



The imperialistic intervention in Korea

*"I ordered the air and naval forces of United States to provide to the troops of government of Korea cover and support. The attack against Korea makes it clear that communism has overrun the stage of utilisation of subversive methods via the conquest of independent nations and now has started reclaiming armed invasion and war..."*¹ It was Tuesday, 27th of June 1950 when the American President Truman released with these words the direct military intervention of United States in Korea, diffusing terror to the entire humanity. The questions that resulted were explicit, concrete and above all agonizing. Was it the beginning of the Third World War right upon the ruins of the Second World War? And what would be the outcome, since this war could include also the use of nuclear weapons?



USA President Harry Truman

One day before the proclamation of President Truman, in the morning of 26th of June 1950, the Chairman of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea Kim Ir Sen (Kim Il Soynkg) proceeded from radio in a dramatic call to the Korean population, saying inter alia: *"Dear compatriots! Dear brothers and sisters, soldiers of our People's Army and partisans of the southern part of our Republic! In the 25th of June the army of the puppet-government of the traitor Li Sin Man has launched an attack against the ground northern of the 38th parallel. Our Guard Divisions fought with heart and repulsed the strike. Our Guard Divisions fought with wilfulness and intercepted the attack of the puppet-army of Li Sin Man. After examining the present situation, the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea ordered our People's Army to launch a decisive counter-attack in order to shatter the enemy armed forces ..."*².

But how did this war begin and where was humanity heading? We will find the answers by going back in 1945.

Korea before the crisis

Till August of 1945 and Korea's liberation by the Red Army, the Korean peninsula was under the colonial occupation of Japan. After WWII, Korea was divided in two military areas. To the north and up to the 38th parallel was the Soviet military area of responsibility and southerly of this parallel was the American military area. The military presence of USA and USSR in Korea was meant to be temporary. Accordingly to the decisions made in the Potsdam Conference (July - August 1945) and the decisions of the ministers of State Department of USSR, USA

and Great Britain (December 1945) the two areas of military responsibility should be unified as fast as possible in order to form a united and independent state.

However, the intentions of the United States and the reactionary circles of Korea were different. Their objective was the socio-political control of the whole country, something that wasn't an easy task for them, since the Korean People's Movement was powerful, and so were the revolutionary forces themselves. Under these conditions, it was obvious that a unified Korean state could not satisfy the interests of the domestic reactionary circles and American imperialism.



General Van Fleet, commander of the American army in the Korean war. He was previously the commander monarchist-fascist army in the Greek Civil War (1946-1949)

Thus, despite the international agreements and the will of the Korean people, in August 1948 they established a puppet regime in the southern part of the country with head Lee Seung-Man (Syngman Rhee) that was named "Republic of Korea".

These developments compelled the progressive forces of the Korean people to respond with the founding of a proportionate type of formation in the north. One month later, in September 1948, Democratic People's Republic of Korea was founded, declaring that the main objective was the peaceful unification of the country, which was quite realistic considering the power of the Korean People's Movement and the revolutionary forces of the whole peninsula³. It is, characteristic that from the day of its foundation, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea was continuously proposing a peaceful unification of the country, but in vain. The proposals were always crashing on the outright denial of Syngman Rhee's puppet regime.

In June 1950, a few days before the South Korean invasion and the beginning of the war, the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea called twice for a peaceful unification (in 7th and in 19th of June 1950), but Lee Syngman Rhee made it clear that anyone in South

Korea who supports this proposition will be considered as a traitor and will face the consequences⁴.

So, who started the war?

As we saw in the beginning, in President Truman's proclamation, the USA government alleged that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea was responsible for the outbreak of the war with the instigation of the Soviet Union and the International Communistic Movement. The same accusation was voiced by the South Korean regime of Lee Seung-Man (Syngman Rhee). The truth however was completely different.

"Among them - writes David Horowitz⁵ - who had an apparent benefit from a "hot incident" and the subsequent military intervention of the United States, were Chiang Kai-shek and Lee Seung-Man, whose dominion was getting extremely unstable".

Syngman Rhee undoubtedly would benefit from an American military intervention in the peninsula. In the 30th of May - only four weeks before the beginning of the hostilities -

Syngman Rhee had suffered a decisive defeat in the general elections. The South Korean regime “*swayed from lack of confidence, in the same grade inside the country and abroad also*”. Confronting a situation which was getting worse day after day, in the last months Syngman Rhee and his minister were regularly threatening to invade North Korea, declaring that they were ready “*to occupy Pyongyang in a few days*”.

So, on the first day of the Korean War, at general Macarthur’s headquarters a high ranking member of the American occupying forces in Japan, had an urgent telephone call. When he returned he announced: “*Just a few minutes ago we received information of a great importance. The South Koreans invaded North Korea*”⁶. According to the rightist-conservative commentator Olms Alexanter, the minister of Exterior Dean Acheson “*doubted that Syngman Rhee was not responsible for the counter-attack of the reds in 1950*”.

Even the most pureblood anti-communists historians couldn't deny the bellicose and anti-people character of Syngman Rhee’s regime. Andre Fontaine, for example, although he defends the thesis that Democratic People’s Republic of Korea was responsible for the outbreak of the Korean War, in his historic description of the South Korean Regime, he actually proves that only the Syngman Rhee’s regime had a really strong interest in provoking the war. “*The elections that took place in South Korea three months ago – says Andre Fontaine inter alia – gave the majority to the “frightful old man’s” (Syngman Rhee’s) opposition However, he has repressed with violence - by no means democratic - every single communist activity, imprisoning 14.000 communists and between them were also 14 deputies. Because of the continuous deterioration of the economic situation, the dysphoria was generalized ... All these developments did not halt Syngman Rhee in declaring in every way his intention to embody the northern part of the country, giving a handhold to the communists to talk about “legal defence”...*”⁷.

USA, USSR and Korean war

The historical evidence is in the same way overwhelming against the allegation that Soviet Union wanted and provoked the Korean war. It was the USA that wished and sought such a development.

“*Seeing things in hindsight and with a wider prospect that the distance of time gives toward this previously tense political situation, - David Horowitz says - it is impossible to accept the basic western thesis that the North Korean invasion was directed by Kremlin in the direction of a general plan of unscrupulous expansionism*”. And continues, talking about the American intervention: “*The decision of Washington to intervene in the Korean conflict had a lot of consequences and a very serious one, was the creation of a war-hysteria in the United States. It was the year of Senator McCarthy’s rise, the year of the mass rearmament of USA The existent conditions can easily emerge from the fact that on 12th of July, while the North Korean forces advanced heading to Busan (Pusan), the US Parliament of Representatives applauded a deputy who urged the american government to use nuclear weapons against North Korean cities if DPRK was not to withdraw in one week*”⁸.

Consequently, there is no doubt that the USA wanted this war and certainly didn’t have the scruple to handle things in a way so they can put the blame on their opponents.

Indeed, Henry Kissinger’s war account melts even the slightest doubt. “*The part that lost the most in Korea - writes Kissinger - was proved to be the Soviet Union... In the first two years of the Korean war, America had mobilised all her own side beyond the world’s bisector line. The United States tripled their defence allocation and transformed the Atlantic Alliance from a*

political coalition in a united military organisation with an American commander in chief. Germany's rearmament was already substantial and the first efforts for the creation of an European army were already on the run. The void that existed until then in the front of the Soviet troops in Central Europe, was filling" ⁹.

Greece and Korea

The imperialistic intervention in Korea came under the formal cover of the Organization of the United Nations. The USA, handling in their favour the absence of the USSR's representative in the Security Council, accomplished a resolution that imputed to North Korea the outbreak of the war and approved the military intervention - under the umbrella of the United Nations - in favour of Lee Seung-Man's (Syngman Rhee) regime. For the last six months, USSR was not participating in the meetings of the Security Council in order to protest against the fact that the seat, which rightfully belonged to the representative of the government of People's Republic of China, was provocatively occupied by a "representative" of the deposed pre-revolutionary regime of Chiang Kai-shek.



The Greek Expeditionary Army receives the flag from king Pavlos short before the departure for this "mission of shame" in Korea

In the imperialistic intervention in Korea took part 21 countries, and one of them was Greece ¹⁰.



Dozens of coffins in the harbour of Piraeus (Greece). This was the "profit" from Greece's attendance in the Korean war

During the Korean War, 669 officers & non-commissioned officers and 9.586 Greek army soldiers were sent there. 7 planes were also sent and afterwards another 2 planes in substitution of the losses.

It was a mission-of-shame for the Greek army.

The losses of the army, according to the official data, were 183 KIA and 610 wounded. The losses of the Greek Air force were 12 KIA and 4 planes lost ¹¹.

The Greek people paid once again a heavy price because of the dependant Greek governments' foreign policy, which aimed in ensuring the interests of the local

bourgeoisie.

A foreign policy that unfortunately stamps, even nowadays, the present and the future of our country.

Bibliography & Sources

- 1. *The entire proclamation of President Truman: Greek Newspaper "The Daily (I Kathimerini)" 28/6/1950***
- 2. *"New World", Volume 1950, p. 366***
- 3. *Great Soviet Encyclopedia, entry "Korea"***
- 4. *"New World", Volume 1950, p. 367 and 369***
- 5. *David Horowitz: "From Yalta to Vietnam", publications "KALVOS", p. 160***
- 6. *Douglas Macarthur, Commander of the American forces in the Pacific.***
- 7. *Andre Fontaine: "History of the Cold War", Military Publication, Athens 1969, Volume B p. 3-4***
- 8. *David Horowitz: "From Yalta to Vietnam", publications "KALVOS", p. 159, 163 and 169***
- 9. *Henry Kissinger: "Diplomacy", publications "A.A. LIVANI", p. 549***
- 10. *"Expeditionary Army of Greece to Korea, 1950 - 1955", publication of the Faculty of History of Army, Athens 1977, p. 13***
- 11. *"Expeditionary Army of Greece to Korea, 1950 - 1955", publication of the Faculty of History of Army, Athens 1977, p. 29 - 30, 166, 180, 182, 187***