

---

## Irregular Warfare

---

# Korean violence is Soviet-deployed

by Linda de Hoyos

On June 12, the day of the visit of President Ronald Reagan to West Berlin, the city was rocked by violent demonstrations led by the Soviet-backed SEW Party and the Green Party. Military strategists in the United States and Western Europe properly view the protests, which have escalated over the last month, not as an eruption of rage against authorities, but as a deployment of irregular warfare ordered and directed by the Soviet Union, in preparation for a global strategic show-down.

The same view must hold for the recent events in the Republic of Korea. On June 10, South Korean cities witnessed the worst violence in seven years. In 1980, the North Koreans and allied forces in the South had launched an uprising in Kwangju, which was put down only with bloody intervention from the armed forces under current President Chun Doo Hwan, leaving 2,000 people killed. For the Soviet Union and North Korea, orchestrated riots in South Korea could serve as an opening shot in a full-scale military move on the peninsula; or to soften the ruling institutions in South Korea and sever its links to the United States preparatory to a global move.

The recent high level of violence was ostensibly sparked by President Chun's refusal to proceed with negotiations for the revising of the Constitution and the holding of direct elections. The opposition, which plays the same role as the Social Democracy of Willy Brandt in West Germany, has demanded that the constitution be immediately changed to allow for direct election of the President, scheduled for early 1988. As of now, the President is elected indirectly by parliament, which is controlled by Chun's Democratic Justice Party (DJP). The opposition contends that this ensures that the DJP retains full power over the choice of president.

However, Chun, a former general who led the operations to put down the Kwangju uprising, is the first president in South Korean postwar history, to step down from office voluntarily. At every other point, the government was forcibly changed through a combination of student violence, withdrawal of U.S. support for the incumbent, and actions to restore order by the military.

The most recent round of riots was timed to coincide with the DJP Convention, which on June 10 endorsed Chun's chosen successor, former Gen. Roh Tae-woo as president of the party. Roh, a long-time associate of President Chun, is now assured of becoming the next President of South Korea.

The protesters were called into action by the Reunification Democratic Party, led by the two leaders of the opposition, Kim Dae-jung and Kim Young-sam. In May, the two Kims had led a split from the opposition National Democratic Korean Party, when a faction of the NDKP leaders wanted to begin negotiations with the government. The Kims, eschewing talks, led the majority of the party away to form the Reunification Democratic Party. The inclusion of the word "Reunification" in the party's name indicates the primary goal of the two Kims—the softening up of South Korea for merger with North Korea, under the imperial umbrella of the U.S.S.R. and China. The new party represents the transformation of the opposition into a fifth-column for North Korea—in the same way the Social Democracy serves this function in West Germany.

While attempting to distance themselves from the violence, the two Kims offer the students their political protection. The demonstrations "all over the nation show that the people question the legitimacy of both President Chun Doo Hwan and his handpicked heir Roh Tae-woo," Kim Young-sam stated. "The people won't stand for this."

In the course of the week's violence, 738 policemen and 38 civilians were injured, 16 police stations and substations were damaged, six police vehicles were burned, and 17 others damaged. As in West Germany, the violence is not random, but militarily organized, with students, led by university professors, marching in rows toward the police. The level of infiltration by North Korean spetsnaz (of which there are 100,000 led by Kim Chong-il) is unknown.

"I have been insisting that we not use violence and that we conduct peaceful demonstrations," Kim stated. "But the police have been so brutal with the use of tear gas that students and citizens had no resort but to resist the brutality."

The organizing networks behind the student riots are the Reunification Party, along with many of South Korea's Christian churches. Protestant ministers and Catholic priests have begun hunger strikes in various cities against the Chun government. On June 12, 2,000 students barricaded themselves in the Myongdong Catholic Cathedral. Roman Catholic Cardinal Stephen Kim, has consistently supported the two Kims. His homilies repeat the theme that only democratic "reform" can heal the "wound" left by the Kwangju uprising. "Hatred is deepening, creating a similar situation in which another Kwangju incident could break out," he stated on the anniversary of the uprising.

The Soviet-controlled World Council of Churches is also working to support the opposition and to give it credibility outside the country. According to a Western European WCC source, "Global ecumenical solidarity with the churches and

students of South Korea, against the government, is increasing. The regime is squeezed. I would say this regime is finished by the end of the year." The WCC is planning an "International Gathering on Peace, Justice, and Unification of the Koreas" for the second week of November 1987, to escalate the agitation. It will include participants from the leading American and Korean churches, and the West German EKD which has led agitation in West Germany for neutralization and reunification of Germany on Moscow's terms.

### And the United States?

The United States is carrying out a dual policy toward South Korea. On the one side, the Pentagon is absolutely committed to the defense of the South Korean peninsula, a commitment backed by the presence of 43,000 American troops in the Demilitarized Zone. Whereas the Pentagon acceded to the overthrow of Ferdinand Marcos in the Philippines in 1986, it has not given a similar green light for U.S. withdrawal of support from President Chun. An amendment presented in May by Rep. Robert Mrazek (D-N.Y.), for phased withdrawal of U.S. troops met with little success—only 60 votes in the House.

However, the State Department and the networks of Project Democracy encourage the opposition, as it encourages the traitors of the Social Democracy and the Green Party in West Germany. From the top of the U.S. foreign policy-making establishment, in May members of the Asia Society and the Council on Foreign Relations met with opposition leaders. Leading the delegation to South Korea was Kenneth Dam, former deputy secretary of state and Richard Holbrooke, former assistant secretary of state. In Seoul, U.S. Ambassador James Lilley, who replaced Richard Walker last year, meets consistently with the opposition, playing the same guiding role that Stephen Bosworth played for the Aquino forces in the Philippines. Speaking before the Korea Bar Association on May 3, Lilley declared that the "work of the Korean Bar Association in investigating the human rights abuses, publishing its human rights reports, and voicing its opposition to such practices plays an important role. . . ."

The National Endowment for Democracy, an official arm of the State Department's Project Democracy, is supplying funds to the National Democratic Institute for International Affairs for work on Korea, according to the NED's Linda Pochek. The funds were for a 1986 seminar with the opposition party on "basic party-building techniques, coalition building."

However, democracy is not the issue. Soviet strategic aims are. As the World Council of Churches source stated: "Korea is becoming more and more an issue on the global scale. It is not isolated internationally. We are receiving reports of unofficial U.S.-Soviet agreements, to allow for the U.S. to push for normalization of the Korean peninsula, with the help of openings into North Korea made through the Soviets."

---

## United Kingdom

---

# Thatcher wins national mandate on defense

by Mark Burdman

In Britain's June 11 national elections, British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher has done what no other prime minister has done since Lord Liverpool in 1828, what such hallmark figures in British politics as Palmerston, Disraeli, Gladstone, Lloyd George, and Churchill failed to do: She has won a third consecutive term in office.

And she has done so resoundingly. With almost all votes counted, Mrs. Thatcher's Tories were credited with 376 seats, while the Neil Kinnock-led Labourites had 229, the Social Democratic-Liberal Alliance 22, and small parties 17.

This would give Mrs. Thatcher a majority of around 100 seats, once all the tallies are in. That is one of the two noteworthy features of the results. The other is the smashing defeat of the Alliance, which had been hoping to do well enough to force a "hung Parliament," by denying Mrs. Thatcher a big majority. The Alliance did so badly, that even some of its top leaders, like former minister Shirley Williams, lost their parliamentary seats.

Unquestionably, Mrs. Thatcher's winning point was defense. Britons, who pride themselves on never having been occupied and on having emerged undefeated from World War II, were aghast at the proposals by Kinnock, that Britain should drop its nuclear deterrent, and rely on a policy of resistance-to-occupation, in the event of war.

In the last days of the campaign, Thatcher associates, including Defense Minister George Younger, Interior Minister Douglas Hurd, and Tory party chairman Norman Tebbit, made defense the top issue, with dire warnings that a Labour victory would mean British surrender to the Russians. This campaign struck a positive chord in the British population. Also helpful to the Tories were leaks in the British press, that most former British defense chiefs were privately ex-