Korean War Propaganda Resumes Pre-Negotiations Patterns

The volume of comment on the Korean war remains relatively constant, as does the concentration of that comment in broadcasts for American audiences. But during the second week there is a return to pre-negotiations emphasis patterns that suggests that Moscow, no longer confident of a speedy end to the Kaesong negotiations, is preparing for prolonged talks.

Class Appeals to Americans: Such changes as occur between the first and second week are minor in magnitude when contrasted with those elements which receive constant treatment. The topical emphasis and emotional phraseology in Korean war propaganda broadcasts to American audiences suggest that Moscow's continuing and primary purpose is to create disunity between the American people and their leaders. Current broadcasts quote a mother as saying that she does not want her sons to die for Wall Street's dollars, while another, adopting the style of wartime "Tokyo Rose" broadcasts, reminds the troops of the pleasures being enjoyed by their more fortunate friends who were able to escape service in Korea. The baldness of these appeals to class feelings is illustrated in a 6 August broadcast which observes that American troops suffer hardships and injuries in Korea, while the Henry Fords and Margaret Trumans relax on vacation cruises.

Comment on the Kaesong Negotiations: U.S. Sincerity: Soviet comment on the Kaesong negotiations continues to be drawn from Sino-Korean sources; but during the second week, in a talk broadcast only in Korean, Moscow initiated comment on the sincerity of the Americans. The question of sincerity is frequently raised in connection with the issues of troop withdrawals and of the establishment of a demilitarized zone, but Moscow does not belabor either issue as such.

U.S. Profiteering and Atrocities: Comment on the War: The pre-negotiations topics which return to the propaganda agenda in the second week include profiteering by American business and political leaders, and charges of bombing and other atrocities by American forces. Neither topic had been highlighted in the intervening six weeks to the degree that it was before Jacob Malik's 23 June peace offer. Furthermore, there is a revival of comment on the war in broadcasts for Korean audiences. In the intervening weeks there was a markedly low volume of comment on this beam which suggested a Soviet desire to shift attention away from the hostilities. But during the second week there is a revival of comment on the Korean beam—some of it recapitulating Syngman Rhee's past and present sins—which contributes to a long-term rather than a brief propaganda campaign.