

A Critique of Juche

Hello everyone, Maoist98 here, with a brand new video. Today's subject will be on the Ideology of Juche. I decided to do this video because I don't think that many people know about the ideology of Juche and its principles. I want to go over it honestly, and show what it truly is, reactionary. Now, this was not an easy video to make, as it was hard to find resources on Juche that were reliable, but I did manage to find some, and they will be in the links down in the description, and I'll also flash a citation when I mention them. Now, let us begin.

The origin of Juche

Juche, or the Juche Idea, was originally considered an application of Marxism-Leninism to the conditions of Korea. In 1955, Kim il-Sung stated that “in order to make revolution, they [Koreans] must know their history, geography and customs, and that through this way they could inspire a revolutionary spirit.”^[1] The Korean people had faced years of subjugation under Japanese occupation, and it is correct to say that the people must understand their history, geography and customs in order to understand the material and historical conditions of their revolution. Yet, over time, it had become more apparent that Juche was not a Marxist-Leninist application at all. In the early 90s, its ideologues officially declared Juche to be a completely separate ideology^[2] What was once considered to be only a Korean application of the Marxist ideology that fit their struggle, was later promoted as an international ideology that could be applied anywhere, despite its lack of focus on class struggle^[3] But before we talk about that, let us first go over the main components Juche lacks to even consider it a “Marxist ideology.”

Juche Ideology is anti Materialist

One of the key things that marks Juche as different from Marxism is its core philosophy. Kim Jong-Il remarks that: “Man is the master of his destiny.” and that “[Juche is] a new philosophical thought that centers around man.”^[4] Now, this could be tongue in cheek romanticism about having control of our conditions, but he goes on to say that:

“The limitations of the preceding theory [Marxism, were] based on the materialist outlook on history [that] have been revealed more clearly in the course of socialist construction since the establishment of the socialist system.”^[4]

Now, did you catch anything odd with that statement? Might take a while, especially for those that aren't fully familiar with Marxist philosophy. What he is saying is that the Marxist understanding of Materialism is limited, and that due to this, we shouldn't solely focus on Materialism. So he argues for an Idealist perspective. How do we know this? Well, if he were talking about Materialism, he would only be talking about either two types, Dialectical Materialism, or Mechanical Materialism. The Marxist understanding of Materialism is that the Material conditions of the world are primary. we have an understanding of the effect of our material world, and how we can change it within limits. Within our material conditions there is universal theory and particular theory. This is the view of Dialectical Materialism. But he is not talking about Dialectical Materialism, nor does he mention the errors of Mechanical Materialism.

Let us observe some other examples that demonstrate Juche's anti-materialist stance:

“Unlike biological beings, man is the master and transformer of the world. He shapes his destiny on his own by transforming the objective world to meet his needs”. (Kim Jong Il: ‘Socialism is a Science’; Pyongyang; 1994; p. 12).

“Man... is a social being with independence,... whereas all other material lives maintain their existence through subordination and adaptation to the objective world.... On the strength of this quality, man throws off the fetters of nature”. (Kim Jong Il: ‘On the Juche Idea’, in: ‘On Carrying Forward the Juche Idea’; Pyongyang; 1995; p. 14, 15).

“Animals are part of nature and their destiny is determined by the natural laws of change and development, whereas man... is not a being which obeys the natural laws of change and development”. (Kim Jong Il: ‘On Some Problems of Education in the Juche Idea’, in: ‘On Carrying Forward the Juche Idea’; Pyongyang; 1995; p. 144).

Contrast this with the Dialectical Materialist understanding of Nature and Man’s contradictions. To quote Engels:

“Freedom does not consist in any dreamt-of independence from natural laws, but in the knowledge of these laws, and in the possibility this gives of systematically making them work towards definite ends. This holds good in relation both to the laws of external nature and to those which govern the bodily and mental existence of men themselves — two classes of laws which we can separate from each other at most only in thought but not in reality. Freedom of the will therefore means nothing but the capacity to make decisions with knowledge of the subject.”^[5]

For example, Gonzalo Thought upholds the universality of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism and upholds Gonzalo Thought to their particular conditions in Peru (note that the universal exists in contradiction with the particular). However Juche does not recognize this contradiction between the universal and particular. Instead of upholding Juche as a particular theory for the conditions of the Korean people, Kim Jong-Il says:

“In order to prove the justice and superiority of Juche philosophy, we must clearly understand the limitations of the preceding philosophy and consider this philosophy in

its correlation with the latter. Only when Juche philosophy is studied in comparison with Marxist Philosophy the limitations of which lie in the fact that it regards the development of all things as a process of the history of nature, can its superiority be clearly elucidated. Some people attempt to explain the fundamental principles of the Juche philosophy, including the essential characteristics of man, from the point of view of the general law of the development of the material world, instead of explaining them by clarifying the law of social movement. In the final analysis, this can be constructed as being tantamount to trying to explain the Juche philosophy from the viewpoint of the development of Marxist Dialectical Materialism, not as a completely original philosophy. This makes it impossible to clarify the originality of the Juche Philosophy correctly.”^[4]

So let us dissect this. Believing that Dialectical Materialism is “limited”, Juche argues that man can control his destiny, or in other words bend material conditions to his will. This isn’t a development of Marxist theory, but a revision of it. It idealistically replaces materialism with the notion of mind over matter. We must remember that matter and mind are inseparable, the subjective is within the objective. Consciousness does not exist separate from matter, as it is a particular form of matter in motion and it’s important to acknowledge how it interacts with other forms of matter. Matter is reflected in consciousness and consciousness is translated into action that changes matter. The term “matter” here is used to refer to the particular forms of matter in motion that are different from consciousness. Man can control his environment but only within his own conditions, he cannot become a complete master of his destiny.

Dialectical Materialism is of course not the same as mechanical materialism, as it only recognizes the first step and fails to understand the dynamic role of man. Idealism understands that man transforms matter, but fails to recognize that man’s ideas are not independent of matter, rather a reflection of matter as we stated before. Correct ideas

deeply reflect matter whereas incorrect ideas are an inversion of matter, a one-sided distortion of material reality. Man can only transform his consciousness by transforming his objective conditions.

Juche is anti-dialectical

Although Juche often references Dialectical Materialism, or “Materialistic Dialectics” in their words, it also distorts its meaning. Now I will give two examples for my case. First we will look at the writings of Kim Jong Il again:

“The main content of Marxist dialectical materialism is the principle of the unity of opposites and of the struggle between them. However, this is not a problem which should be considered simply from a scientific point of view. Like other theoretical problems of Marxism-Leninism, the law of the unity of opposites and of the struggle between them must be historically considered from the point of view of revolutionary practice. Importance was attached to this law in Marxist dialectical materialism. This is due to the fact that it was an important and historic task to elucidate philosophically the socio-economic contradictions of the then capitalist society and the law of the class struggle. Therefore, I think that the principle of the unity and struggle between opposites elucidated by the Marxist philosophy has many unreasonable points in clarifying the law of the development of socialist society at present. That is why we did not mention this principle much when explaining the theory of the Juche philosophy.”^[4]

Kim Il-Sung rejects Dialectics as unreasonable and inapplicable to modern conditions. In fact, Dialectical Materialism is the only world outlook that correctly reflects the general laws of the movement and development of matter. As Engels says:

“In like manner, every organized being is every moment the same and not the same; every moment, it assimilates matter supplied from without, and gets rid of other matter;

every moment, some cells of its body die and others build themselves anew; in a longer or shorter time, the matter of its body is completely renewed, and is replaced by other molecules of matter, so that every organized being is always itself, and yet something other than itself.

Further, we find upon closer investigation that the two poles of an antithesis, positive and negative, e.g., are as inseparable as they are opposed, and that despite all their opposition, they mutually interpenetrate. And we find, in like manner, that cause and effect are conceptions which only hold good in their application to individual cases; but as soon as we consider the individual cases in their general connection with the universe as a whole, they run into each other, and they become confounded when we contemplate that universal action and reaction in which causes and effects are eternally changing places, so that what is effect here and now will be cause there and then, and vice versa.”^[5]

When two forces are at odds with each other, one will overpower the other. Man does not exist independently of the laws of Dialectical Materialism, every single thing that exists in this world is a temporary unity of opposites which takes on different forms.

“Nature is the proof of dialectics, and it must be said for modern science that it has furnished this proof with very rich materials increasingly daily, and thus has shown that, in the last resort, Nature works dialectically and not metaphysically; that she does not move in the eternal oneness of a perpetually recurring circle, but goes through a real historical evolution. In this connection, Darwin must be named before all others. He dealt the metaphysical conception of Nature the heaviest blow by his proof that all organic beings, plants, animals, and man himself, are the products of a process of evolution going on through millions of years...”^[5]

The unity of opposites is an explanation of contradiction, that is tied together until one overpowers the other. Mao says the opposites have identity because each is the condition for the other’s existence.^[6]

Among many contradictions, there is a principal contradiction which exerts the greatest influence on the development of other contradictions and subordinate contradictions which play a secondary role in affecting other contradictions. To disclose which contradiction is principal and which contradictions are subordinate in a given situation is essential to understand the nature of the situation and how it can change. Take for example the transformation of ice into water, the principal aspect of the contradictory identity of water changes from being the force bonding the molecules together to the force of the individual molecules which tend towards a random motion. The transformation of water into gas heavily increases the margin by which this aspect is dominant.

According to Juche, in the contradiction between man and nature, man is always principal. Man always changes nature according to his own desires, but there are no instances in which nature shapes man's desires. This is idealism.^[4]

To quote Mao on the subject of the mutual transformation of opposites:

“Some people think that this is not true of certain contradictions. For instance, in the contradiction between the productive forces and the relations of production, the productive forces are the principal aspect; in the contradiction between theory and practice, practice is the principal aspect; in the contradiction between the economic base and the superstructure, the economic base is the principal aspect; and there is no change in their respective positions. This is the mechanical materialist conception, not the dialectical materialist conception. True, the productive forces, practice and the economic base generally play the principal and decisive role; whoever denies this is not a materialist. But it must also be admitted that in certain conditions, such aspects as the relations of production, theory and the superstructure in turn manifest themselves in the principal and decisive role. When it is impossible for the productive forces to develop without a change in the relations of production, then the change in the relations of production plays the principal and decisive role. The creation and advocacy of

revolutionary theory plays the principal and decisive role in those times of which Lenin said, "Without revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary movement."

When a task, no matter which, has to be performed, but there is as yet no guiding line, method, plan or policy, the principal and decisive thing is to decide on a guiding line, method, plan or policy. When the superstructure (politics, culture, etc.) obstructs the development of the economic base, political and cultural changes become principal and decisive. Are we going against materialism when we say this? No. The reason is that while we recognize that in the general development of history the material determines the mental and social being determines social consciousness, we also--and indeed must--recognize the reaction of mental on material things, of social consciousness on social beings and of the superstructure on the economic base. This does not go against materialism; on the contrary, it avoids mechanical materialism and firmly upholds dialectical materialism."^[6]

But why does the Juche philosophy deny this? Well to explain that, we must first, look at what the "DPRK" society looks like in terms of class.

Juche Distorts Class Struggle

It's important to note that the North of Korea did undergo a short-lived period of socialist construction, although they never fully constructed socialism. For the longest time, the DPRK claimed to have upheld the principles of Marxism-Leninism. However, Kim Il Sung distorted the principles of Class Struggle, one of the basic ideas of Marxism. Il-Sung claimed they will reach communism by revolutionizing the people, calling this "Working Classizing", and intellectualizing all members of society.^{[2][7]} He wanted to remould capitalists peacefully through education and persuasion, rather than struggle. Because the goal of Juche is to "defend the fatherland", Il-Sung assumed all people share a common goal of defending the fatherland from external aggression.^[2] This ignores the internal contradictions of class society, treating the whole population of the Korea as The People and all others who interfere as The Enemy. This sounds remarkably similar to Khrushchev's "Dictatorship of the Whole People". Now, it is not wrong for Communists in semi-colony countries to temporarily align with other patriotic classes if there is a common imperialist or feudalist threat, but they must never forget the internal contradictions between the people. In Kim Il-Sung's rhetoric, he treats contradictions between the people- the proletariat, peasantry, the patriotic intellectuals, petite-bourgeoisie, and the national bourgeoisie as unimportant, regarding them as distractions to the "real enemy"- the nebulous "outside threat". He simultaneously tries to mend what are in reality contradictions between the people and the enemy so long as the enemy elements are Korean. Being Korean somehow makes one patriotically Korean and progressive to Kim Il-Sung.

For an example of how to properly handle such contradictions, let's look to the Chinese Communists. In the Chinese War of Resistance Against Japanese Aggression, when the contradictions were primarily external, the Communists made an alliance with the Koumintang, a representative of Feudal interests. However, they kept in mind that these internal contradictions still existed, the main one being between the proletariat,

peasantry, petty-bourgeoisie, and national bourgeoisie on the one hand and the feudal landlord class and comprador bourgeoisie whose interests were intertwined with imperialism. The Communists never had the intention of maintaining this alliance once the Japanese Aggressors were defeated. However, in a similar case the rhetoric of Kim Il-Sung would have led to a contradiction like that between the Chinese people and the Feudal classes being ‘peacefully’ resolved.

So, we see here that Juche had liquidated class struggle in favor of class collaboration.^{[8][9]} Class collaboration is the idealist notion that all classes should collaborate to serve the country instead of focusing on the contradictions of class, thus creating a “peaceful co-existence” of class.^{[2][7][8][9]} Here the issue is that instead of promoting a proletarian world view, he is pushing a fascistic view that the main goal is only to protect the father land.^[7] Now, is it wrong to proletarianize the people? No, as it transforms their petty bourgeois view into one the proletariat. Is it ok to work with, and struggle with, the intellectuals, yes. As Mao taught us in *On the correct handling of contradictions among the people*, we should critique them and remold them to serve the proletarian class and have them adopt the communist world outlook and shed their bourgeois point of view.^[10] Lastly, of course, is there anything wrong with revolutionaries? No, but revolutionaries must follow correct ideas, which means, they have to have a *Marxist* outlook in all things. The people can be led astray by reactionary forces, and within a society with class conflict and one that is transitioning, we should not let this silly notion that everyone in the country should put off the class struggle in favor of “serving to protect the fatherland”, for that is a revisionist viewpoint akin to Kautsky’s notion of defending the fatherland in WW1. Instead of advocating for class struggle, they would support the bourgeois for the sake of defending their country, whilst ignoring the conditions. To deal with the dialectics of society, we must do it through proper theory and practice, whether that be the GPCR, two line struggle, unity, criticism, unity’, or so on, the goal of the communist party is to deal with these, and not fall for such an idealist notion. So, we can see here that not only does Juche deny the

proper materialist outlook, but it also denies the reality of dialectics. But this isn't the only error they commit.

What is the correct position for the proletariat of a country to take in a situation where their ruling bourgeoisie is fighting a reactionary war against the ruling bourgeoisie of another country? We can look to the example of the Bolsheviks during World War I.

As Lenin States:

“During a reactionary war a revolutionary class cannot but desire the defeat of its government.”^[1]

Now, you might say that any war that the so-called “DPRK” is involved in against U.S. imperialist aggression today would be a progressive war that the proletariat of the “DPRK” should support. What is the problem with this view? It is a failure to understand the current state of the “DPRK”. The “DPRK” would be fighting this war on behalf of another imperialist power. In this case, on behalf of either China, Russia, or both, as the country had been a semi-colony of the revisionist USSR since the 1960s until its dissolution, and ever since, a semi-colony of China and Russia, but we will talk about that later.

Juche Distorts Dialectics by Promoting an Anti-Critical Stance

“Opposition and struggle between ideas of different kinds constantly occur within the Party; this is a reflection within the Party of contradictions between classes and between the new and the old in society. If there were no contradictions in the Party and no ideological struggles to resolve them, the Party's life would come to an end.”

-Mao Zedong, On Contradiction^[6]

Juche, along with the so-called “WPK”, has promoted an anti-critical stance, as well as reactionary hero worship.^{[2][12]} To understand the origins of this anti-critical stance, we must first understand the history of Korea and the Workers Party of Korea (WPK). The Koreans fought two legitimate wars for liberation, one against the Japanese and one against the Americans.^{[1][2]} With the victory of both of these wars, only the Northern half of Korea had gained independence. The WPK, along with the help of the Soviets and the Chinese, managed to gain power and popularity among the masses. In 1948, the WPK was led by Kim Tu-Bong . Kim Tu-Bong was later voted out in favor of Kim Il-Sung. This happened a year before the Korean war, and the rightist line started to consolidate power.^[13] Now, let’s move ahead to 1956; by this time the Khrushchev clique had consolidated power, and they began to dismantle the USSR’s DOTP; Stalin and his contributions had been denounced; The basis of the Sino-Soviet split was set in place. In Korea, the rightist line did the same as the rightists in the CPSU, purging, jailing, and killing those that upheld the opposing line in Korea. The main faction that opposed Kim Il-Sung was the Yen-an faction, who began to give open critique of him.^[13] Of course, the Yen-an faction had issues of their own. One being that Yen-an faction leader, Ch’oe Ch’angik, formed a coalition with the revisionist Soviet faction of the party, which was led by Pak Ch’angik.^[14] Further, the coalition didn't base their faction on ideology nor identity, but solely on anti-Kim il-Sung rhetoric, thus leading to a bad way of dealing with the proper issues and rightism of Kim-il Sung.^[14] Kim Il Sung’s clique would instead resort to administrative measures to purge dissidents from the party.^{[13][14]} This is indicative of a one-sided distortion of dialectical materialism as it relates to the contradiction between centralism and democracy.

The Maoist understanding of the contradiction between centralism and democracy is that centralism is generally principal. Mao underlines the four points of democratic centralism as follows:

- (1) the individual is subordinate to the organization;
- (2) the minority is subordinate to the majority;
- (3) the lower level is subordinate to the higher level; and
- (4) the entire membership is subordinate to the Central Committee.

Points one and two deal with democracy, while points three and four deal with centralism. In order for the first two points to be realized, democracy must be conducted on the basis of centralism. Without unity in action, the individual is not subordinate to the organization and the minority is not subordinate to the majority. Without diversity in discussion, the centralization of correct ideas cannot be attained and the higher level will be prone to committing subjectivist errors in formulating orders for the lower level. A concrete example of the liquidation of centralism in favor of ultra-democracy is to not oblige all party members to follow orders that are formulated through a majority vote. On the other hand, an example of the liquidation of democracy in favor of ultra-centralism is to prevent criticism of the party line from occurring by systematically purging dissenters from the party without conducting an ideological struggle against their faction.^[12] Both will lead to a rightist path.

For Kim Il-Sung, there was no need for an honest struggle between different ideas of different kinds in order to raise the level of unity in the party.^[12] He maintained that the unity of the party can be only preserved by eliminating all struggle within it. Kim Il-Sung's approach was that of ultra-centralism^[15]. What are some examples of ultra-centralism? Well, for one, the capitalist workplace is ultra-centralist. There is no struggle or voting allowed within the workplace. The workers are expected to follow the commands of the bourgeois owners--there is no democratic aspect. Similar to this, the so-called "DPRK" government's ultra-centralism is an egregious example of ultra-centralism without any democracy. They have liquidated any democratic aspect (i.e. struggle), causing the Workers Party of Korea and thus the state of the "DPRK" to be run like a business--ultra-centralist and Corporatist in its approach.^[8]

In April of 1956, the third congress of the Workers party commenced with attempts by the Yen-an faction to critique Kim Il Sung and the other rightists. These criticisms were silenced by Il-Sung, stating that his critics were a “faction aimed at [seizing] power”.^[13] Some months later, Kim Il-Sung takes a trip to Moscow to meet Khrushchev. While he is away, the Yen-an faction prepares a broad criticism of the rightist faction in the Worker’s Party. In response, Il-Sung postponed the general meeting that was originally set for August 2nd to August 30th. The army was stationed at the borders and some agents were sent to dress as civilians in Pyongyang.^[14] This was to scare the Yen-an faction, but they did not fear this cowardly scare tactic. When the Assembly met, Kim Il Sung gave a speech about his trip to Eastern Europe, but at the end of the speech, he gave a clear warning to anyone that critiqued the party or him, saying they were considered as an enemy.^[13] In Marxism we support the practice of “Ruthless Critique of all that exists.”, which is a fundamental principle of learning, and handling incorrect ideas. When Kim Il Sung states that anyone that criticized the party or his lines, was an enemy of the people,^[13] this is a fascistic notion that promotes “Freedom from criticism”. We can also see here the seeds of what will be later a reactionary form of hero worship, planted. Later, there was a speech given by Yon Gong-Heum, another member of the Yen-an Faction, but he was cut off by heckling of the right line. Only fragments were heard, as Yon critiqued Kim Il-Sung.

“Methods of threats and surveillance are being employed with regard to our comrades, who are devoted to the Party and the revolution and who offered constructive opinions and suggestions, [...] He [Kim Il-Sung] himself grossly tramples on intra-Party democracy and suppresses criticism; these actions completely contradict the Party charter and the Leninist norms of Party life; this means undermining revolutionary Marxist-Leninist principles.”^[16]

Another member of the Yen-an Faction, Choe Chang-Ik, also tried to give a speech but he too was heckled. He still argued that the struggle be carried on, but the next day Kim

Il-Sung put forward a vote to exclude the opposing faction, and won. Members of the Yenan Faction were either purged, killed, or jailed.

This has gone down in history as “The August Incident”, ^{[13][14][17]} and this marked the beginning of how the people will begin to have a reactionary view of Kim-Il Sung and the Kims in general. Before we move on, we should know the Yonan faction (and the coalition) wasn’t really leftist, but did oppose Kim-il Sung, who would later reveal a rightist line. The main point is this, he (Kim Il-Sung) liquidated democratic centralism.^[12]

Reactionary Hero Worship

Following the purging of the Yenan Faction, a revisionist social and political trend has manifested in the “DPRK”.^{[12][18]} From the 50’s to the early 70’s, the state regarded itself as Marxist-Leninist (in name only), until 1972 when Juche was labeled as the state ideology, promoted as a “creative” interpretation of Marxism-Leninism.^{[19][8]} In 1998, any mentions of Marxism-Leninism were removed from the constitution^[19] and 11 years later, communism was also removed from the constitution,^[20] and soon were replaced in 2011 with the “theory” of “KimIlSungism-KimJongIlism” which has no basis in anything. In 2014 Kim Jung-Un stated that the party's most powerful weapon is ideology. Not the working masses, not Dialectical Materialism, but the ideology of KimIlSungism-KimJongIlism.^[17] But what is this ideology?

Well, Kim Jung-Un states that KimIlSungism was the founding ideology of the country. In that case it would make one think of Juche,^[17] but KimilSungism advocates that the DOTP is unnecessary for a colonial country such as Korea.^[21] Needless to say, this is a complete deviation from Marxism, as the DOTP is the necessity for a socialist society to happen. Without the proletariat rule over society, there will only exist a rule of the bourgeois, which only looks after the needs of the ruling class, and not the workers. Another deviation is the joint dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, as Kim Il-Sung believed that the national bourgeoisie was part of the Proletariat.^[21] Now of course there are two things that I must stress.

1. The national bourgeoisie, whilst more progressive than the comprador bourgeoisie in colonized countries, are by no means Proletarian. In a truly socialist society, they shall eventually be abolished as a class. And importantly, the alliance between the Proletariat and the national bourgeoisie is a temporary one under New Democracy.

2. That said, KimilSungism is not the same as New Democracy. I bring this up due to the fact that there will be naysayers that would argue that new democracy was something similar, this isn't true. Kim Il-Sung never adopted New Democracy, and if he did, he would know that the National bourgeoisie would be under the class Dictatorship of the Proletariat.

KimilSungism even states that to transition to socialism they must do so with the continued alliance of the national bourgeois.^[21] This, needless to say, is absolute rubbish. An alliance is needed with them only in a new democratic revolution against the semi-feudal and semi-colonial class, but when the progressive force wins, the national bourgeoisie either needs to be overthrown, or be proletarianized and become productive workers. KimJongIllism isn't really defined, from any of the sources I have read. At best one could think it has to do something with the Nuclear program which helped them in terms of putting up with American imperialism, but it's not a real synthesis, least of all a universal synthesis! Instead, they just use this faux-ideology to create hero worship in order to imbue the Korean people with a sense of duty and loyalty to the state.^[2]

There are always references to the theories of the "Dear Leaders", but not the scientific theory of socialism, Marxist political economy, or Marxist Philosophy. There are talks of reunifying and protecting the country, and not of proletarian internationalism and its principles.^[17] As for the social aspect, here is where things get odd. We all know of all the inane, absurd, and mystical propaganda about the "DPRK", but there are some kernels of truth. For instance, one of the common things in the "DPRK", is that the emphasis placed upon the leaders is more fascistic than communist. For instance, in the square, people are required to observe the statues whilst passing, cyclists are required to dismount from their bikes and look at the statues or portraits of Kim Il-Sung and Kim Jong-Il; Car's too must slow down, and gaze upon their leaders.^[22] This isn't culturally acceptable in the Marxist sense. Yes, if a person in private bows down to a picture is one thing, but when the society does it, it is reactionary hero worship. There is a reason why Mao promoted critique and self-critique of the party and himself. With a lack of critique

or a left line, we see this odd culture of leader worship in the so-called “DPRK”. There is a true cult of personality within the “DPRK”, both socially and politically. The Kim’s have made sure their family will stay in power under this absurd philosophy known as Juche.

Juche’s Attack Against the Cultural Revolution

In the 1960’s in China, Chairman Mao launched the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution in order to destroy the remnants of the old capitalist and feudal culture within their newly built socialist society. Revolutionaries struggled against old customs, old traditions, and old ideas, challenged bourgeois academics, and led an unprecedented growth in the productive forces and the economy, along with the quality of life for the people. This sent shockwaves throughout the world. The only other country to try to mimic this campaign was Albania, as they were the other genuine socialist country. As for the supposed “red” countries, they were shocked and appalled. For one, Kim Il-Sung was against the Cultural Revolution, as it challenged not only just old customs, but bureaucracy, opportunism, and reactionary hero cults. Kim had said that “The GPCR has seriously alarmed us!” and called Mao an old fool.^[23] A genuine socialist would’ve welcomed this revolution as it had been shown that failing to counter the old society’s superstructure will lead to a capitalist restoration, as we saw what happened in the USSR.

I wouldn’t be doing any justice if I didn’t mention that Kim Il-Sung’s mentions of carrying out a so-called Cultural Revolution within his country,^[7] but as you may guess, this was nothing like the Cultural Revolution in China, or Albania. Yet, what was this “Cultural Revolution”? Was it the class collaboration I mentioned earlier? Or was it the hero worship and lack of critique? Well, there has been no evidence of shedding of old reactionary culture, or resolving class contradictions through class struggle.^{[14][24]} For instance, according to “Life in North Korea” a film that provides fair coverage, arranged

marriages are still prevalent.^[22] Now to be fair, marriage out of love is a new phenomena which is emerging. However, the fact that there are still arranged marriages, a feudal practice, in a supposed “socialist society” is quite abhorrent. Plus there is another issue, class. The intellectuals, Dongchu (money masters) are at the top, and at the bottom are the people descendant of Japanese ancestry; the Dongchu are a new strata of the “DPRK” bourgeoisie.^{[15][22]} This is an example of reactionary national chauvinism. If there was some form of a cultural revolution, the countryside would have been developed. It is a fact that, in China during the 60’s and 70’s, it was concluded that for socialism it’s not enough for the property regime to be “state property”, rather the proletariat must effectively run the state. If proletarian ideology is not correctly applied, there is an imminent risk of a reemergent bourgeois class in the Socialist state, to restore its mode of production through revisionism. Such has occurred in the USSR under Khrushchev and in China under Deng Xiaoping.

In North Korea, where the “three great differences” (principally between manual and intellectual work) are not narrowed but, on the contrary, it becomes clear the same has already happened in Korea. In China during the GPCR, the countryside was beginning to develop, new schools, clinics, and so on were being built. In the supposed “socialist” Korea, we have seen the only developed place to be the capital; The villages are still poor, and do not receive the same treatment as the select few that live in the city.^[22] Now going back to National Chauvinism, there is a growing lie told by the Kim Family, mainly by Kim Jong Il in his books, and Kim Jung Un in his speeches that the world is looking at Juche as the guiding light for revolution.^[7] This is utter nonsense. As we have seen, the only revolutions that managed to gain traction were that of a Marxist variety. Even then, other groups that are opposed to Marxism do not carry out their “revolution” in the name of Juche. Nobody is looking at Juche as the guiding light. This is just a chauvinist lie to remain in power. The only universal political ideology of our current time is Marxism-Leninism-Maoism. There is no other. Juche is something metaphysical and even then, was once proclaimed only fitting the struggles of the Korean people.^[1] But then the Kims state that it is universal.^[17] Juche was never synthesized to fit the

international world stage. When a theory is synthesized, it has to be proven to work universally, this is how Leninism was synthesized by Stalin, and Maoism was synthesized by Gonzalo. It's important to note as well that during the Peruvian People's War, the so-called "DPRK" sent arms and troops to the fascist Peruvian government to fight against both MRTA and PCP. Instead of supporting the revolutionaries, they allied themselves to the fascist government in Peru.^{[25][26]} Only revisionist states could do such a thing.

The Economic Problem

Let us make one thing clear. Yes, The UN sanctions are part of the reason as to why the north of Korea lags behind. We should oppose such imperialist sanctions as they force states into bending the knee to imperialist powers. It's crucial to note that the sanctions are hardly the invention of only the Yankee imperialists. In fact the Chinese have been in favor of these sanctions in order to force the "DPRK" compradors into further capitulation. Today, the country heavily relies on China for the economic gain, just as they did with the USSR.^[27] This is, in fact, a semi-colonial relation between the social-imperialist China and the "DPRK". This is not merely socialist fraternity, this is a two-faced comprador attack against the Korean people. China and Albania managed to get by fine without help from the revisionist USSR and both were heavily sanctioned, yet they still managed to build socialism and uphold the self-reliant line. They had the support of the people, and managed to get by without foreign capital investment. The "DPRK" has no such mass support, since it sells its country to the highest bidder!

But when did the "DPRK" begin its comprador relations with the Russian and Chinese imperialists?

"Kang Sheng began the meeting by outlining the position in regard to North Korea. While earlier the Korean Party led by Kim Il-Sung had leaned somewhat towards the Chinese position, after the fall of Khrushchev in 1964, the CPSU began an intensive

drive to win the Korean Party to its side. Kang informed me that Brezhnev, the then CPSU leader, had flown to Pyongyang with a package of bribes. These included undertaking to give Korea substantial financial assistance, and offering a wide-ranging trade agreement on very favourable terms along with essential food and military supplies. Kim accepted, signed appropriate agreements and withdrew any support for China.”^[31]

The cause of the arduous march was not just UN sanctions, but also to their sole reliance of the USSR, which now had dissolved in front of their eyes.^{[15][28][29]} They had become another victim of Soviet social imperialism. The amount of private business co-ops have increased over the years,^[27] in a similar trend to the revisionist “PRC”. One of the most notable issues is the “SEZ”, or special economic zones established on southern and northern border zones, which today rely on cheap labor of the Korean people, low tariffs and taxes in order to entice imperialists to invest capital in the north of Korea; They mainly try to attract investments from China, Russia, and Hong Kong.^[27] As I have stated earlier, this form of reliance turns a country into a semi-colony. Both the north and south of Korea are neo-colonies, one for the US, and the other for Russia and China. This isn’t good for the Korean people, and totally spits in the face of the notion of self-reliance, self-determination, and resistance to imperialism. We have seen similar comprador “communists” in Cuba under Castro, where he turned the country into a sugar cane colony for the USSR.^[30] This is all irrefutable proof that the “DPRK” is in no way socialist, and that the only solution for the Korean people trapped under the weight of the oppressive imperialists is to overthrow their state.

Quick note on Songun

Songun translates as “Military First”, a clearly militaristic policy. Militarism clearly is not a communist principle, as militarism exists mostly as a manifestation of fascism and expansionism. In the “DPRK”, the so-called People’s Army is a wholly bourgeois, white army. There are supposedly militias, but these are subordinated totally to the “KPA” and the central state. Furthermore, that the masses are not educated in proletarian principles, not armed, and simply made to follow the state and its bourgeois army is proof enough! Again, this just reiterates that this is just a fascistic policy that puts the state and its bourgeois military in firm control of the workers. The Songun policy signified a complete removal of the proletariat from its revolutionary role, as the first line of defense for socialism. It was a complete negation of the Communist method of revolution, which Marx affirmed and Mao synthesized, in an “armed sea of masses” defending their interests in a death battle with its class enemies. We must ask: Why, then, did the Army replace the proletariat in the role of “principal defense organism of the revolution”? This was a reflection of the objective reality, in which a bureaucratic bourgeoisie is situated in the highest rankings within the Army and began to direct the North Korean state -- not the proletariat. If a country wishes to have an army to protect the people, that country needs a people's army, without the people, revolution is not possible.^[32]

Kim Il-Sung wanted a peaceful reunification

Finally, I must mention that Kim Il-Sung had wanted a peaceful reunification of Korea's, one country, two systems, both wanting to defend the fatherland. This was his so-called Ten Point Program. This is similar to the One Country, Two Systems policy in Hong Kong today, which was implemented by arch-revisionist Deng Xiaoping. This kind of policy is an undialectical approach to unification, removing any line of armed struggle against the capitalist and imperialist, allowing socialist construction to be halted by a liberal sense of nationalism. This Ten Point program is really quite damning, showing the very height of opportunism by the Jucheists.^[33]

Conclusion

With this analysis, we can come to some definitive conclusions. Today the “DPRK” is not socialist, nor has it ever been socialist, as its socialist construction phase was undone before completion. The so-called “DPRK”, like the “ROK”, is nothing more than a semi-colony, and the people of Korea suffer under the boot of both foreign and national capital. As Marxists we must decry this humiliating affair, and call out the role of the Fascist “DPRK” in this abhorrent situation.. Juche is a useless philosophy based on metaphysics meant to serve a new bourgeois class in the north of Korea. It should be regarded as nothing other than a bourgeois ideology. We must give our solidarity to the workers and the oppressed people of Korea that are under the boot of the false “communists” of the North. We condemn all imperialism aggression against the people of Korea, whether that be from the Yankees or the Chinese. We must stand against revisionism, and be ruthlessly critical of it. Given the criticism I’ve constructed here, that certainly includes the ideology of Juche. This is Maoist98 for the Six Heads Study Circle signing off.

Sources

- [1] Cumings, Bruce, 2005, *"Korea's Place in the Sun: a Modern History"*. New York: W.W. Norton. pp. 421–22.
- [2] ["North-Korea: Socialism is Not Only Anti-Imperialism"](#), Red Flag No.3, 2015.
- [3] ["Socialism is a Science"](#), Kim Jong-Il, 1994.
- [4] ["On the Juche Idea"](#), Kim Jong-Il, 1982.
- [5] ["Socialism: Utopian & Scientific, Chapter 2, Dialectics"](#), F. Engels, 1880.
- [6] ["On Contradiction"](#), Mao Zedong, 1937.
- [7] ["Revolution and Socialist Construction in Korea"](#), Kim Il-Sung, 1971.
- [8] ["Corporatism & the Juche Idea"](#), Andrea Matles Savada, ed., 1993.
- [9] ["On Preserving the Juche Character & National Character of The Revolution & Construction"](#), Kim Jong-Il, 1997.
- [10] ["On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People"](#), Mao Zedong, 1957.
- [11] ["The Defeat of One's Own Government in an Imperialist War"](#), V. I Lenin, 1915.
- [12] ["Letter from Seo Hwi, Yun Gong-heum, Li Pil-gyu, and Kim Gwan to the Chinese Communist Party Central Committee"](#), 1956, History and Public Policy Program Digital Archive, GARF, Fond 5446, Opis 98, Delo 721, Listy 170-190. Translated by Gary Goldberg.
- [13] ["New Evidence on North Korea in 1956"](#), Cold War International History Project Bulletin, Issue 16
- [14] ["The August Incident & the Destiny of the Yen'an Faction"](#), Jin Guangxy, 2012.
- [15] ["The Organization of the Government \[of the DPRK\]"](#), U.S. Library of Congress, 1993.
- [16] ["Understanding North Korea: Indigenous Perspectives"](#), Edited by Han Jongwoo & Jong Tae-hern, 2014.
- [17] ["Let Us Hasten the Final Victory Through Revolutionary Ideological Offensive"](#), Kim Jong-Un, 2014.
- [18] ["Ten Principles for the Establishment of the One-Ideology System"](#), Kim Jong-Il, 1974.
- [19] ["DPRK Constitution 1972-1998 Amendments"](#), constituteproject.org.
- [20] ["Reforming North Korea \(Law, Politics, and the Market Economy\)"](#), Darren C. Zook, 2012.
- [21] ["Bill Bland: The Workers' Party of Korea and Revisionism"](#), 1995, revolutionarydemocracy.org.
- [22] ["Life in North Korea"](#), DW, 2020.

- [23] [*"The DPRK Attitude Toward the So-called 'Cultural Revolution' in China."*](#) March 07, 1967, *History and Public Policy Program Digital Archive, AVPRF f. 0102, op. 23, p. 112, d. 24, pp. 13-23*. Obtained by Sergey Radchenko and translated by Gary Goldberg.
- [24] [*"Tradition & Modernity in North Korea"*](#), U.S. Congress Library, 1993.
- [25] [*"Peru Orders Weapons from North Korea"*](#), 1988, UPI Archives.
- [26] [*"Documentation for Commando Rodrigo Franco"*](#), Pro-Government Militia Database Project.
- [27] [*"Special Economic Zones in the DPRK"*](#), National Committee of North Korea, 2014.
- [28] [*"Politics and Ideology. Meetings with Kang Sheng 1966-68."*](#) Ray Nunes.
- [29] [*"\[DPRK\]. China and the Soviet Union."*](#) U.S. Congress Library, 1993.
- [30] [*"Cuba: The Evaporation of a Myth."*](#) RCPUSA, 1977.
- [31] [*"Songun Policies."*](#) KFA, 2011.
- [32] [*"The Ten Point Program of the Great Unity of the Whole Nation for the Reunification of the Country."*](#) Kim Il-Sung, 1993.