



**Wilson  
Center**

**Digital Archive**  
International History Declassified

[digitalarchive.wilsoncenter.org](https://digitalarchive.wilsoncenter.org)

**May 16, 1963**

**Memorandum of a Conversation with the USSR  
Ambassador to the DPRK c. V.P. Moskovskiy.**

**Citation:**

"Memorandum of a Conversation with the USSR Ambassador to the DPRK c. V.P. Moskovskiy.", May 16, 1963, Wilson Center Digital Archive, State Central Archive in Prague. Translated by Adolf Kotlik. <https://digitalarchive.umd.edu/document/116745>

**Summary:**

Moravec and Moskovsky review North Korea's foreign policies, focusing on Kim Chang-man's critical remarks of the Soviet Union.

**Original Language:**

Czech

**Contents:**

Translation - English

MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS  
In Prague on 5/16/1963

file 003786/63-7

Mailing of a conversation record.  
Attachment: 1

For your information, we attached a recorded conversation of the Cs. Ambassador in the DPRK c. Moravec with the USSR Ambassador c. Moskovskiyi. For completeness we add that the family name of the MPR Ambassador, mentioned in the record, is Dorge and not Batyn, as he is erroneously referred to.

Head of department

[signature: illegible]

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs  
7th Territorial Department □□□P r a g u e □□

Memorandum of a conversation with the USSR  
Ambassador to the DPRK c. V.P. Moskovskiyi.

The USSR Ambassador to the DPRK c. V.P. Moskovskiyi visited me on 29th April 1963. He informed me Soviet comrades are aware that the KWP CC called a meeting of the leadership of the KWP CC and the State Administration, which took place in Pyongyang from April 26th to April 28th under the chairmanship of c. Kim Chang-man [Kim Chang Man], second Deputy to the KWP CC Chairman. There were 2 discussions on the agenda of this meeting:

□□□urrent international situation  
. KWP foreign policy.  
□□

Despite all efforts, Soviet comrades were not able so far to find out more about the first matter. The second matter, which c. Kim Chang-man himself talked about, dealt among other things with particular questions of the diplomatic activity of the DPRK MFA. There, c. Kim Chang-man is said to have very strongly criticized the way the MFA and other government branches dealt with foreign embassies, namely "who issued the order" to restrict movement inside the DPRK of embassies workers. Such a shortsighted approach, as he said, can reciprocally jeopardize the activity of their own embassies in our countries.

C. Kim Chang-man then allegedly condemned very strongly the tactically wrong approach especially of the MFA staff towards the resident diplomats, and pointed out that even though the KWP does not agree with the opinion of the CPSU and other fraternal parties of the SCC, it does not want these differences to be transferred into relations with these countries. Attendees of the meeting were then directly asked to make every effort to strengthen the contacts on the state level between our countries as much as possible.

C. Kim Chang-man allegedly said: "I was the first to criticize very strongly the CPSU approach and to express a disagreement with it; however, it does not mean that I am

not interested in nurturing a close and deep friendship with the Soviet people."

Further in his presentation, c. Kim Chang-man is said to have analyzed the activity of the resident embassies and along with that he also brought up the "wrong conduct and behavior of some of the diplomatic staff of the SCC embassies." Allegedly, he talked openly about the 1st Secretary of the GDR Embassy c. Winkelman and the 1st Secretary of the HDR Embassy c. Fendler, who, as he said, not only do not behave as comrades but also assume the positions of bourgeoisie.

Neither Soviet comrades nor any other embassy were able to find out more details about this meeting.

Next in his conversation, c. Moskovskiy mentioned the new conversation of the Mongolian Ambassador c. Batyn Dorge with the Romanian Ambassador Bodnarash about the CMEA. First, c. Bodnarash told to c. Batyn that he completely disagreed with the notion that the "small SCC countries in the CMEA must obey the USSR" - "what equality is that supposed to be?" He also pointed out that the USSR, without prior consultations with the SRR, built a huge oil pipeline together with Poland, GDR, CSSR, HDR and Bulgaria, and thus placed the SRR in a very precarious situation. He said: "Do not take it as my position; it is the opinion of our party."

As for the Romanian membership, they do not see any reason to remain within the CMEA. Romania is a fairly rich country, he said, to be dependent on foreign aid. (I note that c. Kim Il (Sung) mentioned a similar argumentation to c. Bodnarash during celebration of the 15th anniversary of the SRR origination.)

The new aspect of the conversation of c. Bodnarash with the Mongolian ambassador was that he was openly pressuring c. Batyn Dorge into working towards the MPR leaving the CMEA. While at it, he was making rude comments against the USSR and European countries of the SC. In his argumentation, he even tried to intimidate. Among other things he allegedly said: "Why would Mongolia need to become a CMEA member? Such a rich country like Mongolia can only lose by that." "If the USSR really wanted to help you, it could have done it a long time ago", he allegedly said to c. Batyn Dorge. If it were not for the so-called "aid" of the USSR, he said, Mongolia could have been a developed industrialized country by now. "This way (inside the CMEA), Mongolia will become the object of all kinds of interests of the CMEA countries. Countries that lack their own natural resources, like the CSSR, GDR, POLAND, Bulgaria and most of all the USSR, will control your wealth."

This hostile rhetoric against the CMEA countries and namely the USSR provoked a rough response from c. Batyn Dorge, which resulted in mutual "ill-feeling".

I used the conversation with c. Moskovskiy as an opportunity to inform him about the preparations for the celebration of our national holiday, and to consult with him some questions in connection with tours to the DPRK and with the organization of recreation for our embassy staff. C. Moskovskiy emphasized that they, too, were given a directive to strive for expansion of workers tours. As for tours and excursions, they fully accept restrictions implemented by the Korean party.

Ambassador  
[signature: illegible]