

KOREAN WAR

Following the heavy emphasis given the Pongam incident and the Soviet resolution for U.N. condemnation of the affair, Moscow's sharply reduced attention focuses on familiar charges of American profiteering. This theme has recurred prominently when attention to the Korean War has been at a low level.

Atrocities and Profiteering Reveal U.S. Hypocrisy: Both the Pongam "atrocities" and the evidences of American profiteering--which this time are documented on the basis of the annual report submitted by U.S. Defense Mobilization Director Fowler--are cited as new proof of American hypocrisy on the truce issue and are contrasted with the Soviet Union's proclaimed desire for a peaceful solution of the Korean War. The Soviet stand in the United Nations is featured as proof of this desire and Stalin's reply to Reston is given as further evidence of the Soviet Union's humanitarian intentions with respect to Korea. Soviet propagandists seem thus to be mainly concerned with highlighting the Communists' moral position, an effort which suggests a desire to

8 January
1953

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

divert attention from the defeats suffered by the Soviet bloc in the General Assembly. Chou En-lai's 27 December interview with HUMANITE correspondent Pierre Courtade--in which the Chinese Foreign Minister reiterates the vehement accusation that the United States is "sabotaging" the armistice negotiations--is broadcast without comment, mostly to European listeners and once to the Soviet home audience. Although Soviet comment on the Korean War is generally devoid of the extreme belligerency that marks recent Peking broadcasts, Moscow's broadcasting of the Chou interview seems intended to underscore the Communist argument that, far from seeking a genuine peace settlement in Korea, the United States is planning to "intensify and expand" the war.

U.S. "March to the Yalu" for Tungsten Mines: In an unusually prompt reaction to Syngman Rhee's New Year's speech--which has not yet been mentioned by Peking--Moscow minimizes the South Korean President's controversial declaration that his forces would, if need be, "march to the Yalu alone." Instead of belaboring this point as a further indication of plans to extend the war, a widely broadcast PRAVDA commentary by Makarenko declares that Rhee's statement merely reveals "what the U.S. aggressors have on their minds"--namely, a "new march to the North of Korea" for the purpose of seizing the "important tungsten deposits which lie on the other side of the front." The strategic importance of tungsten is not mentioned; rather, the tungsten mines are said to represent potential sources of new "multi-millions of super-profits" for the U.S. imperialists, who "are dreaming of a new offensive for the sake of American business interests."

KOREAN WAR

Following the heavy emphasis given the Pongam incident and the Soviet resolution for U.N. condemnation of the affair, Moscow's sharply reduced attention focuses on familiar charges of American profiteering. This theme has recurred prominently when attention to the Korean War has been at a low level.

8 JAN 53

Atrocities and Profiteering Reveal U.S. Hypocrisy: Both the Pongam "atrocities" and the evidences of American profiteering--which this time are documented on the basis of the annual report submitted by U.S. Defense Mobilization Director Fowler--are cited as new proof of American hypocrisy on the truce issue and are contrasted with the Soviet Union's proclaimed desire for a peaceful solution of the Korean War. The Soviet stand in the United Nations is featured as proof of this desire and Stalin's reply to Reston is given as further evidence of the Soviet Union's humanitarian intentions with respect to Korea. Soviet propagandists seem thus to be mainly concerned with highlighting the Communists' moral position, an effort which suggests a desire to

CONFIDENTIAL

divert attention from the defeats suffered by the Soviet bloc in the General Assembly. Chou En-lai's 27 December interview with HUMANITE correspondent Pierre Courtade--in which the Chinese Foreign Minister reiterates the vehement accusation that the United States is "sabotaging" the armistice negotiations--is broadcast without comment, mostly to European listeners and once to the Soviet home audience. Although Soviet comment on the Korean War is generally devoid of the extreme belligerency that marks recent Peking broadcasts, Moscow's broadcasting of the Chou interview seems intended to underscore the Communist argument that, far from seeking a genuine peace settlement in Korea, the United States is planning to "intensify and expand" the war.

U.S. "March to the Yalu" for Tungsten Mines: In an unusually prompt reaction to Syngman Rhee's New Year's speech--which has not yet been mentioned by Peking--Moscow minimizes the South Korean President's controversial declaration that his forces would, if need be, "march to the Yalu alone." Instead of belaboring this point as a further indication of plans to extend the war, a widely broadcast PRAVDA commentary by Makarenko declares that Rhee's statement merely reveals "what the U.S. aggressors have on their minds"--namely, a "new march to the North of Korea" for the purpose of seizing the "important tungsten deposits which lie on the other side of the front." The strategic importance of tungsten is not mentioned; rather, the tungsten mines are said to represent potential sources of new "multi-millions of super-profits" for the U.S. imperialists, who "are dreaming of a new offensive for the sake of American business interests."