear card as a bargaining device in order to wrest more concessions from the West, i.e. to raise the "price" for its pledge to forfeit nuclear weapons capability and to "open" its economy to the world. (94) North Korea used crucial talks in mid 1993, for instance, to press a series of demands on the US, including a guarantee against nuclear attack, suspending Team Spirit, allowing Northern inspection of the US and ROK military installations, removing the US nuclear umbrella from South Korea, and recognising the North's socialist system. (95) On the other hand, the US, Japan, and the ROK coordinated their approach to the DPRK in such a way as to extract concessions from North Korea as well, such as the nuclear safeguards agreement. In the final settlement of the nuclear crisis agreed 21 October, 1994, the DPRK received a \$3-4 billion dollar nuclear assistance programme, to replace its old reactors with new technology, and the US agreed to establish a liaison office in Pyongyang, the first step toward normalisation.

Japan also played a role in coaxing North Korea out of isolation.

Preliminary meetings between Japan and North Korea started in Beijing in November, 1990, following LDP godfather Shin Kanemaru's visit to North Korea in September, 1990. By the end of 1992 North Korea and Japan had sat through eight rounds of normalisation talks, before North Korea walked out.

Japanese trade, aid, and investment could be the life-line the DPRK needs to survive. North

Korea initially demanded some \$10 billion from Japan in compensation for past harm, a very unrealistic figure.

As the Cold War ended, North and South Korea renewed their dialogue, accompanied this time by great fanfare and media hype. The first Prime Ministerial level talks were held in Seoul in September, 1990, followed soon by a meeting in Pyongyang in mid-October, 1990. These meetings were primarily an occasion to express general goodwill. (96) At the third meeting in December, 1990, the discussion degenerated into antagonistic posturing.

DPRK Premier Yon Hyong Muk attacked the ROK's Nordpolitik as a policy designed to isolate the DPRK.

The fourth round of talks, initially scheduled for 25-28 February, 1991, in Pyongyang, would have addressed the issue of UN membership, but were cancelled due to the Gulf War and Team Spirit. They were finally rescheduled for late October, 1991, with the issue of a non-aggression treaty high on the agenda.

In the fifth round, 11-13 December, 1991, North and South Korea signed an historic basic accord on political reconciliation, military non-aggression, exchange of persons, and economic cooperation, which came into effect in February, 1992. High level talks continued and further agreements were reached on areas of cooperation in September, 1992, at the eighth round. Progress was sharply halted in early 1993, as the nuclear inspections crisis developed. With final resolution of the nuclear crisis in the autumn of 1994, resumption of the North-South Dialogue was being encouraged by the major powers. North Korea's position was somewhat unclear, being pre-occupied with consolidating Kim Jong Il's succession to full power.

VIII. South Korean "Victory" in the Diplomatic Competition

South Korea was well placed to reap benefits from the end of the Cold War; being on a trajectory of rapid economic growth and enjoying increasing international support, following its extraordinarily successful "Olympic diplomacy" in the run up to the 24th Olympiad in 1988. President Noh, Tae Woo then launched an ambitious policy of "Nordpolitik". He issued a Special Declaration on 7 July, 1988, indicating renewed interest in dialogue and exchanges with the North, and an offer of full diplomatic relations with communist states. Noh offered North Korea the chance to trade with the South, promote free exchanges, and called for a summit with Kim Il Sung.

When President Noh spoke to the UN General Assembly on 19 October, 1988, he became the first President of the ROK ever to do so. South Korea was basking in the afterglow of the 24th Olympiad, at which many communist states participated despite North Korea's protests. Noh told the UN that he desired economic and diplomatic exchanges with North

Korea and hoped for eventual UN membership.

He used the occasion to call for a six nation consultative conference on the Korean Question, with the ROK, DPRK, US, USSR, PRC and Japan participating. He called for the good offices of the UN to be employed to promote peace in Korea, but pointedly stopped short of requesting direct UN mediation. He offered to sign a non-aggression treaty with the DPRK and pledged before the world community that the ROK would never use force first in Korea. All this, in retrospect, amounted to a brilliant diplomatic coup for South Korean diplomacy, leaving North Korea looking recalcitrant.

Immediately following Noh's debut at the UN, the US agreed to take the initiative to prod North Korea into new talks. President Noh urged the US to take "meaningful steps to end Pyongyang's isolation and draw it into the international mainstream." The US complied by easing trade and travel restrictions on the DPRK later in October, 1988. Nevertheless, general US commercial trade with North Korea remained illegal and the DPRK remained on the State Department's official list of "terrorist" states. A false start was made in 1989 on the North-South Dialogue, which North Korea again unilaterally suspended in March, on the pretext of Team Spirit.

It was South Korea's spectacular breakthroughs with communist and post-communist governments, however, that totally altered the diplomatic situation, eventually forcing North Korea back to the negotiating table, and into the UN. South Korea's first and key breakthrough in the communist circle was the establishment of full diplomatic relations with Hungary early in 1989. Hungary's 1989 diplomatic accord with the ROK was scathingly denounced by North Korea. North Korea angrily degraded relations with Hungary, on 2 February, 1989, to the level of charge d'affaires, and excoriated Hungary for "betrayal of socialism". This did not prevent first Yugoslavia, and eventually all of Eastern Europe from soon following Hungary's lead.

South Korea's breakthrough in Eastern Europe was more of an unexpected windfall than the result of a particular effort. It is important to note that prior to the revolutions that swept communists out of power from late 1989 onward, South Korea's diplomatic inroads in Eastern Europe were quite limited, usually to a trade office. The sudden change in political atmosphere allowed the successor post-communist regimes to eagerly seek out ROK economic cooperation via normalisation of diplomatic relations.

This interpretation was confirmed in personal interviews conducted in the ROK Ministry of Foreign Affairs in the summer of 1990. (97) The Eastern European precedent had a knock-on effect elsewhere, for instance in Mongolia. According to an official in the division

of Northeast Asian Affairs, Mongolia was stimulated to seek diplomatic relations with the ROK after the revolutions of 1989, since it needed new diplomatic partners and wanted to join the "Northeast Asian Economic Bloc", instead of the European bloc controlled by the USSR. Thus, the initiative to open diplomatic relations with the ROK was taken by the Mongolian side, not the ROK, on 16 March, 1990, and diplomatic relations were established with Mongolia on 26 March, 1990. Mongolia requested ROK economic missions be despatched as soon as possible. (98) This evidence supports the view that economic interests were the determining factor in the diplomatic reversal, even among communist states.

An official in the ROK Foreign Ministry cited three factors that accounted for the breakthroughs in 1989-90: (A) the Seoul Olympics, (B) Nordpolitik, from 7 July, 1988, and (C) the East European reform, opening, and democratisation process. The ROK wanted diplomatic relations, and the East Europeans "eagerly wanted cooperation with the ROK." (99) Full relations were established with Poland on 1 November, 1989; with Yugoslavia on 27 December, 1989; with Bulgaria on 23 March, 1990; with Rumania on 30 March, 1990. with Czechoslovakia on 22 March, 1990.

The process of opening with Hungary is a parable for the rest. Immediately after opening diplomatic relations, economic cooperation meetings were held with Hungarian officials, and several Korean companies opened offices in Budapest, while Hungarian trade companies set up headquarters in Seoul. In general, "Economic relations have been expedited and are a model to other East European countries, and they rushed to open diplomatic relations with the ROK." (100) This model included mutual investment guarantees, trade and economic cooperation, scientific and technical cooperation, and conventions on avoidance of double taxation: all keys to enhancing the incentives for the ROK to invest in the new Eastern Europe.

The opening to Hungary set the tone for ROK political relations with the new regimes of Eastern Europe as well. President Noh visited Hungary in November, 1989. The ROK expected East Europe to support the ROK position on UN membership and the North-South dialogue, expecting that other East Europeans would follow Hungary's lead and support ROK membership in the UN, on the principle of universality. (101) This expectation proved to be generally correct.

Nevertheless, an official of the East European Division (I) of the ROK Foreign Ministry, in a personal interview, maintained that the formal achievement of the breakthrough in Eastern Europe was in fact the result of "long-standing policy" dating from the 23 June, 1973 special declaration by President Park. (102) The early 1980s had been characterised by a convergence of policy between the Chun Doo Hwan, Ronald Reagan, and Nakasone.

These "conservative anti-communist regimes dampened the whole mood of relations with the socialist states" (103), which reached their nadir in 1983 at the time of the shooting down of KAL 007. The Olympic games, however, were the "decisive turning point" for improvement of relations with communist governments. (104) The central breakthrough was Park Chul-On's (Political adviser to the Blue House) secret visit to Hungary in 1988 which led to agreement to open a "permanent mission" in October, 1988. Then followed the rush of other Eastern European governments to the ROK, with the exceptions of East Germany and Albania. (105)

This "Olympic diplomacy" included the USSR, which began informal discussions on opening a "trade office" in December, 1988. After a "tug of war" over the issue of consular functions, a "consular department" was set up in Moscow in February, 1990. Thereafter the momentum increased and moved to high level talks, including between Kim Young Sam and Gorbachev in March, 1990, followed by the Roh-Gorbachev summit in San Francisco on 4 June, 1990. In August, 1990 the ROK and USSR conducted high level discussions on economic cooperation between the Chairman of GOSPLAN and the Senior Secretary to the President for Economic Affairs, Kim, Jong-in. The ROK despatched "survey teams" to tour the USSR in search of economic opportunities, including exploitation of natural resources. In August 1990, when this interview was conducted, the ROK anticipated that full diplomatic relations with the USSR would be forthcoming "in a matter of months", with the anticipation that the ROK would soon expand the agenda to include North Korea and the security environment around the Korean peninsula. (106)

The US also played a role in facilitating the success of Nordpolitik with the East Europeans and the USSR. According to an official in the ROK Foreign Ministry, the US communicated to the USSR the ROK's desire to improve relations and gave support in Eastern Europe as well. However, given the very changed international situation, the cross-recognition formula was "quietly dropped." (107)

The ROK also anticipated that good relations with the USSR would "create a favourable environment for unification and also for Beijing-Seoul relations - because the PRC does not like to lag too far behind the USSR in relations with the ROK." (108) Finally, given full relations with China and the USSR, the "full external conditions will be prepared" for reunification. (109)

Rapprochement with China began very early, but progressed slowly. From the first official contact in 1978, by 1983 the PRC was referring to the ROK by its proper name, and the ROK Foreign Ministry openly called for normalisation of relations with China. The PRC allowed indirect trade with the ROK in 1979, via Hong Kong. (110) Direct talks were again

held in March, 1985. In September, 1986, China participated in the Asian Games in Seoul, and informed the North Koreans that not to attend the Games would have been too much to ask of China's position. (111)

Then China attended the 24th Olympic Games in Seoul in 1988. President Noh Tae Woo prepared for a major expansion in Sino-Korean trade, already standing at a two-way figure of some \$3 billion. ROK investment went into infrastructure on the west coast of South Korea and direct investment increased in China, e.g. in Shandong and especially in Guangdong in south China. From November, 1988, direct trade became possible. The provincial governments of China played a key role in pioneering diplomatic relations. For instance, economic delegations were exchanged with Shandong and Liaoning provinces in August-November, 1988, and trade offices were established at provincial level. A special body was set up by the ROK to discuss economic relations with the PRC and other northern socialist countries - the International Private Economic Council (IPEC). (112) This was accompanied by talks between the Chinese Council of Promoting International Trade, and KOTRA to establish a national trade office, which the ROK wanted to handle consular matters as well.

Sino-Korean relations underwent a temporary setback following the Tienanmen massacre in 1989, but South Korea was keen to improve relations as soon as possible. China's policy of "separating economics from politics" allowed it to increase trade with South Korea tremendously. General Secretary Ziang Zemin announced in August, 1990 that China was interested in re-opening the trade office matter, reflecting the persistence of PRC economic interests in relations with South Korea. At this point, the ROK suggested that the PRC use its influence to persuade North Korea to join the UN alongside the ROK and be "more sincere in the South-North Dialogue." (113)

South Korea realised that the international system had changed and was very favourable to new relations with China and the USSR as "sovereign equals". One official in the Foreign Ministry explained that the post Cold War situation was the best situation that had ever existed for the ROK's relations with China and Russia. Indeed, he argued that "The norms of the present international system favour the ROK." (114)

Given all the spectacular progress with the communist governments and post-communist governments reviewed above, the ROK was extremely well placed to fulfil its agenda of improving its international status via the UN. ROK membership in the UN emerged in 1990 as the "top priority" of ROK foreign policy. (115) The lack of full UN membership was regarded as being "harmful to the ROK's international status", since the ROK was always in the position of asking other governments for their support without being able to

reciprocate in the UN. (116)

The ROK decided to employ diplomacy with the USSR and PRC to support joint entry into the UN by both the DPRK and ROK, thus to get round DPRK objections. Most importantly, direct diplomacy was employed to get the USSR and PRC not to use their veto in the Security Council to bloc ROK membership. The ROK was aware of the fact that the DPRK's argument on joint UN membership as an obstacle to reunification had "collapsed with German and Yemen unification." (117) The ROK was anxious to counter Kim Il Sung's suggestion for UN membership via a single seat, proposed on 24 May, 1990. The previous policy of cross-recognition had been "set aside", after several years of hard effort, precisely because "there was very little chance of implementation without the support of the USSR and PRC." (118) Likewise, it would be up to the DPRK whether it wanted to establish diplomatic relations with the US and Japan, which the ROK had no power to push through. The ROK correctly anticipated that the DPRK would be unable to oppose ROK normalisation of relations with the USSR and PRC, and thus would be compelled to reconsider its position altogether. The Foreign Ministry was very confident that the DPRK would return to the table "to get US and Japanese technology". This was simply "a matter of time." (119)

Already, in 1989, 48 countries had made a formal statement endorsing Korean membership in the UN, on the principle of universality, including socialist Hungary. The ROK anticipated that other Eastern European governments would make similar statements on the Korean Question at the UN in 1990.

It was therefore the ROK that renewed the practice of making a formal statement to the UNGA on the Korean Question, in October, 1988, after its Olympics success. The ROK was fully confident of victory in the UNGA, given that as of June, 1990, a total of 141 countries had diplomatic relations with South Korea, compared to 104 (excluding Ukraine and Byelorussia) with the DPRK. This represented an increase from February 1988, when the ROK had 128 diplomatic partners, compared to 101-2 for the DPRK. Of these, 66 countries had relations with both Korean governments. Since February, 1988, the ROK had established diplomatic relations with: Bhutan, Mongolia, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Rumania, Algeria, Iraq, Cape Verde, Congo, and Namibia. Only a handful of countries had, during the same period, established diplomatic relations with the DPRK, including Peru and Colombia. The way was cleared for ROK victory in the UN, and the final achievement of a new international status.

IX. Conclusion

The rival Korean regimes entered this period in a state of diplomatic parity. Profound change in the international system challenged both regimes to adapt their domestic and foreign policies. South Korea adapted very successfully through a combination of economic diplomacy, political and military neutrality, and the final abandonment of anti-communist ideology in foreign affairs, accompanied by a spectacular windfall at the end of the Cold War and the fall of communist regimes in Europe.

Economic interests played a decisive role in the diplomatic reversal. The basic economic strategy pursued by South Korea of export oriented industrialisation facilitated its successful adaptation to the new international conditions of the 1980s and 1990s. The requirements of economic success pressured the regime into pragmatic policies which were broadly in congruence with main trends in the international political economy. When even the communist regimes accepted the need to adjust to these same trends, South Korea reaped a huge diplomatic harvest at the expense of North Korea. This process culminated in entry into the UN as a sovereign state, alongside the North, thus establishing a new international status.

In contrast, North Korea was unable to successfully adapt to the new international situation. North Korea's close association with the NAM, which was of such benefit to its international legitimacy in the 1970s, became increasingly ineffectual as a tool of diplomacy in the 1980s, as the NAM experienced internal disarray and declining political importance in world politics. Likewise, new ideological conflicts and disarray in the "socialist community" of states left North Korea increasingly isolated and uncertain. The essential reason for the failure of DPRK economic policy was that it never went far enough in embracing necessary reforms, although the US embargo was certainly another important factor. Finally, the ossification of the political regime led to serious foreign policy mistakes and mismanagement, leading to a steady loss of international support throughout this period. The final consequence was a retreat and then "defeat" for North Korea, abandoned by most of its allies and forced to sue for terms with the ROK and the West.

CONCLUSIONS

I. International Change and Domestic Responses: The Framework of Analysis

In chapter one a selective review of the relevant literature on hegemony and international change was undertaken to establish a framework of analysis. This was then applied to the two Koreas' development and competition. Before discussing the findings of the substantive analysis, let us first summarise the key points of the theoretical framework.

International change can be analysed as a series of "hegemonic transitions". These entail significant change in international order, including the global industrial structure. The rhythm of hegemonic transitions establishes the systemic framework within which peripheral states seek to enhance their international standing by pursuing industrialisation.

The world economy experiences a general pattern of cyclical expansion and contraction, with a relationship to hegemonic order. Hegemonic moments of order are usually associated with economic expansion periods, while non-hegemonic interregnums are often associated with economic difficulties, increasing competition, and even war. Within this context, the industrialisation process, at its core a process of technological development, profoundly affects the distribution of power in the international system.

The most powerful states, and those that therefore may become hegemonic, are those that have achieved advanced technological development relative to others, and this is often associated with a prior or concomitant revolutionary transformation of the socio-political and economic order. "Backward" or peripheral states must attempt to "catch up" or suffer various penalties due to their weakness. Peripheral states may attempt to ascend to core industrial status, but this requires the necessary socio-political and economic transformation of state and society demanded by technological modernity. In order to do so successfully, a peripheral state must ideally have a high degree of meaningful sovereignty, i.e. break or reduce existing dependency ties that may obstruct national industrialisation and capital accumulation.

Such "late industrialisation" faces formidable obstacles inherent in the prevailing asymmetries of the international system. Some theorists maintain that change in peripheral states, as a consequence of such asymmetries, is caused more by external factors than by internal, endogenous factors, including ideological currents transmitted from centre to the periphery.

Nevertheless, the most widely accepted prerequisite for successful ascendance from the periphery seems to be a stronger role for the state in organising the national development

process. Such a strong state facilitates the acquisition of technology and the mobilisation of all available resources toward accelerating industrialisation and capital formation. In this sense, there is perhaps a certain type of "advantage of backwardness" whereby a strong state in the periphery may succeed in catapulting national development toward higher stages of industrialisation by acquiring state-of-the-art technologies. This is often associated with nationalistic, or neo-mercantilist economic policies, designed to protect domestic industries, and a planned sequential development of industries.

To this general framework I suggested the addition of "emulation", "imposition of forms", "regime rigidities", and "the structure of opportunities" (or "structural opportunities"), as concepts that could be employed to analyze the process of change by peripheral states. The central point is: to the degree to which the state elite can create a congruence between domestic and foreign policies and the key trends of transformation in the international system, the more the state will be successful both domestically and internationally in promoting its development and enhancing its international standing.

This framework of adaptation by the periphery assumes that while no state presides over an economy that can be truly autonomous from global economic and political trends, it can use its manoeuvrability to either accentuate or ameliorate the effects of the general world economic conditions in which it operates. The policies pursued by peripheral states are therefore crucial, and themselves form part of the periodic restructuring of the world economy. As peripheral states industrialise, and thus global over-capacity emerges in some industrial sectors, this competition is a challenge to the existing industrial powers.

A cyclical pattern of industrial restructuring takes place, which brings with it profound socio-economic and political changes in both peripheral and core states, and affects the character of international order. Some scholars have identified the late 19th century, the 1920s and the 1980s as such periods of structural crisis involving global industrial restructuring.

The rhythm of this general pattern of change in the international system poses opportunities and constraints for peripheral states. Since peripheral state elites are often part of a global coalition of elites in the transnational hegemonic structure, then different phases of international change, as outlined above, imply the possibility of change in the nature of the transnational linkages between peripheral and core elites, and thus of a change in status. Global hegemony may be characterised by the promulgation of certain "universal" values to which peripheral elites subscribe either through emulation or as a result of imposition. However, as hegemonic influence wanes or undergoes transition due to the re-assertion of multi-core structure, peripheral elites may be able to alter their position in the international system.

Finally, it is important to emphasise both the limitations of hegemonic influence over peripheral states and the constraints on successful adaptation and development by any state, peripheral or otherwise. It should never be taken for granted that any elite or any state is capable of being so self-conscious of the "objective" situation that it can or will be able to take the "correct" course of action, or that it can overcome formidable obstacles to reform or restructuring.

II. The Two Korea's Responses to International Change

This thesis examines the case of Korea in modern international relations using the general framework outlined above. The themes of development and international standing are directly intertwined throughout the analysis. Beginning with late Yi dynasty Korea, the framework has been applied with a view to capturing the interaction of domestic and international factors to explain changes in international standing and status.

The analysis of Yi dynasty Korea's responses to international change focuses on the consequences of the failure to successfully modernise. The socio-economic and political order in Yi dynasty Korea proved to be incapable of self-reform, the result of a combination of entrenched oligarchic interests and the influence of foreign powers, particularly China.

In contrast, Japan, successfully met the new challenges posed by Western industrial modernity and ascended from the periphery to the core of the international system, thus altering the nature of the regional system. In the face of Japanese expansionism, Korea's failure to reform, industrialise, and create a centralised state during the late 19th century led to complete loss of sovereignty between 1910-1945. Korea became an integral part of the Japanese imperium.

Korea's international status changed again with liberation and partition in 1945. The emergence of a new international order and Soviet-American rivalry brought frustrated hopes for immediate independence by a unified sovereign state. Occupation policy led to the emergence of the "Korean Question" in post-war international affairs. The international legality of the two rival Korean regimes was contested, though the US used its hegemonic influence to facilitate UN endorsement of the ROK.

To overcome the legacy of colonialism and partition, both Korean regime's attempted strategies of ascent through industrial development. Both were quite successful in eventually establishing strong states and industrial bases. In tandem with this national development, each regime pursued a foreign policy strategy it considered to be compatible

with its domestic economic policies and its ideological and political preferences. Their diplomatic rivalry primarily took the form of competition for international support, especially in the Third World.

The domestic and foreign policies of each Korean regime were analyzed in relation to the main trends of change in the international system, in the search to assess the degree of correspondence, and to interpret the outcome of the competition. The expectation that different periods or phases of hegemonic order would have a direct bearing on the nature of the constraints and opportunities for manoeuvrability has generally been upheld with a reasonable degree of isomorphism.

The Korean regimes' development was initially constrained within the bipolar Cold War system. The occupation period was one in which great power rivalry overwhelmed Korean aspirations for immediate independence. As a consequence of this period of international rivalry, Korea was permanently partitioned. International consensus broke down and two rival claims to international legitimacy were put forward.

Each regime was heavily influenced by ideological currents emanating from its superpower patron, and by the imposition of forms by the occupying power. Only with the return of sovereignty in 1948 did each regime gain a meaningful opportunity for greater independence, marred however by the Korean War, which resulted initially in even deeper dependence upon external support by both regimes.

During the reconstruction period that followed the Korean War, North Korea made the most progress in reducing its dependency on the Cold War international structure, in advancing national industrialisation, and in achieving a higher level of political autonomy. North Korea achieved this through a revolutionary transformation, combining the consolidation of a highly nationalistic version of socialist policies with the receipt of industrial and technical assistance on a very large scale from other socialist countries. In effect, the socialist community of states agreed to industrialise North Korea virtually "overnight" by transferring to it the then state-of-the-art industrial plant prevalent in their economies. However, North Korea manipulated this external assistance in order to establish an autonomous industrial base, including heavy industries. The point of this strategy was to establish economic independence and thus consolidate political independence. The effect of this policy on North Korea's international standing was mainly positive. In effect, North Korea rejected both US and Soviet hegemony.

South Korea, in contrast, failed to achieve rapid industrialisation and remained in extreme unilateral dependence on the United States during the reconstruction period. The

particular domestic coalition that governed South Korea in this period constituted a block on revolutionary transformation, while its extreme anti-communism reduced its capacity to increase its international support. Its political autonomy suffered as a result of the extreme aid-dependence on a single power, i.e. the United States. The economy was characterised by import-dependence rather than import substitution, and exports were nil.

In summation, the policies chosen by South Korea and partly imposed through the bilateral relationship with the United States, led to increased dependency, an absence of technological innovation, poor economic development performance, and were more detrimental than beneficial in terms of enhancing international support, despite the fact that South Korea enjoyed initial advantages due to the global hegemonic influence of the United States.

In the next period the two Koreas' trajectories again sharply diverged. This was a consequence of important regime change in the South and new conditions in the international system, e.g. the gradual erosion of Cold War structures, the momentum of decolonisation and non-alignment as new factors in world politics, and new opportunities in the international division of labour.

In this new environment North Korea remained consistent in its domestic and foreign policies. The correspondence between its domestic and foreign policies was enhanced by an assertion of the "independent line" and increasingly proactive policy toward the emerging nations and liberation movements of the Third World.

Therefore, throughout the 1960s and into the 1970s, while the trend toward decolonisation and national revolution was strongest, North Korea's international support increased, until it achieved diplomatic parity with South Korea in 1975. The analysis of the content of DPRK foreign policy shows how North Korea successfully expanded its circle of diplomatic partners by emphasising shared interests in promoting national independence and national development vis a vis the advanced countries, and the principles of non-alignment vis a vis all great powers.

South Korean diplomacy, by contrast, was largely ineffective, particularly in stemming the advance of the DPRK in the Third World. South Korea's involvement in the Vietnam War and its unfavourable attitude toward national liberation movements and socialism was quite damaging in terms of its prospects of acceptance in the Third World solidarity movement. This situation reflected South Korea's bilateral dependence on the United States. This weakness was reflected in annual increases in support for North Korea in UNGA votes on the Korean Question. In the 1960s, the competition for international support was largely a zero sum game, with gains by one regime being made at the expense

of the other. South Korea's Hallstein Doctrine embodied such zero sum game principles.

Though South Korea lacked sufficient diplomatic flexibility, it possessed other capacity for successful adjustment to new conditions. South Korea underwent a belated domestic revolutionary transformation, under military government, that transformed it into a dynamic, industrialising, export oriented economy. This transition was a result of the convergence of interests between the South Korean elite and the interests of Japan and the United States toward developing a new regional political economy. Foreign policy was adjusted to be more compatible with the new economic strategy and to reduce the damage to international standing that resulted from rigid anti-communism.

Thus, South Korea reduced its level of regime rigidities that had previously obstructed successful development while simultaneously developing a highly successful long term economic policy. However, this economic adaptability was not initially sufficient to offset North Korean political advantages, especially in the Third World. Nevertheless, it laid an extremely good foundation for long term economic, political, and diplomatic success in the period that followed.

In the period of flux in international relations in the late 1960s to early 1970s the international community reached a consensus that the Korean Question was a matter for the Koreans themselves to decide: free from foreign interference. This new international situation can be interpreted, through our analytical framework, as reflecting the gradual decline of US hegemonic influence and the re-assertion of a multi-core structure. In this environment the Korean regimes gained greater autonomy, including South Korea, which used the opportunity to further consolidate state power and to accelerate industrialisation through an ambitious programme of heavy and chemical industrialisation.

Domestic regime rigidities increased in both Koreas in the later part of the 1970s, but particularly in North Korea, which was increasingly unable to innovate and unsuccessfully attempted to open to the world economy. The deepening political rigidity of both regimes became the primary obstacle to progress toward reunification or even peaceful co-existence. Since parity had been achieved in the UNGA in 1975, at least in terms of formal international support, the situation drifted toward impasse.

South Korea's domestic repression alienated many international supporters during the draconian "Yushin" period, though its heavy and chemical industrialisation policies laid the basis for long term industrial deepening and continued growth. North Korea not only failed in its attempt to make a limited opening to the international economy, but more importantly, began to suffer from structural problems that reduced the growth potential of

its economy. Politically, North Korea began to ossify, leaving it far less capable of adjusting its foreign policy to new trends in the international system. In sum, North Korea had reached a point at which the early advantages of its industrial and political policies had reached their limits and restructuring was required to achieve continued success. Instead of reform, however, there was a great increase in regime rigidities in North Korea, as the Kim Il Sung regime sought to perpetuate itself indefinitely.

It is in the intersection of these divergent domestic trajectories and the new trends in the international system in the 1980s that we can arrive at conclusions concerning the outcome of their diplomatic competition. The 1980s were characterised by increasing economic competition, industrial restructuring, efforts to further liberalise world trade, and a general trend toward economic liberalisation by capitalist and socialist economies alike.

South Korea underwent another regime change from 1979-81 that resulted in successful adjustment of both domestic and foreign policy, bringing an increased correspondence with the new trends in the international system. South Korea's economic adjustment proved to be highly successful in restoring economic efficiency and enhancing international competitiveness. Its foreign policy, based on ever increasing pragmatism and emphasis on expanding economic diplomacy, at last began to pay real dividends in terms of increased international support and enhanced international standing.

This took place in an international context in which Third World militancy and solidarity declined and were increasingly replaced by pragmatism and acceptance of the new trends of liberalisation, marketisation, and privatisation. The interviews undertaken in the ROK Ministry of Foreign Affairs in 1985-86 tend to confirm that South Korea very consciously exploited the new international trends through promotion of economic diplomacy, and understood that this strategy should enhance its international standing.

South Korea's final abandonment of anti-communist criteria in foreign policy was a key element in the ultimate success of the adjustment. Once South Korea opened the prospect of economic relations with communist states, the economic diplomacy strategy was so successful that South Korea was eventually able to win over all the principle communist supporters of North Korea, leaving North Korea relatively isolated. South Korea also successfully improved relations with the United States and other Western powers, as well as Japan, during the "Second Cold War", while it greatly enhanced its international prestige by successfully hosting the Olympics in Seoul in 1988.

As a result, a new consensus emerged that South Korea's international status should be confirmed through full membership in the United Nations. South Korea had emerged as a

middle income, newly industrialised country, and one of the most significant trading states in the world economy. Its legitimacy was greatly enhanced, both domestically and internationally, by undertaking a transition to democracy from 1987 onward. Therefore, by the end of the 1980s, South Korea's level of international support had been significantly improved with the West, the Third World, and even with "Second World" communist countries.

North Korea, in contrast, continued to fail to make internal reforms that were urgently necessary for a successful economic adjustment to new international conditions, while its foreign policy also remained inflexible and ever more out of tune with the new international situation. The decline of Third World militancy and solidarity, the trend in the communist states to make a historic compromise with the capitalist world economy, combined with the long term detrimental effects of the US economic and diplomatic embargo on North Korea, all contributed to a deterioration of North Korea's international standing.

North Korea's domestic and foreign policies, left essentially unchanged, lost correspondence with the main trends in the international system. The preservation of the ossified industrial structures of Juche socialism, and the equally ossified political structure of the Kim Il Sung regime, was both a cause and a consequence of the lack of reform. North Korea's support declined as a consequence of its resistance to reform, even among communist governments.

Therefore, the 1980s were a decade of crisis for North Korea, which was ever more beset with the negative consequences of mounting regime rigidities. This situation culminated in a position of extreme weakness and vulnerability, forcing the regime to make concessions, under duress, to foreign demands. These "capitulations" came in the form of an acceptance of "two Koreas", i.e. dual membership in the United Nations, and the necessity of a gradual opening to the world economy and economic investment from capitalist South Korea.

The "final" outcome of the competition between the rival regimes of divided Korea is a somewhat paradoxical one. Though both regimes joined the United Nations, actually on the basis of South Korea's clear diplomatic superiority over North Korea, this did not fundamentally transform the situation on the Korean peninsula itself. The regime rigidities of North Korea continue to threaten instability in Korea and have made reunification a more unlikely short-term prospect than may otherwise have been the case.

Indeed, North Korea's isolation has become a matter of international concern given its nuclear development policies, for instance. North Korea's nuclear policies may be interpreted as a sign of desperation in which it attempted to compensate for its loss of

capability in diplomacy and its declining international support.

South Korea clearly emerged the "victor" in the long international competition, but has been unable to force North Korea to change, thus marring and limiting the realisation of its victory. The key to South Korea's long term success was a combination of its greater adaptability to the main trends of international change in the 1980s and early 1990s, and its pragmatic abandonment of dogmatic ideological positions in foreign policy, combined with much more favourable international trends during this period than in the previous period.

The final conclusion to be drawn from this case study is that ideology itself was not the determining factor of change or of the outcome of competition. Rather, it was in fact the ability to transcend ideology in pursuit of more objective and pragmatic goals that created greater flexibility and thus adaptability to international change. The competition was not therefore, simply "capitalism" versus "communism". Secondly, the case illustrates, once again, the fluidity of the international system, and the opportunities for upward ascendance, as well as downward descent, depending on how well a state manoeuvres. It also confirms the underlying salience of economic policy in determining change in international standing, and eventually even in status.

REFERENCES

Introduction

1. Akehurst, Michael Barton, 1992, A Modern Introduction to International Law, London, Harper Collins Academic; N.Y. Routledge.

Chapter One

1. Higgott, Richard, 1991, "Toward a Nonhegemonic IPE: An Antipodean Perspective", p. 97, in Craig N. Murphy and Roger Tooze, eds, The New International Political Economy, Boulder, Lynne Reinner Publishers.

2. Wight, Martin, 1977, Systems of States, ed. Hedley Bull, London: Leicester University Press in association with the London School of Economics.

3. IBID, p.43.

4. Bull, Hedley, 1977, The Anarchical Society, London: Macmillan.

5. Bull, Hedley and Adam Watson, 1984, eds.,The Expansion of International Society, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

6. Bull and Watson, 1984, op. cit., p.1.

7.Gills, B.K. 1989, "International Relations Theory and the Processes of World History: Three Approaches" in Hugh Dyer and Leon Mangasarian, editors, International Relations: The State of the Art, London: Macmillan, p.108.

8. Bull and Watson, 1984, op. cit., pp. 6-7.

9. B.K. Gills, 1989, op. cit., p.110.

10. Bull and Watson, 1984, op. cit., pp. 7-8.

11. Modelski, George 1987, Long Cycles in World Politics, London: Macmillan; Modelski, George and W.R.Thompson, 1988, Sea Power in Global Politics 1494-1993, London: Macmillan.

12. Gills, B.K., 1989, op. cit., p. 115.

13. Modelski, George, 1978, "The Long Cycle of Global Politics and the Nation-State" Comparative Studies in Society and History 20, No. 2, pp.214-238.

14. Kennedy, Paul, 1987, The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers, New York: Random House.

15. Keohane, Robert O., 1984, After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy, Princeton: Princeton University Press, p. 32.

16. See: Krasner, Stephen D., 1983, ed. International Regimes, Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press; Keohane, Robert O., 1984, op. cit.

17. Kindleberger, Charles, 1973, The World in Depression, 1929-1939, Berkeley: University

of California Press.

18. Kindleberger, Charles 1973, op. cit.; Krasner, Stephen D., 1976, "State Power and the Structure of International Trade", World Politics, 28 (April) ,pp. 317-47; Gilpin, Robert, 1975, U.S. Power and the Multinational Corporation, New York, Basic Books.

19. Lipson, Charles, 1983 "The transformation of trade: the sources and effects of regime change", in Stephen D. Krasner (ed.), International Regimes, Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, pp.233-271, p.253.

20. Krasner, 1976, op. cit., p.322.

21. IBID, p. 318.

22. Robert Gilpin, 1987, The Political Economy of International Relations, Princeton: Princeton University Press, p. 84, p.96.

23. IBID, p.105.

24. IBID, p.111.

25. See: Gills, B.K. 1989, op. cit., p. 112.

26. See: Toynbee, Arnold, 1931, Survey of International Affairs, London: Oxford University Press.

27. Gilpin, Robert, 1981, War and Change in World Politics, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, pp. 43-44, pp. 182-183.

28. IBID.

29. Amin, Samir, 1976, Unequal Development: An Essay on the Social Formations of Peripheral Capitalism, New York: Monthly Review Press, p. 18.

30. Keohane, Robert O., 1984, op. cit.

31. Strange, Susan, 1988, States and Markets: An Introduction to International Political Economy, London: Pinter Publishers.

32. IBID, p. 28.

33. Wallerstein, Immanuel, 1974, The Modern World System, Vol. I, New York and London: Academic Press; Wallerstein, Immanuel, 1980, The Modern World System, Vol. II., New York and London: Academic Press; Wallerstein, Immanuel, 1988, The Modern World System, Vol. III., New York and London: Academic Press.

34. Wallerstein, Immanuel, 1980, op. cit., pp. 38-39.

35. Wallerstein, Immanuel, 1983 "The Three Instances of Hegemony in the History of the Capitalist World-Economy", International Journal of Comparative Sociology 24, no. 1-2, pp.100-108, p. 104.

36. Wallerstein, Immanuel, 1983, op. cit., p. 101; Goldstein, Joshua, 1988, Long Cycles: Prosperity and War in the Modern Age, New Haven and London: Yale University Press., p.

137.

37. Frank, Andre Gunder, 1978, World Accumulation 1492-1789, New York: Monthly Review Press; London: Macmillan.

38. Gills, B.K., 1987, "Historical materialism and international relations theory" Millennium: Journal of International Studies 16 (2) (summer), pp. 265-72; Gills, B.K., 1989, op. cit.; Gills, B.K. and Andre Gunder Frank, 1990, "The Cumulation of Accumulation: Theses and Research Agenda for Five Thousand Years of World System History", Dialectical Anthropology, Vol. 5 (1), pp. 19-42; Gills, B.K. and A.G. Frank, 1991, "5000 Years of World System History: The Cumulation of Accumulation", in: Chase Dunn, C. and T. D. Hall, eds., Core/Periphery Relations in Precapitalist Worlds, Boulder, Westview Press, pp. 67-112; Gills, B.K. and A.G. Frank, 1992, op. cit., Andre Gunder Frank and Barry K. Gills, 1993, eds., The World System: Five Hundred years or Five Thousand?, London and New York: Routledge.

39. Gills, B.K. and A. G. Frank, 1992, "World system cycles, crises and hegemonial shifts 1700 BC to 1700 AD", Review, XV (4)pp. 621-716. p. 625.

40. Mann, Michael, 1986, The Sources of Social Power Vol. I: A History of Power from the Beginning to AD 1760, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

41. See: Stephen Gill, ed., 1993, Gramsci, Historical Materialism, and International Relations, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

42. Waltz, Kenneth, 1979, Theory of International Politics, Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.

43. Keohane, Robert O. and Joseph S. Nye, 1977, Power and Interdependence: World Politics in Transition, Boston: Little, Brown.

44. IBID.

45. Cox, Robert, 1993, "Gramsci, hegemony and international relations: an essay in method", in Gill, Stephen, ed. 1993, op. cit., p. 52.

46. IBID, p. 56.

47. IBID.

48. Gill, Stephen and David Law, 1988, The Global Political Economy: Perspectives, Problems and Policies, New York and London: Harvester, Wheatsheaf, p. 78.

49. IBID.

50. Cox, Robert, 1993, op. cit., p. 57.

51. Gill, Stephen and David Law, 1988, op. cit., p. 78.

52. IBID.

53. IBID.

54. Cox, Robert, 1993, op. cit., p. 59.
55. IBID.
56. Amsden, Alice, 1989, Asia's Next Giant, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
57. Gill, Stephen, 1991, " Reflections on Global Order and Sociohistorical Time", Alternatives (16) pp. 275-314.
58. McNeill, William H., 1983, The Pursuit of Power: Technology, Armed Force and Society since AD 1000, Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
59. Sen, Gautam, 1983, The Military Origins of Industrialisation and International Trade Rivalry, New York: St. Martins.
60. Gilpin, Robert, 1987, op. cit., p. 112.
61. IBID.
62. Skocpol, Theda 1979 States and Social Revolutions: A Comparative Analysis of France, Russia, and China, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
63. Gouvrevitch, Peter A. 1978 "The Second Image Reversed: The International Sources of Domestic Politics", International Organisation, Vol. 32, pp.929-52.
64. Cox, Robert, 1993, op. cit.
65. Gills, B.K., 1989, op. cit.
66. Gills, B.K., 1993, "Hegemonic Transitions in the World System", in Frank, A.G. and Barry K. Gills, eds., op. cit., pp. 115-140.
67. See: Toynbee, Arnold, 1946, A Study of History, Oxford: Oxford University Press; Eisenstadt, S.N. 1963 The Political Systems of Empires, Glencoe: Illinois: The Free Press.; Wight, Martin, 1977, op. cit.; Gilpin, Robert, 1981 op. cit.,; Doyle, Michael, 1986, Empires, Ithaca: Cornell University Press; Mann, M. 1986, op. cit.,; Modelski, G. 1987, op. cit.,; Modelski and Thompson 1988, op. cit.,; Kennedy, Paul, 1987. op. cit.
68. Gills, Barry, 1993, "The Hegemonic Transition in East Asia: A Historical Perspective", in Gill, Stephen, ed., op. cit., p.187; Gills, Barry and R. Palan, 1994, "Introduction", in R. Palan and Barry Gills, eds., Transcending the State/Global Divide: A neo-structuralist agenda in international relations, Boulder: Lynne Rienner.
69. Abu-Lughod, Janet, 1989, Before European Hegemony. The World System A.D. 1250-1350., New York: Oxford University Press.
70. IBID.
71. Cox, Robert, 1993, op. cit., p. 62.
72. IBID.
73. IBID.

74. IBID, p.61.
75. IBID, p. 60.
76. Gilpin, Robert, 1987, op. cit., pp. 104-105.
77. Gills, Barry, 1993, in Gill, Stephen, ed., 1993, op. cit.
78. Bull, Hedley, 1977, op. cit., p. 21.
79. Abu-Lughod, Janet, 1989, op. cit., and Gills, Barry, 1993 op. cit.
80. Cox, Robert, 1993, op. cit., p. 64.
81. Benjamin, Roger and Raymond Duvall, 1985, "The capitalist state in context", in The Democratic State, Benjamin, Roger and Stephen L. Elkin, eds., University of Kansas.
82. Taylor, Peter J., 1994, "States in World-Systems Analysis: Massaging a Creative Tension", in Palan, R. and Barry Gills, eds., 1994, op. cit. p. 143.
83. Taylor, Peter, 1994, op. cit., pp. 167-168, p. 170.
84. Gilpin, Robert, 1987, op. cit., p. 113 (citing Sen, 1984, pp. 157-158).
85. Goldstein, Joshua, 1988, op. cit.; Chase Dunn, 1989, op. cit.
86. Walker, R.B.J., 1993, Inside/outside: international relations as political theory, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
87. Mann, Michael, 1986, op. cit.; Wilkinson, David, 1989, "The Future of the World State", paper presented at the 29th annual meeting of the International Studies Association, London, March 28-April 1.; Gills, Barry, 1993, in S. Gill, ed. 1993, op. cit.

Chapter Two

1. M. Frederick Nelson, Korea and the Old Orders in Eastern Asia, Baton Rouge, Louisiana State University Press, 1946, p. XIV. See also: Chun, Hae-jong, "Sino-Korean Tributary Relations in the Ch'ing Period", in John K. Fairbank, ed. The Chinese World Order, New York, 1968; Chun, Hae-jong, "China and Korea - An Introduction to the Sino-Korean Relations", Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities 29 (Dec. 1968): pp. 1-15; and Hugh D. Walker, "Traditional Sino-Korean Diplomatic Relations: A Realistic Historical Appraisal", Monumenta Serica 24 (1955) pp. 155-169.
2. Frederick Foo Chien, The Opening of Korea: A Study of Chinese Diplomacy 1876-1885, The Shoe String Press, Inc., 1967.
3. James Palais, Politics and Policy in Traditional Korea, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1975.
4. Martina Deuchler, Confucian Gentlemen and barbarian Envoys: The Opening of Korea, 1875-1885, Seattle, University of Washington Press, 1977.

5. IBID.
6. Frederick Foo Chien, op. cit., pp. 26-39.
7. IBID.
8. Mary C. Wright, "The Adaptability of Ch'ing Diplomacy: The Case of Korea", The Journal of Asian Studies VXII May 1958. See also: Martina Deuchler, op. cit., pp. 47-50.
9. Martina Deuchler, op. cit., pp. 49-50.
10. Frederick Foo Chien, op. cit., p. 63.
11. In K. Huang, The Korean Reform Movement of the 1880s: A Study of Transition in Inter-Asian Relations, Cambridge, Mass., Schenkman Publishing Co., 1978, pp. 67-129.
12. IBID, pp. 169-184.
13. Robert W. Swartout Jr., Mandarins, Gunboats, and Power Politics: Owen Nickerson Denny and the International Rivalries in Korea, Honolulu, Asian Studies Program, University of Hawaii, The University Press of Hawaii, 1980.
14. Dalchoong Kim, "Korea's Quest for Reform and Diplomacy in the 1880s: With Special Reference to Chinese Intervention and Controls". Unpublished PhD dissertation, Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, 1972.
15. Andrew C. Nahm, Korea Under Japanese Colonial Rule: Studies of the Policy and Techniques of Japanese Colonialism, Center for Korean Studies, Western Michigan University, 1973, p. 25; See: Martina Deuchler, op. cit.
16. Hilary Conroy, The Japanese Seizure of Korea: 1868-1910: A Study of Realism and Idealism in International Relations, Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1960, pp.206-220.
17. See: George Alexander Lensen, Balance of Intrigue: International Rivalry in Korea and Manchuria, 1884-1899 (2 Vol.), Tallahassee, University Presses of Florida, 1982, pp. 118-354; and Hilary Conroy, op. cit., pp. 221-324.
18. See: George Alexander Lensen, op. cit., pp. 229-255.
19. IBID, Vol II. p. 479. See pp. 488-513.
20. George Alexander Lensen, op. cit., p. 604; p. 614.
21. Ian Nish, Origins of the Russo-Japanese War, London, N.Y.: Longman, 1985, pp. 44-48; and G.A. Lensen, op. cit., pp. 796-813.
22. G.A. Lensen, op. cit., p. 807.
23. Dae-yul Ku, Korea Under Colonialism: The March First Movement and Anglo-Japanese Relations, Seoul, Korea, Published for the Royal Asiatic Society, Korea Branch, 1985, p. 4.

24. See: Ian Nish, Origins of The Russo-Japanese War, op. cit.
25. Peter Lowe, The Origins of the Korean War, London, Longman, 1986, p. 9.
26. Soo Sung Cho, Korea in World Politics 1940-1950: An Evaluation of American Responsibility, Berkely, University of California Press, 1967. p. 18.
27. Foreign Relations of the U.S. (FRUS) Diplomatic Papers, Conference at Cairo and Teheran, 1943, US Department of State, Washington, D.C., 1961, pp. 399-404.
28. FRUS 1943 Vol. III, p. 1096.
29. FRUS: Diplomatic Papers, Conferences at Malta and Yalta, 1945, US Department of State, Washington, D.C., p. 770.
30. FRUS: Diplomatic Papers, Conferences at Malta and Yalta, 1945, op. cit., p. 358; See also: Gar Alperovitz, Atomic Diplomacy: Hiroshima and Potsdam: the use of the atomic bomb and the American confrontation with Soviet Power, N.Y., Penguin, 1985.
31. Mark Paul, "Diplomacy Delayed: The Atomic Bomb and the Division of Korea, 1945", in Bruce Cumings, editor, Child of Conflict: American-Korean Relations 1943-1953, London, 1983, pp. 67-91.
32. Soo Sung Cho, op. cit., pp. 54-56.
33. Peter Lowe, op. cit., p. 13.
34. Gregory Henderson, Korea: The Politics of the Vortex, Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1968, p. 119.
35. Jounghwon Alexander Kim, Divided Korea: The Politics of Development 1945-1972, London, Harvard University Press, 1975, pp. 51-52.
36. E. Grant Meade, American Military Government in Korea, London, King's Crown Press, Columbia University, N.Y. , 1951, p. 8.
37. Bruce Cumings, The Origins of the Korean War. Liberation and the Emergence of Separate Regimes 1945-47, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1981, p. 96.
38. IBID, See also: Gabriel and Joyce Kolko, The Limits of Power: The world and the United States foreign policy, 1945-1954., N.Y., Harper and Row, 1972.
39. Robert Scalapino and Chong Sik Lee, Communism in Korea, Part I, Berkeley, University of California Press, 1972, p. 270 (citing General Arnold's 10 October, 1945 statement, from XXIV Corps G-2 Summary No. 41, June 23, 1946)
40. US Department of State Bulletin, XCII, p. 435 (cited in E. Grant Meade, op. cit., p. 60.)
41. J.A. Kim, op. cit., p. 58.
42. E. Grant Meade, op. cit., p. 76.
43. FRUS 1945(6), US Department of State, Washington, D.C., 1961, p. 1070 (Benninghoff

to Acheson, 10 October, 1945 - cited in Peter Lowe, op. cit., p. 23)

44. Soo Sung Cho, op. cit., p. 72.

45. IBID, pp. 72-73.

46. Young Whan Kihl, Politics and Policy in Divided Korea: Regimes in Contest, Boulder, Colorado, Westview Press, 1984, p. 28.

47. Max Beloff, Soviet Policy in the Far East, 1944-1951, London, Oxford University Press, 1953, p. 159.

48. Soo Sung Cho, op. cit., p. 89.

49. Bruce Cumings, op. cit. (Vol. I), pp. 386, pp. 391-393; Nam Joo Hong, America's Commitment to South Korea: The First Decade of the Nixon Doctrine, London, Cambridge University Press, 1986, pp. 18-19.

50. Young Whan Kihl, op. cit., p. 34; Glenn Paige, The Korean Peoples Democratic Republic, Stanford, California, Hoover Institute, 1966, p. 29; See: US Department of State, Study on Techniques of Communist Takeover in Korea, cited in Chung O. Chin, Pyongyang Between Peking and Moscow, University of Alabama Press, 1978, p. 8.

51. David J. Dallin, Soviet Russia and the Far East, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1948, p. 286.

52. Scalapino and Lee, op. cit., p. 246.

53. IBID.

54. IBID.

55. Bruce Cumings, op. cit. (Vol I), p. 429, p. 433.

56. Charles Dobbs, The Unwanted Symbol: American Foreign Policy, The Cold war, and Korea, 1945-1950, Kent, Ohio, The Kent State University Press, 1981, pp. 36-37; See also: E. Grant Meade, op. cit., p. 65; and Won-sul Lee, "The impact of US Occupation Policy on the Socio-Political Structure of South Korea, 1945-48", Unpublished PhD dissertation, Western Reserve University, 1961.

57. Bruce Cumings, op. cit., p. 442.

58. James Irving Matray, The Reluctant Crusade: American Foreign Policy in Korea 1941-1950, Honolulu, University of Hawaii Press, 1985, pp. 54-55.

59. Bruce Cumings, op. cit., p. 437.

60. Bruce Cumings, op. cit., p. 217; Soo Sung Cho, op. cit, pp. 101-104; Max beloff, op. cit., p. 159; See also: James F. Byrnes, Speaking Frankly, New York, 1947, p. 111; "The Soviet Union and the Korean Question: Documents", London, 1950; and F.I. Shabshina, "Korea After the Second World War", in: History of the Korean Peoples' Struggle for Liberation, Tokyo, 1952, pp. 368-70 (cited in Soo Sung Cho, op. cit., p. 103).

61. Soo Sung Cho, op. cit., p. 122.
62. Bruce Cumings, op. cit., p. 226.
63. Carl Berger, The Korea Knot: A Military and Political History, Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1957, p. 67.
64. James Irving Matray, op. cit., pp. 74-75; p. 83.
65. Bruce Cumings, op. cit.
66. James Irving Matray, op. cit., p. 96.
67. Soo Sung Cho, op. cit., p. 126.
68. Bruce Cumings, op. cit., p. 406.
69. James Irving Matray, op. cit., p. 104.
70. Charles M. Dobbs, op. cit., pp. 100-101.
71. Soo Sung Cho, op. cit., p. 150.
72. Robert Cox, "Gramsci, hegemony and international relations: an essay in method", in Stephen Gill, ed., Gramsci, Historical materialism, and International Relations, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1993, p. 62
73. James Irving Matray, op. cit. pp. 120-121; Charles M. Dobbs, op. cit., pp. 106-107.
74. Hak Joon Kim, The Unification Policy of South and North Korea, op. cit., p. 60; See: UN Official Record, Second Session, General Assembly Resolution 112 (11), pp. 16-18; UN Document A/C 1/229.
75. Charles M. Dobbs, op. cit., p. 127.
76. UN Document A/AC 18/SR.9.
77. Foreign Broadcast Information Service (FBIS), daily Report, Korea, May 3, 1948, "Joint Communique of the North-South Political Consultative Conference".
78. J.A. Kim, op. cit., p. 81.
79. One study of the diplomacy of the Korean War has recently been published. See: Bailey, Sydney D., 1992, The Korean Armistice, London, Macmillan.
80. Tae Han Min Kuk Woekyo Nyun Pyo 1948-61, (Republic of Korea Diplomatic Annals), Seoul, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, p. 173,
81. UN Doc. S/1501, Resolution Adopted by the UN Security Council, 25 June, 1950; Foreign Relations of the United States, (FRUS) 1950, Vol. VII. pp. 155-56.
82. FRUS, 1950, Vol. VII, pp. 148-154, "Intelligence

Estimate Prepared by the Estimates group, Office of Intelligence Research, Dept. of State, Washington, D.C, 25 June, 1950; Tae Han Min Kuk Woekyo Nyun Pyo 1948-61, op. cit., p. 173.

83. See: Paige, Glenn, 1968, The Korean Decision June 24-30, 1950 , N.Y. The Free Press.

84. See: FRUS, 1950, Vol. VII., pp. 202-203; UN Document S/1507.

85. UN Document S/1511. This resolution passed 7 to 1 (Yugoslavia), with Egypt and India abstaining (USSR absent).

86. On 25 June, 1950, Yugoslavia submitted a draft to the Security Council to invite North Korea to "state its case before the Security Council". This draft was defeated 6 to 1 (Yugoslavia), with Egypt, India, and Norway abstaining (USSR absent). The second attempt (UN Doc. S/1509) was defeated 7 to 1 (Yugoslavia) with Egypt and India abstaining (USSR absent).

87. Current Digest of the Soviet Press, (CDSP), 1950 Vol. II, No. 27, pp. 5-6, "Chou En-Lai's Message to Members of Security Council" (July 6, 1950).

88. CDSP, 1950 Vol. II No. 29, p. 2, "Comment and Reports on the Korean War: On Civil War and Agression, Editorial: Ignorance in Questions of International Law" (Izvestia, Aug. 6, 1950, p. 1; Pravda, August 7, 1950); No. 31, pp. 12-13, "On the Definition of Agression", by Professor S. Krylov, Doctor of Law (Izvestia, August 13, 1950, p.3); and No. 29, pp. 5-6, "Against Distortion of the Basic Principles of International Law", by F. Kozhevnikov, Professor of International Law, Moscow State University.

89. See: Whiting, Allen S., 1960, China Crosses the Yalu: The Decision to Enter the Korean War, N.Y., Macmillan, pp. 58-61; CDSP, 1950 Vol. II, No. 30, p. 7, "International Review: Policy of Peace and Policy of War", by Ya. Viktorov (Pravda, July 24, 1950).

90. UN Document S/1588.

91. CDSP, 1950 Vol. II, No. 28, pp. 16-17, "Intervention under UN Flag" (Pravda, July 10, 1950).

92. FRUS, 1950 Vol. VII, pp. 354-5, "The US Representative at the UN (Austin) to the Secretary of State", N.Y. July 10, 1950.

93. FRUS, 1950 Vol. VII pp. 386-7, "Memorandum by Mr. John Foster Dulles, Consultant to the Secretary of State, to the Director of Policy Planning Staff (Nitze)", Washington, 14 July, 1950.

94. FRUS, 1950, Vol. VII pp. 600-603, "Memorandum Prepared in the Central Intelligence Agency", Washington, August 18, 1950.

Chapter Three

1. Chin O. Chung, Pyongyang Between Peking and Moscow: North Korea's Involvement in the Sino-Soviet Dispute, 1958-1975, Tuscaloosa, Al., University of Alabama Press, 1978.

2. Glenn D. Paige, "North Korea and the Emulation of Russian and Chinese Behaviour" In Communist Strategies in Asia, A. Doak Barnett, ed., N.Y., Praeger, 1963; Glenn Paige and

Dong Jun Lee, "The Post-War Politics of Communist Korea", in Robert Scalapino, ed. North Korea Today, N.Y., Praeger, 1963; and Glenn Paige, The Korean Peoples Democratic Republic, Hoover Institution Studies 11, 1966.

3. For a dissenting view, see: Helen Louise Hunter, "North Korea and the Myth of Equidistance" in Tae-Hwan Kwak, Wayne Patterson, and Edward Olson, eds., The Two Koreas in World Politics, Seoul, Kyungnam University Press, 1983, pp. 195-209.

4. See: Erik Van Ree, "The Limits of Juche: North Korea's Dependence on Soviet Industrial Aid, 1953-76", Journal of Communist Studies, Vol. 5, No. 1, March 1989, pp. 50-73. Ree draws heavily on Russian language sources and on George Ginsburgs, "Soviet Development Grants and Aid to North Korea, 1945-1980" Asia Pacific Community, No. 18, 1982, pp. 42-63. For an earlier reappraisal of self-reliance, see: Aidan Foster-Carter, "North Korea: Development and Self-Reliance, A Critical Appraisal", Bulletin of Concerned Asian Scholars, 9, 1 (Jan.-March) 1977, pp. 45-57. The standard work on the early North Korean economy is: Joseph Sang-hoon Chung, The North Korean Economy: Structure and Development, Stanford, Ca., Hoover Institution Press, 1974. Only one major study upholds the myth of self-reliance: E. Brun and J. Hersh, Socialist Korea: A Case Study in the Strategy of Economic Development, N.Y., Monthly Review Press, 1976.

5. Kim Il Sung, "On Eliminating Dogmatism and Formalism and Establishing Juche in Ideological Work", in Selected Works, Vol.1, Pyongyang, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1971, pp. 582-606.

6. Erik Van Ree, op. cit., p.69.

7. IBID, p. 57.

8. Chosun Choongang Nyun Gam 1954-55, (Diplomatic Yearbook of North Korea) Pyongyang, DPRK.

9. Syng-II Hyun, "Industrialization and Industrialism in a Developing Socialist Country: Convergence Theory and the Case of North Korea", Unpublished Ph.D dissertation, Dept. of Sociology, Utah State University, Logan, Utah, 1982; See : Yoon T. Kuark, "North Korea's Industrial Development During the Post-War Period", in Robert A. Scalapino, editor, North Korea Today, Praeger, N.Y. 1963, pp. 51-64. (citing L.N. Karshinov, Peoples Democratic Republic of Korea, Joint Publications Research Service 15687:3822, Sept. 6, 1960, p. 48.

10. See: Youn-Soo KIm, editor, The Economy of the Korean Democratic Peoples Republic 1945-77, Kiel, German-Korea Studies Group.

11. Syng-II Hyun, op. cit.

12. See: John Gittings, "The War Before Vietnam" in Gavan McCormack and Mark Selden, editors, Korea North and South: The Deepening Crisis, N.Y., Monthly Review Press, 1978.

13. See: US Area Handbook for North Korea, 1969, pp. 289-298, and p. 368; See also: Jon Halliday, "The North Korean Enigma", in Gordon White, Robin Murray, and Christine White, editors, Revolutionary Socialist Development in the Third World, Wheatsheaf Books, 1983, pp. 114-154.

14. Aidan Foster-Carter, "North Korea: Development and Self-Reliance: A Critical Appraisal", in Gavan McCormack and John Gittings, editors, Crisis in Korea, London, 1977, Transnational Institute, Amsterdam (also published as McCormack and Selden, op. cit.)
15. Jon Halliday, "The North Korean Enigma", op. cit., p. 119.
16. See: S.J. Noumoff, "The Struggle for Revolutionary Authenticity: the experience of the DPRK", Journal of Contemporary Asia Quarterly, 9, (1): 27-52, 1979.
17. Erik Van Ree, op. cit, p. 57 citing E.A. Konovalov (1975) and G.V. Gryaznov (1966).
18. Syng-II Hyun, op. cit.
19. Chosun Choongang Nyungam 1955, Pyongyang, DPRK.
20. Erik Van Ree, op. cit., p.68.
21. Han Gil Kim, op. cit., p. 588. See also: Barry Gills, "North Korea and the Crisis of Socialism: The Historical ironies of National Division", Third World Quarterly, Vol. 13, No. 1, pp.107-130.
22. Yoon T. Kuark, op. cit., p. 61, citing JPRS, Economic Report on North Korea, JPRS 1291-N, Feb. 26, 1959, pp. 78-80, translated from Kyongje Konsol, Sept. 1958, pp. 18-23.
23. Yoon T. Kuark, op. cit.
24. Foreign Broadcast Information Service, (FBIS), Daily Report, Nov. 2, 1954, North Korea, FFF 1-4; Daily Report, March 8, 1955, North Korea, FFF 1-3; Daily Report, May 3, 1956, North Korea, FFF 1-3; Daily Report Sept. 23, 1957 North Korea, JJJ 1-8; Daily Report, Feb. 5, 1958, North Korea, JJJ 4-6 (cited in Hak Joon Kim, op. cit, pp. 159-160); See also: Soon Sung Cho, "The Politics of North Korea's Unification Policies, 1950-1965", World Politics, Vol XIX, No. 2 (Jan. 1967).
25. Alvin Rubenstein, Yugoslavia and the Non-aligned World, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1970, pp. 63-63.
26. Chosun Choongang Nyungam 1955, Pyongyang, DPRK.
27. Syng II Hyun, op. cit, Table 19, citing Democratic Korea, Pyongynag, Feb. 18, 1958, Feb. 26, 1960 and March 24, 1961.
28. Chosun Choongang Nyungam 1957, Pyongyang, DPRK, pp. 57-58, p. 61.
29. Sang-Seek Park, "North Korea's Policy Toward the Third World", in Robert A. Scalapino and Yun-Yop Kim, editors, North Korea Today: Startegic and Domestic Issues, Center for Korean Studies, Institute of East Asian Studies, University of California, Berkeley, 1983, pp. 309-330, p. 313 (Park's source is Puk Han ui Woekyo Nyun Pyo (3 vols., North Korea's Foreign Relations, Seoul, Library of the National Assembly, 1974-1980).
30. See: David Kimche, The Afro-Asian Movement: Ideology and Foreign Policy of the Third World, Jerusalem, Israel Universities Press, 1973.

31. Chosun Choongang Nyungam 1958, Pyongyang, DPRK, p. 93.
32. William Blum, The CIA: A Forgotten History, Zed Books, London, 1986, p. 112.
33. Chosun Choongang Nyungam 1961, Pyongyang, DPRK.
34. Robert A. Scalapino, "The Foreign Policy of North Korea", in Robert A. Scalapino, editor, North Korea Today, Praeger, N.Y. 1963, p. 48.
35. Chosun Choongang Nyungam 1961, Pyongyang, DPRK, pp. 59-60.
37. Byung Chul Koh, The Foreign Policy of North Korea, Praeger, N.Y., 1969, p. 170.
38. See: Sung Joo Han, op. cit., Se Jin Kim, op. cit., John Oh, Korea: Democracy on Trial, Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 1968.
39. Byung Chul Koh, op. cit., p. 172.
40. Survey of China Mainland Press, No. 2251 (May 5, 1960), p. 31 , American Consulate General, (editorial of Jen-min Jih-pao , April 29, 1960), cited in Hak Joon Kim, op. cit., p. 175.
41. Tae Han Min Kuk Woekyo Nyun Pyo 1948-61, (The Diplomatic Annals of the Republic of Korea) op. cit., p. 230.
42. IBID.
43. IBID, p. 232.
44. Brun and Hersh, Socialist Korea: A Case Study in the Strategy of Economic Development, London, Monthly Review Press, 1976, p. 103.
45. Tae Han Min Kuk Woekyo Nyun Pyo 1948-61, op. cit., p. 237-238.
46. IBID, pp. 239-240.
47. IBID, pp. 241-242
48. IBID.
49. IBID, pp. 244-245; Department of State Bulletin, July 6, 1953, pp. 13-14.
50. Tae Han Min Kuk Woekyo Nyun Pyo 1948-61, op. cit., p. 246.
51. IBID.
52. IBID, pp. 291-3.
53. On 24 April,1954, the Technical Secretary of the US delegation at Geneva, C. Van Hollen, submitted a memorandum on the US basic position on Korean reunification. Three plans were outlined "which would each meet the US objectives of a non-communist, independent, representative government in Korea". These were: A) Administrative

incorporation of North Korea into the existing ROK (GKD 4/7 April 9); Plan B) Elections in North and South Korea for establishment of a Korean National Government within the ROK constitutional structure (GKD 4/10 April 16); Plan C) All-Korean Elections for Constituent Assembly, New Government and New National Government (GKD 4b March 27). Plan A was the opening position, with B to be presented for negotiation, and C held in reserve in case "The communists show signs of desiring seriously to negotiate the peaceful settlement of the Korean Question." FRUS, 1952-54, Vol. XVI, p.131-39. For Dulles pressure on UN allies see: FRUS, 1952-54, Vol. XVI, pp. 163-64, 165-168, 242-43.

54. FRUS, 1952-54, Vol. XVI., pp. 385-7, "Declaration by the Sixteen, Geneva, June 15, 1954".

55. Tae Han Min Kuk Woekyo Nyunpyo 1948-61, op. cit., pp. 335-337.

56. IBID, pp. 335-337.

57. IBID, p. 360.

58. IBID, pp. 363-375.

59. See: Hak Joon Kim, op. cit, pp. 167-168.

60. FBIS, Daily Report, January 31, 1955, South Korea, GGG 1-2.

61. Hak Joon Kim, op. cit., p. 169, citing: ROK Office of Public Information, Korean Report, Vol. IV: Report from the Cabinet Ministries of the ROK for 1955 (Seoul, 1956)

62. UN Document A/3167.2

63. Hak Joon Kim, op. cit., p. 169.

64. IBID, citing: US Department of State, The Record On Korean Unification, pp. 34-37.

65. Tae Han Min Kuk Woekyo Nyun Pyo 1948-61, op. cit., pp. 454-455.

66. Han Kuk Woekyo Sam Sip Nyun Sa, Seoul, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 1979, p. 226.

67. Sang-Seek Park, "Africa and Korea", Korea and World Affairs, Vol. 6, 1982, p. 402.

68. IBID, p. 403.

69. IBID.

70. Jae-Mahn Suh, "Non-Aligned Movement and South Korea's Foreign Relations", Korea and World Affairs, 1981, p. 231.

71. Han Kuk Woekyo Sam Sip Nyun Sa, Seoul, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 1979.

72. Michael Haas, " The Role of Korea in Asian Regional Organizations", Korea and World Affairs, Vol. 3, No. 3, Fall 1979, p. 356.

73. Han Kuk Woekyo Sam Sip Nyun Sa, op. cit., p.227.

74. **IBID**; See also: Kwang Ho Lee, " A Study of United nations Commission on Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea - International System and International Organization", Unpublished PhD dissertation, Pittsburg, University of Pittsburg, 1974.
75. **Han Kuk Woekyo Sam Sip Nyun Sa**, op. cit.,p. 227.
76. **Tae Han Min Kuk Woekyo Nyun Pyo 1948-61**, op. cit., p. 352.
77. **IBID**.
78. **IBID**, pp. 361-362.
79. **Tae Han Min Kuk Woekyo Nyun Pyo 1948-61**, op. cit., p. 462.
80. Edwin O. Reischauer, **Japan: The Story of a Nation**, London, Duckworth, 1970, p. 267.
81. Gavan McCormack, "Japan and South Korea, 1965-1975: Ten years of 'Normalisation", in McCormack and Selden, op. cit., p. 173.
82. See: Jon Halliday and Gavan McCormack, **Japanese Imperialism Today**, N.Y. 1973; and Herbery Bix, "Regional Integration: Japan and South Korea in America's Asian Policy", **Bulletin of Concerned Asian Scholars**, Nov. 1973.
83. For background on Japanese corporate investment in Korea, see: Chang, Dal-joong, **Economic Control and Political Authoritarianism: The Role of Japanese Corporations in Korean Politics 1965-1979**, Seoul, Sogang University Press, 1985.
84. See: Kim, Kwan Bong, **The Korea-Japan Treaty Crisis and the Instability of the Korean Political System**, N.Y., Praeger, 1971.
85. **Tae Han Min Kuk Woekyo Nyun Pyo 1948-61**, op. cit., pp. 343-344.
86. **IBID**, p. 346.
87. **IBID**, p. 443.
88. **IBID**, p. 445.
89. **IBID**, p. 493.
90. **IBID**, pp. 494-495.
91. **IBID**, p. 500.
92. See: W.D. Reeve, **The Republic of Korea: A Political and Economic Study**, London, Oxford University Press, 1963. See also: Anne Krueger, **The Developmental Role of the Foreign Sector and Aid**, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1979; David Cole and Princeton Lyman, **Korean Development: The Interplay of Politics and Economics**, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1970; Paul Kuznets, **The Korean Economy: Issues and Development**, Berkeley, University of California Press, 1980.
93. See: Barry Gills, "The International Origins of South Korea's Export Orientation", in Ronen P. Palan and Barry Gills, eds., **Transcending the State/Global Divide: A**

Neostructuralist Agenda in International Relations, Boulder and London, Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1994, pp.203-222.

94. Barry Gills, op. cit.; For further discussion of change in the administration, See: Lee, Hahn Been, **Time, Change and Administration**, Honolulu, East-West Center, 1968.

95. UN Document 4077, 29 December, 1958.

96. **IBID.**

Chapter Four

1. On the "second revolution", see: Barry Gills, "North Korea and the crisis of socialism: the historical ironies of national division", **Third World Quarterly**, Vol. 13, No. 1, 1992, pp. 107-130; and Barry Gills, "The Crisis of Socialism in North Korea", in Barry Gills and Shahid Qadir, eds., **Regimes in Crisis: The Post-Soviet Era and the Implications for Development**, London, Zed, 1995.

2. **Chosun Choongang Nyungam 1962** (North Korea Central Diplomatic Yearbook), Pyongyang, Foreign Ministry, p. 142.

3. **IBID.**, p. 214.

4. **Chosun Choongang Nyungam 1965**, Pyongyang, p. 38.

5. **IBID.**, pp. 83-86.

6. **IBID.**, p. 40.

7. During this period there was a leadership contest within the Afro-Asian movement. The DPRK simultaneously endorsed all the contestants.

8. **Chosun Choongang Nyungam 1965**, pp. 34-35.

9. **IBID.**, pp. 89-98.

10. **IBID.**, p. 96.

11. **IBID.**, p. 98.

12. **IBID.**, pp. 87-88.

13. **Chosun Minju Ju-ui Inmin Konghwa Kuk Tae Woe Kwankye Sa (2)**, (Democratic Peoples Republic of Korea Foreign Relations History) 1987, Pyongyang, DPRK, pp. 14-19.

14. **IBID.**, p. 17.

15. Byung Chul Koh, **The Foreign Policy of North Korea**, N.Y., Praeger, 1969, p. 179.

16. **Chosun Choongang Nyungam 1962**, op. cit., pp. 101-102.

17. **IBID.**, p. 164.

18. Chosun Choongang Nyungam 1963, Pyongyang, pp. 102-103.
19. Chosun Choongang Nyungam 1962, op. cit.,p. 137; p.143.
20. IBID, p. 146.
21. Chosun Choongang Nyungam 1963, op. cit., p. 44.
22. Barry Gills, 1992, op. cit.
23. IBID.
24. IBID.
25. Pyongyang Times, June 10, 1965.
26. Pyongyang Times, June 17, 1965, p. 1.
27. IBID.
28. Pyongyang Times, July 15, 1965.
29. Pyongyang Times, January 27, 1966; February 3, 1966; February 10, 1966.
30. Han Gil Kim, Modern History of Korea , Pyongyang, FLPH 1979, p. 424.
31. Pyongyang Times, October 13, 1966.
32. IBID.
33. Byung Chul Koh, op. cit., p. 188.
34. Pyongyang Times, February 15, 1968.
35. Pyongyang Times, May 26, 1966.
36. Chosun Choongang Nyungam 1968, Pyongyang, Foreign Ministry.
37. Pyongyang Times, June 24, 1965. p.7., Among the signatories were the Pan-Africanist Congress, SWAPO, ZANU, the Mozambique National DEMocratic Union, and AAPSO representatives from several Asian countries.
38. Including: ANC, MPLA, SWAPO, ZANU, Mozambique Liberation Front, African Independence Party of Portuguese Guinea and Cape Verde Island.
39. Pyongyang Times, January 11, 1968.
40. Pyongyang Times, July 8, 1965.
41. Pyongyang Times, October 14, 1968.
42. IBID.

43. IBID.
44. Pyongyang Times, May 11, 1970.
45. Pyongyang Times, November 6, 1971.
46. Pyongyang Times, December 20, 1973.
47. Rodong Shinmun, February 19, 1966.
48. Pyongyang Times, September 2, 1965.
49. Chosun Choongang Nyungam 1967, Pyongyang, Foreign Ministry.
50. Chosun Choongang Nyungam 1968, Pyongyang, Foreign Ministry.
51. Pyongyang Times, June 8, 1967.
52. Chosun Choongang Nyungam 1969, Pyongyang, Foreign Ministry.
53. Chosun Chonggang Nyungam 1970, Pyongyang, Foreign Ministry.
54. Pyongyang Times, June 27, 1968.
55. Chosun Choongang Nyungam 1970, op. cit.
56. IBID.
57. Pyongyang Times, April 13, 1970.
58. Pyongyang Times, November 6, 1971.
59. Pyongyang Times, June 10, 1972
60. Han Gil Kim, op. cit., p. 510.
61. IBID, pp. 510-511.
62. IBID, pp. 522-524.
63. See: Ralph Clough, 1987, Embattled Korea: The Rivalry for International Support, Boulder, Co., Westview Press, pp. 274-301.
64. Pyongyang Times, September 1, 1973.
65. Han Gil KIm, op. cit., p. 529.
66. Pyongyang Times, October 12, 1974.
67. Pyongyang Times, July 12, 1975.
68. Chosun Choongang Nyungam 1971, Pyongyang, Foreign Ministry.

69. Pyongyang Times, February 20, 1971.
70. Pyongyang Times, August 12, 1972.
71. Pyongyang Times, September 8, 1974.
72. Pyongyang Times, August 4, 1973.
73. Pyongyang Times, March 22, 1975.
74. Pyongyang Times, November, 1970.
75. Pyongyang Times, May 29, 1971.
76. Pyongyang Times, June 12, 1971.
77. Pyongyang Times, August 5, 1972.
78. Han Gil Kim, op. cit., pp. 526-528.
79. Pyongyang Times, June 2, 1973.
80. Han Gil Kim, op. cit., p. 531; Pyongyang Times, September 15, 1973; and Chosun Minju Ju-ui Inmin Kongwha Kuk Tae Woe Kwankye Sa (2), op. cit., 1987, pp. 124-131.
81. Pyongyang Times, March 16, 1974.
82. Pyongyang Times, April 27, 1974; May 11, 1974, p. 4.
83. IBID.
84. Han Gil Kim, op. cit., p. 555.
85. Pyongyang Times, April 26, 1975.
86. Pyongyang Times, June 21, 1975.
87. Pyongyang Times, September 6, 1975.
88. The Non-aligned Movement Is A Mighty Anti-Imperialist Revolutionary Force of Our Times, Pyongyang, FLPH, 1976, p. 2. (Published originally in the inaugural issue of the Argentine magazine "Guidebook to the Third World", December 16, 1975)
89. IBID.
90. Han Kuk Woekyo Sam Sip Nyun Sa, (Republic of Korea Thirty Year Diplomatic History) ROK Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Seoul 1979, p. 190. See also: Bukhan Taewoe Chongchaek Kipon Charyochip (Collection of Basic Documents on North Korea's Foreign Policy) Vol. 2, Seoul, Dong-A Ilbo, 1976, pp. 581-582.
91. Chosun Choongang Nyungam 1963, op. cit., p. 154.

92. Chongwook Chung "North Korea and the International Community: The Search for Legitimacy in the United Nations and Elsewhere", in Robert A. Scalapino and Hongkoo Lee, editors, North Korea in a Regional and Global Context, Institute of East Asian Studies, University of California, Berkeley, Center for Korean Studies, 1986, pp. 344-370, p. 353.
93. Chosun Minju Ju-ui Inmin Kongwha Kuk Tae Woe Kwankye Sa, op. cit., pp. 124-131.
94. IBID.
95. IBID.
96. Chongwook Chung, op. cit., p. 353.
97. Chosun Minju Ju-ui Inmin Kongwha Kuk Tae Woe Kwankye Sa, op. cit., p. 132.
98. Chosun Choongang Nyungam 1975, Pyongyang, Foreign Ministry, pp. 826-827.
99. Chosun Choongang Nyungam 1976, Pyongyang, Foreign Ministry, pp. 500-501.
100. Han Gil Kim, op. cit., pp. 536-537.
101. Chosun Minju Ju-ui Inmin Kongwha Kuk Tae Woe Kwankye Sa (2), op. cit., pp. 137-138. , See also: Chosun Choongang Nyungam 1976, p. 501.
102. Han Gil Kim, op. cit., p. 537.

Chapter Five

1. See: Han, Sung Joo, The Failure of Democracy in South Korea, University of California Press, Berkeley, 1974.
2. Robert T. Oliver, Syngman Rhee and American Involvement in Korea, 1942-1960: A Personal Narrative, Panmun Book Company, Ltd., Seoul, 1978, p.485; Operation Everready refers to a US contingency plan to remove Rhee, developed under Eisenhower during the Korean War.
3. IBID, p. 486.
4. Han Kuk Woekyo Sam Sip Nyun Sa (Thirty Year Diplomatic History of the Republic of Korea), Foreign Ministry, Seoul, 1979, Chapter Six.
5. Tae Han Min Kuk Woekyo Nyun Pyo 1948-1961 (Republic of Korea Diplomatic Yearbook), Foreign Ministry, Seoul, p. 535; The Liberal party was the political vehicle of Rhee.
6. IBID.
7. IBID, p.536.
8. Tae Han Min Kuk Woekyo Nyun Pyo 1948-1961, op. cit., pp. 549-550.
9. Han, Sung Joo, op cit. p. 92.

10. Hak Joon Kim, The Unification Policy of South and North Korea: A Comparative Study, Seoul, Korea: Seoul National University Press, 1977, p. 179.
11. IBID, p.180.
12. See: Han, Sung Joo, op. cit.
13. Han Kuk Woekyo Sam Sip Nyun Sa, op. cit., Chapter Six.
14. See: Cole and Lyman, op. cit.; and Leroy Jones and SaKong Il, Government, Business, and Entrepreneurship in Economic Development: The Korean Case, Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1980.
15. See: Barry Gills, 1994, op. cit.
16. See: Kwan Bong Kim, The Korea-Japan Treaty Crisis and the Political Instability of the Korean Political System, N.Y., Praeger, 1971.
17. Barry Gills, 1994, op. cit.
18. See: Anne Krueger, The Development of the Foreign Sector and Aid, Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1979.
19. Han Kuk Woekyo Sam Sip Nyun Sa, op. cit., Chapter Six.
20. IBID.
21. Tae Han Min Kuk Woekyo Nyun Pyo 1962, Seoul, Foreign Ministry.
22. Han Kuk Woekyo Sam Sip Nyun Sa, op. cit., Chapter Six.
23. Tae Han Min Kuk Woekyo Nyun Pyo 1962, op. cit.
24. Han Kuk Woekyo Sam Sip Nyun Sa, op.cit., Chapter Six.
25. Tae Han Min Kuk Woekyo Nyun Pyo 1964, Seoul, Foreign Ministry.
26. R.D. McLaurin and Chung-In Moon,"A precarious Balance: Korea and the Middle East", Korea and World Affairs, Vol. 8. No. 2, 1984, pp. 235-264, p. 239; and Han Kuk Woekyo Sam Sip Nyun Sa, op. cit., pp. 182-185.
27. R.D. McLaurin and Chung-In Moon, op. cit., pp. 239-240.
28. Tae Han Min Kuk Woekyo Nyun Pyo 1966, Seoul, Foreign Ministry.
29. Tae Han Min Kuk Woekyo Nyun Pyo 1967, Seoul, Foreign Ministry, p. 171.
30. Tae Han Min Kuk Woekyo Nyun Pyo 1970, Seoul, Foreign Ministry, p. 280.
31. IBID.
32. Tae Han Min Kuk Woekyo Nyun Pyo 1971, Seoul, Foreign Ministry.

33. **IBID.**
34. **IBID.**
35. **Tae Han Min Kuk Woekyo Nyun Pyo 1973**, Seoul, Foreign Ministry, pp. 200-201.
36. **Tae Han Min Kuk Woekyo Nyun Pyo 1972**, Seoul, Foreign Ministry, pp. 227-228.
37. **Han Kuk Woekyo Sam Sip Nyun Sa**, op. cit., Chapter Six.
38. **Tae Han Min Kuk Woekyo Nyun Pyo 1973**, op. cit., p. 290.
39. **Tae Han Min Kuk Woekyo Nyun Pyo 1974**, Seoul, Foreign Ministry, pp. 209-210.
40. **IBID**, pp. 247-249.
41. **Tae Han Min Kuk Woekyo Nyun Pyo 1974**, op. cit.
42. **IBID**, p. 186.
43. **IBID**, p. 181.
44. **IBID**, p. 194.
45. **IBID**, pp. 232-235.
46. **IBID**, pp. 290-292.
47. **Tae Han Min Kuk Woekyo Nyun Pyo 1975**, Seoul, Foreign Ministry, pp. 175-176.
48. **Tae Han Min Kuk Woekyo Nyun Pyo 1970**, op. cit., pp. 378-379.
49. **Tae Han Min Kuk Woekyo Nyun Pyo 1971**, op. cit., p. 166.
50. Interview with former ROK ambassador to Latin America, Seoul, Institute for Foreign Affairs and National Security, 1986.
51. **Tae Han Min Kuk Woekyo Nyun Pyo 1975**, op. cit., pp. 197-198
52. **IBID**, p. 264, pp. 271-272.
53. General Assembly Official Records, 19th Session, Supplement No. 12 (A/5812), UNCURK Report.
54. **Tae Han Min Kuk Woekyo Nyun Pyo 1965**, Seoul, Foreign Ministry, p. 277.
55. **IBID**, pp. 282-285.
56. **Tae Han Min Kuk Woekyo Nyun Pyo 1966**, op. cit., pp.43-48.
57. **IBID**, pp. 52-53.

58. Tae Han Min Kuk Woekyo Nyun Pyo 1966, op. cit., pp. 49-51.
59. See: Kim, Se-jin, "South Korea's Involvement in Vietnam and Its Economic and Political Impact", Asian Survey, 10, 6 (June 1970), pp. 519-532; Han, Sungjoo, "South Korea's Participation in the Vietnam Conflict: An Analysis of the US-Korea Alliance", Orbis 21,4 (Winter 1978), pp. 893-912; and Princeton N. Lyman, "Korea's Involvement in Vietnam", Orbis 12, 2 (Summer 1968), pp. 563-581.
60. Tae Han Min Kuk Woekyo Nyun Pyo 1966, op. cit., pp. 52-53.
61. IBID, pp. 135-136; p. 234.
62. IBID, pp. 103-116.
63. Tae Han Min Kuk Woekyo Nyun Pyo 1967, op. cit., pp. 139-145; pp. 191-204.
64. Tae Han Min Kuk Woekyo Nyun Pyo 1968, Seoul, Foreign Ministry, p. 99.
65. IBID, pp. 218-224.
66. Tae Han Min Kuk Woekyo Nyun Pyo 1969, Seoul, Foreign Ministry, pp. 211-212.
67. IBID, pp. 243-247.
68. IBID, pp. 371-374.
69. Text of the Resolution on National Security of the National Assembly of the R.O.K. adopted on 6 February, 1968.
70. Personal Interview with former US Secretary of State, Dr. Henry Kissinger, London, 1987.
71. Tae Han Min Kuk Woekyo Nyun Pyo 1970, op. cit., p. 280.
72. The official vote was 54% for Park, Chung Hee, and 46% for Kim Dae Jung. The cities went to Kim.
73. Tae Han Min Kuk Woekyo Nyun Pyo 1972, op. cit., pp. 293-298.
74. Tae Han Min Kuk Woekyo Nyun Pyo 1970, op. cit., p. 267.
75. Tae Han Min Kuk Woekyo Nyun Pyo 1971, op. cit., p. 343.
76. IBID.
77. Tae Han Min Kuk Woekyo Nyun Pyo 1970, op. cit., pp. 306-30.
78. Tae Han Min Kuk Woekyo Nyun Pyo 1971, op. cit., p. 132.
79. Tae Han Min Kuk Woekyo Nyun Pyo 1972, op. cit., pp. 220-221
80. Tae Han Min Kuk Woekyo Nyun Pyo 1973, op. cit., pp. 180-184.

81. **IBID.**
82. **Tae Han Min Kuk Woekyo Nyun Pyo 1974**, op. cit., pp. 109-113
83. **Tae Han Min Kuk Woekyo Nyun Pyo 1974**, op. cit., pp. 441-444.
84. **Tae Han Min Kuk Woekyo Nyun Pyo 1975**, op. cit., pp. 265-267.
85. **IBID.**
86. UN Document A/C I/L.268; A/C I/L.272; A/C I/L.273; and UN Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifth Session, Part V, First Committee, p.29.
87. **Tae Han Min Kuk Woekyo Nyun Pyo 1948-1961**, op. cit., pp.589-599.
88. **IBID.**, pp. 558-584.
89. Sang-Seek Park, "Africa and Korea", **Korea and World Affairs**, Vol. 6 1982, pp. 402-417, p. 404. See also: Chong-han Kim, "Korea's Diplomacy Toward Africa", **Orbis**, XI (Fall 1967), pp. 885-896.
90. **IBID.**
91. Interview, Africa Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Seoul, Korea, March, 1986.
92. Park, Sang-Seek, op. cit., p. 406.
93. General Assembly Official Records, 19th Session, Secretary General's Report on the Korean Question, p. 29.
94. **IBID.**
95. Official Records of the General Assembly, 16th Session, Supplement No. 13 (A/4900), Annex IV.
96. Official Records of the General Assembly, 21st Session, Supplement No. 1 (A/6301), p. 37.
97. **IBID.**
98. Official Records of the General Assembly, 22nd Session, Supplement No. 1 (A/6701), p. 43.
99. Official Records of the General assembly , 22nd Session, Supplement No. 12 (A/6712), UNCURK Report, p. 2.
100. **IBID.**, (A/7212) UNCURK Report, pp. 4-5.
101. Official Records of the General Assembly, 23rd Session, First Committee, 1619th Meeting, 25 November, 1968, pp. 2-3.
102. Official Records of the General Assembly, 23rd Session, First Committee, 1620th Meeting, 26 November, 1968, p. 6.

103. Official Records of the General Assembly, 23rd Session, First Committee, 1637th Meeting, 11 December, 1968, pp. 1-4.
104. Official Records of the General Assembly, 23rd Session, 1621st Meeting, 26 November, 1968, p. 5.
105. IBID.
106. Official Records of the General Assembly, 23rd Session, 1622th Meeting, 27 November, 1968, p. 7.
107. IBID.
108. IBID.
109. Official Records of the General Assembly, 23rd Session, First Committee, 1642nd Meeting, 16 December, 1968, pp. 9-10.
110. Official Records of the General Assembly, 24th Session, First Committee, 1672nd Meeting, 30 October, 1969, p. 18.
111. Official Records of the General Assembly, 25th Session, Supplement No. 1 (A/8001), Report of the Secretary General on the Work of the Organization, 16 June, 1969 - 15 June, 1970, p. 63.
112. Official Records of the General Assembly, 25th Session, First Committee, 1747th meeting, 30 October, 1970.
113. Official Records of the General Assembly, 26th Session, Supplement No. 1 (A/8401)
114. Tae Han Min Kuk Woekyo Nyun Pyo 1972, op. cit., pp. 229-230.
115. IBID, pp. 267-268.
116. Tae Han Min Kuk Woekyo Nyun Pyo 1973, op. cit., pp. 213-214.
117. IBID.
118. Official Records of the General Assembly, 28th Session, 2181st Plenary Meeting, 28 November, 1973 (A/PV.2181)
119. IBID.
120. Tae Han Min Kuk Woekyo Nyun Pyo 1973, op. cit., pp. 260-270.
121. Tae Han Min Kuk Woekyo Nyun Pyo 1974, op. cit., pp. 307-309.
122. IBID, pp. 342-343.
123. IBID, pp. 355-359.
124. IBID, pp. 371-384.

125. **IBID**, p. 410.
126. **IBID**, p. 412.
127. **IBID**.
128. **IBID**, p. 410.
129. **IBID**, pp. 445-456.
130. **IBID**, pp. 468-469.
131. **IBID**, pp. 470-471.
132. **Official Records of the General Assembly , 29th Session, Plenary Meetings Verbatim Records of the 2297th to 2325th and 2350th meetings, 25 November- 18 December 1974, and 16th September, 1975.**
133. **IBID**.
134. **IBID**.
135. **IBID**, pp. 1522-1523.
136. **Tae Han Min Kuk Woekyo Nyun Pyo 1975**, op. cit., pp. 208-209.
137. **IBID**, pp. 208-209.
138. **IBID**, pp. 290-291.
139. **IBID**, pp. 296-297.
140. **See: Koh, Byung Chul, "The Battle Without Victors: The Korean Question in the 30th Session of the UN General Assembly", Journal of Korean Affairs, 5, 4 (January 1976) pp.43-63.**
141. **Tae Han Min Kuk Woekyo Nyun Pyo 1975**, op. cit., pp. 314-315.
142. **IBID**.
143. **IBID**.
144. **IBID**, pp. 323-324.

Chapter Six

1. Gilpin, Robert, 1987, op. cit.; Keohane, Robert O., 1984, op. cit.
2. Keohane, Robert O. and Jopseph Nye, 1977, **Power and Interdependence: World Politics in Transition**, Boston, Little Brown.

3. Wallerstein, Immanuel, 1979, The Capitalist World Economy, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press; Frank, A.G., 1980, Crisis in the World Economy, N.Y., Holmes and Meier; Goldstein, Joshua, 1988, Long Cycles: Prosperity and War in the Modern Age, New Haven and London, Yale University Press; Chase-Dunn, Christopher, 1989, Global Formation: Structures of the World Economy, Oxford, Basil Blackwell.
4. Gill, Stephen and David Law, 1988, op. cit.; Gill, Stephen, 1993, op. cit.; Overbeek, Henk and Kees Van der Pijl, (eds) 1994, Restructuring Hegemony, London, Routledge.
5. Halliday, Fred, 1983, The Making of the Second Cold War, London, Verso; Fred Halliday, 1987, Beyond Irangate: The Reagan Doctrine and the Third World, Amsterdam, Transnational Institute.
6. Murphy, Craig and Enrico Augelli, 1988, America's Quest for supremacy and the Third World: A Gramscian Analysis, London, Pinter Publishers.
7. See: George, Susan, 1988, A Fate Worse than Debt, Harmondsworth, Penguin Books; Frank, A.G., 1981, Crisis in the Third World, N.Y., Holmes and Meier Publishers.
8. See: Nester, William R., 1990, Japan's Growing Power Over East Asia and the World Economy: Ends and Means, London, Macmillan.
9. Kim Il Sung, The Non-aligned Movement is a Mighty Anti-imperialist Revolutionary Force of Our Times, Pyongyang, FLP, 1975 (December).
10. "On Removing the Danger of War and maintaining and Consolidating Peace in Korea and Accelerating Independent and Peaceful Reunification of Korea", Draft Resolution submitted to the 31st UNGA, 16 August, 1976.
11. Clough, Ralph, 1987, op. cit.
12. IBID.
13. Barry K. Gills, "Third World Solidarity", unpublished M.A. thesis, Dept. of Politics, University of Hawaii, August, 1983.
14. Chosun Choongang Nyungam 1979, Pyongyang, Foreign Ministry.
15. Charles Armstrong, "South Korea's Northern Policy", Pacific Review, 3 (1), 1990.
16. Choue, Inwon, "The Politics of Industrial Restructuring: South Korea's Turn Toward Export-Led Heavy and Chemical Industrialization 1961-74", Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1988.
17. "T-K" originated in Taegu city, Kyongsang province, and among classmates of the Korean Military Academy.
18. See: Chang, Dal-Joong, 1985, Economic Control and Political Authoritarianism: The Role of Japanese Corporations in Korean Politics 1965-1979, Seoul, Sogang University Press.
19. Barry Gills, "Korean capitalism and democracy" in Barry Gills, Joel Rocamora, and Richard Wilson, editors, Low Intensity Democracy: Political Power in the New World

Order, London, Pluto Press, (October) 1993. pp. 226-257. See also: Frederic Deyo, Beneath the Miracle: Labour subordination in the new Asian industrialism, Berkeley, University of California Press, 1989; George Ogle South Korea: Dissent Within the Economic Miracle, London: Zed, 1990; Martin Harts-Landberg, The Rush to Development: Economic Change and Political Struggle in South Korea, N.Y., Monthly Review Press, 1993.

20. See: Nam Koon Woo, The North Korean Communist Leadership: 1945-1965; a study of factionalism and political consolidation, University of Alabama Press, 1974; Robert Scalapino and Chong-sik Lee Communism in Korea, Berkeley, California, University of California Press, 1972; Barry Gills, 1992, op. cit.

21. Shinn, Rinn-sup, "North Korea in 1981: First Year for De Facto Successor Kim Jong Il", Asian Survey 22, 1 (Jan.,1982) pp. 99-106.

22. See: The Pyongyang Times, October, 1983- October 1984.

23. Personal Interview with the Director of the South America Division of the ROK Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Seoul, 28 May, 1986. (not to be quoted by name)

24. IBID.

25. North and South Korea emerged as major arms exporters from 1979-82 onwards. Sales were estimated at \$2 billion for the ROK, and \$1.8 billion for the DPRK during this period. Arms sales became a major source of foreign exchange for the DPRK. DPRK arms sales to Iran alone in 1982 are estimated at \$470 million. See: Stephen Goose, "The Military Situation on the Korean Peninsula", in John Sullivan and Roberta Foss (eds), 1987, Two Koreas-One Future?, Lanham, Md., University Press of America, pp. 55-94.

26. IBID.

27. IBID.

28. IBID.

29. IBID.

30. IBID.

31. IBID.

32. IBID.

33. IBID.

34. IBID.

35. Personal Interview with the Director of the East Africa Division of the ROK Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Seoul, May 1986. (Not to be quoted by name)

36. IBID.

37. IBID.

38. **IBID.**

39. **IBID.**

40. **IBID.**

41. **Personal Interview with a former ambassador of the ROK to Kenya (1982-1985), and Swaziland, Botswana, Lesotho and Mauritius, in Seoul May, 1986.**

42. **IBID.**

43. **IBID.**

44. **IBID.**

45. **IBID.**

46. **IBID.**

47. **IBID.**

48. **Personal Interview with Lee, Suk-Jo, the Director of the Maghreb Division of the ROK Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Seoul, May, 1986.**

49. **IBID.**

50. **IBID.**

51. **IBID.**

52. **IBID.**

53. **IBID.**

54. **IBID.**

55. **IBID.**

56. **Personal Interview with the Director of the West Africa Division of the ROK Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Seoul, September, 1986. (not to be quoted by name)**

57. **IBID.**

58. **IBID.**

59. **Personal Interview in the Southeast Asia Division of the ROK Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Seoul, September 9, 1986.**

60. **IBID.**

61. **IBID.**

62. **Personal Interview in the Southwest Asia division of the ROK Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Seoul, September 9, 1986.**

63. IBID.
64. IBID.
65. IBID.
66. IBID.
67. Rodong Shinmun, (The Workers Daily), 22 December, 1989.
68. Gills, Barry, 1992, op. cit.
69. The Peoples Korea, 17 March, 1990.
70. IBID.
71. Joan Robinson, "Korean Miracle", Monthly Review, Vol. XVI:9, January, 1965, pp. 541-549.
72. Scalapino and Lee, 1972, op. cit.
73. Andre Gunder Frank, "The Socialist Countries in the World Economy: The East-South Dimension", in Brigitte H. Schultz and William W. Hansen, eds., The Socialist Bloc and the Third World. The Political Economy of East-South Relations, London, Westview Press, 1989. See also: Andre Gunder Frank, "Long Live Transideological Enterprise! Socialist Economics in the Capitalist International Division of Labour", Review, I, Summer, 1977.
74. Far Eastern Economic Review, 6 June, 1975, "North Korea: Deeper in Debt", p. 52; Koh, Byung Chul, "North Korea 1976: Under Stress", Asian Survey, 17, 1 (Jan., 1977) pp. 61-70.
75. Koh, Byung Chul, 1977, op. cit.
76. Teruo Komaki, "North Korea Inches Toward Economic Liberalization", Japan Review of International Affairs, Summer, 1992, pp. 155-174.
77. See: Kim, Jong Il, "On Building Up the Revolutionary Ranks and Further Accelerating Socialist Construction"; "On Further Improving Part Ideological Work"; and "On Further Enhancing the Role of the Party Organizations of the Central Authorities", 1989, Pyongyang, FLPH.
78. Far Eastern Economic Review, 19 January, 1989, pp. 27-28.
79. The Peoples Korea, various dates, 1989-90, citing official DPRK statements.
80. Far Eastern Economic Review, 10 October, 1991, p. 75.
81. BBC Summary of World Broadcasts, FE/WO164 A/10, No. 72, January 1991; FE/WO174 A/6, No. 39, April 1991; FE/WO178 A/8 No. 99, 8 May, 1991; FE/WO180 A/12, No. 87-90, 22 May, 1991.

82. Teruo Komaki, 1992, op. cit.
83. IBID, pp. 162-165.
84. Andrew Mack, "The Nuclear Crisis on the Korean Peninsula", Asian Survey, Vol. XXXIII, No. 4 April 1993, pp. 339-359, p. 348.
85. The Guardian, 20 August, 1993, citing: The Bank of Korea, Seoul, ROK; The Guardian, 25 August, 1993.
86. BBC Summary of World Broadcasts, FE/WO196 A/7, 11 Sept., 1991; Far Eastern Economic Review, 10 October, 1991, p. 75.
87. Far Eastern Economic Review, 10 October, 1991, p. 75.
88. BBC Summary of World Broadcasts, FE/WO183 A/7, No. 55, 12 June, 1991.
89. Charles Armstrong, "South Korea's "Northern Policy", Pacific Review, Vol. 3, No. 1, 1990.
90. Far Eastern Economic Review, 3 September, 1992, p. 8.
91. Far Eastern Economic Review, 8 October, 1992, p. 7.
92. Andrew Mack, 1993, op. cit.
93. For a full discussion of the Nuclear Crisis in Korea, See: Barry Gills, Feb., 1995, Prospects for Peace and Cooperation in Northeast Asia: The Korean Conflict, London, Royal Institute for the Study of Conflict and Terrorism.
94. IBID.
95. Far Eastern Economic Review, 3 June, 1993, pp. 12-13.
96. See: South-North Dialogue in Korea, Intercultural Society of Korea, Seoul, Korea, February, 1991.
97. Personal Interview with Kim, Joong-Jae, East Europe Division II, ROK Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 24 August, 1990, Seoul, ROK.
98. Personal Interview with John S. Lee, ROK Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 24 August, 1990, Seoul, ROK.
99. Interview with Kim, Joong-Jae, op. cit.
100. IBID.
101. IBID.
102. Personal Interview with Wi, Sang-Rak, East European Division I, ROK Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 18 August, 1990, Seoul, ROK.

103. IBID.

104. IBID.

105. IBID.

106. IBID.

107. Personal Interview with Cho, Il Hwan, ROK Ministry of Foreign Affairs, August, 1990, Seoul, ROK.

108. IBID.

109. IBID.

110. Personal Interview with Shin, Hyung Kun, Northeast Asia Division II, 24 August, 1990, ROK Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Seoul, ROK.

111. Personal Interview, Institute for Social Sciences, Beijing, Peoples Republic of China, September, 1986.

112. Personal Interview with Lee, Hahn Been, Director of the International Private Economic Council, August, 1990, Seoul, ROK.

113. Personal Interview with Shin, Hyung Kun, op. cit.

114. Personal Interview with Wi, Sang Rak, op. cit.

115. Personal Interview with Lee, Kyu Hyung, United Nations Relations Division, 21 August, 1990, ROK Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Seoul, ROK.

116. IBID.

117. IBID.

118. IBID.

119. Personal Interview with Shim, Yoon-Jo, 1 August, 1990, ROK Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Seoul, ROK.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Documentary Sources: Korean Language

Buk Han ui Woekyo Nyun Pyo (3 vols., North Korea's Foreign Relations, Seoul, Library of the National Assembly, 1974-1980).

Buk Han Taewoe Chongchaek Kipon Charyochip, (Collection of Basic Documents on North Korea's Foreign Policy) Vol. 2, Seoul, Dong-A Ilbo, 1976.

Chosun Choongang Nyungam, 1948-1980, (North Korea Central Diplomatic Annual) Pyongyang, Chosun Choongang Tongsin Sa, DPRK.

Chosun Minju Ju-ui Inmin Konghwa Kuk Tae Woe Kwankye Sa (2), (Democratic Peoples Republic of Korea Foreign Relations History) 1987, Pyongyang, DPRK.

Han Kuk Woekyo Sam Sip Nyun Sa (Thirty Year Diplomatic History of the Republic of Korea), Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Seoul, ROK, 1979.

Tae Han Min Kuk Woekyo Nyun Pyo, 1948-1985, (The Republic of Korea Diplomatic Annual), Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Seoul, ROK.

Primary Documentary Sources: English Language

Department of State Bulletin, US Department of State, Washington, D.C.

Foreign Relations of the United States, (FRUS), Department of State, Washington, D.C., United States Government Printing Office.

FRUS: Diplomatic Papers, Conference at Cairo and Teheran, 1943, Department of State, Washington, D.C., USGPO, 1961.

FRUS 1943 Vol. III, Department of State, Washington, D.C, USGPO.

FRUS: Diplomatic Papers, Conferences at Malta and Yalta, 1945, Department of State, Washington, D.C., USGPO.

FRUS 1950 Vol. VII, Department of State, Washington D.C., USGPO.

FRUS 1952-54 Vol. XVI, Department of State, Washington, D.C., USGPO.

Kim Il Sung, Selected Works, 7 vols., Pyongyang, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1971-1979.

Kim Il Sung, 1975, The Non-aligned Movement is a Mighty Anti-imperialist Revolutionary Force of Our Times, Pyongyang, FLPH.

Kim Il Sung, The Non-aligned Movement Is A Mighty Anti-Imperialist Revolutionary Force of Our Times, Pyongyang, FLPH, 1976.

Kim Il Sung, "On Eliminating Dogmatism and Formalism and Establishing Juche in Ideological Work", in Selected Works, Vol.1, Pyongyang, FLPH, 1971, pp. 582-606.

Kim, Jong Il, 1982, On the Juche Idea, Pyongyang, FLPH.

Kim, Jong Il, 1989, "On Building Up the Revolutionary Ranks and Further Accelerating Socialist Construction"; "On Further Improving Part Ideological Work"; and "On Further Enhancing the Role of the Party Organizations of the Central Authorities", Pyongyang, FLPH.

UN Documents

Official Records of the General Assembly, 5th Session, Part V, First Committee.

Official Records of the General Assembly, 16th Session, Supplement No. 13 (A/4900), Annex IV.

Official Records of the General Assembly, 19th Session, Supplement No. 12 (A/5812), UNCURK Report.

Official Records of the General Assembly, 19th Session, Secretary General's Report on the Korean Question.

Official Records of the General Assembly, 21st Session, Supplement No. 1 (A/6301).

Official Records of the General Assembly, 22nd Session, Supplement No. 1 (A/6701).

Official Records of the General Assembly, 22nd Session, Supplement No. 12 (A/6712), UNCURK Report.

Official Records of the General Assembly, 23rd Session, First Committee, 1619th Meeting, 25 November, 1968.

Official Records of the General Assembly, 23rd Session, First Committee, 1620th Meeting, 26 November, 1968.

Official Records of the General Assembly, 23rd Session, 1621st Meeting, 26 November, 1968.

Official Records of the General Assembly, 23rd Session, 1622th Meeting, 27 November, 1968.

Official Records of the General Assembly, 23rd Session, First Committee, 1637th Meeting, 11 December, 1968.

Official Records of the General Assembly, 23rd Session, First Committee, 1642nd Meeting, 16 December, 1968.

Official Records of the General Assembly, 24th Session, First Committee, 1672nd Meeting, 30 October, 1969.

Official Records of the General Assembly, 25th Session, Supplement No. 1 (A/8001), Report

of the Secretary General on the Work of the Organization, 16 June, 1969 - 15 June, 1970.

Official Records of the General Assembly, 25th Session, First Committee, 1747th meeting, 30 October, 1970.

Official Records of the General Assembly, 26th Session, Supplement No. 1 (A/8401).

Official Records of the General Assembly, 28th Session, 2181st Plenary Meeting, 28 November, 1973 (A/PV.2181)

Official Records of the General Assembly, (A/7212) UNCURK Report.

Official Records of the General Assembly , 29th Session, Plenary Meetings Verbatim Records of the 2297th to 2325th and 2350th meetings, 25 November- 18 December 1974, and 16th September, 1975.

UN Official Record, Second Session, General Assembly Resolution 112 (11).

UN Document 4077

UN Document S/1501

UN Document S/1507

UN Document S/1509

UN Document S/1511

UN Document S/1588

UN Document A/3167.2

UN Document A/C I/L.268

UN Document A/C I/L.272

UN Document A/C I/L.273

UN Document A/C 1/229

UN Document A/AC 18/SR.9.

"On Removing the Danger of War and maintaining and Consolidating Peace in Korea and Accelerating Independent and Peaceful Reunification of Korea", Draft Resolution submitted to the 31st UNGA, 16 August, 1976.

Text of the Resolution on National Security of the National Assembly of the R.O.K. adopted on 6 February, 1968.

The Soviet Union and the Korean Question: Documents, London, 1950.

US Department of State, 1961, North Korea: A Case Study in the Techniques of Takeover, Washington, D.C. US Government Printing Office.

INTERVIEWS:

Africa Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Seoul, Korea, March, 1986.

The Director of the East Africa Division of the ROK Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Seoul, May 1986. (Not to be quoted by name)

The Director of the South America Division of the ROK Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Seoul, 28 May, 1986. (not to be quoted by name)

A former ambassador of the ROK to Kenya (1982-1985), and Swaziland, Botswana, Lesotho and Mauritius, Institute for Foreign Affairs and National Security, Seoul, ROK, May, 1986.

Lee, Suk-Jo, the Director of the Maghreb Division of the ROK Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Seoul, May, 1986.

The Director of the West Africa Division of the ROK Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Seoul, September, 1986. (not to be quoted by name)

The Southeast Asia Division of the ROK Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Seoul, 9 September, 1986.

Institute for Social Sciences, Beijing, Peoples Republic of China, September, 1986.

A former ROK ambassador to Latin America, Seoul, Institute for Foreign Affairs and National Security, September, 1986.

The Southwest Asia division of the ROK Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Seoul, September 9, 1986.

Dr. Henry Kissinger, former US Secretary of State, London, 1987.

Kim, Joong-Jae, East Europe Division II, ROK Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 24 August, 1990, Seoul, ROK.

John S. Lee, ROK Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 24 August, 1990, Seoul, ROK.

Wi, Sang-Rak, East European Division I, ROK Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 18 August, 1990, Seoul, ROK.

Cho, Il Hwan, ROK Ministry of Foreign Affairs, August, 1990, Seoul, ROK.

Shin, Hyung Kun, Northeast Asia Division II, 24 August, 1990, ROK Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Seoul, ROK.

Lee, Hahn Been, Director of the International Private Economic Council, August, 1990, Seoul, ROK.

Lee, Kyu Hyung, United Nations Relations Division, 21 August, 1990, ROK Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Seoul, ROK.

Shim, Yoon-Jo, 1 August, 1990, ROK Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Seoul, ROK.

UNPUBLISHED DISSERTATIONS:

Choue, Inwon, "The Politics of Industrial Restructuring: South Korea's Turn Toward Export-Led Heavy and Chemical Industrialization 1961-74", University of Pennsylvania, 1988.

Gills, Barry K., "Third World Solidarity", M.A. thesis, Dept. of Politics, University of Hawaii, August, 1983.

Kim, Dalchoong, 1972, "Korea's Quest for Reform and Diplomacy in the 1880s: With Special Reference to Chinese Intervention and Controls", Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy.

Lee, Kwang Ho, " A Study of United Nations Commission on Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea - International System and International Organization", Pittsburg, University of Pittsburg, 1974.

Lee, Won-sul, "The impact of US Occupation Policy on the Socio-Political Structure of South Korea, 1945-48", Western Reserve University, 1961.

Syng-II Hyun, "Industrialization and Industrialism in a Developing Socialist Country: Convergence Theory and the Case of North Korea", Utah State University, Logan, Utah, 1982.

NEWSPAPERS AND PERIODICALS:

BBC Summary of World Broadcasts, London

Current Digest of the Soviet Press, Moscow

Far Eastern Economic Review, Hong Kong

The Financial Times, London.

Foreign Broadcast Information Service, Arlington, Va.

The Guardian, London.

International Herald Tribune, New York.

Joint Publications Research Service

Korea Herald, Seoul.

Korea Times, Seoul

Minju Chosun, Pyongyang

North Korea Report, Seoul.

The Peoples' Korea, 1988-1995 (All Issues), Tokyo.

The Pyongyang Times, 1965-1985 (All Issues), Pyongyang.

Rodong Shinmun (Labour News), Pyongyang.

Vantage Point, Seoul.

BOOKS and ARTICLES

Abu-Lughod, Janet, 1989, Before European Hegemony. The World System A.D. 1250-1350., New York: Oxford University Press.

Akehurst, Michael Barton, 1992, A Modern Introduction to International Law, London, Harper Collins Academic; N.Y. Routledge.

Alperovitz, Gar, 1985, Atomic Diplomacy: Hiroshima and Potsdam: the use of the atomic bomb and the American confrontation with Soviet Power, N.Y., Penguin.

Amin, Samir, 1976, Unequal Development: An Essay on the Social Formations of Peripheral Capitalism, New York: Monthly Review Press.

Amsden, Alice, 1989, Asia's Next Giant, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

An, Tai-Sung, 1983, North Korea: A Political handbook, Wilmington, Delaware, Scholarly Resources Inc.

Mack, Andrew, "The Nuclear Crisis on the Korean Peninsula", Asian Survey, Vol. XXXIII, No. 4 April 1993, pp. 339-359.

Armstrong, Charles, "South Korea's Northern Policy", Pacific Review, 3 (1), 1990.

Bailey, Sydney D., 1992, The Korean Armistice, London, Macmillan.

Baldwin, Frank, "America's Rented Troops: South Koreans in Vietnam", Bulletin of Concerned Asian Scholars, Vol. VII., No. 4 (October-December) 1975.

Beloff, Max, 1953, Soviet Policy in the Far East, 1944-1951, London, Oxford University Press, 1953.

Benjamin, Roger and Raymond Duvall, 1985, "The capitalist state in context", in The Democratic State, Benjamin, Roger and Stephen L. Elkin, eds., University of Kansas.

Berger, Carl, 1957, The Korea Knot: A Military and Political History, Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press.

Bix, Herbert, "Regional Integration: Japan and South Korea in America's Asian Policy", Bulletin of Concerned Asian Scholars, Nov. 1973.

Blum, William, 1986, The CIA: A Forgotten History, Zed Books, London, 1986, p. 112.

Bradbury, John, "The Sino-Soviet Competition in North Korea", China Quarterly, (April-June) 1961.

Brun, E. and J. Hersh, 1976, Socialist Korea: A Case Study in the Strategy of Economic Development, London, Monthly Review Press.

Bull, Hedley, 1977, The Anarchical Society, London: Macmillan.

Bull, Hedley and Adam Watson, 1984, eds., The Expansion of International Society, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Byrnes, James F., 1947, Speaking Frankly, New York.

Chang, Dal-Joong, 1985, Economic Control and Political Authoritarianism: The Role of Japanese Corporations in Korean Politics 1965-1979, Seoul, Sogang University Press.

Chase-Dunn, Christopher, 1989, Global Formation: Structures of the World Economy, Oxford, Basil Blackwell.

Chien, Frederick Foo, 1967, The Opening of Korea: A Study of Chinese Diplomacy 1876-1885, The Shoe String Press, Inc.

Cho, Soon Sung, "The Politics of North Korea's Unification Policies, 1950-1965", World Politics, Vol XIX, No. 2 (Jan. 1967).

Cho, Soon Sung, 1967, Korea in World Politics 1940-1950: An Evaluation of American Responsibility, Berkeley, University of California Press.

Chun, Hae-jong, "China and Korea - An Introduction to the Sino-Korean Relations", Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities 29 (Dec. 1968): pp. 1-15.

Chun, Hae-jong, "Sino-Korean Tributary Relations in the Ch'ing Period", in John K. Fairbank, ed., 1968, The Chinese World Order, New York.

Chung, Joseph Sang-hoon, 1974, The North Korean Economy: Structure and Development, Stanford, Ca., Hoover Institution Press.

Chung, Chongwook, "North Korea and the International Community: The Search for Legitimacy in the United Nations and Elsewhere", in Robert A. Scalapino and Hongkoo Lee, editors, 1986, North Korea in a Regional and Global Context, Institute of East Asian Studies, University of California, Berkeley, Center for Korean Studies, pp. 344-370.

Chung, Chin O., 1978, Pyongyang Between Peking and Moscow: North Korea's Involvement in the Sino-Soviet Dispute, 1958-1975, Tuscaloosa, Al., University of Alabama Press.

Clough, Ralph, 1987, Embattled Korea: The Rivalry for International Support, Boulder, Co., Westview Press.

Cole, David, and Princeton Lyman, 1970, Korean Development: The Interplay of Politics and Economics, Cambridge, Harvard University Press.

Conroy, Hilary, 1960, The Japanese Seizure of Korea: 1868-1910: A Study of Realism and Idealism in International Relations, Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press.

Cox, Robert, 1993, "Gramsci, hegemony and international relations: an essay in method", in Gill, Stephen, ed. 1993, Gramsci, Historical Materialism and International Relations, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Cox, Robert, "Gramsci, hegemony and international relations: an essay in method", in Stephen Gill, ed., 1993, Gramsci, Historical Materialism, and International Relations, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Cumings, Bruce, "Kim's Korean Communism", Problems of Communism, (March-April) 1974.

Cumings, Bruce, 1981, The Origins of the Korean War, Liberation and the Emergence of Separate Regimes 1945-47, Princeton, N.J., Princeton University Press; 1990, Vol. 2 The Origins of the Korean War: The Roaring of the Cataract 1947-1950.

Dallin, David J., 1948, Soviet Russia and the Far East, New Haven, Yale University Press.

Deuchler, Martina, 1977, Confucian Gentlemen and barbarian Envoys: The Opening of Korea, 1875-1885, Seattle, University of Washington Press.

Deyo, Frederic, 1989, Beneath the Miracle: Labour subordination in the new Asian industrialism, Berkeley, University of California Press.

Dobbs, Charles, 1981, The Unwanted Symbol: American Foreign Policy, The Cold war, and Korea, 1945-1950, Kent, Ohio, The Kent State University Press.

Doyle, Michael, 1986, Empires, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Eisenstadt, S.N. 1963 The Political Systems of Empires, Glencoe: Illinois: The Free Press.

Foster-Carter, Aidan, "North Korea: Development and Self-Reliance: A Critical Appraisal", in Gavan McCormack and John Gittings, editors, 1977, Crisis in Korea, London, Transnational Institute, Amsterdam.

Foster-Carter, Aidan, "North Korea: Development and Self-Reliance, A Critical Appraisal", Bulletin of Concerned Asian Scholars, 9, 1 (Jan.-March) 1977, pp. 45-57.

Frank, A.G., "Long Live Transideological Enterprise! Socialist Economics in the Capitalist International Division of Labour", Review, I, Summer, 1977.

Frank, Andre Gunder, 1978, World Accumulation 1492-1789, New York: Monthly Review Press; London: Macmillan.

Frank, A.G., 1980, Crisis in the World Economy, N.Y., Holmes and Meier.

Frank, A.G., 1981, Crisis in the Third World, N.Y., Holmes and Meier Publishers.

Frank, A.G., "The Socialist Countries in the World Economy: The East-South Dimension", in Brigitte H. Schultz and William W. Hansen, eds., 1989, The Socialist Bloc and the Third World, The Political Economy of East-South Relations, London, Westview Press.

Frank, A.G., and Barry K. Gills, 1993, eds., The World System: Five Hundred years or Five Thousand?, London and New York: Routledge.

George, Susan, 1988, A Fate Worse than Debt, Harmondsworth, Penguin Books;

Gill, Stephen and David Law, 1988, The Global Political Economy: Perspectives, Problems and Policies, New York and London: Harvester, Wheatsheaf.

Gill, Stephen, 1991, "Reflections on Global Order and Sociohistorical Time", Alternatives (16) pp. 275-314.

Gill, Stephen, ed., 1993, Gramsci, Historical Materialism, and International Relations, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Gills, B.K., 1987, "Historical materialism and international relations theory" Millennium: Journal of International Studies 16 (2) (summer), pp. 265-72.

Gills, B.K. 1989, "International Relations Theory and the Processes of World History: Three Approaches" in Hugh Dyer and Leon Mangasarian, editors, International Relations: The State of the Art, London: Macmillan

Gills, Barry, "North Korea and the crisis of socialism: the historical ironies of national division", Third World Quarterly, Vol. 13, No. 1, 1992, pp. 107-130.

Gills, Barry, "North Korea and the Crisis of Socialism: The Historical ironies of National Division", Third World Quarterly, 1992, Vol. 13, No. 1, pp.107-130.

Gills, Barry, 1993, "The Hegemonic Transition in East Asia: A Historical Perspective", in Gill, Stephen, ed., Gramsci, Historical materialism and International Relations, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Gills, B.K., 1993, "Hegemonic Transitions in the World System", in Frank, A.G. and Barry K. Gills, eds., The World System, London, Routledge, pp. 115-140.

Gills, Barry, "Korean capitalism and democracy" in Barry Gills, Joel Rocamora, and Richard Wilson, editors, 1993, Low Intensity Democracy: Political Power in the New World Order, London, Pluto Press, pp. 226-257.

Gills, Barry, "The International Origins of South Korea's Export Orientation", in Ronen P. Palan and Barry Gills, eds., 1994, Transcending the State/Global Divide: A Neostructuralist Agenda in International Relations, Boulder and London, Lynne Rienner Publishers, pp.203-222.

Gills, Barry, "The Crisis of Socialism in North Korea", in Barry Gills and Shahid Qadir, eds., 1995, Regimes in Crisis: The Post-Soviet Era and the Implications for Development, London, Zed.

Gills, Barry, Feb., 1995, Prospects for Peace and Cooperation in Northeast Asia: The Korean Conflict, London, Royal Institute for the Study of Conflict and Terrorism.

Gills, B.K. and Andre Gunder Frank, 1990, "The Cumulation of Accumulation: Theses and Research Agenda for Five Thousand Years of World System History", Dialectical

Anthropology, Vol. 5 (1), pp. 19-42.

Gills, B.K. and A.G. Frank, 1991, "5000 Years of World System History: The Cumulation of Accumulation", in: Chase Dunn, C. and T. D. Hall, eds., Core/Periphery Relations in Precapitalist Worlds, Boulder, Westview Press, pp. 67-112.

Gills, B.K. and A. G. Frank, 1992, "World system cycles, crises and hegemonial shifts 1700 BC to 1700 AD", Review, XV (4) pp. 621-716.

Gills, Barry and R. Palan, 1994, "Introduction", in R. Palan and Barry Gills, eds., Transcending the State/Global Divide: A neo-structuralist agenda in international relations, Boulder: Lynne Rienner.

Gilpin, Robert, 1975, U.S. Power and the Multinational Corporation, New York, Basic Books.

Gilpin, Robert, 1981, War and Change in World Politics, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Gilpin, Robert, 1987, The Political Economy of International Relations, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Ginsburgs, George, "Soviet Development Grants and Aid to North Korea, 1945-1980" Asia Pacific Community, No. 18, 1982, pp. 42-63.

Gittings, John, "The War Before Vietnam" in Gavan McCormack and Mark Selden, editors, 1978, Korea North and South: The Deepening Crisis, N.Y., Monthly Review Press.

Goldstein, Joshua, 1988, Long Cycles: Prosperity and War in the Modern Age, New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Goose, Stephen, "The Military Situation on the Korean Peninsula", in John Sullivan and Roberta Foss (eds), 1987, Two Koreas-One Future?, Lanham, Md., University Press of America, pp. 55-94.

Gouvrevitch, Peter A. 1978 "The Second Image Reversed: The International Sources of Domestic Politics", International Organisation, Vol. 32, pp.929-52.

Grajdanzev, A.J., 1944, Modern Korea, N.Y. The John Day Company.

Haas, Michael, " The Role of Korea in Asian Regional Organizations", Korea and World Affairs, Vol. 3, No. 3, Fall 1979.

Haggard, Stephan, 1990, Pathways from the Periphery: The Politics of Growth in the Newly Industrializing Countries, Ithaca, N.Y. Cornell University Press.

Halliday, Fred, 1983, The Making of the Second Cold War, London, Verso.

Halliday, Fred, 1987, Beyond Irangate: The Reagan Doctrine and the Third World, Amsterdam, Transnational Institute.

Halliday, Jon, and Gavan McCormack, 1973, Japanese Imperialism Today, N.Y., Penguin.

Halliday, Jon, "The North Korean Enigma", in Gordon White, Robin Murray, and Christine White, editors, 1983, Revolutionary Socialist Development in the Third World, Wheatsheaf Books, pp. 114-154.

Han, Sungjoo, 1974, The Failure of Democracy in South Korea, University of California Press, Berkeley.

Han, Sungjoo, "South Korea's Participation in the Vietnam Conflict: An Analysis of the US-Korea Alliance", Orbis 21,4 (Winter 1978), pp. 893-912.

Harts-Landberg, Martin, 1993, The Rush to Development: Economic Change and Political Struggle in South Korea, N.Y., Monthly Review Press.

Henderson, Gregory, 1968, Korea: The Politics of the Vortex, Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press.

Higgott, Richard, 1991, "Toward a Nonhegemonic IPE: An Antipodean Perspective", in Craig N. Murphy and Roger Tooze, eds, The New International Political Economy, Boulder, Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Huang, In K., 1978, The Korean Reform Movement of the 1880s: A Study of Transition in Inter-Asian Relations, Cambridge, Mass., Schenkman Publishing Co.

Hunter, Helen Louise, "North Korea and the Myth of Equidistance" in Tae-Hwan Kwak, Wayne Patterson, and Edward Olson, eds., 1983, The Two Koreas in World Politics, Seoul, Kyungnam University Press, pp. 195-209.

Im, Hyug Baeg, "The Rise of Bureaucratic Authoritarianism in South Korea", World Politics, 39 (2), (Jan.) 1987, pp. 231-257.

Kennedy, Paul, 1987, The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers, New York: Random House.

Keohane, Robert O. and Joseph Nye, 1977, Power and Interdependence: World Politics in Transition, Boston, Little Brown.

Keohane, Robert O., 1984, After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Khrushchev Remembers, 1971, Introduction and commentary by Edward Crankshaw, Translated by Strobe Talbot, N.Y., Bantam Books.

Kihl, Young Whan, 1984, Politics and Policy in Divided Korea: Regimes in Contest, Boulder, Colorado, Westview Press.

Kim, Chong-han, "Korea's Diplomacy Toward Africa", Orbis, XI (Fall 1967), pp. 885-896.

Kim, Hak Joon, 1977, The Unification Policy of South and North Korea: A Comparative Study, Seoul, Korea: Seoul National University Press.

Kim, Hak Joon, "The Rise of Kim Chong-II: Implications for North Korea's Internal and External Policies in the 1980s", Journal of Northeast Asian Studies, 2, 2 (June) 1983.

Kim, Han Gil, 1979, Modern History of Korea, Pyongyang, FLPH.

Kim, Han-Kyo, 1980, Studies on Korea: A Scholars Guide, Honolulu, University of Hawaii Press.

Kim, Il Pyong, 1975, Communist Politics in North Korea, N.Y. Praeger.

Kim, Joungwon Alexander, 1975, Divided Korea: The Politics of Development 1945-1972, London, Harvard University Press.

Kim, Kwan Bong, 1971, The Korea-Japan Treaty Crisis and the Instability of the Korean Political System, N.Y., Praeger.

Kim, Samuel S. "Pyongyang, the Third World, and Global Politics", Korea and World Affairs 3, 4 (Winter) 1979.

Kim, Se-jin, "South Korea's Involvement in Vietnam and Its Economic and Political Impact", Asian Survey, 10, 6 (June 1970), pp. 519-532.

Kim, Young C., "North Korea in 1980: The Son Also Rises", Asian Survey, 21, 1 (Jan.) 1981.

Kim, Young C., "North Korean Foreign Policy", Problems of Communism, (Jan.-Feb.) 1985.

Kim, Youn-Soo, editor, The Economy of the Korean Democratic Peoples Republic 1945-77, 1979, Kiel, German-Korea Studies Group.

Kimche, David, 1973, The Afro-Asian Movement: Ideology and Foreign Policy of the Third World, Jerusalem, Israel Universities Press.

Kindleberger, Charles, 1973, The World in Depression, 1929-1939, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Kiyosaki, Wayne, 1976, North Korea's Foreign Relations: The Politics of Accomodation, 1945-1975, N.Y., Praeger.

Koh, Byung Chul, 1969, The Foreign Policy of North Korea, N.Y., Praeger.

Koh, Byung Chul, "The Battle Without Victors: The Korean Question in the 30th Session of the UN General Assembly", Journal of Korean Affairs, 5, 4 (January 1976) pp.43-63.

Koh, Byung Chul, "North Korea 1976: Under Stress", Asian Survey, 17, 1 (Jan., 1977) pp. 61-70.

Koh, Byung Chul, "North Korea in 1977: Year of 'Readjustment'", Asian Survey 18, 1 (Jan.) 1978.

Koh, Byung Chul, 1984, The Foreign Policy Systems of North and South Korea, Berkeley, University of California Press.

Kolko, Gabriel and Joyce Kolko, 1972, The Limitis of Power: The world and the United States foreign policy, 1945-1954., N.Y., Harper and Row.

Komaki, Teruo, "North Korea Inches Toward Economic Liberalization", Japan Review of International Affairs, Summer, 1992, pp. 155-174.

Krasner, Stephen D., 1976, "State Power and the Structure of International Trade", World Politics, 28 (April), pp. 317-47.

Krasner, Stephen D., 1983, ed. International Regimes, Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.

Krueger, Anne, 1979, The Developmental Role of the Foreign Sector and Aid, Cambridge, Harvard University Press.

Ku, Dae-yul, 1985, Korea Under Colonialism: The March First Movement and Anglo-Japanese Relations, Seoul, Korea, Published for the Royal Asiatic Society, Korea Branch, 1985.

Kuark, Yoon T., "North Korea's Industrial Development During the Post-War Period", in Robert A. Scalapino, editor, 1963, North Korea Today, Praeger, N.Y., pp. 51-64.

Kuznets, Paul, 1980, The Korean Economy: Issues and Development, Berkeley, University of California Press.

Lee, Chong-sik, "The Korean Communists in Yenan", China Quarterly, (April-June) 1963.

Lee, Chong-sik, 1963, The Politics of Korean Nationalism, Berkeley, University of California Press.

Lee, Chong-sik, "Politics in North Korea: Pre-Korean War", China Quarterly, (April-June) 1963.

Lee, Chong-sik, ed., 1977, Materials on Korean Communism: 1945-1947, Honolulu, Center for Korean Studies, University of Hawaii.

Lee, Chong-sik, 1978, The Korean Workers' Party: A Short History, Stanford, Hoover Institution Press.

Lee, Hahn Been, Time, Change and Administration, Honolulu, East-West Center, 1968.

Lensen, George Alexander, 1982, Balance of Intrigue: International Rivalry in Korea and Manchuria, 1884-1899 (2 Vol.), Tallahassee, University Presses of Florida.

Lipson, Charles, 1983 "The transformation of trade: the sources and effects of regime change", in Stephen D. Krasner (ed.), International Regimes, Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, pp.233-271.

Lowe, Peter, 1986, The Origins of the Korean War, London, Longman.

Lyman, Princeton N., "Korea's Involvement in Vietnam", Orbis 12, 2 (Summer 1968), pp. 563-581.

Mann, Michael, 1986, The Sources of Social Power Vol. I: A History of Power from the Beginning to AD 1760, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Matray, James Irving, 1985, The Reluctant Crusade: American Foreign Policy in Korea 1941-1950, Honolulu, University of Hawaii Press.

McCormack, Gavan, "Japan and South Korea, 1965-1975: Ten years of 'Normalisation'", in McCormack and Selden, op. cit.

McLaurin, R.D., and Chung-In Moon, "A precarious Balance: Korea and the Middle East", Korea and World Affairs, Vol. 8. No. 2, 1984, pp. 235-264.

McNeill, William H., 1983, The Pursuit of Power: Technology, Armed Force and Society since AD 1000, Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Meade, E. Grant, 1951, American Military Government in Korea, London, King's Crown Press, N.Y., Columbia University.

Modelski, George, 1978, "The Long Cycle of Global Politics and the Nation-State" Comparative Studies in Society and History 20, No. 2, pp.214-238.

Modelski, George 1987, Long Cycles in World Politics, London: Macmillan; Modelski, George and W.R.Thompson, 1988, Sea Power in Global Politics 1494-1993, London: Macmillan.

Murphy, Craig and Enrico Augelli, 1988, America's Quest for supremacy and the Third World: A Gramscian Analysis, London, Pinter Publishers.

Nahm, Andrew C., 1973, Korea Under Japanese Colonial Rule: Studies of the Policy and Techniques of Japanese Colonialism, Center for Korean Studies, Western Michigan Univeristy.

Nam, Koon Woo, 1974, The North Korean Communist Leadership: 1945-1965; a study of factionalism and political consolidation, University of Alabama Press.

Nam, Joo Hong, 1986, America's Commitment to South Korea: The First Decade of the Nixon Doctrine, London, Cambridge University Press.

Nelson, Frederick M., 1946, Korea and the Old Orders in Eastern Asia, Baton Rouge, Louisiana State University Press.

Nester, William R., 1990, Japan's Growing Power Over East Asia and the World Economy: Ends and Means, London, Macmillan.

Nish, Ian, 1985, Origins of the Russo-Japanese War, London, N.Y.: Longman.

Noumoff, S.J., "The Struggle for Revolutionary Authenticity: the experience of the DPRK", Journal of Contemporary Asia Quarterly, 9, (1): 27-52, 1979.

Ogle, George, 1990, South Korea: Dissent Within the Economic Miracle, London, Zed.

Oh, John Kie-chiang, 1968, Korea: Democracy on Trial, Ithaca, Cornell University Press.

Oliver, Robert T., 1978, Syngman Rhee and American Involvement in Korea, 1942-1960: A Personal Narrative, Panmun Book Company, Ltd., Seoul.

Overbeek, Henk and Kees Van der Pijl, (eds) 1994, Restructuring Hegemony, London, Routledge.

Paige, Glenn D., "North Korea and the Emulation of Russian and Chinese Behaviour", In Communist Strategies in Asia, A. Doak Barnett, ed., 1963, N.Y., Praeger.

Paige, Glenn, and Dong Jun Lee, "The Post-War Politics of Communist Korea", in Robert Scalapino, ed. 1963, North Korea Today, N.Y., Praeger.

Paige, Glenn, 1966, The Korean Peoples Democratic Republic, Stanford, Ca., Hoover Institution Studies 11.

Paige, Glenn, 1968, The Korean Decision June 24-30, 1950, N.Y. The Free Press.

Palais, James, 1975, Politics and Policy in Traditional Korea, Cambridge, Harvard University Press.

Park, Chung Hee, 1962, 1970, Our Nation's Path, Seoul, Hollym Corp.

Park, Jae Kyu, "Foreign Policy of North Korea", Asian Perspective 5, 2 (Fall) 1981.

Park, Sang-Seek, "Africa and Korea", Korea and World Affairs, Vol. 6, 1982, pp. 402-417.

Park, Sang-Seek, "North Korea's Policy Toward the Third World", in Robert A. Scalapino and Yun-Yop Kim, editors, 1983, North Korea Today: Strategic and Domestic Issues, Center for Korean Studies, Institute of East Asian Studies, University of California, Berkeley, pp. 309-330.

Paul, Mark, "Diplomacy Delayed: The Atomic Bomb and the Division of Korea, 1945", in Bruce Cumings, ed. 1983, Child of Conflict: American-Korean Relations 1943-1953, Seattle, Washington, University of Washington Press.

Rees, David, 1964, Korea: The Limited War, London, Macmillan.

Reeve, W.D., 1963, The Republic of Korea: A Political and Economic Study, London, Oxford University Press.

Reischauer, Edwin, O., 1970, Japan: The Story of a Nation, London, Duckworth.

Robinson, Joan, "Korean Miracle", Monthly Review, Vol. XVI:9, January, 1965, pp. 541-549.

Rubenstein, Alvin, 1970, Yugoslavia and the Non-aligned World, Princeton University Press, Princeton, pp. 63-63.

Scalapino, Robert A., "The Foreign Policy of North Korea", in Robert A. Scalapino, editor, 1963, North Korea Today, N.Y., Praeger.

Scalapino, Robert, and Chong-sik Lee, 1972, Communism in Korea, Berkeley, California, University of California Press.

Scalapino, Robert A., and Hongkoo Lee, eds., 1986, North Korea in a Regional and Global Context, Institute of East Asian Studies, University of California, Berkeley, Center for

Korean Studies.

Sen, Gautam, 1983, The Military Origins of Industrialisation and International Trade Rivalry, New York: St. Martins.

Shinn, Rinn-sup, et. al., 1969, Area Handbook for North Korea, Washington, D.C., US Government Printing Office.

Shinn, Rinn-sup, "North Korea in 1981: First Year for De Facto Successor Kim Jong Il", Asian Survey 22, 1 (Jan.,1982) pp. 99-106.

Simmons, Robert, "The Korean Civil War", in Frank Baldwin, ed., 1974, Without Parallel: The American-Korean Relationship Since 1945, N.Y., Pantheon Books.

Simmons, Robert, 1975, The Strained Alliance: Peking, Pyongyang, Moscow, and the Politics of the Korean Civil War, N.Y., The Free Press.

Skocpol, Theda, 1979, States and Social Revolutions: A Comparative Analysis of France, Russia, and China, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

South-North Dialogue in Korea, Intercultural Society of Korea, Seoul, Korea, February, 1991.

Strange, Susan, 1988, States and Markets: An Introduction to International Political Economy, London: Pinter Publishers.

Suh, Dae-Suk, 1967, The Korean Communist Movement 1918-1948, Princeton, Princeton University Press.

Suh, Dae Suk, "North Korea: Emergence of an Elite Group", in Richard F. Starr, ed., 1968, Aspects of Modern Communism, Columbia, S.C., University of South Carolina Press.

Suh, Dae Suk, and Chae-jin Lee, eds., 1976, Political Leadership in Korea, Seattle, University of Washington Press.

Suh, Dae-Suk, 1981, Korean Communism 1945-1980: A Reference Guide to the Political System, Honolulu, University Press of Hawaii.

Suh, Jae-Mahn, "Non-Aligned Movement and South Korea's Foreign Relations", Korea and World Affairs, 1981.

Swartout, Robert W. Jr., 1980, Mandarins, Gunboats, and Power Politics: Owen Nickerson Denny and the International Rivalries in Korea, Asian Studies Program, University of Hawaii, The University Press of Hawaii.

Taylor, Peter J., 1994, " States in World-Systems Analysis: Massaging a Creative Tension", in Palan, R. and Barry Gills, eds., 1994, Transcending the State/Global Divide, Boulder, Lynne Rienner.

Toynbee, Arnold, 1931, Survey of International Affairs, London, Oxford University Press.

Toynbee, Arnold, 1946, A Study of History, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

US Department of State, 1961, A Case Study in the Techniques of Takeover, Washington, D.C., USGPO.

Van Ree, Erik, "The Limits of Juche: North Korea's Dependence on Soviet Industrial Aid, 1953-76", Journal of Communist Studies, Vol. 5, No. 1, March 1989, pp. 50-73.

Walker, Hugh D., "Traditional Sino-Korean Diplomatic Relations: A Realistic Historical Appraisal" , Monumenta Serica 24 (1955) pp. 155-169.

Walker, R.B.J., 1993, Inside/outside: international relations as political theory, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wallerstein, Immanuel, 1979, The Capitalist World Economy, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Wallerstein, Immanuel, 1974, The Modern World System, Vol. I, New York and London: Academic Press.

Wallerstein, Immanuel, 1980, The Modern World System, Vol. II., New York and London: Academic Press.

Wallerstein, Immanuel, 1983 "The Three Instances of Hegemony in the History of the Capitalist World-Economy", International Journal of Comparative Sociology 24, no. 1-2, pp.100-108.

Wallerstein, Immanuel, 1988, The Modern World System, Vol. III., New York and London: Academic Press.

Waltz, Kenneth, 1979, Theory of International Politics, Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.

White, Gordon, "North Korean Chuch'e: The Political Economy of Independence", Bulletin of Concerned Asian Scholars, (April-June) 1975.

Whiting, Allen S., 1960, China Crosses the Yalu: The Decision to Enter the Korean War, N.Y., Macmillan.

Wight, Martin, 1977, Systems of States, ed. Hedley Bull, London: Leicester University Press and the LSE.

Wilkinson, David, 1989, "The Future of the World State", paper presented at the 29th annual meeting of the International Studies Association, London, March 28-April 1.

Wright, Mary C., "The Adaptability of Ch'ing Diplomacy: The Case of Korea", The Journal of Asian Studies VXII May 1958.

Zagoria, Donald S., and Young Kun Kim, "North Korea and the Major Powers", Asian Survey, 15, 12, (Dec.) 1975.