

**SONGUN POLITICS AND
PEACE ON THE
KOREAN PENINSULA**

Songun Politics and Peace on the Korean Peninsula

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PUBLISHING HOUSE
PYONGYANG, KOREA
JUCHE 97 (2008)

CONTENTS

1. SUMMARY OF SONGUN POLITICS	1
1) THE BASIC POLITICAL MODE OF KOREAN-STYLE SOCIALISM.....	1
2) POLITICS BASED ON THE PRINCIPLE OF GIVING PRIORITY TO MILITARY AFFAIRS	5
2. SONGUN POLITICS AND PEACE ON THE KOREAN PENINSULA	12
1) SONGUN POLITICS IS A WAR DETERRENT.....	12
COUNTERMEASURE TO THE US WAR STRATEGY TOWARDS KOREA	12
A POWERFUL MEANS FOR SETTLEMENT OF THE NUCLEAR PROBLEM ON THE KOREAN PENINSULA.....	20
2) PEACE AND REUNIFICATION ON THE KOREAN PENINSULA	28
A BASIC MEANS OF ENSURING PEACE ON THE KOREAN PENINSULA	28
THE POLITICS OF SAFEGUARDING THE WHOLE NATION	34
WITHDRAWAL OF US TROOPS FROM SOUTH KOREA	38
NATIONAL REUNIFICATION	44
3) SAFEGUARDING PEACE IN NORTHEAST ASIA	49

1. SUMMARY OF SONGUN POLITICS

1) THE BASIC POLITICAL MODE OF KOREAN-STYLE SOCIALISM

Songun politics is the basic political mode of socialism in Korea. Its political mode, hitherto unknown, is characterized by safeguarding national sovereignty and the right to its existence and pushing ahead with socialist construction as a whole, by giving priority to military affairs and relying on the People's Army.

The matter of the basic political mode of socialism was raised and dealt with in the preceding revolutionary theories of the working class. A major political mode of socialism propounded by the earlier classics can be said to be proletarian dictatorship geared to democracy for the working masses and dictatorship exercised against hostile elements.

The political mode of proletarian dictatorship played a positive role in the revolutionary struggle of the masses and in socialist construction by the working class when in power. This mode of politics, however, had limitations of the times and history owing to the limitations of the fundamental principles of revolution on which it was based and to the immaturity of its practical experience.

In the formerly socialist countries that had dogmatically applied this theory to the building of socialism there were hectic discussions as to which is more important—dictatorship or democracy. Before and after the 1990s the renegades of

socialism negated the revolutionary core of Marxist-Leninist theories, denied the class character of the political mode of socialism and advocated pure “democracy,” causing socialism to crumble in the long run in these countries.

The modern political history of mankind left a serious lesson in its wake that socialism in a country may crumble unless a correct solution is found to the problem of its basic mode of politics. In order to correctly resolve the problem of the basic political mode of socialism, therefore, it is imperative to get rid of the old concepts and find out a new solution to the problem as suited to the requirements of the new age.

The mode of Songun politics propounded by Kim Jong Il has found a rational solution to this problem in Korea.

Songun politics is the basic political mode of socialism in that, above all, it is the most scientific mode of politics whereby to defend socialism securely.

Defending socialism constitutes the essential aspect of socialist politics, for it is a critical issue bearing upon the destiny of the masses of the people. It poses itself as an urgent matter of greater importance now that the imperialists are stepping up their anti-socialist offensive following the collapse of socialism in several countries.

The United States has been doing its utmost to bring down socialist Korea in all fields of politics, the military and diplomacy.

Following the Gulf War, it has been spearheading an intense military threat and provocations at Korea by mobilizing huge forces of aggression and the latest lethal weaponry, as well as employing nuclear blackmail. In 1993, on the excuse of “suspicious nuclear development,” it demanded “special inspection” of Korea’s nuclear facilities. It openly threatened Korea with “collective sanctions” unless its demand for

“coercive inspection” of the latter’s military installations was accepted. It declared the resumption of the US-south Korea Team Spirit joint military exercises that had been suspended temporarily, and held a large-scale military exercise involving double the number of troops that had been committed during the Caribbean Crisis. In 1998 it made public its Operation Plan-5027, aimed at aggression against Korea, which envisages the mobilization of more than 545 000 US troops and 630 000 south Korean puppet troops, five to seven aircraft carrier battle groups, Stealth bombers, strategic bombers loaded with nuclear weapons, and other advanced equipment and large strike means.

The US policy of isolating and stifling Korea has reached a climax since the advent of the Bush administration in 2001, bringing the situation on the Korean peninsula to the most critical phase in the history of Korea-US confrontation. This notwithstanding, peace still reigns over this land, the fact of which the world community comments is ascribable to Songun politics and Korea’s powerful self-defensive war deterrent provided by it.

Just one example, the pursuit by planes of the Korean Air Force of the US reconnaissance plane RC-135 in March 2003, suffices to prove that the best mode of politics that makes it possible to crush and frustrate the imperialists’ reckless moves for aggression and to defend socialism is Songun politics.

Songun politics is the basic political mode of socialism for the reason that it enables a socialist society to give full play to its essential quality as a genuine people’s society where the masses of the people take up the position of masters of the society and perform their duties as such.

It safeguards socialism, thus rendering the position of the masses as masters of the socialist society secure on the one

hand and enhancing their role as such to the full on the other. Korea, a relatively small land with a rather small population, has been making great headway in its endeavour to attain the ambitious target of building a great, prosperous and powerful nation because it relies on the strength of the army and people who have turned out in this undertaking with a sense of their position and role, strength which is more powerful than the effect of any abundant resources or enormous amounts of foreign capital.

Another reason why Songun politics is the basic political mode of socialism is that it interrelates with other political modes of socialism while at the same time producing a great effect on them.

Songun politics embodies the requirements of benevolent politics and socialist democratic politics exercised in a socialist society while constituting the basic underlying political mode that serves as their prerequisite and guarantee.

Benevolent politics, like Songun politics, is a political mode of socialism, and both of them are closely interrelated with each other. Benevolent politics is, in short, politics of love for and trust in the masses of the people.

Benevolent politics is impossible to pursue unless the people's safety and the security of the socialist motherland are reliably ensured. Failure to thwart the aggression of the imperialists leads to collapse of socialism, bringing the masses of the people subject to exploitation and oppression accompanied by their independence being trampled upon mercilessly. The self-defensive military power made available by Songun politics renders the people and their socialist motherland secure from the aggression of the imperialists. This role of Songun politics provides firm guarantee for the full embodiment of benevolent politics.

In the meantime, Songun politics firmly guarantees the thoroughgoing application of socialist democracy, a basic mode of activities of a socialist state serving the masses of the working people.

In order to apply socialist democracy, it is essential, above all, to firmly defend the socialist state. It is Songun politics that safeguards the state from the aggression of the imperialists. The application of socialist democracy also requires enhancement of the functions and role of socialist power.

With the application of Songun politics in Korea, the functions and role of socialist power have been enhanced, with the result that the state and social system have been strengthened remarkably.

2) POLITICS BASED ON THE PRINCIPLE OF GIVING PRIORITY TO MILITARY AFFAIRS

One of the essential aspects of Songun politics is the resolution of all problems arising in the course of the accomplishment of the socialist cause on the principle of giving priority to military affairs.

What principle should be set and embodied in state policies is a matter of great importance in the conduct of politics. The principle state policies set to adhere to defines the area in which a country should concentrate its force, and has a great impact on the prosperity or ruin of the country concerned.

Success is in store for policies which define the principle correctly reflecting the specific situation and external environment of a given country and accurately embodying it, whereas policies devoid of such a principle are doomed to failure.

One of the essential aspects of Songun politics is its adherence to the principle of giving priority to military affairs, a principle enabling Korea to smash by force of arms any attempts of the United States and its vassal states to bring it down, and to successfully resolve all problems arising in the course of accomplishing socialism.

Embodying the principle of giving priority to military affairs means putting forward military affairs as the most important undertaking of the state, and subordinating all state activities to strengthening the military power. This principle constitutes an essential aspect of Songun politics, for, above all, it places the military on the top of the list in the formulation of state lines and policies.

The military is a wide-ranging concept encompassing all spheres related to national defence, including the army, munitions industry and war. Formulating lines and policies on the basis of giving priority to military affairs means giving precedence to the build-up of the armed forces, defence industry and preparation of combat efficiency for a war over all other matters, and, on this basis, setting the orientation of politics and the ways for its embodiment and putting forward concrete tasks for the purpose.

The validity and viability of the Party and state lines and policies depend on the accuracy of their reflection of the will and demands of the masses of the people.

The principle of giving priority to military affairs enables the Party and the state to accurately reflect in their lines and policies the most fundamental and primary demand of the masses, namely, the aspiration and desire to defend their socio-political independence.

Man, if deprived of his lifeblood as a social being, namely, his socio-political independence, is as good as dead, even

though he may lead an affluent material and economic life. Man's socio-political independence is realized if he maintains his position as the master of state and society; conversely, it comes to be trampled upon mercilessly if he is deprived of his position as master at the hands of foreign or anti-socialist forces. For this reason, the masses of the people follow the road of Songun to fight their enemies who are attempting to encroach upon their right to independence and dignity. The principle of giving priority to military affairs, a principle of regarding military affairs as the top-priority work of the state, reflects the overall demand of the masses of the people for defence of their socio-political independence.

The principle of giving priority to military affairs constitutes an essential aspect of Songun politics also because it sets as its key aim the build-up of the army.

Songun politics regards the build-up of the army as the provision of a firm guarantee for Korea's victory in the cause of socialism, for the following reasons:

First, building up the army as the top concern over all other affairs ensures victory in military confrontation with the imperialists.

The imperialists' high-handed and arbitrary manner is flagrant as never before. The imperialist United States, which has emerged as the sole "superpower" following the end of the Cold War, is now behaving haughtily and arrogantly on the international arena for the sake of its "national interests," in disregard of international organizations, international laws or the fair opinions of the international community. Its extremely high-handed and arbitrary behaviour is expressed in the use of its military might. As clearly shown through its "war against terrorism" following the "9. 11 incident," the United States brought about the brutal disintegration of the Taliban regime in

Afghanistan and the government of Saddam Hussein in Iraq by means of its massive arsenal.

The Bush administration designated Korea as part of the “Axis of Evil” and slung mud at it, calling it an “outpost of tyranny”; it even railed that it would not rule out a pre-emptive nuclear strike against Korea. Subsequently, a series of Korea-targeted nuclear war exercises of the United States and its allied forces have been taking place ceaselessly in and around south Korea, bringing the Korean peninsula to a powder-keg situation. Now that the United States is employing its weapons recklessly, regarding them as a cure-all for its international problems, confrontation with the United States is reduced necessarily to a sharp military confrontation. To win a victory in this confrontation and staunchly defend the destiny of the country and nation and socialism requires the build-up of the might of the People’s Army in every way. The full guarantee for the success of the task of thoroughly preparing the People’s Army politically and ideologically, militarily and technically is made only by Songun politics that sets the build-up of the army as its main task.

Secondly, it enables the army to creditably perform its mission and role as the main force of revolution.

In order to ensure success in socialist politics, it is important to correctly define the hard-core force of society on the one hand and concentrate great efforts on its build-up on the other.

The force that Songun politics holds up as the hard core of society is the People’s Army, and not the working class, as designated by preceding theories. To hold up the army as the pillar of revolution and defend the security of the motherland and the gains of revolution by force of arms, and to build up the subject of revolution and undertake all work of socialist

construction in a militant manner with the army as the hard core—this is the essential characteristic of Songun politics.

Korea's endeavour to hold up the People's Army as the central pillar of society, as the main force of revolution, and strengthen it proceeds from the vital requirements of such essential characteristic of Songun politics.

Finally, it makes it possible to make the defence industry the priority concern in the overall economic construction and pour maximum resources into its development.

Songun politics requires the application of the principle of attaching importance and giving priority to military affairs in economic construction. With deep insight into such requirements, Kim Jong Il put forward a new line on economic construction in the era of Songun, a line of developing the defence industry on a priority basis, while pushing ahead with the development of light industry and agriculture simultaneously.

Developing the defence industry on a priority basis means making it the top concern in overall economic construction, and channelling primary efforts into its development before any other sector.

Making the defence industry the top concern, and pouring maximum resources into its development is the most reasonable mode of politics in that above all it serves as the sure guarantee for the work of building a self-defensive military power.

Owing to the US attempts to squeeze Korea, the Korean peninsula has turned into the most volatile tinderbox with the highest density in the deployment of nuclear weapons and with the highest degree of concentration in the deployment of WMD and hi-tech weapons in the world. Nonetheless, the United States is reluctant to pounce upon Korea as swiftly as it did on

Afghanistan and Iraq, for fear of Korea's self-defensive military power.

The main components of a self-defensive military power are the soldiers and arms. It is clear to all that the numerical strength of servicemen alone cannot be the main factor leading to the defeat of the enemy in a war, a force-to-force confrontation. A key aspect of preparation for battle is the development and production of modern weaponry and its field deployment.

How important the munitions industry is depends on whether it can supply ammunition decisive of victory or not.

During the Second World War, 1 200 tons of ammunition were used for an attack by a corps a day on average, while in present-day warfare it is calculated that about 4 000 tons are used a day. During the fourth war in the Middle East one Syrian division fired some 105 000 shells from 1 500 guns in a matter of 55 minutes during a counterattack against the Israeli army.

During the over 40 days of the Gulf War the United States mobilized 11 times as many planes as it had done in the Pacific War, dropping 88 500 tons of bombs of all kinds, 1.5 times the number of bombs it had dropped during the nine years of the Vietnam War.

The figures above indicate that the primary effort should be channelled into the development of the defence industry for the build-up of self-reliant armed forces.

Enhancing the self-reliance of the defence industry, making it modernized and IT-based at a high level and further increasing investment in it are the important requirements for strengthening self-defensive military capacity. Moreover, now that the United States, by abusing the latest scientific and technological achievements of mankind, has been developing a

variety of hi-tech weaponry one after another with which it has been playing at war as children play games, striking and threatening recalcitrant countries at random, and keeping expanding its armaments to fully ensure its military supremacy to which no competitor can ever offer a challenge, building up munitions industry cannot but become a serious question concerning all countries on this planet in defending their national sovereignty and dignity. Neither a partner nor an ally can remain beyond the tentacles of the US ambition for domination of the whole world. A few years ago the United States openly made an aerial reconnaissance of a member state of NATO. The latter denounced this as an act of encroachment upon its sovereignty, but could do nothing about it for lack of power to counter it. The case is different with Korea.

As mentioned above, on March 1, 2003, there occurred an incident in which an RC-135 US reconnaissance plane made an aerial reconnaissance over the Korean East Sea. Planes of the KPA Air Force immediately scrambled, and approached close to the US plane, a distance at which they could see the enemy's crew, and chased it away. This incident was just one example that proves that a country can hardly safeguard its sovereignty and dignity unless it attaches the utmost importance to its defence industry and increases its investment in it.

Next, it makes it possible to strengthen the overall national power by giving precedence to the development of the defence industry.

Even Korea's enemy has commented that Korea's economy will never crumble so long as its munitions industry is competitive worldwide and the unique defence industry-centred economic structure remains. Korea's reality is clearly indicative of the fact that Songun politics, which directs its primary effort at the defence industry, is the firm guarantee for

upgrading the overall national power of the country.

As explained above, a mode of politics formulating lines and policies with priority given to military affairs, directing main efforts at army build-up and developing the defence industry on a priority basis, Songun politics embodies the principle of giving priority to military affairs as one of its essential aspects.

2. SONGUN POLITICS AND PEACE ON THE KOREAN PENINSULA

1) SONGUN POLITICS IS A WAR DETERRENT

Countermeasure to the US War Strategy towards Korea

A mode of politics geared to defending socialism from the imperialists' vicious challenges, blockade and offensive, Songun politics is characterized as an anti-imperialist strategy, which means a strategy to counter the US hostility towards Korea.

The core of the US hostility towards Korea is the former's war strategy which was checked during the Korean war (June 1950 to July 1953), and later the US bided its time in the shade of the Cold War.

Kiguchi Kenji, a Japanese political commentator, observed that the Cold War was a policy of inflicting damage and confusion on the rival by diplomatic, economic, military and

psychological methods short of war, and that the basic target of the Cold-War policy pursued by the United States was to amend the post-World War II territorial and social situation incongruous with US interests. In other words, it was to hold in check the onward movement of the countries on the road of socialism, overthrow their socialist governments and turn them back to capitalism.

This Cold-War policy was manifested specifically in the form of military and economic pressure.

The US Cold-War policy continues in a new form, though the Cold War ceased as a result of the collapse of socialism in the former Soviet Union and other East European countries. It is now geared to achieving US ambitions by means of actual war rather than by means of long-term military and economic pressure. Living evidence of this is the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, where US high-handedness, arrogance and unilateralism reached their acme.

The US strategy for domination of the world in the 20th century was a Cold-War policy, whereas it is a war policy in the 21st century.

The main target of this war strategy of the United States is Northeast Asia, specifically, Korea. The United States intends to materialize its strategy for domination of the whole of the Korean peninsula at a stroke by means of a war, a strategy that has so far remained unfulfilled due to the East-West Cold War, which lasted for over half a century.

In the late 1980s and into the 1990s socialism collapsed in several countries, and the former Soviet Union went through disintegration, giving rise to dislocation in the balance of political forces and bringing about a complicated situation in the international arena. Occasioned by these upheavals, the Clinton administration mapped out a plan for creating a nuclear

crisis on the Korean peninsula and even making a military strike at Korea, considering that Korea would also disintegrate soon in the whirlpool of the turmoil. In the course of its confrontation with Korea, however, it came to recognize any war with Korea would be disastrous for it, and so was forced to sign the Korea-US Agreed Framework.

The Bush administration that came into office in January 2001 took a different option—to control Korea by means of “force” at any cost.

Following its advent, it has escalated the level of hostility in its policy towards Korea to a critical state, without ever attempting to deal with Korea.

It defined Korea as its “archenemy” and the “enemy of freedom,” asserted that it would “disintegrate” Korea’s socialist system, and nullified the Korea-US Agreed Framework.

In June 2001 Bush published a “Policy Statement on Korea,” in which the United States might use force if Korea rejected the US demand for allowance of nuclear inspection and its suspension of missile launches and reduction of conventional arms, a statement that set confrontation with Korea as the US policy. In his State of the Union Message in January 2002, he designated Korea as part of the “Axis of Evil,” along with Iraq and Iran, and asserted that the objective of the US policy towards Korea was “regime change.”

Even the US administration’s policy makers openly claimed that the current administration should employ all means, even nuclear weapons, to accelerate Korea’s “disintegration,” instead of waiting for it as the previous administration had done.

And the US Defence Department, on Bush’s order for a “nuclear strike plan,” drew up a “Nuclear Posture Review,” in

which it stipulated that the US army may use nuclear weapons when “exigencies” occur on the Korean peninsula, and, in this case, the United States would develop “bunker busters” and thus contract out of the nuclear test ban agreement. In March 2002 the United States formulated a policy of nuclear pre-emptive strike at seven countries, including Korea.

Accordingly, the United States mapped out a plan for a nuclear war against Korea, known as a “contingency plan,” and staged nuclear war exercises such as RSOI (reception, staging, onward movement and integration) and Foal Eagle. In 2003 it deployed F-117 Stealth bombers, F-15E fighters and other hi-tech military equipment, land-based mechanized units and the aircraft carrier *Carl Vinson* to south Korea and its adjacent regions, and has been keeping them on standby.

In October 2002, it sent a presidential envoy to Pyongyang to put forward a “list of items of US concern.” Upon the special envoy’s return home, it cooked up a story of “Pyongyang’s admission of possession of nuclear weapons,” and thus created the second nuclear crisis that might spark a new Korean war.

While stepping up its war preparations full steam, the United States asserted that it would strike Korea’s underground facilities with a “special penetration weapon,” and set about developing such a type of nuclear weapon. It even dispatched a group of experts to both Japan and south Korea to make a detailed survey of Korea’s geological conditions.

The US war moves are now at a critical state, and only the moment to pull the trigger remains undecided.

Now the Korea-US confrontation has assumed the clear character of a war, and only a tug-of-war is going on fiercely between the two in the face of a war.

The United States is now preparing for a showdown with

Korea in a more difficult situation than it was for any of its historical wars with other countries. In fact, it is very worried over the calamity of a possible real war, over the outcome of victory or defeat in the war.

What the United States is anxious about is what the whole world anticipates in unison.

Recently a British defence bulletin carried an article under the headline “A Military Power Capable of Fighting an All-Out War against the United States,” which read as follows: North Korea with the capacity of fighting an all-out war with the United States, the self-proclaimed superpower, cannot be said to be a minor state; few military powers are now capable of countering the enormous military capabilities of the United States; Russia, though diminished in terms of its military power following the disintegration of the Soviet Union, can still be listed as a military power equal in military strength to the United States; China, too, though a little behind Russia in the aspect of military strength, may be capable of fighting the United States; but, in fact both China and Russia are devoid of will for an all-out war with the United States and intentionally avoid such a possibility; north Korea, however, is a military power full of the will to fight an all-out war against the United States; in the light of the will to fight against the United States, north Korea far surpasses both Russia and China, and it is a military power that would dare to engage in an all-out war with the United States if it is subjected to a pre-emptive attack.

As shown clearly in this article, the United States would not dare ignite a war against Korea for fear of the latter’s huge military capabilities and politico-ideological might with which it is determined to defeat the former without fail.

The enormous political and military might that Korea has is nothing but the might of Songun politics.

Songun politics, a countermeasure against the US war strategy vis-a-vis Korea, acts as a deterrent to the US mania for war.

The huge striking power of Songun politics of which the United States is afraid is precisely the might of military power.

Entering the new century, the United States has keyed up its war mania in its own interests, but it dare not unleash a war against Korea for fear of the latter's enormous military capabilities made available by Songun politics.

In the world there are many countries that regard themselves as powers in the military field.

A military power is not characterized only by its military expenditure, the level of its armaments and the number of its soldiers.

The most striking feature of Korea as a military power is that it has a great, brilliant commander in the top position of its national defence.

Traditional military theories analyze the military strength of each country on the basis of the outcome of a war or a battle decided by military and technical preparedness, depending on the number of soldiers and armaments, by military and economic potential, and by military science.

These factors, however, cannot be said to be decisive of the overall military capabilities of a given country, in that they are objective factors that may vary with a given historical period, battle situation or other conditions.

Any army, however well-equipped it may be with modern arms and however great its manpower and material resources, cannot emerge victorious in a war nor safeguard the destiny of its country and nation unless it has an outstanding leader as its supreme commander.

Korea has elected Kim Jong Il to the top position of its

national defence as the successor to President Kim Il Sung, who defeated two imperialist countries, the United States and Japan.

Korea's overall military capacity is strong enough to fight any type of modern war, as a result of Kim Jong Il's Songun politics, his Songun-based revolutionary leadership.

Another feature of Korea as a military power is that it has transformed its revolutionary ranks into an elite force, a strong legion, on the pattern of the People's Army as the model, and established an all-people, all-nation defence system.

Korea holds up the People's Army as the main force of the revolution, as the pillar of the country, and has been inducing all the people to emulate the high sense of revolution, organization and unity on the part of the People's Army and the revolutionary spirit of the soldiers.

Consequently, the unity between the army and the people in ideology and fighting manner based on the revolutionary spirit of the soldiers has been materialized, with the result that the might of single-hearted unity, the political and ideological might, has been strengthened beyond imagination.

Moreover, as a result of establishment of an all-people, all-nation defence system, the whole land of Korea has been rendered impregnable.

All the people have been pushing ahead with the building of a great, prosperous and powerful nation with a rifle in one hand and hammer or sickle in the other.

As far as the reality of Korea is concerned, military commentator Kim Myong Chol, a Korean resident in Japan, compared Korea, in which all the people are armed and the whole land has been turned into an impregnable fortress, to a scorpion, and commented that any provocation against Korea would invite irretrievable ruin.

The next feature of Korea as a military power is that the country relies on its Juche-oriented, self-reliant defence industry.

A self-reliant and modern defence industry constitutes the material foundation and actual source of strength enabling a country to be a military power.

The United States feels conceited over its victories in the wars against Afghanistan and Iraq it fought at the threshold of a new century; however, the two wars, as the world public agrees, were not worthy of the name of real wars.

How poor the state of armaments of the Taliban in Afghanistan had been was known throughout the world. Yet, the United States committed all of its modern arms and equipment to the war against Afghanistan, which is not much more than a patch of desert.

The war on Iraq was unworthy of the name of a real war, either.

The war the United States fought against the Iraqi army was nothing but sham hostilities it fought against cowards and renegades after it had destroyed the means of war of its opponent through sanctions and weapons inspections for more than a decade.

If the United States engages in hostilities against Korea, it will have to endure a war in the real sense of the word. The United States mobilized all of its modern hi-tech armaments for its sham wars. If it decides to fight a real war with Korea, to what extent will it have to mobilize its armaments? Even the United States itself would find it difficult to estimate the extent.

The US newspaper *USA Today*, dated February 27, 2003, made public the following Korean war scenario:

The moment the United States makes a pre-emptive strike

against north Korea's nuclear facilities, the north Korean guns deployed along the demarcation line will start firing 50 000 shells per hour; within a few hours, the defence line of the south Korea-US allied army will be reduced to a shambles; Seoul and its surrounding areas will be submerged in a sea of fire; north Korean paratroops appear in several parts of south Korea's rear; north Korean missiles will hit military installations and key facilities over the whole area of south Korea; two or three weeks after the outbreak of the war there will be over one million casualties and north Korean long-range missiles flying to Japan and the US mainland.

It is a scenario which indicates that a war against Korea will bring only death to the United States.

The military strength provided by Songun politics is precisely a war deterrent vis-a-vis the United States.

A Powerful Means for Settlement of the Nuclear Problem on the Korean Peninsula

As for the nuclear problem on the Korean peninsula, it can be classified into two aspects: The problem of US nuclear weapons deployed in south Korea and Korea's "nuclear issue" about which the world community, including the United States, make much ado.

Songun politics acts as a powerful means for the settlement of the nuclear problem on the Korean peninsula.

Viewed in the light of its origin, Korea's "nuclear issue" stems from the US deployment for a long period of time of numerous nuclear weapons in south Korea.

Failing to hold Asia under control will lead to the loss of the whole world and holding the dagger called "Korea" is the

way to cut the Asian continent into pieces at will—this is the tenet of the US policy towards the Korean peninsula.

Motivated by this tenet, the United States started the Korean war in June 1950, only to sustain a crushing defeat.

Immediately after the Korean war, the United States declared south Korea to be a “theatre of operations” vital to the US strategy for the domination of Asia and the rest of the world, and set nuclear deployment in south Korea as its policy.

The United States had arrived at the conclusion that with such arms as had been employed in the Korean war it could not win in the future military confrontation with Korea.

In February 1957 the United States discussed the matter of arming the US troops in south Korea with nuclear weapons at the US-south Korea military talks, and in July the same year made public its “start of nuclear weaponization” (*Haptong Nyongam*, south Korean Yearbook 1983).

The US policy of making south Korea a US nuclear outpost was ceaselessly supplemented and complemented through the US proclamation in the 1970s of a “frontline defence area” (the area where nuclear weapons are deployed), its formation in the 1980s of the US-Japan-south Korea tripartite military alliance and formulation of the “Air Land Battle” strategy, its adoption in the 1990s of strategy for a revanchist nuclear threat, its conversion in 2000 from a Europe-centred to an Asia-centred policy, and its formulation of a strategy for a pre-emptive nuclear strike.

Following its official announcement on January 29, 1958, of its shipment of nuclear weapons to south Korea, the United States shipped all kinds of nuclear weapons one after another to south Korea, starting with Honest John nuclear missiles and large-calibre nuclear shells. In the mid-1970s, the number of US nuclear weapons deployed in south Korea amounted to over 1 000.

At the threshold of the 1990s, the nuclear armaments of the US troops in south Korea were four times those in the NATO-controlled areas in terms of their deployment density, and 1 000 times those dropped on Hiroshima, Japan, in terms of their explosive power, ranking south Korea first in the world nuclear bases in terms of nuclear concentration as per area of 100 square kilometres.

The US policy of turning south Korea into a nuclear base continued even after the end of the Cold War, reducing the whole land of south Korea, with an area of only 100 000 square kilometres, to the biggest nuclear arsenal in the Far East, full of tactical and strategic nuclear weapons, ground- and air-launched nuclear weapons, nuclear warheads and instruments of nuclear delivery.

The US base in Kunsan, south Korea, has scores of nuclear strategic aircraft and 36 underground nuclear depots containing piles of nuclear bombs for F-4 and F-16 bombers, 203-mm and 155-mm nuclear shells and Lance and Honest John nuclear missile warheads.

Such US nuclear bases are spread over all parts of south Korea, including Uijongbu, Tongduchon, Chunchon, Osan, Taejon, Kwangju, Sachon, Jinhae, Pusan, Ulsan, Taegu, Mt. Thaebaek, Mt. Phalgong and Mt. Tobong.

The US nuclear weapons deployed in south Korea are to be used to bring down Korea and ensure US control of the whole Korean peninsula, and, moreover, pave the way for further US aggression on the Asian continent.

The nuclear armaments of the US troops in south Korea are, in essence, for military aggression to all intents and purposes.

Nevertheless, successive US administrations attempted to disguise the aggressive nature of such weapons as a means of reprisal, as a war deterrent. The current Bush administration,

however, has cast away even such a mask, openly asserting that they are the means for a pre-emptive strike, a means of aggression.

In its 2002 “Nuclear Posture Review,” the United States listed Korea as a target of a nuclear pre-emptive strike, and declared that the United States might deliver a nuclear pre-emptive strike at Korea even if the latter did not possess nuclear weapons and the United States was not subjected to a direct nuclear attack.

By means of its nuclear weapons deployed in south Korea, the United States has constantly made threats of a nuclear offensive against Korea.

The US Korea-targeted nuclear war exercises, to name only the large-scale ones, were staged on more than 10 000 occasions from the 1950s to the 1990s, involving about 20 million troops.

In the light of this historical record, one can understand that Korea’s “nuclear issue” is the outcome of the US strategy for the domination of Korea and its nuclear threat against Korea on the basis of its hegemonic power policy. In spite of this stark reality, however, the world fails to take issue with the US nuclear problem as the focal point of global politics.

Then how did Korea’s “nuclear issue” crop up, a problem about which the United States, Japan and south Korea have been making much ado?

It was raised first by the United States in the early 1990s.

On January 20, 1992, both the north and south of Korea published the “Joint Declaration on Denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula.” As a follow-up, in April the same year the third session of the Ninth DPRK Supreme People’s Assembly approved a proposal for ratification of the nuclear safeguards accord with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA),

thus binding Korea under the obligations of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) into which it entered in December 1985.

Korea signed the NPT in order to remove the US nuclear threat against it, and, more importantly, to find a satisfactory solution to its shortage of electric power by using atomic energy.

Korea entered into the nuclear safeguards accord with the IAEA in early 1992, when socialism in Eastern Europe had completely collapsed due to the disintegration of the Soviet Union at the end of the previous year and when the United States had recently emerged “victorious” in the Gulf War.

The spear of the US military action aimed at establishing a new world order was already aimed at Korea, which was staunchly continuing to maintain socialism.

Iraq’s invasion of Kuwait had provided a good excuse for the US war in the Persian Gulf. Likewise, the United States needed a justification for a military offensive against Korea. Hence, the United States made an issue of Korea’s peaceful nuclear activities, which entailed a graphite-moderated reactor.

Presenting photos taken by a military satellite, the United States asserted that Korea’s nuclear facilities were typical ones for manufacturing nuclear bombs, made up of a research reactor and a re-processing plant, and made a din about “suspicious nuclear development,” accusing Korea of being a “dangerous state” and an “element of instability” threatening the security of Asia.

It manipulated the IAEA into an all-out inspection of Korea’s nuclear facilities from May 1992 under the signboard of the NPT.

During the inspection, some of the undesirable elements within the IAEA asked for a “special inspection” and “surprise

inspection” on the excuse of “inconsistency,” while the United States instigated the IAEA to pass an unreasonable “resolution” calling for a coercive inspection of military objects unrelated to nuclear activities at a session of its Board of Governors.

Timed with the IAEA’s adoption of its unjustifiable “resolution,” the United States resumed the Team Spirit joint military exercise, seriously menacing Korea’s sovereignty and right to existence once again.

In response to the prevailing situation, Korea put itself in a semi-war state to defend its sovereignty and security, and took the step of withdrawing from the NPT on March 12, 1993, in order to safeguard its supreme interests.

Article 10 of the NPT stipulates that a party to the treaty may withdraw from the treaty in the case of special danger to its supreme interests. Therefore, Korea’s decision to withdraw from the NPT was the exercise of its undeniable legal right. Subsequently, the United States was compelled to come to the negotiation table: On June 11, 1993, the DPRK-US Joint Statement was adopted in New York, followed by publication of the DPRK-US Agreed Framework in Geneva on October 21, 1994. Given the situation, Korea unilaterally declared a moratorium on its withdrawal from the NPT for a period it considered necessary. Consequently, the first-round of the nuclear crisis sparked by the United States faded into oblivion.

Korea’s “nuclear issue” came under the public spotlight once again in October 2002, following the election of George W. Bush as US President in 2001. The fuss was kicked up by James Kelly, assistant secretary of the US State Department, on a visit to Pyongyang as the special envoy of the US President in early October 2002. From the outset, Kelly approached Korea with the high-handed superpower attitude of the United States, claiming that he had come to Pyongyang not to talk or

negotiate with Korea but to put forward a “list of items of US concern,” and presenting a unilateral demand of the United States with regard to a new “nuclear issue.”

He behaved in an extremely menacing and arrogant manner by delivering an ultimatum that there would be no talks between Korea and the United States and that inter-Korean relations and Korea-Japan relations would move into a catastrophic state, unless the “items of US concern” were dispelled.

In response to the US special envoy’s high-handed and threatening statements, the Korean representative exercised Korea’s dignified sovereign right by stating that Korea was entitled to have nuclear weapons and other weapons even more powerful than nuclear ones to counter the US attempt to strangle Korea by means of nuclear blackmail.

The United States manipulated this statement into an “admission of development of nuclear weapons,” and worked out a new “nuclear scenario.”

The US side ruptured the Korea-US Agreed Framework by unilaterally suspending from December 2002 its supply of heavy oil, a commitment bound by the framework agreement, and denounced Korea as part of the “Axis of Evil,” and as a “despotic regime,” and listed Korea as a target for a US nuclear pre-emptive strike, thus declaring its undisguised intention of aggression.

The United States instigated the IAEA into passing a “resolution” against Korea and sending an ultimatum to Korea that it would transfer the matter to the United Nations Security Council for sanctions against Korea unless its “resolution” was implemented.

Scathingly denouncing and rejecting these moves as a serious encroachment upon the sovereignty of the country and

national dignity, Korea published a government statement on January 10, 2003 that it was withdrawing from the NPT and accordingly getting out of the fetters of its safeguards accord with the IAEA.

The US manipulation of a new nuclear crisis in October 2002 was motivated by the prevailing situation on the Korean peninsula, which was developing quite favourably owing to the remarkable improvement of the traditional relations between Korea and China, and between Korea and Russia, and to the positive developments in inter-Korean relations and Korea-Japan relations. It was also aimed at finding a pretext for scrapping the DPRK-US Agreed Framework and evading the responsibility of the United States for the delay in the construction of light-water reactors (LWRs) in Korea.

The strategic aim of the United States was, all in all, to find a pretext for a war with Korea.

Relaxation of tension or peace on the Korean peninsula was not what the United States actually needed for materializing its predominant control in East Asia by occupying Korea by means of force, as it had taken control of Iraq.

Therefore, Korea's "nuclear issue" is a groundless racket worked up by the United States in the light of its strategy for domination of the whole world. The actual nuclear threat, the "nuclear issue," on the Korean peninsula, stems from the US nuclear weapons deployed in south Korea.

Songun politics is a mighty military strike power, a war deterrent, rendering the US nuclear weapons ineffective.

The military deterrent provided by Songun politics is a deterrent to the US "precision strike," "surgical strike" or "nuclear pre-emptive strike," and responds to the enemy's "air offensive" with an air offensive, and "ground strategy" with a ground strategy.

It also renders the US “nuclear umbrella,” “missile defence system” or “redisposition of US troops in south Korea” useless.

In the final analysis, only the huge military capabilities, military strike power, made available by Songun politics, serve as the key to the settlement of the US-devised nuclear issue on the Korean peninsula.

No other method can ever work as a solution to the issue.

The United States has two choices—forefeit its position as a superpower through a war with Korea or open up a way for the peaceful development of the Korean peninsula by complying with Songun politics.

2) PEACE AND REUNIFICATION ON THE KOREAN PENINSULA

A Basic Means of Ensuring Peace on the Korean Peninsula

Peace is vital to man’s life, and to the work of carving out the destiny of a country and a nation.

“Peace” is used mainly as the contrary concept in opposition to “war”, but it serves, in essence, as the precondition for man’s life, and for the existence and development of a country and a nation. Man will be unable to get rid of the fetters of anxiety and suffering, antagonism and animosity, disorder and confusion, destruction and death, unless he is provided with the social conditions for peace, such as tranquility, harmony, unity, freedom and progress.

In this sense, peace is a matter of cardinal importance to man’s life and to the undertaking of hewing out the destiny of a country and a nation.

Peace is a universal concept aspired to by all countries, the guiding ideal of all states and the *raison d'être* of all political organizations.

But peace does not come of its own accord, however much it is advocated by everyone.

Only peace that contributes to materializing and guaranteeing the independence of the masses of the people is worth calling genuine peace. "Peace" which infringes upon the work of realizing the independence of the masses and serves as the means of ensuring the interests of a certain special group is nothing but sham peace.

George W. Bush professes to be a pacifist committed to the punishment of "evil" in the world, under the slogan of "prevention of terrorism." Yet, he should be called the most disgraceful disturber of peace in the world, with the double-faced head of Janus, as he persists in committing acts of war while paying lip-service to "peace."

Peace is guaranteed only by the force of justice, for the root cause of disturbance of peace is an unjust war. Peace is not defended just because the commitments to it have been confirmed by legal instruments, nor is it safeguarded just because it is based on permanent neutrality.

On August 23, 1939, the Soviet Union and Nazi Germany signed the Nonaggression Pact for a period of a decade, but Hitler reneged on it two years later, launching an attack on the Soviet Union. During the first war in the Middle East (May 15, 1948 to February 24, 1949), the United States took the side of Israel in persuading the belligerent parties to achieve a truce on two occasions, thus saving Israel from its crisis and helping it occupy 6 700 square kilometers of Palestinian territory, including the West Bank and Gaza Strip, expel as many as one million Palestinians and plunder property worth 336 million USD.

Peace cannot be gained by begging; it can only be achieved by force of arms. And it can be guaranteed only when it is based on a war deterrent that is far more powerful than the might of the peace disturbers.

A clear example of this is the case of Iraq, where Saddam Hussein's "sincerity" in showing that he had clean hands by opening even his presidential palace for inspection just to avoid a war only occasioned the United States to decide to attack it, assured that Iraq had no war deterrent worth worrying about.

The Korean peninsula is now the most volatile hot spot in the world in terms of danger of outbreak of hostilities.

The Korea-US nuclear standoff is drawing near to a critical touch-and-go phase.

The strained relations between the two that started cooling down rapidly following the visit to Pyongyang in early October 2002 by James Kelly, assistant secretary of the State Department for East Asia and Pacific Affairs, in the capacity of the special envoy of the US President, reached freezing-point on the occasion of the US-south Korea and US-Japan summit talks held in May 2003.

During the US-south Korea summit talks, the United States openly claimed that it would bring down Korea by all means. And the United State and the south Korean hawks expressly stipulated in the text of the joint statement that it would take additional steps, meaning resolution of the second nuclear crisis by dint of a military strike, thus making the US-south Korea versus Korea war a fait accompli.

And in the following US-Japan summit talks, both sides held repeated deliberations on a war scenario in relation to the so-called "nuclear crisis," and decided to take hardline measures against Korea.

An international cooperation system of the United States,

Japan and south Korea was set in motion on the subject of a military strike against Korea.

This meant that the United States, which had been threatening Korea with the alternate cards of war and peace as needs arose, had lost its senses at last and was stampeding to the stage of installing a nuclear war programme on the Korean peninsula.

With the keen interest of the whole world focused on the counter-action to be taken by the Korean side, the Central Committee of the Democratic Front for the Reunification of the Fatherland and the Committee for the Peaceful Reunification of the Fatherland jointly released the “Appeal to the Entire Korean Nation” under the title “Our Powerful War Deterrent Is the Guarantee of Peace on the Korean Peninsula” on May 28, 2003.

Running through the appeal was a message that now that a war was imminent on the Korean peninsula due to the US racket about a “nuclear standoff,” war could be prevented and peace safeguarded only when the entire fellow countrymen supported Korea’s possession of the powerful war deterrent.

The appeal enumerated the situation as follows: The scheme worked out by the United States and its acolytes behind the veil of the so-called “peaceful settlement” predicts a dangerous nuclear holocaust for the entire Korean nation; the “additional steps” asserted by the United States and south Korea in their joint statement for the peaceful settlement of the “nuclear issue” are a non-peaceful means, clearly implying “sanctions,” “blockade” and “military option”; Korea has already declared that it would consider any sort of “sanctions” to be a declaration of war; when the “additional steps” have been taken, nuclear hailstones will fall in this land, reducing the whole area of the Korean peninsula to a heap of ashes and

plunging the entire Korean nation into a disaster. It continued, “The only way to break out of this critical prevailing situation of grave concern to the entire Korean nation and safeguard peace in this country and national security is to possess a strong war deterrent. We have such a war deterrent at our disposal.”

Only a strong physical deterrent to counter the US power policy can remove the crisis of war and safeguard peace and security. The appeal was an official statement of Korea on the possession of such a military deterrent.

Korea had already affirmed on October 25, 2002, through the statement of the spokesman for its Foreign Ministry under the title “Conclusion of a Nonaggression Treaty between Korea and the US Is the Way for the Settlement of the Nuclear Issue,” that “we are entitled to have something more powerful than nuclear weapons, not to speak of nuclear weapons themselves, in order to defend our sovereignty and right to existence from the ever-increasing US nuclear threat.” The statement of the spokesman for Korea’s Foreign Ministry on April 30, 2003, clarified this matter as follows: “Reality requires physical control of the US stepped-up attempt to squeeze Korea dry, compelling us to translate into reality our decision on having a requisite deterrent. If the United States usurps the name of the UN once again by bringing the nuclear issue to the United Nations, we will be compelled to take action in anticipation of the subsequent emergency. It will become obvious that our determination is by no means blackmail or intimidation.”

A bulletin of the Korean Central News Agency released on May 12, 2003, under the title, “The US Crime of Having Disrupted the Process of Denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula Disclosed,” read:

“The world has drawn a bloody lesson from the Iraq war,

that only when enormous physical deterrent power, military capabilities with which to deal a crushing blow at the offensive backed up by the latest hi-tech weapons are available, is it possible to prevent war and safeguard state sovereignty and national security.

“Reality indicates that the matter of building a self-reliant physical deterrent is the most pressing requirement for the prevention of a nuclear war on the Korean peninsula and for world peace and security, now that the United States has no political will or intention whatsoever to renounce its hostile policy towards Korea.

“We will further build up huge self-defensive power capable of annihilating the aggressors, responding to US air strikes with the air strikes, and ground warfare with ground warfare.”

The bulletin clarified the fact that Korea was compelled to possess its military deterrent as a powerful means of preventing war and safeguarding peace in order to cope with the aggravating situation on the Korean peninsula due to the ever-more frantic moves of the United States to squeeze Korea dry by means of nuclear blackmail.

As far as war is concerned, any bellicose party, however desperate it may be, intentionally avoids fighting if it recognizes that its opponent is strong and if it considers a possible engagement unwinnable.

In this case, powerful military capacity serves as a deterrent to acts of war of the bellicose party.

Korea’s striking power, as Korea itself declared, has been built up as a mighty deterrent to the US attempt to unleash a war on the Korean peninsula.

War deterrent immediately leads to defending and ensuring peace, and such a war deterrent serves as the guarantee of peace.

The fact that Korea's huge military capabilities made available by dint of Songun politics guarantee peace provides a most scientific and realistic reason for the assertion that Songun politics is the basic means of ensuring peace on the Korean peninsula.

The Politics of Safeguarding the Whole Nation

In October 2001 the United States unleashed a war against Afghanistan on the pretext of "arresting Osama bin Laden" and removed the Taliban government before occupying the whole country.

In March 2003 it started its aggressive war against Iraq to "overthrow Saddam Hussein's government" on the plea of "looking for weapons of mass destruction" by mobilizing a huge force of 290 000 troops, over 1 000 aircraft, more than 100 warships, including six aircraft carriers, over 2 000 tanks, and hundreds of armoured cars and precision-guided weapons for the purpose.

During the war it mobilized three times as many aircraft as those for the 1991 Gulf War, which flew more than 1 000 sorties a day, used cluster bombs and depleted-uranium shells, the use of which is prohibited by international conventions, and tested all kinds of new weapons indiscriminately.

The lesson drawn not only from the wars against Afghanistan and Iraq but from the history of war down through the ages is that a country or a nation forfeits its sovereignty and right to existence unless it is possessed of huge military capabilities with which to defeat the aggressors.

The destiny of a country or a nation cannot be safeguarded by "God" or, worse still, by means of a foreign army. It can be guaranteed only by force of one's own powerful arms.

A country or a nation, proceeding from its intrinsic nature of existence, requires self-defence capacity as its lifeline.

The past of the Korean nation clearly illustrates this truth.

At the outset of the previous century the Korean nation was subjected to a miserable state of entrusting a foreign army with the guarding of its royal palace, and went through a history of national suffering, a history of a ruined nation deprived of its national name, sovereignty and right to existence, for lack of any weapon or army capable of offering resistance to the aggressors.

Songun politics is a powerful mode of politics with which to allow no repetition of such a history of national misery, and to crush at a stroke the desperate moves of the United States, nonsensical and mindless of international law, public opinion and even the United Nations, for a new war, and defend the safety and sovereignty of the country and nation.

Given the situation that the Korean peninsula remains divided into north and south, the nuclear armaments of the US troops in south Korea, the root cause of thermonuclear war, must be held in check by enormous military strength in order to guarantee peace and safety of the entire Korean nation.

Now that the nuclear armaments of the US troops in south Korea serve as the basis of US strategy for its Korea-targeted crushing operation, Korea, for its part, should possess nuclear weapons or other war deterrent, legitimate self-defence capabilities more powerful than nuclear weapons, so that peace and security on the Korean peninsula can be safeguarded and the Korean nation can avoid the ravages of a thermonuclear war.

The United States proclaims its intention to make a pre-emptive nuclear strike at Korea; it has already mapped out plans for a “precision strike,” a “surgical strike,” a “limited

strike” and so on, and has been completing them through their application not only to actual wars but also to military exercises staged on the US mainland in anticipation of an all-out war based on “air strike,” “ground warfare strategy” and “naval operations.” As matters stand, the US nuclear weapons deployed in south Korea are disclosing their true colours as the centre of a nuclear war.

Korea’s war deterrent provided by dint of Songun politics serve as the reliable means of protecting and safeguarding the whole Korean peninsula, including south Korea, and the entire nation, in that they constitute a most precious sword of justice for national independence, permeated with noble love for the country, nation and people, and geared to full protection and guarantee of the sovereignty and dignity, peace and security of the country and nation from US aggression.

They, in terms of might, also make up a most secure shield protecting the whole Korean peninsula from any military threat or raging flames of an aggressive war.

Such an enormous war deterrent has so far kept the Korean peninsula peaceful.

But for the physical deterrent made available by means of Songun politics, a deterrent capable of crushing US aggression, scores of clashes might have already broken out on the Korean peninsula, plunging the entire Korean nation into the most horrible ravages beyond comparison with those suffered by the Afghan and Iraqi peoples.

Therefore, all Koreans in the north and the south owe their existence to Songun politics, and all the political parties, organizations and businesses on the Korean peninsula are assured of their normal activities by Songun politics. For this reason, the entire Korean nation accords a welcome to and unreserved support and approval for Songun politics.

The present structure of confrontation on the Korean peninsula has been turned into a Korean people in the north and the south versus the United States arrangement.

The Korea-US nuclear standoff can be said to be a process of putting an end to the US strategy for domination of the Korean peninsula aimed at bogging the peninsula down in a quagmire of war for the destruction of the entire Korean nation itself.

Consequently, the Korea-US showdown over the “nuclear issue” is Korea’s most sacred struggle for national salvation in defence of dignity and sovereignty of the whole nation, and an all-out confrontation between the entire Korean nation and the United States, more specifically, between justice and injustice, and between peace and anti-peace. This is precisely the reason why the Korean people in the north, south and abroad, irrespective of their residence, political tenets, ideology, system or status of property, have all turned out in this sacred struggle for national salvation.

The anti-war, anti-US movement to save the national destiny from the aggression of foreign forces makes no distinction between north and south, ideas and ideals, authorities and non-governmental organizations, ruling and opposition parties, and takes no heed of class or social stratum, sex or age.

It is a natural duty devolving upon each and every member of the Korean nation to turn out in a nationwide struggle to frustrate the US attempt to start a nuclear war, and safeguard the national destiny by dint of unity of the whole nation.

Bearing this duty in mind, the south Korean people, too, have been launching a struggle to drive out the US troops and their nuclear armaments from south Korea, to resolutely oppose and reject the US arms build-up and military exercises

in preparation for a war against the north and to smash the moves of the United States and its lackeys to squeeze Korea dry by means of a nuclear racket.

Withdrawal of US Troops from South Korea

The controversial readjustment of US forces in south Korea, i.e., reduction and redeployment, an issue that aroused a lot of debate with the arrival of the new century, came to be settled finally in favour of the largest arms build-up since the 1953 ceasefire, with an investment of USD 11 billion over a period of three years.

Included in this “arms build-up programme” is a plan for “arms expansion” with a list of more than 100 items in all, for instance, deployment of the latest-model Patriotic missiles and unmanned airplanes capable of undertaking both reconnaissance and strike missions, shipment of precision-guided bombs and introduction of Apache gunships.

It was also decided that the readjustment of US forces in south Korea, an issue which was shelved till the settlement of Korea’s “nuclear issue” upon the request of the south Korean side during the US-south Korea summit talks, would take place in such a way that the US troops deployed north of the Han River, including the 2nd Division in the vicinity of the Demilitarized Zone, within range of the guns of the Korean People’s Army, as well as the US Command in Seoul would be moved south of the Han River.

The United States dispatched Deputy Defence Secretary Paul Wolfowitz to Seoul in early June 2003 to inform south Korea of its decision and ask for an increase in south Korea’s defence expenditure, referring to the need for further investment in the war capacity of the south Korean puppet

army in line with the extended scale of arms expansion of US forces in south Korea. On June 3, Wolfowitz said in Seoul that the plan for arms expansion of the US forces in south Korea was not a north Korea-targeted offensive measure, but in Tokyo on the same day he explained that it was a step to effectively counter north Korea's potential threat. His explanation laid bare the true intention of the United States to deal with Korea's "nuclear issue" by means of a military countermeasure, namely, war.

Timed with the publication of the "arms build-up programme," the US military authorities remarked one after another that the programme was aimed at dislocating the front line of the People's Army and a straight advance to Pyongyang, disclosing the US intention for an aggressive offensive against Korea. As regards the US announcement of its "arms build-up programme," the south Korean newspaper *Hangyore* commented that "the United States is not interested in efforts to settle the problem at hand through sincere negotiations but seeks a readjustment of US forces in south Korea aimed at a military option, and asks south Korea to toe this line," highlighting the nature of the alarming US readjustment measure. Moreover, *The Washington Times* carried an article which read in part: Both south Korea and Japan are worried over the on-going process of rearrangement of US forces, especially in south Korea and Japan, as the situation with regard to north Korea's nuclear issue has reached a crisis. As such, the public and mass media in south Korea, the United States and the rest of the world expressed great apprehension about the US full-scale preparations for war on the Korean peninsula.

Given this situation, the Korean Central News Agency released a statement on June 7, 2003, in which it made

comment on the US “arms build-up programme” as a prelude to a war that might cause immeasurable disasters to the Korean peninsula, and clarified Korea’s hardline standpoint as follows: “The Korean army and people will respond to the US ‘arms build-up programme’ with a corresponding deterrent, and to a US pre-emptive strike with the immediate annihilating strike.”

The fact that the deliberation on the issue of US forces in south Korea led to a decision on their largest-ever expansion since the Korean war instead of their withdrawal is clearly indicative of the US embarrassment and panic in the face of the might of Songun politics.

Following Korea’s launching of the artificial satellite *Kwangmyongsong No. 1*, an illustration of might of Songun politics, the United States conducted a comprehensive examination of its strategy for a war against Korea.

Finally, it arrived at the conclusion that the 42 000 GIs and over 120 US bases in south Korea were nothing but hostages of the People’s Army. Subsequently, it worked out a readjustment plan, i.e., a rearrangement of US forces deployed in south Korea, Japan and the surrounding areas. However, while drawing up its plan for a second Korean war, the United States made it a rule to orient the readjustment of its forces towards a large-scale arms build-up, rather than reduction, on the plea of the “nuclear issue.”

Yet, its “arms build-up programme” is by no means a solution to the survival of US forces. In spite of the redeployment step, the US forces cannot get out of the striking range of the Songun-based military deterrent.

And even if the United States has shipped into south Korea the most powerful armaments it has developed, endeavouring to rearrange its forces on the line of modernization with preponderance given to “air strikes” and “naval operations” in

the process, it would only multiply the probabilities of US destruction in the case of the outbreak of a new war on the Korean peninsula.

Whatever arms build-up it may seek, the United States is not in a position to counter the might of Songun politics. This means that on no account can the US strategy vis-a-vis Korea achieve success by means of arms.

The only reasonable option the United States can take in its confrontation with Korea's war deterrent provided by dint of Songun politics is to dismantle its military bases in and around south Korea and pull all of its troops and armaments, including nuclear weapons, out of south Korea and the nearby areas.

Now is the most appropriate time for the withdrawal of US forces, a historic task the United States must not leave unfulfilled.

The United States, in fact, forfeited the justification for keeping its forces stationed in south Korea following the rapid change in the international situation in the late 1980s and early 1990s.

However, it is still dead set against withdrawal of its forces from south Korea, which clearly reveals its ambition for the conquest of Korea and also for the control of Northeast Asia with the Korean peninsula as the springboard.

The withdrawal of US forces from south Korea will never come of its own accord unless the United States gives up its ambition to dominate the whole world.

In the long run, there arises the historic task of national importance for the Korean people to drive the US forces out of south Korea by their own efforts.

The fulfillment of this task is a matter of taking back national sovereignty.

Owing to the US forces stationed in south Korea, the

Korean nation has been deprived of sovereignty over one half of its territory, and the history of national division has been continuing for 60 years.

The Korean people worked out an inter-Korean agreement on achieving national reunification independently by the “concerted efforts of the Korean nation itself” through the historic inter-Korean summit meeting in Pyongyang in June 2000; yet, such independent reunification is impossible to achieve so long as the US forces remain stationed in south Korea. The phrase “by the Korean nation itself” implies exclusion of foreign forces from the process of endeavouring to achieve Korea’s reunification, and the phrase “independent reunification” means achieving reunification by the efforts of the Korean nation itself without involvement of foreign forces.

Consequently, the withdrawal of US forces from south Korea constitutes the prerequisite for Korea’s national reunification and the guarantee for ensuring peace on the Korean peninsula.

It is only when peace reigns over the Korean peninsula that inter-Korean reconciliation and cooperation can proceed smoothly in an amicable atmosphere and the common interests and demands of the Korean nation can be satisfied.

The US forces in south Korea are the root cause of aggravating tension, confrontation and instability and also the epicentre of a possible new war on the Korean peninsula.

There is not a single foreign serviceperson in the DPRK, whereas a huge force of US troops remains concentrated in south Korea. This fact itself is a factor of menace to Korea and the cause of aggravating tension on the Korean peninsula.

The United States has in more than 40 countries over 2 000 overseas military bases, most of them in the Asia-Pacific region. Its main force is concentrated in and around south Korea.

The US forces in south Korea occupy an area of 50 million *pyong* (one *pyong* is equivalent to 3.3 square metres) of land for their 120 bases in various parts of south Korea, including Tongduchon and Ryongsan, where the US Command, US-South Korea Combined Forces Command and “UN Command” are located, and for over 40 000 troops equipped with more than 1 000 nuclear weapons and hi-tech arms.

The US forces in south Korea are using the land for their bases free of charge and the expenses for their stay are borne by south Korea. The south Korean regime has allowed its whole territory to be used for US military installations and has been supporting the US troops at the cost of heavy taxes levied on the south Korean people.

The US bases in south Korea are the den of all hues of crimes and the hotbed of evils infringing upon the sovereignty and right to existence of not only the south Korean people but also the whole Korean nation.

The incident in which a US armoured vehicle ran over two 14-year-old schoolgirls in June 2002 sparked a series of mass struggles against the United States, finally giving rise to a massive change in the south Korean people’s view of the US forces in south Korea.

The Headquarters of the Movement for the Withdrawal of US Troops, Headquarters of the Movement for the Return of US Bases, Anti-American Women’s Society and many other anti-US organizations have been formed in south Korea, and the south Korean people’s struggle to drive US troops out of south Korea and to take back the land now occupied by US bases is gaining further ground.

To south Koreans who are directly prone to harm from the US troops every minute of their daily lives, the struggle for their withdrawal is a matter of critical and vital importance. For

this reason, they have turned out en masse in this struggle, firmly trusting Songun politics, which is a mode of politics geared at national salvation and a most powerful means for the withdrawal of US troops, and the military deterrent made available by this politics.

National Reunification

Songun politics is a powerful mode of politics which is geared, externally, to safeguarding sovereignty of the country and nation from foreign domination and interference and bringing national dignity into full play, and, internally, to giving a strong impetus to the revolution and construction by strengthening internal forces in every way.

This role of Songun politics is manifested not only in Korea's endeavour to safeguard and build socialism but also in the efforts of the entire Korean nation for accomplishing the cause of national reunification. Songun politics is the means of defending national independence from foreign domination, interference and war moves, and of opening up a vista for independent and peaceful reunification of the country by uniting all Koreans in the north, south and abroad into a strong driving force of national reunification.

Songun politics, above all, has brought about a turning-point in the struggle for national reunification, thus inspiring the entire Korean nation to greater efforts with full confidence in their reunification movement.

Kim Jong Il led the Korea-US confrontation in the 1990s to a historic victory and brought the unprecedented "Arduous March" in Korea to its victorious ending, thus opening up a phase favourable for reunification on the Korean peninsula.

In August 1999 the 1999 Grand Festival for National

Independence and Unity and the 10th Pan-National Rally took place, involving delegations from three sides—north, south and abroad—and the reunification movement proceeded in an organized and brisk way on a nationwide scale, turning the balance between the pro-reunification forces and the anti-reunification forces in favour of national reunification.

Even the conservatives and decision-makers of the ruling party in south Korea had to jump on the bandwagon of reunification, putting forward the improvement of inter-Korean relations and the reunification of the country as the *raison d'être* of their status in power.

Going with the tide of such an irresistible trend, the then south Korean President, too, had to publish his Berlin declaration, in which he made public his regime's attitude towards the improvement of inter-Korean relations.

Consequently, the two leaders of the north and the south had a historic meeting, the first of its kind in the history of national division, in Pyongyang between June 13 and 15, 2000, and adopted the June 15 North-South Joint Declaration, a landmark on the road to national reunification. In the declaration the two leaders considered their first-ever meeting and talks eventful and significant in promoting mutual understanding, developing inter-Korean relations and moving to achieve peaceful reunification, and pointed out the items of their agreement.

The June 15 joint declaration is a declaration of national independence, national unity and pro-reunification. South Korea's KBS reported, "The south and north successfully worked out the joint declaration amidst the keen interest of the whole world, thus decorating the first stage of independence splendidly. The fact that Chairman Kim Jong Il of the National Defence Commission has brought about this historic agreement

beyond the expectations of all at such a high rate suffices to prove the effect of his potential energy.” This indicates that the declaration was the outcome of the strength and vitality of Songun politics.

In addition, Songun politics rendered the US strategy for domination of the Korean peninsula futile by bringing about a historic victory in the Korea-US nuclear standoff, thus creating the conditions for the Korean nation to achieve the independent and peaceful reunification of the country.

It is the aspiration of the entire Korean nation to reunify the country independently and peacefully through the concerted efforts of the “Korean nation itself.”

Following the adoption of the June 15 North-South Joint Declaration, inter-Korean relations leaped onto a stage of reconciliation and cooperation, accompanied by positive changes in the process.

As the first step for implementation of the joint declaration, inter-Korean ministerial talks were held at the close of July 2000, followed by a series of talks and negotiations through various channels. In early August, a large delegation from the south Korean mass media, including the presidents of leading newspaper and broadcasting corporations, and other relevant officials, visited Pyongyang for seven nights and eight days. Kim Jong Il met the delegation and encouraged the delegates to take the lead in the implementation of the joint declaration.

In September the same year, 63 patriotic fighters, who had been called unconverted long-term prisoners in south Korea, came over to Pyongyang via Panmunjom.

In August and November, separated families and relatives met in both north and south Korea.

In addition, multifaceted exchanges and cooperation, including economic exchanges and collaboration, went ahead,

ushering in a new era of dialogue, an era of reconciliation, cooperation and exchanges for inter-Korean relations, a complete change from the previous era in which dialogue had been impossible.

In south Korea, the National Security Law, a restrictive mechanism born of long-standing confrontation and division, has gradually become ineffective, and the broad democratic forces, including the Confederation of Trade Unions and Federation of University Student Councils of south Korea, which had been repressed by south Korea's policy of confrontation against communism, have brought their mass reunification movement into higher gear. Flowing on the tide of the trend, the scope of democratization of south Korea has grown wider, and the zeal for national reconciliation and unity between the north and south of Korea has mounted to an unprecedented height.

However, this situation was far from what the United States wanted on the Korean peninsula. As far as the United States was concerned, the developing situation contributed to making the US domination of Korea more and more untenable and rapidly narrowing the sphere of its influence in south Korea. It had to put a brake on the favourable development of inter-Korean relations and keep the situation on the Korean peninsula strained, so as to create an atmosphere favourable for the materialization of its dominationist strategy.

It brought pressure to bear upon the south Korean authorities, claiming that inter-Korean relations were improving at a faster rate than required, and urging the slow-down of the process, and incited the south Korean conservative Rightists and military authorities to pursue confrontation against the north.

Subsequently, the assertion by the south Korean military

authorities of the DPRK as the “archenemy” swayed the south Korean public and the situation on the Korean peninsula turned towards a critical phase during the years 2001, 2002 and 2003.

But the United States can hardly decide to embark on an actual war, however much it may bluster about a war against the north, for it cannot ignore the blood price it would have to pay for its resistance to the formidable might of Songun politics.

As a mode of politics capable of actively countering the US programme for arms build-up in south Korea, south Korea’s action for increase in defence expenditures, or Japan’s contingency bill, Songun politics always confronts the imperialist forces with an extremely hardline approach. It brings home to the south Koreans its vitality as a mode of politics geared to national independence and running through with love for the country and nation, inspiring them with growing confidence that national reunification should be materialized by means of Songun politics, which safeguards peace and security, and making them turn their backs on the war policy of the US aimed at the north.

In this way, Songun politics renders the reckless moves of the United States for an aggressive war futile, and safeguards peace and security on the Korean peninsula, thus certainly opening up the road to materialization of the independent and peaceful reunification of the country by the Korean nation itself.

3) SAFEGUARDING PEACE IN NORTHEAST ASIA

At the outset of its war on Iraq, the United States described it as a campaign for “freedom” and “peace.”

Yet, the actual process and the outcome of the war proved that the much-clamoured-about “freedom” and “peace” of the United States meant anti-freedom and anti-peace acts of aggression to overthrow the government of a legitimate sovereign state.

The US logic of “freedom” and “peace” is obviously a brigandish assertion which is diametrically opposed to the United Nations Charter and international laws.

The brutal massacres committed by the US troops in Iraq are war crimes, actions fundamentally contrary to the Red Cross humanitarian principles and international laws such as the 1949 Geneva Convention Relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide and Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations.

The UN Charter stipulates that a military threat or aggression by one state against another is intolerable. A member state of the United Nations is obliged to respect the Charter and refrain from violating it.

The United States, however, overthrew Saddam Hussein’s government by means of military aggression, killed Iraqi civilians en masse and reduced Iraq to a heap of ashes, in disregard of either the UN Charter or international laws.

The WMDs and biochemical weapons which the United States used as an excuse for its offensive against Iraq have never been discovered.

It is the unanimous opinion of the world public that the United States launched its attack on Iraq for its interests, and, more concretely, to seize the oil fields of Iraq, ranking second in oil deposits in the world.

In this way, the United States has been satisfying its demands and interests by force of arms, by means of war, on the basis of its military supremacy, subjecting global peace to a grave threat.

Following the end of the Cold War almost no country on this planet has remained untouched by the tentacles of the US armed forces. By means of the Afghan war, the United States has set foot in Central Asia, and, without firing a single shot, has extended the radius of NATO's activities to Eastern Europe.

The United States is now aiming its military aggression at Northeast Asia, specifically, the Korean peninsula.

At the close of the 20th century US military strategists switched the centre for US acquisition of external interests from Europe to Asia, particularly Northeast Asia. They undertook a strategic readjustment aimed at gaining enormous profits decisive of the future of the United States in the Asia-Pacific region, judging that the 21st century would be an Asia-Pacific era.

The primary task put forward by the United States in its Asia-Pacific-centred strategy for domination of the whole world is to translate into reality its strategy for control of the Korean peninsula on the premise of Korea's disruption.

The unprecedentedly hardline approach of the Bush administration, which assumed power in 2001, with regard to Korea's nuclear issue and its preparations for war against Korea were practical steps taken to achieve its above-mentioned strategic objective.

Songun politics acted on the prevailing situation as a mode of politics rendering a new US strategy for domination of the whole world futile, and ensuring peace on this planet by means of its flexible external policy geared at preventing a war and safeguarding peace on the Korean peninsula.

Preventing the US-prompted arms race between several countries and the threat of a new war, and ensuring peace and security in Asia on the threshold of the 21st century posed itself as a burning question in international politics to be settled immediately.

Songun politics enabled Korea to hold the historic inter-Korean summit meeting in Pyongyang and adopt the June 15 North-South Joint Declaration in June 2000, and to engage in its political consultations with Russia, China and Japan in a proactive manner, bringing about a great impact on matters of cardinal importance in international politics—smashing the US attempts at “globalization,” “unipolarization” and starting a new war in Northeast Asia, while establishing a multipolar world, maintaining global security and ensuring peace.

The June 15 North-South Joint Declaration stated in its preamble that the historic Pyongyang meeting took place according to the noble will of the entire Korean nation for the peaceful reunification of the country, and that the first-ever inter-Korean summit meeting and talks since the division of the Korean nation were events of great significance in promoting mutual understanding, developing inter-Korean relations and achieving peaceful reunification. It is none other than a joint declaration of peace illuminating a way for the Korean nation to achieve national reunification independently by opposing imperialist aggression and war, and realizing peace on the Korean peninsula.

The Korea-Russia treaty on friendship, good neighbour-

liness and cooperation signed on February 9, 2000, laid a foundation on which both signatories could further promote their traditional relations, good neighbourliness and mutual trust, and strengthen multifaceted cooperation, so as to respect the objectives and principles of the UN Charter, achieve international security and develop equal and mutually beneficial cooperation in Northeast Asia and the rest of the world.

The Korea-Russia joint declaration was adopted in July 2000, and the Korea-Russia Moscow Declaration was made public in August 2001.

During Kim Jong Il's visit to the Russian Far East in August 2002, the two leaders of Korea and Russia expressed their intention to make an active contribution to the formation of a new world structure, peaceful, stable and just, in Northeast Asia and the rest of the world, true to the spirit of the Korea-Russia joint declaration, Korea-Russia Moscow declaration and Korea-Russia treaty of friendship, good neighbourliness and cooperation.

Korea's friendly relations with another of its neighbouring countries, China, too, reached a higher stage than ever before around this time, greatly contributing to peace and security in Northeast Asia and the rest of the world.

Kim Jong Il's visit to the Chinese embassy in Korea on the occasion of the lunar New Year's Day 2000, followed by his unofficial visits to China at the end of May the same year and in January the next year, and the official visit to Korea by General Secretary Jiang Zemin of the Communist Party of China in September 2001, preceded by his visit to the Korean embassy in Beijing in October 2000 on the occasion of the 55th anniversary of the founding of the Workers' Party of Korea, and the events held in Pyongyang to celebrate the 50th

anniversary of participation of Chinese People's Volunteers in the Korea war, consolidated the bilateral relations between Korea and China all the more at the turn of the new century when the international situation was changing rapidly and unpredictably, thereby producing positive influence on peace, security and development in Asia and the rest of the world. All this is clearly indicative of the efforts devoted to opposing great-power domination in the international arena and safeguarding world peace and security.

On September 17, 2002, Japanese Prime Minister Koizumi visited Pyongyang, and Korea and Japan signed the Pyongyang declaration in which Japan officially apologized and committed itself to compensation for Japan's barbarous crimes against the Koreans in the old days. Japan's apology and compensation to Korea were vital to the normalization of relations between the two countries. In the declaration both sides confirmed their common recognition of the fact that the settlement of the pending issues between the two countries and establishment of fruitful bilateral relations in the political, economic and cultural spheres conform with the basic interests of both sides and render a great contribution to regional peace and security, agreed on matters related to the normalization of diplomatic relations and economic cooperation between the two countries on the basis of mutual trust, and promised to cooperate with one another for the maintenance and promotion of peace and security, particularly in Northeast Asia.

Korea-Russia, Korea-China and Korea-Japan relations could now develop favourably on the basis of the common interest in ensuring peace and security in Asia, which could not but have a great impact upon the peace and security of the whole world.

Official talks also took place between Korea and the

European Union. Korea entered into diplomatic relations with Italy in January 2000, and then with Germany, Great Britain, the Netherlands, and later almost all the EU member states.

The fact that those countries that had been hostile or had given a wide berth to Korea for over half a century have now recognized the DPRK and set about improving relations with it is an indication of the crisis which looms for the policy of the US aimed at swallowing up Korea.

The Russian newspaper *Pravda*, dated December 21, 2000, commented that “these developments meant the end of the blockade of Korea that had cost the United States too much.” A European newspaper that had been very prejudiced against Korea carried an article which read, in part: “North Korea has driven home to the West the importance of the question of the Korean peninsula by dint of its adroit art of diplomacy and its military capacity, and has been earning enormous economic profits from this.”

The prevailing situation indicates that the sphere of influence of the US-led warmongers has dwindled to a great extent, whereas the scope of the activities of the peace-loving forces, including Korea, has grown equally much wider and their influence on global peace has likewise grown so much greater.

Songun politics is acting as a brake on the progress of the US endeavour for realization of its strategy for domination of the whole world, giving the fullest play to its viability as a mode of politics geared to preventing war and safeguarding peace worldwide.

* * *

The reality of Korea following the end of the Cold War is convincing proof of the validity and might of Songun politics. A saying goes that the military is present behind the veil of politics. Only with a military capacity strong enough to withstand any aggressive war can a country or a nation defend its political sovereignty and contribute to building a peaceful new world.

In this sense, the might of Songun politics will be all the more recognized with each passing day.