the journal of korean studies

VOLUME 13
NUMBER 1
fall 2008

Peripheral Influence: The Sinŭiju Student Incident of 1945 and the Impact of Soviet Occupation in North Korea

Adam Cathcart and Charles Kraus

This article examines the North Korean city of Sinŭiju during the era of Soviet occupation, focusing specifically on the Sinŭiju incident of 23 November 1945. A violent clash between local youth and Communist security forces, the incident revealed the combustible mixture of factors present in postcolonial North Korea. The Soviet military government's deadly response to the protests seriously threatened Korea's receptiveness to the Korean Communist Party and to the Soviet Union, and forced stronger control over both the city of Sinŭiju and youth nationwide. This article considers the visit that Kim Il Sung (Kim Ilsŏng) made to Sinŭiju in the aftermath of the incident, as well as subsequent North Korean policies in Sinŭiju. Drawing on previously untapped files from the Archive of Military History of the Russian Federation, newly declassified CIA documents, and Korean- and Chinese-language texts, this article examines a North Korean city whose peripheral influence in the postcolonial period has not yet been adequately understood.

For the port city of Sinŭiju (located in what is now North Korea, or the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, DPRK), the twentieth century brought transformation and trauma. At a pivotal location along the Amnok (Yalu) River, which connects Korea to Manchuria, the city expanded into a symbol of Japanese ambitions. Then Sinŭiju's moorings and signature bridges were nearly obliterated by U.S. bombs in November 1950, as American generals, under the oversight of Douglas MacArthur, assumed that the city would again be the default capital for rulers fleeing Pyongyang (P'yŏngyang). After its encounter with the U.S. military, Sinŭiju was flooded with Chinese People's Volunteers, Chinese military aid,

Adam Cathcart is assistant professor of history at Pacific Lutheran University in Tacoma, Washington.

Charles Kraus, formerly of the North Korea International Documentation Project, is currently a Boren Scholar in China's National Security Education Program.

The Journal of Korean Studies 13, no. 1 (Fall 2008): 1–28

and war refugees on their way to China. Following the Chinese exodus in 1958, the city accelerated through Ch'ŏllima-style economic campaigns and rebuffed Maoist radicalism during the Cultural Revolution. Today, perched at the edge of the relative wealth of the Chinese Dandong, Sinŭiju remains an important center of trade with the People's Republic of China. There is much—largely fruitless—speculation about its potential as a free economic zone that might revive North Korea's moribund economy.

Amid these powerful cross currents of historical change, the Soviet occupation of Sinŭiju from 1945 to 1948 has received relatively little attention. In the months following the August 1945 *haebang* (liberation) from Japan, Sinŭiju was a major testing ground for Korean Communism. As Korea's most populous northwestern port city, Sinŭiju embodies the story of North Korea's formation, including the process of political consolidation. Sinŭiju rapidly became a site of heated interaction between nationalists and Communists, and, perhaps more than any other northern city outside of Pyongyang, influenced the direction of North Korea's eventual shift to Communism. As events in Sinŭiju unfolded in Korea's postliberation milieu, it became clear that Seoul and Pyongyang were not the only centers of significant political activity and change. Just as instability in the Chŏlla provinces and Cheju Island stimulated profound changes in South Korean and American policy in 1948 and 1949, North Korea was beset by peripheral influences.[1] Likewise, North Hamgyŏng Province, particularly the port of Ch'ŏngjin, was unsettled by autonomous forces that required serious attention from the northern authorities.[2] In studying North Korea's foundations, peripheral areas provide important case studies for the impetus of Kim Il Sung's (Kim Ilsŏng's) centralization of power.

Soviet influence in these areas also bears examination. Documents produced by the Soviet military occupation government in Sinŭiju and North P'yŏngan Province reveal the powerful overlay of nationalism and anti-Soviet sentiment present in North Korea after August 1945.[3] These documents indicate that while the Red Army worked arduously to forestall outbreaks of anti-Soviet resistance, the Soviets did not always successfully mitigate the concerns of the Korean people. Gaining a clearer picture of the extensive Soviet activities in the north during this formative period makes it possible to reinterpret North Korea's origins without fully ascribing these to Soviet influence. Self-mobilized Koreans in North P'yŏngan Province, especially students, worked at cross-purposes with the Soviet occupation authorities and the new Communist government. No better example of this opposition exists than the central event of Sinŭiju's history in the years under Soviet occupation: the Sinŭiju student incident of 23 November 1945.

Several important historical works have referenced the Sinŭiju incident, but few scholars have dedicated more than a couple of pages of writing to this bloody event in early North Korean history. Robert Scalapino and Chong-sik Lee reduced the Sinŭiju incident to a lengthy footnote in volume one of their *Communism in Korea*, including at least one error.[4] While Bruce Cumings limited the event to a

one-sentence footnote in the first volume of his *Origins of the Korean War*, it merited a whole paragraph in the body of the second volume.[5] Given that Christian students were involved in the revolt, a number of Christian scholars and organizations have followed Cumings's precedent in emphasizing the role of Christianity in the Sinŭiju incident.[6] Unfortunately, the works of this group are rife with error.[7] Sŏ Tongman's recent survey of North Korean history from 1945 to 1960 is immense and comprehensive, but the text mentions Sinŭiju only twice and fails to address the November 1945 episode in depth.[8] Kim Hayŏng's works, and their translation and analysis by Owen Miller, shed light upon the origins of the Sinŭiju incident while reframing the Soviet occupation more generally.[9] The best-known South Korean treatment of the incident resides in the *Chungang Ilbo*'s oft-cited *Pirok Chosŏn minjujuŭi inmin konghwaguk* (Secret History of the DPRK).[10] While the interviews in the *Pirok* text are useful for reconstructing the outbreak of protests, the book lacks reference to Soviet documents and shows little concern for documents in English or Chinese that further contextualize the incident. Histories of the Sinŭiju incident published in South Korea during the Park Chung-hee (Pak Chŏnghŭi) years remain of great interest, but their content is difficult to disentangle from the larger purpose of discrediting the current North Korean government.[11] While North Korean histories discuss the incident, they have limited use since they follow the line laid down by Kim Il Sung in his 27 November 1945 analysis of the event.[12] The most credible and extended English-language treatment of the Sinŭiju incident appears in Charles K. Armstrong's *The North Korean Revolution,* centering on Kim Il Sung's response to the event. Armstrong, however, omits the role of Christianity and telescopes the incident into "a student protest" that merits only four cursory (though illuminating) pages of writing.[13] No known English-language text has yet focused upon the Sinŭiju incident and its aftermath as an episode in Korean history worthy of extended treatment. Nor have scholars done much to detail the specific Soviet actions and policies that provided the background to the civil strife (or as the North Koreans call it, "the revolt") that occurred in November 1945. This article seeks to fill the gaps by showing how the violence in Sinŭiju both shook the Soviet occupation of North Korea and imperiled the personal rule of Kim Il Sung. What led to the student uprising of 23 November 1945?

SOVIET OCCUPATION

On 16 August 1945, the residents of the port city of Sinŭiju awoke to a whirlwind of change—the Japanese had capitulated. As yet unrestrained by an Allied occupying army, and receiving cooperation from Japanese administrators suddenly eager to curry favor, Korean elders emptied the colonial prison and established an autonomous provisional committee (*winwŏnhoe*) to regulate local affairs.[14] The committee, composed mainly of conservative nationalists, succeeded in establishing

order without the aid of a police force, and by 25 August was exerting control over the entirety of North P'yŏngan Province.[15] For two weeks following Japan's surrender, Sinŭiju's residents were masters of their own affairs. But, as in southern Korea, the appearance of Allied troops would bring with it heavy impositions.

The entrance of Soviet troops into Sinŭiju on 30 August jeopardized the autonomous committee and shattered its ability to exert control over the province. The Red Army, confronted by town elders who had deep political roots among North P'yŏngan citizens, immediately dissolved the *winwŏnhoe* and redirected provincial political energies by sponsoring a new People's Political Committee (PPC) that privileged Communist leaders over conservative nationalists.[16]

The Soviets began the occupation with a rather open attitude toward religion and religious parties, advocating a tolerant line in interest of stability.[17] But when partisan disagreements emerged among the Koreans, Soviet policy toward churches was reevaluated. After the *winwŏnhoe* was dissolved, on 9 September a number of Presbyterian pastors in Sinŭiju responded by organizing the Christian Social Democratic Party (CSDP).[18] Soviet military analysts rapidly branded the nearly one thousand members of Sinŭiju's newest political party as part of the "bourgeois social stratum" and believers in the political platform of "the landlord class."[19] In early October the party dropped "Christian" from its name and, under Soviet pressure, merged with the Chosŏn Minjudang (Korean Democratic Party, KDP), led by charismatic Christian spokesperson and political leader Cho Mansik.[20]

While Christian nationalists operated as political competitors, the Soviet authorities also faced inevitable friction with Korean landlords. Aware of the connection between landlords and the KDP, the Red Army, in its internal discussions of land reform, anticipated that problems would arise when agricultural social systems in Sinŭiju and North P'yŏngan Province were restructured.[21] While much of the land had yet to be redistributed before spring 1946, farmers under Soviet protection pushed toward a steady erosion of landlords' social stature and standard of living.[22] As one of the most historically conservative sections of Korea, the area around Sinŭiju was home to many disaffected landlords, who encouraged Korean youth to protest the Soviet occupation and land reform.[23] Tensions between farmers and the landed elite—exacerbated under the Japanese colonial system—would not be easily resolved in North P'yŏngan.

Political change promoted unrest, but the region's social instability most clearly and consistently arose from acute agricultural problems.[24] One Soviet report from early October 1945 reveals the depth of grain shortages in North Korean cities, noting that struggles against local landlords had disrupted grain production at harvest time. Red Army administrators further stated that their troops' claim to foodstuffs was exacerbating Korea's hunger and heightening tension between the Soviets and urban intellectuals.[25] Following this rather frank self-assessment, Soviet administrators convened meetings in Pyongyang on 9 and 10 October, in which both Korean farmers and intellectuals discussed the region's agricultural problems and the sensitive issue of feeding the Red Army.[26] (Although the parallel is not extended in

Soviet documents, it is possible that some Koreans likened Soviet actions to the feverish Japanese export of Korean rice at the height of the Pacific War.)[27] Other economic difficulties associated with the Soviets, including the plunder of factories and poor railroad transport, gave Sinŭiju residents more reasons for agitation.[28] In fall 1945, Soviet documents stated that "reactionary forces" were using the economic difficulties as "justification for opposing the Red Army, the Soviet Union, and the local democratic parties," distributing leaflets, and otherwise "terrorizing" local authorities.[29] In this environment, no issue was so explosive as that of food. In Sinŭiju the price of rice had tripled from 30–40 wŏn to 110 wŏn per *mal* under Soviet occupation. Rumors circulated through the city that the Soviets were set to expropriate more rice stocks from the surrounding countryside.[30]

As the first "winter of victory"[31] set in upon the Korean Peninsula, democratic and Communist parties continued to clash in Sinŭiju via conflicting propaganda. Pro-Soviet messages were broadcast by local radio and printed in publications; city streets, public parks, and backyards were frequently littered with leaflets dropped from Soviet aircraft.[32] Working at cross-purposes, city churches maintained their activities within the city limits and moved to extend influence into the political realm. Conservative nationalists and Christian leaders alike effectively used church pulpits to publicize political content, while a South Korean Christian radio station known as Tongyang Pangsong (Far Eastern Broadcasting) was reportedly accessible to those tuned in on the northwestern Sino-Korean border.[33] Into this environment, the Soviets sent an army captain named Grafov from Pyongyang to investigate Sinŭiju's ideological terrain. His 13 November 1945 report characterizes prevalent trends in the city's newspaper market, and does so with some alarm. Noting that Sinŭiju had only two newspapers, Grafov critiqued the irregularity of their appearance, noting that "the People's Committee has published 19 issues [and] the Communist Party has published two issues." Complaining that he was "unable to examine" the newspapers because of a lack of capable translators, the captain recommended that newspaper journalists in the city should have frequent meetings where they turned over "all of their writings" to censors for approval.[34] By mid-November, the People's Committee newspaper had become the only regular publication on Sinŭiju newsstands, but even its contents were not always strictly controlled by the Soviets.[35]

In early November 1945, commemorations of the high ideals of the Bolshevik Revolution were juxtaposed in Sinŭiju against serious breaches of discipline among the rank-and-file of the occupation army.[36] A Red Army report investigating the situation in Sinŭiju, dated 13 November 1945, described soldiers' violations of all manner of military laws, including those forbidding public drunkenness and robbery. The report drew attention to the rise of venereal disease within the Red Army ranks in Sinŭiju, and noted that although twenty-two soldiers had been arrested for visiting a local brothel, such visits were difficult to prevent.[37] In Soviet-occupied Harbin, the Red Army resolved similar disciplinary problems by executing the offenders and blaming their deaths on Japanese renegades.[38] If

in fact the Soviets employed such techniques in Sinŭiju (and it appears they did not), they were unable to staunch the flow of incidents in the city. In the face of Soviet misbehavior between mid-September and mid-November 1945, the apparent complicity of the local Korean Communist Party administrators galled Sinŭiju citizens, building momentum toward an eventual confrontation.

Growing restlessness in North P'yŏngan was further aggravated by the Red Army's suppression of Korean troops returning from China. In October 1945, an estimated two thousand Korean Volunteer Army (KVA) veterans arrived in Andong, Sinŭiju's Chinese counterpart directly across the Yalu River. These Korean troops had begun their journey in Shenyang the day after Japan's capitulation, and thousands of Koreans had flocked to their standard.[39] Chinese Koreans in the vicinity rapidly joined the KVA ranks as it became clear that the economic and food situation in Soviet-occupied Andong would not improve in the near future.

On 24 October 1945, when the Chinese Guomindang succeeded in pushing the Chinese Communist Party out of Andong City (an act undertaken with the permission of the Soviets, no less) the entry of the Korean forces into Sinŭiju became more urgent.[40] Kim Kang and Kim Ho, both veterans of the Chinese 8th Route Army, led these two thousand soldiers and directed correspondence with the Russian command across the river in Sinŭiju, hoping to span the Andong-Sinŭiju Bridge and return home. In mid-November, the troops crossed the bridge and at last reentered Korea. Lieutenant General Bankowsky, however, demanded that the commanding Soviet colonel prevent the troops from moving any farther than the city limits of Sinŭiju. Confined to the city yet still proud to be within Korea's borders, the Korean volunteers paraded through Sinŭiju's streets before returning to their bunks at a local high school. But their homeward-bound excitement was cut short when, that same night, the Soviet troops collected all weapons held by the Koreans. The next day, the Soviets sent many back into the Manchurian borderlands.[41] Little documentation is available about the response of the students in Sinŭiju to the appearance of a veritable Korean army in their midst, but, given the circumstances, it is difficult to imagine anything other than excitement. In addition, it is worth recalling that Kim Il Sung had not yet appeared in Sinŭiju.

While Korean troops from Manchuria likely excited the sensibilities of Sinŭiju youth, another group that had entered from Manchuria—Japanese refugees—also agitated the students. Many of these refugees were housed in Korean schools in November 1945.[42] Meanwhile, several thousand Japanese students remained enrolled in North P'yŏngan's 604 schools.[43] Opening schools well after the traditional start of classes in late August, Korean administrators struggled to eliminate Japanese pedagogues and to employ a curriculum sensitive to both Korean nationalism and the needs of Soviet occupiers.[44] Beyond the persistence of the Japanese, news was circulating that Soviet troops were being garrisoned in local school buildings. Student frustration turned against the Soviets, who were seen as simultaneously responsible for both wrenching changes and a frustrating lack of change.[45] The presence of Soviet troops inside the sanctum of Korean educa-

tion—the classrooms—elucidates the situation of the youth. As their counterparts would in the south in 1960 and again in Kwangju in 1980, Korean students in North P'yŏngan displayed their abilities not only to represent but also to roil the national consensus.[46]

Occupation documents reveal conflicting Soviet impulses in school governance. While the Soviets declared eagerness to "establish and employ an anti-Japanese spirit among the high and elementary school teachers," by necessity they presided over a school system that continued to employ large numbers of Japanese teachers and "pro-Japanese" Koreans.[47] Seeking to preempt possible opposition, the Soviets sought to communicate with principals, investigate personnel in schools, and otherwise work with education administrators.[48] In the wake of student protests, the Soviets' inability or simple failure in this arena became clear. As the occupiers saw student unrest grow, their internal documents more frequently noted "the anti-Soviet movement going underground."[49] But with a series of actions in the towns surrounding Sinŭiju, this student movement would emerge into the open.

THE INCIDENT

Material conditions, swift social change, and Soviet missteps in North P'yŏngan Province had set the conditions for student unrest. The direct spark for the Sinŭiju incident came, appropriately, from a middle school in a small nearby town, Yongamp'o. The town's Susan middle school had been subjected to the same pressures as other schools in the region: it suffered from a lack of teachers, eviscerated resources, and firm Soviet control over curricula and personnel. Faculty and students were particularly outraged at the local Communist party's efforts to minimize the importance of the wave of Soviet misbehavior.[50] The school's lead administrator, identified in Chinese documents as "Principal Chu," had been called to Pyongyang, most likely to emphasize his responsibility for implementing the Soviet reforms. Upon his return, Chu was removed from his position for criticizing the Soviet soldiers and Korean Communists.[51] Believing that Principal Chu's intransigence merited further steps, on 18 November 1945, the Peace Preservation Bureau arrested him.[52] The arrest of the school principal became the catalyst for a series of bloody and disheartening clashes between students and armed Soviets and Korean Communists.

News of Chu's arrest spread quickly and students at several nearby schools organized their resistance.[53] Pupils at a fisheries school in Yongamp'o held an after-school meeting to debate their response, making comments highly critical of the incident and of Korean Communists in general. At this meeting, organized by the students and attended by local citizens, someone suggested that the students meet Yi Yonghŭp, the then-chairman of the Yongamp'o Council of People's Commissars, and confront him with the issue of freedom in their schools.[54] As he was the best-known local Communist representative, the students did not antici-

pate great results from the meeting. "Without restraints from the armed security force or the Soviet army," recalled one participant, "the students went out to meet Yi Yonghŭp."[55] When Yi could not be found, a rumor spread that he was running away to Sinŭiju, prompting "dozens of students to stack up logs on the road to Sinŭiju and wait."[56]

A farmers' union friendly to Soviet troops and Korean Communists assembled a crowd of about one hundred to disrupt the student roadblock. Wearing headbands and propelled by the sound of drums and gongs, the group approached the students "with hammers and clubs in their hands," then wordlessly set upon the students—scions of the bourgeoisie—giving them an "inevitable" beating.[57] After they returned to their homes and classrooms, the injured students appeared determined to escalate their resistance. In Sinŭiju itself, students looked to the events taking place in Yongamp'o as evidence that a political demonstration was required against the Korean Communists and the new occupying power.[58]

The North P'yŏngan Students' Association became active at this time, communicating with local Communists in an effort to broker a compromise. On 22 November, thirteen student executives from the association rode a truck from the headquarters of the Communist Party to Yongamp'o, accompanied by an executive from the Democratic Youth League and a Communist official. Again, the Communists engaged in a strategy of student intimidation. Before arriving at Yongamp'o in the evening, the students were pulled into a farm worker's assembly, after which Soviet police threatened to arrest them. The student association representatives were nonetheless able to set up a secret meeting with fellow students at 1:30 a.m. in a local restaurant, where the latter responded positively to the Yongamp'o students' request for revenge.[59] The students' growing radicalism can be seen in their determination to revolt, regardless of the actions of a Communist-sponsored inquiry commission. After a few short nighttime hours that may or may not have included sleep, the students' conviction was strengthened by a predawn meeting at the home of Ch'oe Nakto, executive of the student association at Sinŭiju's Cheil Kongŏp Hakkyo (First Technical School). At Ch'oe's home, the students decided to revolt immediately, delegating specific targets for specific groups of students, a decision confirmed in a final secret conference at a student boarder's house at 10 a.m. on 23 November. Each school's representative decided to take part in the attack.

The swelling ranks, which numbered between five hundred and one thousand and represented a collective body of seven schools, bolstered student leaders' confidence that they could mount a challenge to the privileged power of Soviet and Korean Communists. Christian influence fueled the rapid growth of the movement. The Soviets had tried to prevent Christian pastors from defending the students by disbanding local religious political organizations, but this was not completely successful.[60] Among the student leaders were Christians such as Chang Toyŏng, who in Sinŭiju had helped to organize a Christian coalition that might ultimately have centered on a charismatic figure such as Cho Mansik. With youth from several

other schools, the students would protest what they saw as the depredations of the Soviet soldiers and the complicity of the Korean Communists.[61]

A consortium of students assembled at 2 p.m. on 23 November 1945. Carrying both Korean and Soviet flags as cover, they approached the People's Committee's main building. The students then attacked the building. Machine gun fire erupted into the crowd and Soviet soldiers soon joined the Korean Communists in subduing the students, some of whom were armed with rocks. Meanwhile, several student groups had gathered in front of the North P'yŏngan's Communist Party Headquarters and the Peace Preservation Bureau, extending the confrontation to three different Communist bureaucracies. Students of Tong Middle School and First Technical School had approached the Peace Preservation Bureau with cheers of "Stalin hurrah!" to prevent attacks from guards with machine guns, and, in the words of one participant, "to show that we were not saying we were anti-Soviet."[62] The cheers for Stalin, however, quickly gave way to a cry of "Charge!" and the students began piling over the wall into the compound.[63] After a short period of physical struggle, Korean and Soviet security forces began firing rifles and handguns into the crowds, dispersing the protestors.

Each school had decided to take part in the attack. The Normal School and Second Technical Schools were delegated the task of striking the headquarters of the Communist Party. One participant in the attack on this facility (in the central-west part of the city) recalls that most of the students were armed with only "stones picked up on the road."[64] This group of students was unhindered by a wall and, shouting, streamed directly to the third floor of the building. The first casualty was a student named Chang Wŏnbong, who was said to have died when a Soviet officer shot him in the head. With the sound of gunfire, armed security forces rose up from the basement and began beating the protestors with their rifle butts, prompting the students to run from the building. A few students were said to have jumped from the third floor to escape automatic gunfire. Hwang Changha, sixteen years old at the time, remembers that "everyone just ran away as if they were out of their minds."[65] Students later recalled that a Soviet aircraft strafed the student crowds, driving some to seek refuge in the cold waters of the Yalu River.[66]

By the end of the afternoon, the violence had drawn about three thousand people to the streets from both sides of the protest.[67] U.S. intelligence services estimated that twenty-three students died and a number of others were seriously injured, estimates that largely accord with those of two student participants in the movement who later fled to Seoul and headed organizations to commemorate the incident. (These estimates are 15–24 student deaths and 168–350 injuries.)[68] But a Soviet military report—presumably a better source than U.S. intelligence or student refugees—indicates that about one hundred students died in the revolt.[69] This larger estimate is reflected in the work of Scalapino and Lee, as well as that of Erik Van Ree, who all state that seven hundred students were wounded.[70] Regardless of the specific numbers of casualties, the gravity of the protest and its potentially harmful impact on the Communist movement in North Korea should not be minimized.

The local Korean Communists and Red Army soldiers made few immediate efforts to acknowledge the deaths of the students. Aside from one flyer sent out within Sinŭiju, the Communists directed their energy toward removing all evidence of the incident. In November 1945, Communist authorities removed another Christian leader, Ham Sŏkhŏn, head of education in the Provincial People's Committee (PPC), and imprisoned him after a severe beating.[71] A wave of arrests in the locale ensued, with a credible account alleging that up to one thousand individuals were imprisoned in one day alone. Although most were released within a week—and told by their Soviet captors that only Kim Il Sung's personal intervention had saved them—the arrests inaugurated a political cleansing in northwest North Korea.[72]

The date 23 November 1945 came to represent the largest single demonstration of anti-Communist sentiment during the period of "liberation," revealing underlying social rifts in the nascent proletarian state. Within this context, Kim Il Sung was soon forced to confront an undercurrent of anti-Communist public opinion when he visited the shaken river city.

KIM'S VISIT

In an effort to reconcile the region's youth to unpleasant realities and make his first show of leadership along the northwestern border, Kim Il Sung boarded a Soviet aircraft and flew to Sinŭiju on 26 November 1945.[73] While Kim Il Sung cannot be directly blamed for the outbreak of student unrest, as he has been by several authors, he can be credited, at least in part, for its resolution.[74] As students and their families waited nervously, no apology was forthcoming from Kim. For the Communist leader, civil strife could not be tolerated anywhere in North Korea, and obstacles to the state's economic and social redevelopment had to be eliminated. Sinŭiju's strategic position along the Chinese border rendered the recent upheaval all the more serious. The importance of his visit is highlighted in Kim's official autobiography, which indicates that "local [Sinŭiju] authorities said only Kim Il Sung could save the situation."[75] Upon landing in the city, Kim posed for a photograph, wearing a Western-style suit and displaying a cunning smile.[76] He then proceeded to a series of assemblies at Sinŭiju schools.[77]

During a meeting with organized student groups on 27 November, Kim addressed the incident. He denounced the bloody collision, and laid down the gauntlet against civil strife: "Shooting between our people is not only a disgrace to the nation but also a serious hindrance to nation-building."[78] After returning to Pyongyang, Kim recalled his remarks:

> I asked the students why they acted like that and they answered that they had been misled quite unawares. The incident had not been conceived by the students themselves but triggered off by naïve students under the influence of reactionary wirepullers behind the scenes.[79]

Kim's remarks indicate the presence of dialogue between students and the leader, revealing that, during the meeting, Kim had at least momentarily suppressed his customary volubility. But if the students had indeed told Kim that "they had been misled" into protesting, such a disingenuous response indicates an unwillingness to express legitimate grievances to the new leader in the aftermath of the protests. Recent events, after all, had shown that complaints would be met with further retribution. Kim's remarks following his return to Pyongyang appealed to a positive conception of a unified Korean nation. As Kim noted: "It is deeply regretted that such a disturbance took place at a time when all the people should be uniting in the cause of nation-building. The Sinŭiju student incident reveals that our nation is not yet united."[80] Kim's rhetoric of unity, though laced with paternal shame, was more likely to appeal to the students than a reproach for having "been misled." Offering an oblique self-criticism of his party, Kim directed more opprobrium toward the "rogues lurking in the Communist Party and government organs."[81] This is the first recorded criticism of intraparty traitors in his public works. In later years, as he sought to expose various factional plots to challenge his leadership, Kim would repeatedly mention the negative forces "behind the scenes."

Primary sources that deal with Kim's arrival in Sinŭiju are scarce, making it difficult to assess the factuality of his memoirs.[82] But it appears that Kim did temporarily soothe tensions and calm the local population. The Sinŭiju incident appears to have been a catalyst that enabled Kim to fully employ the potent tool of nationalism for use in public talks and propaganda. In his address to Sinŭiju students, Kim wisely emphasized his anti-Japanese past and even moved to align himself with the adulated Korean fighters who had entered the city from Manchuria in mid-November. In subsequent propaganda aimed at students, Kim stressed his own nationalism and the need for youth to follow in his footsteps.[83]

Kim's reprimand of those who had been influenced by pro-Japanese elements and anti-Communist educators finds rich parallels in Soviet documents. Nikolai Georgievich Lebedev, major-general in the 25th Army, claimed that the Sinŭiju incident and subsequent protests were organized by an underground rightist student organization sent from Seoul to provoke turmoil.[84] But the Soviet military government took a more critical line than Kim, suggesting that the Korean Communist Party was leaning too far to the left and had not yet taken steps to ensure cooperation with the so-called bourgeois democratic camp. Soviet sources also indicated that "reactionary lectures"—like those delivered at schools in Yongamp'o—had influenced the students and the democratic party in Sinŭiju to oppose the Communist Party and the People's Committee.[85] Such analyses blamed the local Communist Party, not the impressionable students.

The most detailed known extant Soviet report on the incident gives an in-depth and somewhat more objective assessment of the origins of the strife in Sinŭiju. This report blames the Korean Democratic Party for the incident, and states that two or three groups of student instigators from below the 38th parallel had been

sent to Pyongyang and Sinŭiju to encourage resistance among student populations. The first group, the report noted, arrived in Pyongyang only to be arrested. The group that traveled to Sinŭiju found at their disposal an already restless and easily provoked population. After assessing the causes of the incident, the report directed several passages directly to students, written from the perspective of a fellow student. This section of the report was apparently intended as the basis for leaflets or educational materials in Sinŭiju schools. Linking the protest to the Japanese defeat, the document chastises the students in Sinŭiju for failing to construct an independent nation. According to the report, the clash gravely interfered with nation-building in Korea's transition period:

> Classmates, you must be the persons who study knowledge, not the persons who engage in politics. Those of you who engaged in political adventurism, you suffered a bloody punishment, committing a heinous crime which any responsible society would not accept. It must be pointed out that in New Korea's transition period, a bloody clash should not occur. You ought not to become the opportunists of false patriotism. Take to the streets and approve of Communism! Whether or not you are present in the struggle for the laboring people's liberation and whether or not you are a genuine Communist, you should not fear sacrifice.
>
> The people were enslaved by Japan for 36 years, and on August 15 finally won the liberation and began to feel proud and elated. You, however, did not go [to the streets] to construct an independent country, but instead participated in a bloody clash.[86]

Even though it does not mention the emerging North Korean leader, the language in this document closely mirrors Kim Il Sung's rhetoric in Sinŭiju.

To explain why farmers were drawn into the incident, the report diverges from other reports on student-farmer confrontations and asserts that the farmers opted to contain the violence rather than challenge it. In the conclusion, the report demands that the students yield to the needs of newly liberated rural communities and express their sympathy with agricultural workers. Such appeals had two outcomes. First, they diverted blame from the Soviets for appropriating grain from the countryside. Second, they strengthened the contemporary case for viewing the social unrest in Sinŭiju as an outcome of long-standing strife between landlord families and farmers.

IMPACTS

The incident in Sinŭiju inspired similar student protests in Pyongyang and Wŏnsan, making student unrest—and its blatant anti-Soviet overtones—a fact of life for Soviet and Korean authorities in the coming months.[87] Taking steps to reverse growing public distaste for Communism, whether Soviet or Korean, Kim Il Sung used the theme of nation-building to demand that students abandon

factionalism and merge all youth organizations into a single, cohesive, and disciplined organization under the auspices of the Democratic Youth League (DYL). In Kim's words, "Just as an army lacking iron discipline cannot win battles, so an undisciplined youth organization is up to no good."[88] Through internal regulation, goals, statistics, and stern advisers, the DYL took steps toward becoming an organization known for its "iron discipline." The regime's efforts to mobilize an estimated one hundred thousand North Koreans in Pyongyang on 6 January 1946, at the "Solidarity and Support of the Moscow Conference," were correspondingly intense, and included the arrest of the Christian political leader Cho Mansik.[89]

Despite "Solidarity and Support" and other internal campaigns, public sentiment opposing the Soviet occupation remained strong in both North Korea and northeast China. On 22 February 1946, a wave of student demonstrations broke out in Chinese cities to protest the Soviet occupation of Manchuria. Triggered by revelations of the secret Yalta accords and probable Soviet involvement in the murder of a Chinese government representative in Fushun, the protests put additional pressure on the Soviets to withdraw from Manchuria.[90] As with the Sinŭiju student protests, a seemingly small spark in the Manchurian coal center of Fushun—itself a peripheral city—had ignited anti-Soviet indignation. These student protests caused great concern among Soviet administrators in Manchuria and, from the perspective of occupation officials in North Korea, their timing could not have been worse. On 25 February 1946, a report originating from Chongqing briefly alluded to the Sinŭiju incident. A broken translation, which ended up in the hands of U.S. State Department officials, reads: "On the December of last year a great number of innocent and patriotic Korean students had been killed for no reason in Sinyechow [sic] in North Korea by Russian soldiers and Korean Communists. The details will be published later."[91] As the 1 March 1919 demonstrations in Korea had inspired China's "May Fourth Movement" of the same year, the above document suggests that swift Korean student resistance to Soviet occupation in Sinŭiju provided similar impetus for Chinese student protests in spring 1946.

The resonant anniversary of the March First (*Samil*) Movement was approaching. Soviet occupiers in the north, like their American counterparts in the south, faced the significant challenge of how to handle the popular sentiments that the anniversary would inevitably stimulate. Despite intense Korean Communist Party efforts to reinterpret March First as a Bolshevik-led movement, Christian and student rallies, and their accompanying cries for political representation, culminated on 1 March 1946.[92] On 28 February, schools throughout Pyongyang were practically empty, as many students stayed away from school in order to voice their opposition to the staged *Samil* celebrations. After some students were forced to march in a *Samil* parade, a huge crowd of Christians assembled at a Pyongyang Presbyterian Church to protest. Under the close watch of Soviet soldiers, the crowd lingered until 3 March. Occupation leaders responded to these protests by closing schools for several days and by holding private meetings

with school principals. Even then, however, students issued statements ignoring Soviet orders.[93]

Amid the tension, a report, "Korea Under Russian Regime: Reign of Death, Famine and Chaos," surfaced. Months earlier, in December, the Returned Korean Student League (RKSL) had prepared this report in Chongqing.[94] Before exposing the Sinŭiju incident and the Soviet "massacre," the league chastised the Korean Communists for abusing Sinŭiju's population, stealing Japanese goods for private use, and vowing obeisance to Marshal Stalin and the Soviet Union. "These Korean communists love the Russian Red flag more than their own Korean National Flag," wrote the students. "These Korean Communists," they repeated, "even defended for the Russians about their plundering of Korean foodstuffs, properties, the raping of Korean women and massacre of Korean students."[95] The Sinŭiju incident remained a potent symbol, and added to the challenges that both the Soviets and the North Korean regime faced in commemorating March First.

DISCIPLINING AND CONSOLIDATING SINŬIJU

For the remainder of the Soviet occupation, special measures were implemented in schools to ensure that organized student unrest would be near impossible in North P'yŏngan. The educational bureaucracy shuffled letters of reference, autobiographies, investigative reports, and other determining files on teachers—including information on their social class and role under Japanese rule—back and forth from Pyongyang to the frontier province.[96] Because of the paucity of trained and appropriately experienced teachers who were not associated with the Japanese, in 1948 and 1949 several students who had participated in the anti-Soviet demonstrations applied to be teachers. These individuals were expected to explain how their attitudes had changed since the heady days of November 1945.[97] If teachers were to be filtered out and remolded, students would also experience similar drastic changes and undergo the same types of investigations. Accordingly, the DYL was closely watched, with careful attention paid to members' social class and history.[98] This rapid and often undifferentiated absorption of youth and teachers into party organs was performed in the name of security in the wake of the Sinŭiju incident, but it would later result in problems for the Workers' Party in North P'yŏngan.[99]

Many students would in fact be drafted into the army and trained as Communist soldiers. The Peace Preservation Officers' School was soon formed and the youngest, most able individuals were chosen for enlistment. Upon being selected, the students underwent rigorous daily field training and "thought inspection" conducted by the top Soviet officials. Ch'oe Yonggŏn, who rose to leadership in the KDP, led the Peace Preservation Bureau Corps Officers' School, fulfilling influential roles across the board of Communist enterprises.[100] Not surprisingly, one section of the Officers' School was stationed in the former Sinŭiju Commercial

Middle School, whose students had participated in the 23 November student movement. The South Sinŭiju Peace Preservation Corps Officers' School bunked three thousand Sinŭiju students by the third graduating class. While instruction in military training was primary, political classes stressed the anti-Japanese struggle, the history of the Red Army, and self-criticism.[101] Through rigorous training, many students in Sinŭiju had been oriented toward Soviet-style military discipline via the *poandae* (security force) school, founded in Pyongyang in 1945, which diminished any chance of further open resistance.

By spring 1946, Kim Il Sung and the Soviets were actively engaged in organizing youth into various Communist organizations, as Kim railed against what he called the misleading and traitorous behavior of Christian ministers.[102] Sinŭiju and North P'yŏngan Province, although now in the background of the nationwide unrest, still produced churchmen eager to disagree with Communist authority. As a result, these areas saw much anti-Christian activity on the part of Korean Communists. In the wake of nationwide church protest movements urging more religious freedom, three churches in Sinŭiju were reportedly burned to the ground. In nearby Yongamp'o, where the Sinŭiju incident had been sparked, local forces tore a Presbyterian church to the ground, carted it away in pieces, and later executed the church leader. In Ŭiju, only a short way up the Yalu River, the Methodist church was torched, and its minister forced to tug an oxcart through town carrying the label of "national traitor."[103]

A list of requests to Pyongyang from the Soviet military representative in North P'yŏngan Province called for a counterespionage unit to curb infiltrators from the south in the aftermath of the Sinŭiju incident. (Whether the need for such a force was real or simply a means to reconcile bad Red Army behavior remains unknown.)[104] When U.S. presidential representative Edwin Pauley visited Sinŭiju in spring 1946, his Soviet guides, following standard protocol, were not anxious to let Pauley's team speak directly to the people of Sinŭiju. Perhaps the unbecoming events that had taken place several months earlier in the city made the Soviet guards hesitant to allow any direct contact with local Koreans, particularly the student-workers who were industriously running factory machinery. When Pauley asked about general living conditions, however, one of the Soviets plainly stated that the people were underfed. Food was scarce, workers received less than the mandated ration, and their spouses ate only a portion of the worker-ration.[105] Soon after, American agents in Pyongyang reported that refugees from northwest Korea, some Japanese, were flowing in increasing numbers into Manchuria and South Korea, as food ration problems continued.[106] Pauley's report, despite its preoccupation with economic data, depicts a disheartened and devastated city.

While Pauley's nigh-mandatory bouts with the vodka urged on him by his Russian hosts may have prevented him from engaging the Soviets deeply on the situation in Sinŭiju, American spies were more diligent. As Soviet military control over Sinŭiju deepened in 1946 and 1947, documents filed by American spies increased in number. According to these documents, passengers arriving at the Sinŭiju train

station were routinely inspected; passengers traveling from the Sinŭiju station to Ch'ŏngju underwent three separate inspections. The Pyongyang-Sinŭiju route was even more intensive, with two inspections invariably given before arriving in Sinŭiju, and additional inspections given before and after departure. Public buses in the Sinŭiju area were also seen as likely targets for security inspections and questioning by the *poandae*, as were the overcrowded vehicles traveling the frequented route to nearby Ŭiju.[107] Three Soviet infantry companies, two heavy machine gun companies, one quartermaster company, and one medical unit were reportedly stationed in Sinŭiju. "Anti-Aircraft Rapid Firing Guns" surrounded the city—three on the Yalu River, one at the city's highest point, and two bordering the coveted Sinŭiju airfield to protect Soviet aircraft. The city had become a highly policed and militarized zone, intended to deter enemy forces, although it was sometimes unclear who the enemy was.[108]

One final element that contributed to the Sinŭiju incident came from across the border in China. In an order from the Provincial Committee in Andong dating from the week after the Sinŭiju incident, the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) noted the ongoing prevalence of Japanese "fascists and special agents" in the area, and spurred on local cadres to make revolution among the mobile masses of Korean and Japanese migrants, a population the CCP saw as critical to "aiding the organization of the North Korean people" across the Yalu.[109] Like the North Korean cadre, the local CCP was working hard to overturn present social structures by convincing people of the old pro-Japanese landlords' "traitorous crimes."[110] Although exchanges and cooperation among Asian comrades along the Manchurian-North Korean border were fairly intense, the North Koreans remained naturally wary of the Chinese, particularly given the fact that the Soviets maintained that infiltrators had provoked the Sinŭiju incident. The North Korean regime kept a vigilant eye on the Chinese, and grouped them under "external management" along with the Japanese in surveillance files. Over several years, the Korean Communists produced thousands of pages of documentation on Chinese residents in Ŭiju county (*kun*) alone.[111] Based on such sources, further research on Sinŭiju's role in the North Korean revolution should certainly consider the Chinese connection more thoroughly.

CONCLUSION

In stark contrast to the spontaneous and raucous protests of November 1945, the heavily militarized city of Sinŭiju staged an organized celebration in the last week of June 1947. Soviet soldiers and Sinŭiju citizens took joint part in sporting events, parades, and other activities to strengthen Soviet-Korean friendship and to express gratitude to the Red Army and the Soviet Union.[112] From 1947 until 1950, opposition forces were rooted out and remolded, student unrest never resurfaced, and the general populace of Sinŭiju moved toward acceptance of the region's changed way of life.

The Sinŭiju incident was a pivotal event in the emerging North Korean state's early history. The persistence of churchmen and students to protest against Communist policy and to provoke open outbreaks of protest in the early months of liberation led the Soviet Union, Kim Il Sung, and other Korean Communists to shape their own policies in ways that minimized dissent. As student unrest continued several months after the Sinŭiju incident, the Communists responded by stamping out sources of resistance and redirecting youthful energies. The latter goal influenced Kim Il Sung's rhetoric and drew the young leader out of Pyongyang on his first-ever inspection tour.

The Japanese exodus had created a political vacuum that was too volatile to permit a coalition government north of the 38th parallel. Student and church participation in the Sinŭiju incident, and the distressing aftermath of the protests, offered the first clear evidence that cooperation between Communist and democratic parties was unlikely. Indeed, the Communists' consolidation of power involved suppressing church influence, revamping the educational system, and building a sustainable youth following.

The Sinŭiju incident also revealed rifts between rural adherents to the revolution and the scions of the landed classes—the student elite—in the early years of the occupation. Similar societal rifts and methods of power consolidation existed in many other Communist states in the early postwar period. The Sinŭiju incident was unique insofar as it provided a test case for Kim Il Sung's leadership and accelerated his use of personalized nationalism.

The Sinŭiju incident did not mushroom into a larger social movement requiring suppression by Soviet tanks (as in Prague in 1948), but the incident nevertheless had a lasting impact into the late 1940s. It stimulated further abortive protests against the Soviets in North Korea, increased tensions surrounding the March First commemorations in 1946, and was clearly instrumental in sparking a patriotic Chinese student movement in neighboring Manchuria that spring. Ultimately, the Sinŭiju incident had its greatest impact in the way it accelerated North Korean state power. Having been imperiled in peripheral Sinŭiju, the Korean Communists went on to place the city within a matrix of discipline whose centralizing power would withstand and outlast even the savagery of the Korean War.

NOTES

1. A well-researched discussion of localized areas diverging from both Seoul and Pyongyang can be found in Bruce Cumings, *The Origins of the Korean War, vol. 1, Liberation and the Emergence of Separate Regimes, 1945–1947* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1981). See also Allan R. Millett, *The War for Korea, 1945–1950: A House Burning* (Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas Press, 2005). On the Cheju rebellion, see John Merrill, "The Cheju-do Rebellion," *Journal of Korean Studies* 2 (1980),

139–97; see also United States National Archives and Records Administration, Record Group (hereafter RG) 59, Everett F. Drumright to the Secretary of State, "Transmitting Report of Development of Cheju Island," 7 January 1949, 895.00/1–749.

2. For reference to "terrorist acts," unemployment, starvation, corruption, and separatist tendencies in Ch'ŏngjin and North Hamgyŏng in 1946 and 1947, see Kim Il Sung, *Works, vol. 3, January–December 1947* (Pyongyang: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1981), 44; Kim Il Sung, *Works, vol. 2, January–December 1946*, 167, 261–62, 490; see also United States National Archives and Records Administration, RG262 *Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service*, Box 167, File October 1946, Broadcast from Ch'ŏngjin, 4 October 1946. Our use of Kim Il Sung's *Works* in this paper is informed by the caveats offered in Dae Sook Suh, *Korean Communism, 1945–1980: A Reference Guide to the Political System* (Honolulu, HI: University Press of Hawaii, 1981), and Li Sangjo (Ri Sangjo), "Letter to the Central Committee of the Korean Workers Party," 5 October 1956, RGANI (Russian Government Archive of Contemporary History [*Rossiskiy Gosudarstveniy Arkhiv Noveyshey Istorii*]), *Fond 5, Opis 28, Delo 410, Listy 233–295*, obtained by Nobuo Shimotomai and translated by Gary Goldberg, in "North Korea in 1956: New Evidence from the Archives of the Russian State Archive of Contemporary History," 65–66. This text was distributed by James Person at the "International Workshop on the Cold War and the Korean Peninsula: The Domestic Politics and Foreign Relations of North and South Korea," Beijing University, 18 May 2007.

3. All Russian documents cited in this paper are from the Archive of the Defense Ministry of the Russian Federation, Moscow (hereafter ADMRF). The authors thank Professor Kim Tonggil, of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, for making these documents (and his Chinese translations thereof) available to the authors for research.

4. The authors state that 700 students were wounded in the movement, while most other reports indicate that only between 700 and 1,000 students total took part in the protest. See Robert Scalapino and Chong-Sik Lee, *Communism in Korea, Part I: The Movement* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1972), 336n.

5. Cumings, *Origins, vol. 1*, 558n; Cumings, *The Origins of the Korean War, vol. 2, The Roaring of the Cataract, 1947–1950* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1990), 319. Cumings reemphasizes the incident in an identical fashion in *Korea's Place in the Sun: A Modern History* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2005), 230–31.

6. U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom (USCIRF), "Thank You Father Kim Il Sung: Eyewitness Accounts of Severe Violations of Freedom of Thought, Conscience, and Religion in North Korea," November 2005 <http://foreignaffairs.house.gov/archives/109/NKwitnesses.pdf> (17 July 2008), 36; Wi Jo Kang, *Christ and Caesar in Modern Korea: A History of Christianity and Politics* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1997), 156; Andrew Nahm, *Korea: Tradition and Transformation—A History of the Korean People* (Elizabeth, NJ: Hollym International Corp., 1988), 333.

7. English translations of Kim Sŏngsu's work, for instance, simply quote Bruce Cumings without attribution. See Kim Sŏngsu, *Ham Sŏkhŏn p'yŏnjŏn: Sin ŭi tosi wa sesok tosi sai esŏ* (Biography of a Korean Quaker: Voice of the People and Pioneer of Religious Pluralism in Twentieth Century Korea) (Seoul: Samin, 2001), 87–88. For the English version, see Kim Sung Soo, *Ham Sok Hon: Voice of the People and Pioneer of Religious Pluralism in Twentieth Century Korea: Biography of a Korean Quaker* (Seoul: Samin Books, 2001), 139.

8. Sŏ Tongman, *Puk Chosŏn sahoejuŭi ch'eje sŏngnipsa, 1945–1961* (The Formation of the North Korean Socialist System, 1945–1961) (Seoul: Sŏnin, 2005), 84, 397.

9. Kim Ha-yong (Kim Hayŏng), "The Formation of North Korean State Capitalism," trans. Owen Miller, *International Socialism: A Quarterly Journal of Socialist Theory* <http://www.isj.org.uk/?id=205> (30 June 2008). For the Korean monograph, see Kim Hayŏng, *Kukchejuŭi sigak eso pon hanbando* (The Korean Peninsula from an International Perspective) (Seoul: Ch'aek pŏlle, 2002). Owen Miller's interpretive essay provides further insights; see Owen Miller, "North Korea's Hidden History: Recent Writing on North Korea from South Korea's Internationalist Left," *International Socialism: A Quarterly Journal of Socialist Theory* 109 <http://www.isj.org.uk/index.php4?id=166&issue=109> (30 June 2008), 153–66.

10. *Chungang Ilbo*, T'ŭkpyŏl Ch'wijaeban, *Pirok Chosŏn minjujuŭi inmin konghwaguk* (Secret History of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea) (Seoul: Chungang Ilbosa, 1992).

11. Sinŭiju Pan'gong Haksaeng Ŭigŏ Kinyŏmhoe, *Amnok kangbyŏn ŭi hwaeppul: Sinŭiju pan'gong haksaeng ŭigo chinsanggi* (Torchlight on the Yalu River: Truthful Chronicle of the Just Anti-Communist Students in Sinŭiju) (Seoul: Ch'onggu Ch'ulp'ansa, 1964). For other Korean language sources on the Sinŭiju incident as an anti-Communist uprising, see Sinŭiju Siminhoe, *Sinŭiju-si chi 1969* (Sinŭiju City Gazetteer: 1969) (Seoul: Sinŭiju Siminhoe, 1969); and *Chungang Ilbo*, *Pirok*, vol. 1.

12. North Korean treatments of the incident are hard to find, but the Sinŭiju incident is alluded to in the entry for "Sinŭiju Broadcasting" in *Chosŏn taebaekkwa sajŏn* (Great Encyclopedia of Korea), vol. 15 (Pyongyang: Paekkwa Sajŏn Ch'ulp'ansa, 2000).

13. Charles K. Armstrong, *The North Korean Revolution, 1945–1949* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2003), 62–64.

14. On similar Japanese initiatives in Seoul, see Millett, *War for Korea,* 43–46. For the analogous attitude among Japanese diplomats in China, see Mamoru Shigemitsu to Japanese Diplomats in China, "MAGIC" Diplomatic Summary, 29 August 1945, A1–A3, quoted in United States Army General Staff, *The MAGIC Documents: Summaries and Transcripts of the Top Secret Diplomatic Communications of Japan, 1938–1945,* Microfilm (Washington, D.C.: University Publications of America, 1980).

15. The Political Adviser in Korea (Benninghoff) to the Secretary of State, 1 October 1945, *Foreign Relations of the United States* [*FRUS*], *1945: The British Commonwealth, The Far East*, vol. 6 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1969), 1065–66; Armstrong, *North Korean Revolution,* 50.

16. Pu Shun na. *Pu-yong yu 1945–1948 nian de chao xian ban dao—guang fu hou chao xian ban dao zheng zhi jin cheng zhong ben tu gong chan dang ren huo dong kao cha* (Park Song and the Korean Peninsula, 1945–1948: Investigation of the Progress of Activities by Local Communists after the August 15 Liberation) (master's thesis, East China Normal University, Shanghai, 2005), 19.

17. Soviet military administrators noted with some satisfaction that they had received "letters of thanks" from North Korean Christians in return for the occupation's policies of religious tolerance. See "Report Concerning Investigation of the Conditions of North Korean Local Political Departments," 30 October 1945, ADMRF, F[ont].Ustatsk, O[pis].433847, D[elo].1, 42–45. The tolerance of local religious practices in the name of political consolidation was consistent with Stalin's reacquisition of the Soviet Union's

Western borderlands. See Steven M. Miner, *Stalin's Holy War: Religion, Nationalism, and Alliance Politics, 1941–1945* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2003).

18. On the symbolism of 9 September in East Asia, see Ren Jun, *Rifu Riqiao Da Guifan* (Great Repatriation of Japanese Prisoners and Overseas Japanese) (Nanjing: Nanjing Chubanshe, 2005), 25–44.

19. "Investigative Report Concerning the North Korean Political Situation," Russian Presidential Archive, F.013, O.7, D.4, D.46, 8.

20. The Political Adviser in Korea (Benninghoff) to the Secretary of State, 1 October 1945, *FRUS, 1945: The British Commonwealth, The Far East*, vol. 6, 1066; USCIRF, "Thank You Father Kim Il Sung," 69–70; Kang, *Christ and Caesar in Modern Korea*, 156; United States National Archives and Records Administration, *Records of the Army Staff, Assistant Chief of Staff (G-2), Intelligence Administrative Division, Document Library Branch, "P" Files, 194–1951*, RG319, Box 1862, *Intelligence Summary Northern Korea* (INSK), 1 December 1945.

21. "Written Report Concerning the North Korean Land Reform Work Situation," 11 November 1945, ADMRF, F.Ustatsk, O.433847, D.1, 216–18; Ignatiev, "Report Concerning the Question of Providing Personnel," 12 November 1945, ADMRF, F.Ustatsk, O.433847, D.1, 170–72. For a detailed report on the history of the landlord-tenant system in Korea, see "Evaluation Report Concerning the Inhabitant Social Hierarchy," 30 October 1945, ADMRF, F.Ustatsk, O.433847, D.1, 106–18.

22. Kuksa P'yŏnch'an Wiwŏnhoe, eds., *Pukhan kwan'gye saryojip* (Historical Materials on North Korean Relations), vol. 12 (Seoul: Kuksa P'yŏnch'an Wiwŏnhoe, 1989), 340–82. For analysis, see Yi Sŏgyun, "Pukhan sahoejuŭii ch'eje ŭi sŏngnip kwa nongch'on kyongje kŏnsŏn e kwakhan yŏn'gu" (A Study on the Formation of the North Korean Socialist System and the Establishment of the Rural Economy after Liberation), (master's thesis, Kyŏngnam University, South Korea, 2001), 84. For extended comparison of land policy in Soviet-occupied Korea with that in the occupied Baltic states, see Yi Chaehŭi, "Pukhan ŭi t'oji kaehyŏk e kwakhan yŏn'gu" (A Study on the Land Reform in North Korea), (master's thesis, Kyŏngnam University, South Korea, 1997).

23. Ryoo Kihl-Jae (Ryu Kilchae), "Pukhan ŭi kukka kŏnsŏl kwa inmin wiwŏnhoe ŭi yŏkhal" (A Study of the People's Committees in State Building in North Korea, 1945–1947) (Ph.D. dissertation, Koryŏ University, Kaesong, North Korea, 1995), chapters 3–4; e-mail communication with Dr. Ryoo Kihl-Jae, 10 August 2007; Chulho Awe, with Herbert F. Webster, *Decision at Dawn: The Underground Christian Witness in North Korea* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1965), 25. For more on the intransigent attitudes of merchants in Ŭiju in an earlier period, see Sun-Hee Yoon (Yun Sŏnhŭi), "Migrants, Captives and Hostages: The Making of Northeast Asia in the Seventeenth Century," paper presented at Association for Asian Studies Annual Meeting, Atlanta, 5 April 2008. See also Sun Joo Kim, "Marginalized Elite, Regional Discrimination, and the Tradition of Prophetic Belief in the Hong Kyŏngnae Rebellion" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Washington, 2000), 17–30, 123.

24. For confirmation of this statement in a contemporary context, see Stephan Haggard and Marcus Noland, *Famine in North Korea: Markets, Aid, and Reform* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2007).

25. "Collected Report Concerning the Proceedings of the Local PPC Conference," 13 October 1945, ADMRF, F.172, O.614630, D.9, 42–43.

26. "Collected Report Concerning the Proceedings and Situation of the Local PPC Conference," 13 October 1945, ADMRF.

27. Ienaga Saburo, *The Pacific War, 1931–1945: A Critical Perspective on Japan's Role in World War II* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1978).

28. "Concerning the Japanese War Industry in Korea and the Situation Report on Heavy Manufacturing," December 1945, Russian Presidential Archive. Presidential Envoy Edwin Pauley, the only major figure in the Truman administration to visit the city during the occupation period, provides further data on the Soviet extractions from Sinŭiju. See Edwin W. Pauley, *Report on Japanese Assets in Soviet-Occupied Korea to the President of the United States, June, 1946* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1946), 56–58. See also the Acting Secretary of State to the Ambassador in the Soviet Union (Harriman), 26 December 1945, *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1945: The British Commonwealth, The Far East*, vol. 6 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1976), 1149.

29. "Investigative Report Concerning the North Korean Political Situation," December 1945, Russian Presidential Archive, F.013, O.7, D.4, D.46, 13.

30. G-2 Periodic Report #87, 6 December 1945, *G-2 Periodic Reports, Headquarters, 7th Infantry Division (1945.9–1947.9)*, vol. 9, 388.

31. The phrase is borrowed from Allyn and Adele Rickett, *Prisoners of Liberation* (New York: Cameron Associates, Inc., 1957), 188.

32. The Political Adviser in Korea (Benninghoff) to the Secretary of State, 1 October 1945, *FRUS, 1945: The British Commonwealth, The Far East*, vol. 6, 1066.

33. USCIRF, "Thank You Father Kim Il Sung," 46. For available international radio broadcasts in North Korea, see Anna Louise Strong, *In North Korea: First Eye-Witness Report* (New York: Soviet Russia Today, 1949), 13.

34. Captain Grafov, "Report to General A. A. Romanenko Concerning Deficiencies in Translation Work," 13 November 1945, ADMRF, F.Ustatsk, O.343253, D.2, 111.

35. On the August 1945 publication and later suppression of the Sinŭiju *wiwŏnhoe*'s *Apkang Ilbo* ("The Yalu River Daily"), see Kim Ha-yong, "The Formation of North Korean State Capitalism," n. p.

36. Soviet military administrators apparently concluded that public commemorations of the Great Soviet October Revolution could help the Korean people understand Soviet justice. Documents about these extensive commemorations, usually written by political officers in individual cities, never acknowledged that such ceremonies might have offended Koreans living in cities where Communist organizations had barely taken root. These populations were eager to resume Korean, rather than foreign, festivals in their cities. See "Report on Local Work in the Period from October 10 to October 28, 1945," 28 October 1945, ADMRF, F.Ustatsk, O.343253, D.2, 14–15.

37. Captain Grafov, "Report to General A. A. Romanenko Concerning Deficiencies in Translation Work," 13 November 1945, ADMRF, F.Ustatsk, O.343253, D.2, 110–11.

38. According to a British observer, between 15 March and 23 April 1946, "One hundred and twenty Russian soldiers were shot by order of the Russian Command in Harbin during this period for various offences against public order." See United States National Archives and Records Administration, RG59, "British Report on Manchuria," 893.00 MANCHURIA/7-1546, *Records of the U.S. Department of State Relating to the Internal Affairs of Korea, 1945–1949*, Decimal File 895.00.

39. Kim Tonggil writes: "On October 12, 1945, the leader of the pioneer group of Korean Volunteer Army, Han Cheong, led the pioneer detachment of the KVA to enter into the Korean middle school in Sinuiju across Andong and negotiated with the Soviet Red Army. But the latter rejected the entry of the KVA into the North Korea, saying that 'only the presence of the Soviet Red Army rather than any other military forces is in accordance with the international regulation.' Twenty days later the pioneer detachment of the KVA had to return to Shenyang from Sinuiju." (Kim Tonggil, "Re-examination of the Return of the Ethnic Korean Divisions in the PLA to North Korea," unpublished paper.) See also *Chungang Ilbo, Pirok,* vol. 1, 148–54.

40. Odd Arne Westad adeptly addresses the complexities of Chinese Guomindang-Soviet relations in Manchuria at this time in *Cold War and Revolution: Soviet-American Rivalry and the Origins of the Chinese Civil War, 1944–1946* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993). See also Robert Levine, *Anvil of Victory: The Communist Victory in Manchuria, 1945–1948* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1987).

41. Kim Tonggil, "Re-examination," and Scalapino and Lee, *Communism in Korea, Part I,* 333.

42. United States National Archives and Records Administration, RG319, Box 1862, *ISNK*, 1 December 1945; *Chungang Ilbo, Pirok,* vol. 1, 163.

43. More than one thousand Chinese students were also enrolled in the provincial high schools. See "Report Concerning the Situation of Public Education in North Korean Localities," 20 October 1945, ADMRF, F.Ustatsk, O.433847, D.1, 60–61.

44. "Data Sheet Concerning North Korea's National Education Situation," September 1945, ADMRF, F.Ustatsk, O.433847, D.1, 76–79. For more general information on education reforms in this period, see H. C. Kim and D. K. Kim, *Human Remolding in North Korea: A Social History of Education* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2005), 50–63.

45. United States National Archives and Records Administration, RG319, Box 1862, *ISNK*, 1 December 1945; *Chungang Ilbo, Pirok,* vol. 1, 163.

46. Sheila Miyoshi Jager, *Narratives of Nation Building in Korea: A Genealogy of Patriotism* (New York: M.E. Sharpe, 2003), and Gi-Wook Shin and Kyung Moon Hwang, eds., *Contentious Kwangju: The May 18 Uprising in Korea's Past and Present* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2000).

47. "Report Concerning North Korean People's Provisional Committee Representative Meeting," 13 October 1945, ADMRF, F.Ustatsk, O.433847, D.1, 22. For Kim's anti-Japanese rhetoric, see Kim Il Sung, *Works, vol. 1,* 266. For extended treatment of Soviet use of educated Japanese in occupied Dalian, see Christian Hess, "From Imperialist Enemies to Socialist Friends: The Japanese in Dalian, 1945–1949," paper presented at Midwest Conference on Asian Affairs, Madison, Wisconsin, 22 October 2006.

48. "Report Concerning North Korean People's Provisional Committee Representative Meeting," 13 October 1945, ADMRF, F.Ustatsk, O.433847, D.1, 19; "Report Concerning the Situation of Public Education in North Korean Localities," 20 October 1945, ADMRF, F.Ustatsk, O.433847, D.1, 60–61.

49. "Report Concerning Investigation of the Conditions of North Korean Local Political Departments," 30 October 1945, ADMRF, F.Ustatsk, O.433847, D.1, 45.

50. *Chungang Ilbo, Pirok,* vol. 1, 164–66.

51. On the scheduled convening of Korean school principals with Soviet educational administrators, see "Report Concerning North Korean People's Provisional Committee Representative Meeting," 1–25; and "Report Concerning the Situation of Public Education in North Korean Localities," 20 October 1945, 60–61.

52. According to two student refugees who arrived in Seoul from Sinŭiju in early December, Chu's actual destination had been Seoul, and the principal had been arrested after his return to Sinŭiju because he had overtly discussed American laws in Seoul. See G-2 Periodic Report #88, 7 December 1945, *G-2 Periodic Reports, Headquarters, 7th Infantry Division (1945.9–1947.9),* vol. 9, 388.

53. Scalapino and Lee, *Communism in Korea, Part I,* 336n.

54. One of the most detailed sources on the incident incorrectly states that Yi ordered his armed guards to encircle the school at this time, arresting all students and faculty involved in the debate. See United States National Archives and Records Administration, RG59, Returned Korean Student League, "Korea Under Russian Regime: Reign of Death, Famine and Chaos," 3 December 1945, enclosed in Park Soon to President Truman, 3 March 1946, 895.01/3-346.

55. Testimony of Yi Tomyŏng, quoted in *Chungang Ilbo, Pirok,* vol. 1, 164.

56. Testimony of Yi Tomyŏng, quoted in *Chungang Ilbo, Pirok,* vol. 1, 164.

57. Testimony of Yi Tomyŏng, quoted in *Chungang Ilbo, Pirok,* vol. 1, 164.

58. United States National Archives and Records Administration, RG59, Returned Korean Student League, "Korea Under Russian Regime: Reign of Death, Famine and Chaos." 3 December 1945. While the city of Yongamp'o is not included in this report, the report's description of Lung-Ai-fu fits the description that Scalapino and Lee offer of Yongamp'o. The reason behind the differing city names could simply be a problem of translation and romanization. For instance, the romanization of Sinŭiju in this report is "Sinyechow," clearly a romanization of the Chinese, *Xinyizhou,* and not the often contemporarily utilized Korean romanization "Sinuiju." Furthermore, the removal of Principal Chu fits well into other accounts, which also state that the People's Committee removed a local school principal. Unlike other accounts, however, the report of the Returned Korean Student League recounts the events that preceded 23 November as more tumultuous and in much greater detail.

59. Reminiscence of Kim Indŏk, quoted in *Chungang Ilbo, Pirok,* vol. 1, 164–66.

60. The Returned Korean Student League asserted that the pastors themselves were killed or wounded. Other sources do not bear this out. See United States National Archives and Records Administration, RG59, Returned Korean Student League, "Korea Under Russian Regime: Reign of Death, Famine and Chaos," 3 December 1945.

61. Chang later became a general in the ROK Army. See Kang, *Christ and Caesar in Modern Korea,* 156.

62. *Chungang Ilbo, Pirok,* vol. 1, 167.

63. Testimony of Yi Tomyŏng, in *Chungang Ilbo, Pirok,* vol. 1, 164–66.

64. *Chungang Ilbo, Pirok,* vol. 1, 167.

65. *Chungang Ilbo, Pirok,* vol. 1, 167.

66. United States National Archives and Records Administration, RG59, Returned Korean Student League, "Korea Under Russian Regime: Reign of Death, Famine and Chaos," 3 December 1945. See also testimony of Kim Indŏk, in *Chungang Ilbo, Pirok,* vol. 1, 165. Although the allegation that Soviets used aircraft to suppress the protest may

appear unlikely, Soviet documents indicate that only two weeks before 25 November, the local Provincial People's Committee (PPC) had requested permission to begin the work of clearing complete damaged Japanese planes from Sinŭiju's coveted airfield. See "Report to Soviet Military Representatives in All Provinces Regarding Deficiencies in Translation Work," 13 November 1945, 110–12.

67. "Special Issue: Sinŭiju Student Revolt," 25 November 1945, ADMRF, F.Ustatsk, O.343254, D.2, 194.

68. *Chungang Ilbo, Pirok,* vol. 1, 168.

69. United States National Archives and Records Administration, RG319, Box 1862, *ISNK,* 1 December–15 December; and "Special Issue: Sinŭiju Student Revolt," 25 November 1945, 194.

70. See Erik Van Ree, *Socialism in One Zone: Stalin's Policy in Korea, 1945–1947* (Oxford: Berg Publishers Ltd., 1989), 117; and Scalapino and Lee, *Communism in Korea, Part I,* 336n.

71. See Kim, *Ham Sŏkhŏn p'yŏnjŏn* (Biography of a Korean Quaker), 87–88; Cumings, *Korea's Place in the Sun,* 230–31; and Cumings, *Origins, vol. 2,* 319. For a speech that targeted similar religious leaders in South P'yŏngan, see Kim Il Sung, "Speech Delivered at the First Enlarged Committee Meeting of the South P'yŏngan Provincial People's Political Committee," 23 January 1946, *Works, vol. 2,* 22.

72. *Chungang Ilbo, Pirok,* vol. 1, 168.

73. Hwang Chaejun's research has Kim arriving on 26 November and staying until 1 December. See Hwang Chaejun, "Pukhan ŭi 'hyŏnji chido' yŏn'gu t'ŭksŏng kwa kinŭng chungsim ŭro" (A Study of North Korea's 'On-the-Spot Guidance' System: Focusing on its Characteristics and Functions), Ph.D. dissertation (Department of North Korean Studies and Unification Policy, Sŏgang University, South Korea, 1999), p. 1 of the appendix.

74. Kim, *Ham Sŏkhŏn p'yŏnjŏn* (Biography of a Korean Quaker), 88; Nahm, *Korea: Tradition and Transformation,* 333.

75. Kim Il Sung, *With the Century,* Korean Friendship Association, 2003 <http://www.korea-dpr.com/library/202.pdf> (22 April 2008), 1732.

76. *Chungang Ilbo, Pirok,* vol. 1, 166. For an almost certainly fabricated, but nevertheless interesting, account of Kim's conversation at the Sinŭiju airport with a relatively well-to-do pilot worried about his class status, see *History of the Revolutionary Activities of the Great Leader Comrade Kim Il Sung* (Pyongyang: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1983), 196–99.

77. See Armstrong, *North Korean Revolution,* 62–64; and Cumings, *Origins, vol. 2,* 319.

78. Kim Il Sung, "Which Path Should Liberated Korea Take? Speech at a Mass Rally in Sinŭiju," 27 November 1945, *Works, vol. 1,* 397.

79. Kim Il Sung, "Students Should Actively Help in Building a Democratic Country: Speech Delivered at a Great Lecture Meeting of the Young Students from Middle Schools and Schools of Higher Levels in Pyongyang," 7 December 1945, *Works, vol. 1,* 411.

80. Kim Il Sung, "Students Should Actively Help in Building a Democratic Country," 7 December 1945, *Works, vol. 1,* 411.

81. Kim Il Sung, "Which Path Should Liberated Korea Take? Speech a Mass Rally in Sinuiju," 27 November 1945, *Works, vol. 1,* 397.

82. Kim Il Sung, *With the Century,* 1732.

83. *Chŏngno,* 21 December 1945, and *Chŏngno*, 26 December 1945, reprinted in Kuksa P'yŏnch'an Wiwŏnhoe, eds., *Pukhan kwan'gye saryojip* (Historical Materials on North Korean Relations), vol. 32, 80–82.

84. Van Ree, *Socialism in One Zone*, 117.

85. "Investigative Report Concerning the North Korean Political Situation," December 1945, 4–13.

86. "Special Issue: Sinŭiju Student Revolt," 25 November 1945, 194.

87. United States National Archives and Records Administration, RG319, Box 1863, *ISNK*, 20 March 1946.

88. Kim Il Sung, "On the Occasion of Formation of the Democratic Youth League of North Korea: Speech Delivered at the Conference of Representatives of the Democratic Youth Organization in North Korea," 17 January 1946, *Works, vol. 2,* 18.

89. United States National Archives and Records Administration, RG319, Box 1862, *ISNK*, 18 January 1946.

90. See Adam Cathcart, "Chinese Nationalism in the Shadow of Japan, 1945–1950," Ph.D. dissertation, Ohio University, 2005, chapter 2. See also *Chinese Press Review*, U.S. Information Service, Chungking, China, no. 366 (26 January 1946), and no. 5 (18 March 1946).

91. United States National Archives and Records Administration, RG59, "News From Korea," enclosed in Pak Sun (of the Provisional Government of Korea in Chungking), to President Harry S. Truman, 3 March 1946, 895.01/3-346, 1.

92. Kuksa P'yŏnch'an Wiwŏnhoe, eds., *Pukhan kwan'gye saryojip* (Historical Materials on North Korean Relations), vol. 25, 36–37, 213–15, 235–42; Kim Il Sung, "On the Occasion of the 27th Anniversary of the March First Uprising: Speech Delivered at the South P'yŏngan Provincial Celebration of the 27th Anniversary of the March First Uprising," 1 March 1946, *Works, vol. 2,* 86–90.

93. United States National Archives and Records Administration, RG319, Box 1863, *ISNK*, 20 March 1946.

94. The article's translator, and the paper in which it was originally published (if any) are omitted from the document. For more information on the relationship between Guomindang-controlled Chongqing and the various Korean exile groups (including publishing regulations), see Ku Daeyol (Ku Taeyŏl), "China's Policy toward Korea during World War II: Restoration of Power and the Korea Question," *Korea Journal* 43, no. 4 (Winter 2003), 238; and Choe Dok Sin (Ch'oe Tŏksin), *The Nation and I* (Pyongyang: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1987), 15–16.

95. United States National Archives and Records Administration, RG59, Returned Korean Student League, "Korea Under Russian Regime" 3 December 1945, 2. While it is one of the most detailed sources on the incident, this document incorrectly states that Yi ordered his armed guards to encircle the school, and that he arrested all students and faculty involved in the debate.

96. United States National Archives and Records Administration, RG242, *National Archives Collection of Foreign Records Seized, 1941–, Records Seized by U.S. Military Forces in Korea,* SA2006, 2/8. These sources contain personal histories, autobiographies, letters of inquiry, and letters of estimation of employees for 1949 from the Teachers Training School, North P'yŏngan Province, North Korea. For similar files, see also RG242, SA2005, 8/4, which contains personal histories and autobiographies of teachers and written

opinions of principals (1946, Songnim 1st and 2nd High School and Songnim Girls' School, Hwanghae-do); RG242, SA2005, 8/6, which contains personal histories and autobiographies of junior high school teachers and written opinions of principals (1946, Educational Bureau of Sariwŏn); RG242, SA2005, 8/7, which contains personal histories, autobiographies, and application of candidates for high school literature teachers (1947, Pyongyang Special City); RG242, SA2005, 8/16, which contains personal histories and autobiographies of teachers and the written opinions of the principal (1949, Chaeryong High School for Girls); RG242, SA2006, 2/4, which contains personal histories, brief autobiographies, and records of investigation of candidates for teachers of Central Education Leaders' Training School (1949, Ministry of Education); and RG242, SA2006, 2/25, for the "Register of High School Teachers in North Korea" (1950, North Korean Educational Bureau).

97. United States National Archives and Records Administration, RG242, SA2006, 2/8, which contains personal histories, autobiographies, letters of inquiry, and letters of estimation of employees (1949, Teachers Training School, North P'yŏngan Province, North Korea).

98. United States National Archives and Records Administration, RG242, SA2009, 4/178, Roster of Youth Association members and personal histories of staff of the North Korean Democratic Young Men's League, January 1946, North Korean Democratic Young Men's League, Sunch'on Branch, North Korea.

99. Kim Il Sung, "Tasks of the Party Organizations in North P'yŏngan Province: Speech at a North P'yŏngan Provincial Party Conference," 7 April 1956, *Works, vol. 10, January–December 1956,* 116.

100. See Central Intelligence Agency Records Search Tool (CREST), Korea Office, "Military Information: Peace Preservation Corps Officers Schools in North Korea," September 1947, CIA-RDP82-00457R000800840007-8; Van Ree, *Socialism in One Zone*, 150; CREST, Korea Office, "Military Information: North Korean People's Army or Peace Preservation Corps Officers Schools," 3 November 1947, CIA-RDP82-00457R001000450007-8.

101. CREST, Korea Office, "Military Information: Peace Preservation Corps Officers Schools in North Korea," September 1947; and *CREST,* Korea Office, "Military Information: North Korean People's Army or Peace Preservation Corps Officers Schools."

102. See Kim Il Sung, "The Results of the Democratic Elections and the Immediate Tasks of the People's Committee: Speech Delivered at the Third Enlarged Meeting of the Provisional People's Committee of North Korea," 25 November 1946, *Works, vol. 2,* 487; and Kim Il Sung, "Speech at a Conference of the Organization of Sŏnch'ŏn County, South P'yŏngan Province, of the Workers' Party of North Korea," 24 January 1948, *Works, vol. 4, January–December 1948,* 49.

103. See CREST, Korea Office, "Political Information: Persecution of Christians in North Korea," 2 June 1947, CIA-RDP82-00457R000600440008-3. See also United States National Archives and Records Administration, RG319, Box 1398, G-2 Periodic Report, USAFIK, Seoul, Korea, Eastern Asia, Operational Intelligence, Glenn Newman, Political Trends #28, 8 April 1946. Newman's intelligence reports from Seoul tend to be more accurate and less hysterical than others also included in the G-2 series.

104. Lieutenant Colonel Ignatiev, "Report from the Soviet Union Military Representatives Concerning Red Army Behavior," December 1945, ADMRF, F.Ustatsk, O.343253, D.2, 99–107.

105. See Pauley, *Report on Japanese Assets,* 126–28. See also CREST, Korea Office, "Economic Information: Food Conditions in North Korea; Commodity Prices in Pyongyang," 10 July 1947, CIA-RDP82-00457R000700340002-9.

106. CREST, Korea Office, "Economic Information: Food Conditions in North Korea; Commodity Prices in Pyongyang," 10 July 1947.

107. CREST, Korea Office, "Political Information: Controls Encountered on a Trip through North Korea," 13 June 1947, CIA-RDP82-00457R000600680008-7 and CREST, Korea Office, "Economic Information: Transportation in North Korea," 24 June 1947, CIA-RDP82-00457R000700050002-1.

108. United States National Archives and Records Administration, RG319 Box, 1863, *ISNK,* 22 June 1946; and CREST, Korea Office, "Military Information: Soviets in Sinŭiju," 2 June 1947, CIA-RDP82-00457R000600480002-5.

109. "Andongsheng gongwei guanyu ziqian kaizhan chunzhong yundong de zhishi" (Andong Province Working Committee Concerning Instructions for the Present Unfolding Mass Movement), 1 December 1945, in Zhonggong Liaoning Shengwei Dangshi Yanjiushi, Zhonggong Dandongshiwei Dangshi Yanjiushi (Chinese Communist Party Liaoning Province Party History Research Office, Chinese Communist Party Dandong Municipal Party History Research Office), *Jie fang zhan zheng shi qi de an dong gen ju di* (The Andong Base Area during the Liberation War Period), (Beijing: Chinese Communist Party History Publishing House, 1993), 34.

110. Conversely, in December 1945, members of the Guomindang and the Andong-Korea Society published a bilingual report that praised Jiang Jieshi's stance toward China and an independent Korea. This report provides further evidence of the cultural and propaganda warfare that was taking place on the Sino-Korean border. See Andong jianchaju, Andongshi siweidui, Andong Chaoxian xiehui (Andong Police Department, Andong Self-Defense Team, Andong-Korea Association), "Zhi Chaoxianren he Zhongguoren de huyu (kouhao)" (Appeal [Slogans] to Korean and Chinese People), December 1945, ADMRF, F.Ustatsk, O.343253, D.2l, 115.

111. See United States National Archives and Records Administration, RG242, SA2005, 9/1, "List of Resident Chinese Nationals in Ŭiju-gun, P'yongan Pukto," 26 July 1949, Documents Section of North Korean Foreign Affairs Ministry; and United States National Archives and Records Administration, RG242, SA2006, 1/58, "Resident Chinese in Ŭiju-gun."

112. CREST, Korea Office, "Military Information: Soviet Troops in Sinŭiju and Ŭiju Area," 2 September 1947, CIA-RDP82-00457R000800890008-2.