

**DOCUMENTS**  
on the  
**Cease-Fire and Armistice Negotiations**  
**In Korea**  
**(III)**

**Supplement to People's China**  
**Vol. IV, No. 6, September 16, 1951**

## CONTENTS

- 1) Documents on the Panmunjon murder of platoon leader Yao Ching-hsiang on August 19..... 4
- 2) Documents on the bombing and strafing of the Kaisung neutral zone by U.N. aircraft on August 22..... 7
- 3) Documents on the dropping of a flare near the Kaisung conference site by U.N. aircraft on August 29..... 16
- 4) Documents on the murder of two more patrolmen of the Chinese people's volunteers on August 30..... 18
- 5) Documents on the bombing by U.N. aircraft near General Nam Il's residence in Kaisung..... 20
- 6) Statement by the spokesman of the Korean-Chinese Delegation on the question of public disclosure of communications ..... 22
- 7) Document listing U.N. air invasions over the Kaisung neutral zone between September 1 and 8..... 23

## INTRODUCTION

Two months have passed since the Kaisung talks began, but there has been no progress towards an armistice agreement in Korea. Session after session, the American negotiators put forward their preposterous demand for 12,000 square kilometres of territory in North Korea above the present battlefield as compensation for the so-called "independent superiority" of their air and naval forces. The Korean-Chinese Delegation held firm to the just proposal that the demilitarised zone should be fixed along the 38th Parallel.

On August 16 when the Kaisung talks had been deadlocked for three whole weeks on this issue, the conference adopted an American proposal to set up a sub-committee to work out a solution. But it soon became clear that the reason for this American "initiative" was to keep their absurd territorial demand from receiving the publicity which a full-dress conference would inevitably entail. The same U.S. stalling tactics were employed in the secrecy of the smaller committee, and hopes for an early armistice agreement receded further and further. Then came the assassination of a Chinese military police patrol leader and the murderous bombing attack on the living quarters of the Korean-Chinese Delegation in the neutral zone of Kaisung.

In spite of the incontrovertible evidence which established the responsibility of the United Nations Command for these two incidents, the U.N. Delegation refused either to carry out serious investigations or to give any assurances that such incidents would not recur. Under these circumstances, the conferences have been suspended since August 23. Meanwhile the neutral zone of Kaisung was violated in the air and on the ground with increasing flagrancy. On August 29 a U.N. military aircraft flew over the Kaisung neutral area and dropped a flare near General Nam Il's residence. On August 30 armed units under the U.N. Command intruded into the neutral zone and killed two patrolmen from the people's forces. On September 1, a U.N. military plane again bombed the residence of General Nam Il. Between Sept. 1 and 8, there were 139 flights over Kaisung by U.N. air forces. Strong protests were addressed to the U.N. Command, but each one of these met with a blank or evasive denial.

The protests which form the major section of the present Supplement sufficiently characterise the culpability of the U.N. side and their attitude towards reaching an agreement to end the war in Korea. This Supplement covers the period from Aug. 10 to Sept. 9.

# DOCUMENTS

The following documents relate to the murder of platoon leader Yao Ching-hsiang and the wounding of fighter Wang Jen-yuan on August 19. Both were members of a military patrol of the Korean-Chinese forces patrolling—as was agreed by both sides—the Kaisung neutral zone. The patrol was attacked by more than 30 armed men from the U.N. side.

## FROM GENERAL NAM IL, August 19, 1951

Vice-Admiral Joy, Chief of the United Nations Forces Delegation:

At 5:55 a.m. on August 19, nine men of a military patrol of our side led by platoon leader Yao Ching-hsiang, who were doing patrol duty in the Kaisung neutral zone, in conformity with the agreement, and moving in an easterly direction along the heights north of Songgongri southwest of Panmunjon, were attacked by over 30 armed men of your side who had illegally entered the neutral area and prepared an ambush. Platoon leader Yao Ching-hsiang and fighter Wang Jen-yuan were instantly seriously wounded. Your men fired two additional shots at the forehead of the gravely wounded platoon leader of our military patrol, Yao Ching-hsiang, who was thus killed. The liaison officers of our delegation immediately notified your liaison officers and asked that your side send personnel at once to carry out joint investigations. On the spot investigations were carried out jointly by the liaison officers of both sides right away. Local residents and our patrols, together with circumstantial evidence at the site of the incident, fully confirm the truth of the above-mentioned facts.

Ever since both sides reached agreement on the neutral zone of Kaisung, your side has violated the agreement again and again. Your aircraft has continuously violated the neutral zone by flying over it, has repeatedly strafed supply vehicles of our delegation, and armed men from your side have frequently fired on the neutral zone. Our side has lodged one protest after another, without any satisfactory reply ever coming from your side.

On July 17, I called your attention to the incident when armed men of your side opened fire on Panmunjon inside the neutral zone. On August 7, when your armed men again fired at Panmunjon, I called your serious attention to this and lodged a protest with you. But you have time and again deliberately evaded responsibility and have never given any satisfactory reply. This time your armed men have illegally entered the neutral zone, and taking ad-

vantage of the fact that our military patrol, who were doing their police duties, were entirely unprepared for any engagement, killed the platoon leader, Yao Ching-hsiang, and seriously wounded fighter Wang Jen-yuan of our military patrol who were faithfully carrying out the neutral zone agreement. This grave incident is actually the climax of a series of unlawful actions in disregard of the agreement which both sides should observe and in persistent violation of the neutral zone agreement. I must point to the serious nature of this violation by your side of the neutral zone agreement. We have always maintained that to guarantee the carrying out of the Kaisung neutral zone agreement, it must be respected by both sides. Facts, however, show that your side has constantly undermined this agreement which should be jointly respected by both sides. We have always maintained that if either side should violate the neutral zone agreement, it must be settled by such means as protest, investigation and consultation, so as to enable the armistice talks to go on, but the facts show that your side has consistently rejected all efforts by our side to find means of settling violations of the agreement by your side. This incident is the inevitable result of the policy of your side of consistently violating the reasonable methods. This cannot be tolerated. I lodge a serious protest with you and firmly demand of you:

(1) That severe punishment be meted out to the culprits of your side who shot and killed platoon leader, Yao Ching-hsiang, and heavily wounded a fighter of our military patrol, Wang Jen-yuan; and

(2) That thorough guarantees be provided against the recurrence of any further violation by your side of the neutral zone agreement.

I desire that you give me a satisfactory reply immediately.

(Signed)

NAM IL,

*General, Chief of the Delegation of the Korean People's Army and the Chinese people's volunteers.*

## REPORT BY THE LIAISON OFFICERS OF THE KOREAN-CHINESE DELEGATION, August 27, 1951

### 1. Facts regarding the incident:

Early in the morning of August 19, nine of our military police, led by platoon leader, Yao Ching-hsiang, who were fulfilling their duty of guarding

the Kaisung neutral zone in accordance with the agreement, were on patrol duty moving in an easterly direction along the high ground between Chyngsantong, southwest of Panmunjon, and the

north of Songgongri. At 05:55 hours, when they reached the high ground between Songgongri and Balsanri, they were suddenly attacked by over 30 members of the United Nations armed forces who had illegally penetrated into the neutral zone and lay in ambush in a camouflaged clump of trees about 50 metres to the south. Platoon leader Yao Ching-hsiang of our military police and fighter Wang Jen-yuan were hit by bullets on the left thighs and were seriously wounded. The United Nations armed force personnel went further and murdered platoon leader Yao Ching-hsiang of our military police by firing two shots through his forehead. They then withdrew in the direction of the United Nations forces battleline in Baikongemri.

**2. Report on the investigation made between 09:00 to 12:50 hours, August 19, by our liaison officers, Colonel Chang Chun San and Lieutenant Colonel Si Sung Mun, in conjunction with Colonel Murray, liaison officer of the United Nations Forces Delegation.**

At 08:30 hours on August 19, our side notified the liaison officer of the United Nations Forces Delegation of the incident and demanded that the other side send an officer to come and make a joint investigation at once. At 09:00 hours, Colonel Murray, liaison officer of the United Nations Forces Delegation, brought with him two interpreters and came to the vicinity of the Panmum Bridge to meet our liaison officers, Colonel Chang Chun San and Lieutenant Colonel Si Sung Mun. In an attempt to overtake and intercept the United Nations armed men who withdrew in the direction of the United Nations battleline, our side demanded that they proceed first to Balsanri and Baikongemri for an investigation and then turn back to the scene of the incident to carry out an investigation. After obtaining the consent of the opposite side they departed for Balsanri.

On reaching the eastern approach to Balsanri, they came across two young boys in a field. Colonel Murray asked them whether they heard the sound of gunfire that morning. The young boys answered that they had. On entering the village of Baikongemri, they came across another two young lads who were holding spent rifle and carbine cartridges and clips (all American-manufactured) which they had picked up. The young boys were asked to hand them over, which they did. The liaison officers of both sides examined these and found the spent cartridges bore a strong smell of gun power and inside the cartridge case there still remained traces of smoke, proving that they were fired a short while back (the spent cartridges and the clips have all been kept by our side). In the village of Baikongemri, Colonel Murray questioned a lame man and an old man named Kim, both of whom said they heard gun shots in the early morning. In a cornfield at the western end of Pachon village, Colonel Murray questioned a young woman who said that when it became light and time for breakfast, she heard gun shots, and shortly before the liaison officers arrived, she saw Syngman Rhee national defence troops passing at a point about 200 yards away and that they wore uniforms and moved in an easterly direction, crossed the ridge of the hill on the north side of Baikongemri and were gone. She

also said that Syngman Rhee national defence troops constantly came and went in that village and that sometimes they took meals in a small house to the south of where she stood.

Both sides then agreed to return to Songgongri to investigate. First they inspected the dead body of platoon leader Yao Ching-hsiang, who had sacrificed his life in the morning. There was one bullet hole on the left thigh of the dead body and in the middle but inclining a little to the right of the forehead there were two red bullet holes. Later, they went to see wounded fighter Wang Jen-yuan. Wang was seriously wounded and had bled too much to talk, but he answered questions by gestures and indicated that the attackers had fired many shots. After that, Colonel Murray suggested that, apart from the dead man and the wounded, the original patrol squad take up its original formation and guide the liaison officers along the original route to the place of the incident. On the road details of what happened were related.

According to the statement of vice-platoon leader Li Ching-lin, at 05:55 hours just when he had reached the slope of the hill between Songgongri and Balsanri, he located the enemy in a clump of trees about 50 metres to his south. First he saw a plain-clothes man who was wearing white on his upper parts and black trousers. Immediately following he noticed from five to eight other enemies. He hid at once and took a roundabout route, whereupon, he discovered another group of over 10 persons lying in the dense wood, and these immediately fired at him. He did not carry any weapon, and, moreover, he was alone in front and he had no time to observe carefully, so he at once took shelter by rolling down into a small pit below the slope. At this juncture, the enemy firing was violent and came nearer to him. He then withdrew further.

Fighter Ko Wen-chu was with platoon leader Yao Ching-hsiang. He said that when the platoon leader was hit in the thigh and unable to move, Ko tried to carry him but could not manage his weight. As the firing became intensified, Yao ordered Ko to go at once for shelter. Our patrolmen returned when the enemy left and found that the platoon leader Yao had been killed by two additional shots in the forehead. The wounded fighter, Wang Jen-yuan, had crawled to shelter in the grass and was not discovered by the enemy, thus escaping being killed. The liaison officers of both sides examined the two patches of blood where platoon leader Yao had sacrificed his life, and also the broken camouflaged tree branches and the spent cartridges (all of American manufacture) left by the United Nations armed men in the place of ambush.

Colonel Murray questioned vice-platoon leader Li whether he saw clearly what troops the attackers were and what uniforms they wore. Li answered that at the time the shooting was very heavy, and he could not raise his head to see clearly: "But with the exception of the one plain-clothes man, the rest all wore uniforms of the same colour as yours." At this point, Colonel Murray indicated that he had no other questions to ask.

After our military police had withdrawn, our liaison officers declared that the present investiga-

tions had clearly established that the United Nations forces' side had violated the neutrality agreement. They said: "Since the agreement on the neutral zone, violations by the United Nations forces of the neutrality agreement have occurred continuously. On July 16 and August 7, your side time and again fired into the neutral zone. We lodged protests with your side, but your side took a delaying, perfunctory and irresponsible attitude towards these incidents, thus resulting in events developing to the present grave state. Today's incident has been investigated in three phases. The first was the examination of and the conversation with our military police unit and the inspection of the dead body and the wounded fighter. The second was the investigation carried out on the scene of the incident. The third was the inquiry made of the inhabitants of Baikongemri, the point at which your side penetrated into the neutral zone. What the woman said in particular is very clear. She heard the gunfire and saw the Syngman Rhee national defence troops as they withdrew. Furthermore, she clearly stated that the Syngman Rhee national defence troops moved in that area regularly. This clearly showed that your side regularly violates the agreement. Today's incident is a grave one in which the United Nations forces' side intentionally violated the agreement and attacked the neutral zone. On behalf of our chief delegate,

*Vice-Admiral Joy on Aug. 22 replied: "A preliminary report does not substantiate the charges." On Aug. 23, Joy stated that while he accepted the fact that the patrol was attacked at the time and in the manner in which "your liaison officers have reported to you," the identity of the attackers was not established beyond the fact that it was "an armed band." Joy said that the evidence indicated that "the band was an irregular or partisan force."*

## FROM GENERAL NAM IL, September 3, 1951

Vice-Admiral Joy, Chief of the United Nations Forces Delegation:

With reference to your letter dated August 22 concerning the serious incident of the intrusion into the Kaisung neutral zone and the murder of platoon leader, Yao Ching-hsiang, and the serious wounding of Wang Jen-yuan of our military patrol by your armed personnel on August 19, I hereby point out to you that your reply is totally unsatisfactory. Although you have to admit in your letter the authenticity of the fact that our military patrolmen were ambushed on August 19, you nevertheless deliberately distorted the facts and doctored the results of the investigation made on the scene by the liaison officers of both sides on the very day of the occurrence of the incident in an attempt to deny that the armed troops which murdered our military police were under the command of the U.N. forces. In this way you attempt to deny your inescapable responsibility for this serious incident. It was clearly stated by all the people who testified on the spot while the liaison officers of both sides were conducting their investigation that our military patrolmen were ambushed by South Korean troops, some of them in plain clothes and some in uniform.

But you alleged without any justification that "such evidence as was developed indicates that the armed band was not part of a regular military force.

I lodge a strong protest with your side and declare that we reserve the right to put forward demands for the settlement of this incident."

Colonel Murray admitted that the evidence of the occurrence of the incident was authentic. It was clear that our patrol squad in the neutral zone was attacked in ambush. He admitted that none of the spent cartridges and clips discovered was of our side, but, on the contrary, were all American-manufactured. He also admitted that the testimony given by the woman at Baikongemri was that she personally had seen that the attackers who withdrew were Syngman Rhee national defence troops. At this point, both sides decided to return in their respective directions and not investigate further. The time then was 12:50 hours.

In fact, the United Nations Forces Cavalry Division have regularly violated the Kaisung neutral zone agreement and penetrated into places between Balsanri and Baikongemri in the vicinity of Panmunjon, the neutral zone, to launch activities to disturb the inhabitants. This can be proved by everyone who lives in that area. As regards the incident on August 19, apart from those who were questioned during the investigation made on the spot by the liaison officers of both sides, there are many other inhabitants who can furnish evidence which need not be set forth here.

It indicates, on the contrary, that the band was an irregular or partisan force."

It was clearly pointed out by all the witnesses at the time that your South Korean troops which ambushed our military patrolmen entered the neutral zone from your positions, harassed the inhabitants in Baikongemri and its neighbourhood and withdrew to your positions only a little while before the liaison officers of both sides began their investigation. Yet you made the arbitrary allegation that these armed men were partisans in the Kaisung neutral zone acting on their own initiative.

Your liaison officer, Colonel Murray, clearly stated when summing up the results of the investigation just prior to its conclusion, that the young woman in Baikongemri questioned by your liaison officer forthrightly declared that she saw with her own eyes the uniformed South Korean troops withdraw eastwards from the neutral zone to your positions after the attack.

But in the relevant parts of the so-called report on the investigation, you did not mention the South Korean troops at all, deliberately covering up the illegal action of the South Korean troops under the command of the United Nations forces.

It is clear that your South Korean troops, taking advantage of the fact that our military patrolmen,

in accordance with the strict observance of the neutral zone agreement, were unprepared for fighting, illegally invaded the neutral zone and murdered our military patrolmen. But you attempt to present this mean, cowardly action as being a question of security in the neutral zone.

Tricks such as distorting facts, doctoring records and misleading public opinion not only cannot absolve your side from the responsibility for this serious event, nor can they achieve the purpose of covering up the truth and deceiving the people of the whole world. I once again lodge a serious protest with

you and demand that you deal with this question in a responsible and serious manner, severely punish your South Korean troops who murdered our military patrolmen, and fully guarantee that there will be no repetition of violations of the agreement by your side.

(Signed)

NAM IL,

*General, Chief of the Delegation of the Korean People's Army and the Chinese people's volunteers.*

---

**The following documents relate to a U.N. military aircraft which invaded, bombed and strafed the Kaisung neutral zone at 22:20 hours on August 22. The target was the residence of the Korean and Chinese Delegation.**

### **FROM GENERAL KIM IL SUNG AND GENERAL PENG TEH-HUAI, Aug. 23, 1951**

General Ridgway:

Whilst the blood of our heroic fighter, Yao Ching-hsiang, who fell victim to the illegal murder by armed personnel of your side, is still warm, an aeroplane of your side invaded the air over the meeting place in the Kaisung neutral zone at 22:20 hours on August 22, and carried out bombing and strafing which were aimed at the residence of our delegation. Although our delegation was filled with indignation, it nevertheless notified your side at 22:35 hours on August 22 to send personnel to investigate, in order to make the truth of the event known to the whole world and prevent any pretext on your side of regarding the cause of the event as accidental. The liaison officers sent by your side saw with their own eyes the craters made by bombs dropped by the aeroplane belonging to your side, the bomb splinters and other items of evidence which proved that the bombs were dropped a few hours previously. They had nothing to say. In fact, even without the joint investigation of liaison officers of your side, the witnesses and items of evidence which we possess already fully prove the undeniable provocative action of your side.

The reason why you dare unscrupulously to continue the provocations is because you have mistaken our patience in striving for peace as a sign of weakness. Assuming that we would not be willing to break off the negotiations on account of these questions, you therefore even went to the extent first of firing on Panmunjon, then of murdering a military patrolman of our side and lastly attempting to murder our delegation. We must tell you that such considerations are wrong.

It is true that in order to secure peace and an armistice, our attitude throughout has been one of extreme patience. There is, however, a limit to our patience. We, moreover, know very well that peace cannot be won by the desire for peace on our part alone. The lack of sincerity on your side in the armistice negotiations has now been clearly exposed by your unscrupulous provocations

outside the meetings, as well as by your arrogant demands inside the meetings in insisting on pushing the military demarcation line into our positions in order to hold up the progress of the negotiations. It is our hope that the armistice negotiations will proceed smoothly and that a just and reasonable agreement acceptable to both sides will be reached. Yet how can such a hope be realised when the deliberately murderous bombing directed at our delegation follows the killing of our military patrolman?

Therefore, our delegation cannot but declare the meeting adjourned as from August 23, until you take responsible action with regard to this serious provocation made by your side. Just think for a moment, how is it possible for the armistice negotiations to continue when the neutral zone is regarded as meaningless by your side and when your side is all the time preparing to murder the unarmed delegates of our side stationed in the neutral zone for negotiating an armistice? You should understand that up to the present all our dealings with you have been on a basis of equality; if your side does not demonstrate in practice your respect for this principle, and has the audacity to regard yourselves as victors and arbitrarily wreck all agreements based on this, including the agreement on the neutralisation of Kaisung, then all responsibility and consequences arising from this will fall entirely on your side. On account of the provocative action in which the armed forces of your side bombed the Kaisung neutral zone at 22:20 hours on August 22, deliberately attempting to murder our delegation, we lodge our serious protest with you before the eyes of all just people throughout the world, and await your satisfactory answer.

(Signed)

KIM IL SUNG,  
*Supreme Commander of the Korean People's Army.*

PENG TEH-HUAI,  
*Commander of the Chinese people's volunteers.*

## STATEMENT BY THE SPOKESMAN OF THE KOREAN-CHINESE DELEGATION, August 25, 1951

Joy's report, one-sided, and a distortion of the joint investigations of this incident as conducted during the night of the 22nd by the liaison officers of the United Nations forces and of our side, is a complete misrepresentation. It stands facts on their heads and is self-contradictory. Vice-Admiral Joy's attitude in the report is one of utter refusal to get the question settled in an attempt to evade the grave responsibility of the United Nations forces for this serious event.

The fact that the United Nations Command has acted and persists in acting in this way forces one to the conclusion that the United Nations Command is deliberately breaking up the armistice talks in Kaisung.

Vice-Admiral Joy quotes the results of the fact-twisting, so-called investigation made by the United Nations Command's liaison officers in the hope of proving that this serious incident, in which a U.N. military aircraft illegally flew over the neutral zone of Kaisung and carried out murderous bombing and strafing, with the residence of our delegation as the target, was a fabrication by us.

But the actual events completely refute this arbitrary propaganda. In fact, the attitude of the liaison officers of the United Nations forces towards the investigations was, from start to finish, biased, malicious and designed to pave the way for denial.

When our liaison officers first notified the liaison officers of the other side to come and investigate this serious incident jointly with us, they refused to come on the pretext that it was too late in the night. Even after they finally came to the bombed area upon the firm demand by our side, they had scarcely glanced at the effects of the bombing on the spots close to and northwest of the dormitory of our delegation when they immediately took the attitude that the results of these explosions were not worth looking at. The report of their investigations which they made on the basis of this irresponsible, biased and malicious attitude cannot in the first place be regarded as a full reflection of the facts. Even so, Vice-Admiral Joy cannot say for certain that these explosives were not dropped from the air. There is still another more important factor, when the liaison officers of both sides had just about completed the investigations on the spot, the liaison officer of the other side asked us whether it was possible to come again in daylight, saying that it was not convenient to make the investigations in the dead of night. Our liaison officers immediately told him, that we considered the evidence as conclusive and that it was not necessary to make a re-investigation. But our side did not reject their coming in daylight to make a re-investigation but merely remarked that if they came again, they should please first make contact by radio. Our liaison officers reported this demand of the other side's liaison officers to our chief delegate and, as a matter of fact, our side was waiting for them to come on the morning of the 23rd to make a re-investigation. They failed to come in the morning of the 23rd. Instead, at 10:00 hours in

the morning of the 23rd, Vice-Admiral Joy issued a report in which he turned all the facts upside down, alleging that our side had rejected the continuation of the investigation in daylight on the 23rd. What then is the real purpose of the United Nations Command in behaving and speaking in this way? This is worth careful examination.

After the incident which occurred on the night of the 22nd through the dawn of the 23rd, our side not only did not refuse the other side a continuation of the investigations in daylight on the 23rd, but, even now, we do not reject a re-investigation by the other side. Facts are stronger than eloquence and truth is on our side. The United Nations Delegation dare not face the facts. They did not allow their liaison officers to make a re-investigation on the spot in daylight on the 23rd, and, on the 24th and the 25th, they sent only the South Korean liaison officer to receive and deliver documents at Panmunjon, being afraid to let the American liaison officers who made the false report on the night of the 22nd meet our liaison officers. Apparently, thieves do have guilty consciences and are afraid of meeting people.

Vice-Admiral Joy, in his report, even maliciously slandered us by intentionally distorting the contents of the verbal protest which our liaison officers lodged with his liaison officers at the time of the investigations on the instructions of the chief delegate of our side. He did this in an attempt to show that the whole incident was a frame-up of ours to have an excuse for stopping the negotiations. Since this extremely serious incident happened, our delegation has been placed in the position of being exposed to possible attack at any time; and in fact it was impossible to continue meeting on the 23rd. Thus our chief delegate had to suspend all meetings scheduled for the 23rd. This was very natural. Consequently, our chief delegate instructed our liaison officers to give the following notification to the liaison officers of the other side—to show our care, this notification, like all other serious statements by our side, was in written form prepared by the liaison officers of our side, in accordance with instructions from our chief delegate:

"I must point out the extremely serious nature of this incident. On the instructions of the chief delegate of our side, I first lodge a grave verbal protest with you, and also notify you that all meetings for August 23 are suspended. Our side reserves the right to make all necessary demands."

No one, except a biased or malicious person, would add to or subtract from the meaning of the above important note.

But in his report, Vice-Admiral Joy hinted that in the face of this obvious and serious provocation of theirs, our chief delegate had no right to decide to suspend meetings for the 23rd, and attempted to use this to prove that the entire event was premeditated by our side. In fact, our chief delegate's decision to suspend the meetings was natural and inevitable; it does not prove any so-called premedita-

tion. On the contrary, it is the attitude of the United Nations Command, which demanded re-investigation but deliberately did not come to re-investigate and repeatedly stated that our side rejected re-investigation, that strongly suggests of a pre-meditated plan on their side deliberately to disrupt the Kaisung negotiations.

Even according to the fact-twisting report by his own liaison officers, Vice-Admiral Joy could not deny that the traces of bombing and the bomb splinters, which his liaison officers saw with their own eyes, came from the air. So, to prove his presumed conclusion, Vice-Admiral Joy fabricated the possibility that these signs of bombing were explosives dropped by our planes, or that they were done by our planes flying over in conjunction with arrangements on the ground. Trying to prove this absurd argument, Vice-Admiral Joy said that at the time when the bombing occurred, the radar detecting station of the 5th Air Force of the United Nations Command reported that an unidentified plane flew over the area west of Kaisung at 21:30 hours, hinting that this plane was one of our side which flew to Kaisung to arrange this matter. It can be said that Vice-Admiral Joy has now reached the end of his rope in his fabrication, but unfortunately for him, here the contradiction in Joy's report grows beyond repair. How could the radar detecting station of the 5th Air Force of the United Nations Command know that a plane flying over the area west of Kaisung at 21:30 hours was unidentified and yet at the same time that it was definitely not a plane of the United Nations forces? This is really a case of the thief who gratuitously draws attention to his guilt before he is even questioned.

True, a military aeroplane actually did fly over the Kaisung neutral zone at 22:20 hours on August 22, and, with our delegation's residence as the target, dropped bombs. But this aeroplane was not an unidentified one, but was actually a military plane

which belongs to the United Nations forces. In the course of the negotiations, Vice-Admiral Joy has repeatedly emphasised that the United Nations air force has complete control in Korea up to the banks of the Yalu River. Is it conceivable that during the few minutes at 22:20 hours on August 22, they suddenly lost their control and permitted an unidentified plane to fly over Kaisung at ease without meeting any challenge? Can anybody except an idiot imagine that the 5th Air Force of the United Nations forces would not mobilise their own planes to fight after their radar detecting station had discovered a military plane not belonging to their own side flying within 20 miles of their own frontline? It is inconceivable. Vice-Admiral Joy attempts to use the detecting report of the 5th Air Force radar station to justify his absurd argument that this event was planned beforehand by our side, but the items of evidence put forward by Vice-Admiral Joy serve precisely to prove that the military plane, which penetrated into the Kaisung neutral zone at 22:20 hours on August 22 and bombed and strafed, with the residence of our delegation as a target, was in fact a military plane equipped by the United Nations forces.

It can be seen from this that the report of Vice-Admiral Joy on the serious occurrence in which a military aircraft of the United Nations forces illegally flew over the Kaisung neutral area at 22:20 hours on August 22 and bombed and strafed with our delegation's residence as the target is an out-and-out distortion of the facts and a reversal of the truth as well as being self-contradictory. The United Nations forces can in no way evade its heavy responsibility for this grave incident. Persistence in this attitude which the United Nations Command has taken up to the present time will only deepen the impression made on people throughout the world that the United Nations forces are deliberately disrupting the Kaisung armistice negotiations.

## STATEMENT BY GENERAL NAM IL, August 26, 1951

At 22:20 hours on August 22, a military aircraft of the United Nations forces invaded the Kaisung neutral zone, circled several times over the residence of our delegation in the area of the meeting site, dived and dropped a number of bombs, then carried out machine-gun strafing and flew off.

**(A) A Report on the investigation made on the spot, between 00:25 hours and 03:15 hours on August 23 by our liaison officers, Colonel Chang Chun San and Lieutenant Colonel Si Sung Mun, together with the liaison officers of the United Nations Forces Delegation, Colonel Kinney and Colonel Murray:**

(1) At 22:35 hours on August 22, our side began trying to contact the United Nations Forces Delegation over the radio telephone, then after getting through at 23:00 hours, our side notified the liaison officers of the other side of the event and demanded that they immediately send personnel to carry out a joint investigation on the spot. At first the other side would not come immediately, claiming that it was late at night; it was only after we seriously per-

sisted in our demand, that the other side sent its liaison officers, Colonel Kinney and Colonel Murray, with two interpreters to the meeting site at 00:25 hours on the 23rd, to meet our liaison officers, Colonel Chang Chun San and Lieutenant Colonel Si Sung Mun, and begin a joint investigation.

(2) At that time, not all the traces of bombing had yet been discovered; the liaison officers of both sides first went to a place not far and northeast of the residence of our delegation to investigate the crater of a napalm bomb and a big piece of napalm bomb casing which had fallen on the highway after explosion. Colonel Kinney immediately declared that if these could be regarded as bombs, they have plenty of them and showed unwillingness to continue with the investigation. It was only after our side insisted on our right to ask for the investigation to be made and firmly pressed for a detailed investigation that the other side consented to examine the place north of the residence of our delegation where the bombs fell, and found six craters around which were scattered bomb fragments and splinters. After inspecting

each crater, Colonel Kinney showed reluctance to go on with the investigation which was continued only on the insistence of our side. Finally, Colonel Kinney declared that nothing our side had shown him could be regarded as bombs.

At that time, Colonel Chang Chun San pointed out to the other side that this air attack was an extremely serious incident and there was undeniable evidence of it, and asked him what more he had to say about the matter. He then made a verbal protest to the other side, saying: "We must point out the extreme gravity of this incident. Under instructions of our chief delegate, we hereby lodge first a most serious verbal protest with your side and inform you that all meetings on August 23 are suspended. Our side reserves the right to raise all necessary demands." Colonel Kinney replied that he would report the protest to the chief delegate of his side. At 01:40 hours, the liaison officers of the other side left. Soon after their departure, our side received reports from citizens living in the bombed area and the military patrolmen that two more craters had been found. Thereupon our men chased after and overtook the liaison officers of the other side and asked them to return and investigate further. Colonel Kinney refused to come back, saying that it was too late at night and raining. Only after we insisted that the investigation be continued did they, after nearly half an hour, finally return and examine the place southwest of and not far from the residence of our delegation, where two napalm bombs fell and made conspicuous bomb craters. One bomb left evident traces of burning, while the other, unexploded, had its petroleum jelly spread on the ground. Colonel Kinney asked if there was any eyewitness. Colonel Chang Chun San replied: "The whole of the population of Kaisung could vouch for this incident." The other side then demanded that responsible members of our military patrol on the scene be questioned. Thereupon deputy squad leader Lu Yen-tse described in detail how the plane dropped its bombs, which he saw with his own eyes. But Colonel Kinney again demanded the ending of the investigation on the pretext that there were correspondents of our side present, and said that he would carry on the investigation only on the condition that correspondents of both sides were present. Our side rejected the proposal that the investigation should be interrupted on account of such minor points, and voluntarily told the correspondents to leave the area. Again the other side, on the pretence of poor light, proposed resuming the investigation after daybreak. Our side replied that the existing evidence was sufficient and conclusive and in fact no further examination was required. But our side did not reject any re-investigation by the other side in the morning, only requesting that radio contact be made beforehand. Our side also stated that some of the traces of the bombing might possibly be washed away in the event of rain. Colonel Kinney replied: "Steel won't wash away and oil won't mix with water." The liaison officers of both sides then departed. The time was 03:15 hours.

(3) After investigation on the spot, our liaison officers reported to me that the liaison officers of the United Nations Forces Delegation would come to

continue the investigations the next morning. But the other side did not send personnel for further investigations after daybreak on August 23.

(4) On August 23 I made a report on the above lines to Supreme Commander Kim Il Sung and Commander Peng Teh-huai of the investigations which the liaison officers of both sides made on the scene from 00:25 hours to 03:15 hours the same day.

**(B) A report on the re-investigation made on the scene in the period from the afternoon of August 23 to August 26 by our liaison officers, together with surveyors, press correspondents and press photographers:**

From the afternoon of August 23 to August 26 our liaison officers, together with surveyors, press correspondents and press photographers, made a re-investigation of the results of the bombing and strafing of the residence of our delegation carried out by the military aircraft of the United Nations forces. They found four napalm bombs, 13 anti-personnel bombs and machine-gun cartridge cases. Here are the details:

I. Four napalm bombs:

(1) One fell some 600 metres southwest of our delegation's residence. Having burned itself out, it made a crater with a diameter of 1.3 metres and a depth of 48 centimetres in a field on a slope. A fragment of the bomb casing, which was flung as far as 15 metres from the crater, is an irregular eclipse in shape whose breadth ranges from 60 to 62 centimetres and whose length is about 60 centimetres.

On the upper part of the bomb casing, there are ridges with markings not easily distinguishable. The first row has the word INCENDIARY (this word is inside the ridge and not completely distinguishable). The second row has AN-4xx3 (two figures between the numbers are not distinguishable, but the number on the corresponding pieces of two bomb splinters is 47A3). The third row has MFG 1945 and the fourth REWKD, TAD 1950. Grass near the bomb casing was scorched, the area of scorching being irregular, about five metres in length and 2.4 metres in width. In the neighbourhood, there were several big and small patches that had been burnt.

(2) One fell about 30 metres southwest of the first bomb. There was no burning. In the neighbourhood, there was some oil which had already solidified. The diameter of the bomb crater is about 1.3 metres and its depth about 50 centimetres. There was a bent iron strip, many fragments and a bell-like bomb cap. One fragment has the following small description on it: the first line has LOT 1 and the second, 5-45.

(3) One was dropped on crops by the roadside, about 700 metres northeast of the residence of our delegation. Its bomb crater is about one metre in length, 1.5 metres in width and half a metre in depth. There was water in it because of the rain. On the surface of the water was grease. The bomb casing was about 4.5 metres from the crater and had fallen on the roadway. There were the marks of burning on the crops, the grass and rocks in the

neighbourhood. The bomb casing had not split into pieces but its bottom had crumpled. Markings on the bomb casing are not distinguishable. It, too, has a bell-like cap.

(4) One fell about 650 metres west-northwest of the residence of our delegation on a hill slope where there is more rock than grass and trees.

The bomb crater is not very noticeable. But there are many traces of burning on the rocks, on the grass and the trees. At one big burnt patch, there was a large bomb fragment on which were found a description and markings similar to those found on bomb (1). This fragment is about 78 centimetres in length and 56 centimetres in width, with two small protracting parts at the top and bottom. It is squarish in the middle. Another fragment has the following marking and figures: in the first row HSP 6-18, and in the second, 545. There was a fuse already broken, about 4.5 centimetres in length.

II. All the 13 anti-personnel bombs were dropped some 200 metres north of our delegation's residence. They all exploded a short distance from one another, ranging from a few metres to 20 metres. Details about the places where they fell:

(1) Fell in a field making a crater 2.2 metres in diameter and 40 centimetres deep. In the crater is a bomb fin, 15 centimetres long, with a tube with four wings each five centimetres wide. (Bomb fins of the remainder of the anti-personnel bombs are similar and need no further description.)

(2) Fell on grassy land opposite the hill. The crater it caused is about one metre in diameter and some 13 centimetres deep, in which a bomb fin was found.

(3) Fell on rocks just above the surface of the ground. The biggest mark of the bombing on the rock is some 75 centimetres long and 38 centimetres broad. The bomb caused a roughly semi-circular crater measuring two metres in the soil near the rock.

(4) Fell in a small water gully in which a bomb fin was also found. Rocks on one side of the gully had bomb markings and traces of fallen earth.

(5) Another was dropped on grassy land close to rocks on the hillside where a small tree was uprooted. The crater is of an irregular shape, some 1.5 metres in diameter and some 20 centimetres deep, in which a bomb fin was found.

(6) Fell on grassy land, uprooted a fairly big tree. The bomb crater is about one metre in diameter, 20 centimetres deep, in which was found a bomb fin.

(7) Fell on the grassy land near an overhanging rock. The bomb crater is about one metre in diameter, 20 centimetres deep, in which was found a bomb fin.

(8) Fell on the slope at the top of a hill. The bomb crater is about one metre in diameter, 20 centimetres deep, in which was found a bomb fin.

(9) Fell near a hill top. The bomb crater is about one metre in diameter, 25 centimetres deep, with a bomb fin in it.

(10) Fell on the farther side of a hilltop. The bomb crater is about one metre in diameter, 20 centimetres deep.

(11) Fell on a plot of cultivated land opposite a little ditch on the hillside. The bomb crater is about 1.5 metres in diameter, 10 centimetres deep. Nearby is a small damaged metal band and several bomb fragments.

(12) Fell near the previous bomb. The crater being irregular and about three metres long, two metres wide, 30 centimetres deep, and with bomb fragments.

(13) Fell on a plot of cultivated land, blasted away a considerable part of the standing crop. The bomb crater is about one metre in diameter, 25 centimetres deep, and with bomb fragments.

III. Empty cartridge cases. As to machine-gunning by the enemy aeroplane at a nearby hill slope north of our delegation's residence, an empty machine-gun cartridge case was picked up, the bottom of which was marked WH20MM M21A 11945.

IV. As regards this incident of the bombing and strafing by the United Nations aeroplane directed at the residence of our delegation, our delegation not only has detailed and solid evidence through the investigation as stated above, but all our military patrolmen guarding the Kaisung neutral zone are able to testify to it with eyewitness accounts. All Kaisung residents personally saw or heard the bombing and strafing and they will serve in varying degrees as eyewitnesses of the incident. Since the August 22 incident, the residents in the Kaisung neutral zone have begun to build air-raid shelters in great haste or to move out of the city. The August 22 incident has in fact changed the appearance of Kaisung city. The residents, old and weak, women and children, are not only eyewitnesses but are also protesters or accusers as regards this incident. Since nearly all Kaisung residents are eyewitnesses who can be interviewed and questioned at any time, it seems unnecessary to name a small number of individuals.

*General Ridgway replied on Aug. 25, denying all charges connected with the "Aug. 19 ambush" and also the charges of bombing and strafing Kaisung on Aug. 22. With regard to the various incidents Ridgway charged that they were either "fabricated" or "have proven to be the action of irregular groups without the slightest connection overtly or covertly with any forces or agencies under my control." As for the Kaisung bombing, Ridgway referred to them as "alleged incidents." In violent language, he referred to the Korean-Chinese protest against the bombing as "so utterly false, so preposterous and so obviously manufactured . . . that it does not in its own right merit a reply." A further message from Ridgway on Aug. 29 flatly refused to re-open the investigation of the Aug. 22 bombing of Kaisung.*

## FROM GENERAL KIM IL SUNG AND GENERAL PENG TEH-HUAI, Aug. 27, 1951

General Ridgway:

Your reply letter dated the 25th has been received. In this letter, you not only deny the serious provocative action of the illegal penetration by an aeroplane of your side over the Kaisung neutral zone on the night of August 22, which carried out bombing and strafing with the residence of our delegation as its target, but you also unreasonably refuse to settle this matter in a serious and responsible manner. Moreover, you utter the malicious slander that this incident was "manufactured" by our side, thus attempting to evade the heavy responsibility for this incident which should be borne by your side. We regard this reply of yours as entirely unsatisfactory.

Since the Kaisung armistice negotiations began, in settling any event arising from a violation, by either side, of the Kaisung neutral zone agreement, our side has always adopted a careful and responsible attitude and the principle of equality in order that the negotiations may go ahead smoothly. The entire record on these questions during the Kaisung negotiations irrefutably bears out this point. The full texts of documents and messages that have passed between both sides on these questions have been published by our side, so that people may know the entire truth of the events. What, however, is the position on your side? On all questions of breaches and violations of the Kaisung neutral zone agreement by your side, you have either denied or failed to settle them when our side has called your attention to them or lodged protests with your side. Even after the incident of August 19, when armed men of your side illegally entered the Kaisung neutral zone and attacked our military patrol, Vice-Admiral Joy, your chief delegate, still issued a denial, stating that it was a "voluntary" action by so-called "citizens of the Republic of Korea" within our area and that your side was not responsible for it, despite the fact that investigations were carried out on the spot by the liaison officers of both sides and local inhabitants testified that it was an ambush laid by marauding South Korean troops in uniform.

Yet you state in your recent reply that this incident was "malicious falsehoods totally without foundation in fact." Are you not aware that Vice-Admiral Joy admitted the fact of the ambush in his reply to our General Nam Il on August 23? One may ask whether the South Korean troops can be excluded from the United Nations forces; and if so, what is the job of the South Korean delegate, General Pak Sun Yup, in the United Nations Delegation? What is the basic difference between so-called "citizens of the Republic of Korea" who wear uniforms, carry arms and force their way into the neutral zone, and South Korean troops? If the headquarters of the United Nations forces cannot control and bear responsibility for these South Korean troops, then how can your delegation conduct armistice negotiations representing all United Nations forces, including the South Korean forces?

This kind of distortion of facts, peremptory denials, reversal of the truth and self-contradictions by your side reached its highest peak in the incident

which took place on the night of August 22. At the very outset of your reply, you make the slanderous assertion that this incident was "manufactured" by our side and "does not in its own right merit a reply." This arbitrary attitude of yours is itself proof enough that this incident was premeditated by your side, because only in such a case would you adopt a policy of blank refusal and slander to evade your grave and inescapable responsibility in face of iron facts. Thus, it is not surprising that your liaison officers, when they first heard of the incident, found pretexts for refusing to come to Kaisung to investigate. And when they eventually came on the scene, they expressed the opinion that the traces of the bombing and the bomb splinters were not worth looking at, and they wanted to investigate again in daylight, claiming that it was not convenient to investigate in the dark.

However, on August 23, Vice-Admiral Joy, your chief delegate, tried to forestall us with a report denying all the facts and making the "fabrication" slander. Moreover, your liaison officers did not come to re-investigate but, on the contrary, repeatedly alleged that our side refused to allow a re-investigation. Is it not clear that all this results from the fact that there was premeditation on your side in regard to the incident so that after it occurred, your side hurriedly tries to evade and deny responsibility, afraid to face reality?

Facts speak louder than eloquence. Your side's aeroplane intruded into the Kaisung neutral zone. It bombed and strafed. Although, disregarding the facts, you allege in your reply that it is a "malicious falsehood totally without foundation in fact," the fragments of the bombs dropped by your plane and the craters, the blasted rocks, the scorched earth are all still as they were near the residence of our delegation in the Kaisung meeting area and the citizens of the Kaisung area can also testify to the actual facts of the bombing and strafing by your plane. Only if your side is determined to break up the negotiations, and prohibit your delegation and liaison officers, and even press correspondents, from coming to Kaisung, can you evade the test of reality. As far as our side is concerned, we did not, on the night of the 22nd, reject your making a re-investigation in daylight and we are still waiting for your side to do so. If one sticks to the facts on the actual spot of the bombed area in Kaisung, it becomes obvious who manufactured this provocative incident and who is arbitrarily telling absurd lies in the face of the facts.

Moreover, even in the report distorting all facts prepared by your liaison officers which Vice-Admiral Joy of your side has already published, your side cannot deny that the bomb fragments and other evidence of bombing which your liaison officers saw with their own eyes were wrought by aircraft bombing. And the radar report by your 5th Air Force has well testified that an aircraft appeared west of Kaisung at 21:30 hours on August 22. Of course, it is difficult to identify aircraft picked up by radar. But on what grounds were Vice-Admiral Joy and the liaison officers of your side able to

allege arbitrarily that it was not an aircraft of the United Nations forces but our aircraft that attempted to murder our delegation? Such are the astonishing and absurd lengths to which the denials and slanders have reached. In your reply, in addition to repeating their opinions, you also allege that the other incidents were either "fabricated" by our side, or "actions of irregular groups without the slightest connection overtly and covertly" with your side. But, if the South Korean troops in the August 19 incident were not directly connected with the U.N. Command, can you deny that they were connected, overtly or covertly, with the headquarters of the South Korean troops? Is it possible that the aircraft appearing on the night of August 22 was also an irregular aircraft of South Korea?

When the aircraft of the United Nations forces illegally flew over the Kaisung neutral zone and bombed and strafed the area, your side committed an act of provocation which cannot be brushed aside. And your attitude regarding the affair is such a distortion of the facts, such a denial of the truth, such a confusion of right and wrong and so filled with contradictions that it is very hard to make people believe that your aim is not one of manufacturing incidents and undermining the negotiations, while, at the same time, avoiding the responsibility for breaking off the negotiations. But the responsibility will never fall upon us, because our attitude has always been realistic, fair and reasonable so as to guarantee the carrying on of the armistice negotiations. Only when your military aircraft violated the neutral zone, with our delegation as its target, attempting to murder them, was

our delegation compelled to suspend the meetings and wait for your side to take responsible action about this incident.

We hereby once more propose to you that this grave act of provocation should be dealt with by your side with an attitude of serious responsibility. Only thus can the continuation of the negotiations for a just and reasonable armistice agreement be guaranteed. At the same time, we demand that you order your liaison officers to proceed to Kaisung to carry out a re-investigation, jointly with our liaison officers, of the incident which occurred on the night of August 22 when your military aircraft bombed and strafed the vicinity of the residence of our delegation, in order once again to prove the full validity of our protest.

In order to enable people throughout the world to understand the full and true picture of the incident, we demand that the full text of the communications exchanged between both sides be made public, following the example of our side, and that your news agencies and press everywhere be permitted to release and publish them in full.

We await your reply.

(Signed)

KIM IL SUNG,  
*Supreme Commander of the Korean  
People's Army.*

PENG TEH-HUAL,  
*Commander of the Chinese people's  
volunteers.*

## STATEMENT BY THE SPOKESMAN OF THE KOREAN-CHINESE DELEGATION, August 30, 1951

To give the world the truth of what happened, the following statement is issued:

To cause confusion and cover up the facts, the Public Information Office of the United Nations Command, in its document of August 28, has deliberately exaggerated and distorted questions of press coverage in the conference area during the Kaisung negotiations, of the inadvertent straying into the conference area of our military patrolmen, and the accidental stopping for some minutes of a messenger of the United Nations Forces Delegation and a vehicle of their delegation by our military patrolmen. In fact, these questions have already been dealt with reasonably by our side, on the principle of equality, in a way helpful to the armistice negotiations and in a serious and responsible manner, and the United Nations forces side has indeed expressed its satisfaction.

While exaggerating and misrepresenting a problem which has in fact long been settled, the Public Information Office devotes itself to creating rumours and slanders about serious events—the murder of our military patrol platoon leader, Yao Ching-hsiang, and the serious wounding of fighter, Wang Jen-yuan, by armed units of the United Nations Command who illegally entered the neutral zone on August 19; and the bombing and strafing of our delegation residence by the United Nations forces aircraft on August 22,

in an effort to murder our delegation—to evade and deny its own grave responsibility.

Regarding the murder of platoon leader, Yao Ching-hsiang, General Nam Il, our chief delegate, in his detailed report of August 28, proved irrefutably with eyewitness and other material evidence that it was a crime committed by armed units attached to the United Nations forces. Even Colonel Murray, in the joint investigation by the liaison officers of both sides, and Vice-Admiral Joy, in his reply to our chief delegate General Nam Il, could not deny this fact. Yet the United Nations Command refused to accept our reasonable demand for severe punishment of the culprits who violated the neutral zone agreement and murdered our military patrolman—who was doing his duty under the agreement—and for thorough guarantees against the recurrence of further violations of the neutral zone. It not only refused, but went further and published lies through its Public Information Office with the object of evading its responsibility, declaring that the troops of the "Republic of Korea," though they wore uniforms, carried arms and forced their way into the neutral zone, were not under the military command and control of the United Nations forces.

What is more, the Public Information Office violates all sense of justice and reason by saying that our military police did not put up any resist-

ance, implying that the victim deserved to die. But villagers on the spot explicitly testified during the joint investigations that the armed murderers of Yao Ching-hsiang had intruded into the neutral zone from outside and fled back from the neutral zone after the murder. This proves that these armed and uniformed murderers of Yao Ching-hsiang who intruded into the neutral zone are armed men under the control of the U.N. forces. These armed men sneaked lawlessly into the neutral zone from U.N. forces positions several kilometres away. Had they not been given cover and supported by the U.N. forces, these armed men would have been eliminated.

The crux of the problem is not that our military patrol, equipped only with arms for patrolling, could not wipe them out, but rather in the fact that this group of armed personnel was given protection by the United Nations forces. Does not protection prove that these armed personnel are a part of the United Nations forces?

As to the bombing by a United Nations military aircraft of the Kaisung neutral zone during the night of August 22, the Public Information Office of the United Nations Command in its official release tried to deny that the military aircraft which dropped bombs belonged to the United Nations forces. It even uttered the slander that this incident was manufactured by our personnel. And in trying to justify this slander, the Public Information Office did not shrink from distorting all the facts and reversing the truth by brazenly asserting that our liaison officers had refused to allow their liaison officers to make another investigation in daylight. But there is the coincidence that the radar-detecting station of the 5th Air Force under the U.N. Command reported an unidentified plane west of Kaisung at the time of the bombing and strafing. Since that unidentified plane was not identified, how could it be identified as ours? Is this not the case of the fool who gratuitously draws attention to his guilt? To say that the bombing and strafing of the residence of our delegation by a plane was done by our men is an insane fabrication.

In the first place, the idea of gaining any purpose by murdering one's own delegates is inconceivable. Except American generals who are completely devoid of conscience, we are quite sure no one on earth could think of such an idea. Secondly, the actual facts of the bombing by the United Nations forces military plane show that the great majority of the bombs fell about only one or two hundred metres from the residence of our delegation.

Anybody with any knowledge of air bombing knows that it is almost impossible to control bombing in such a way as to drop the bombs exactly two to three hundred metres from one's target without ever hitting it. Therefore, unless it were for the purpose of murdering one's own delegates, such pre-arranged bombing, in which bombs fall so close to the residence of one's own delegation but deliberately miss it, is inconceivable.

In fact this insane slander will deceive nobody. On the contrary, the more the United Nations Com-

mand loudly propagates such slanders, the more it proves that it was the United Nations forces that created this lawless and serious provocation with the aim of murdering our delegation.

The material evidence, preserved intact on the scene, and the eyewitness evidence of the whole population of Kaisung city testify that the military aircraft which bombed and strafed murderously on the night of August 22, aiming at our delegation's residence in the Kaisung neutral zone, belonged to the United Nations Command.

The best and final proof is the scoundrelly refusal to re-investigate the matter, which the United Nations forces side still maintain.

To justify its refusal, the United Nations Command has concocted a mass of groundless slanders. The plain fact is that its liaison officers promised to re-investigate on the 23rd and our side agreed to this. But they have reversed the truth and claimed that our side denied them a re-investigation in the daytime of August 23. It is also a plain fact that our delegation's spokesman once more stated on August 26 that we waited for them to return to make another investigation; but, despite this fact, they have said that not until August 27 did we give approval to them to re-investigate.

Supreme Commander Kim Il Sung and Commander Peng Teh-huai on August 27 did indeed for the third time make a clear demand that they come and re-investigate, so as to arrive at a reasonable solution to the question. But then the United Nations Command said that it was too late and a re-investigation would be completely meaningless.

Well, then, look at the facts. As soon as the incident occurred, we demanded that they come immediately for a joint investigation. Their liaison officers came and showed extreme impatience to make a careful and responsible examination on the pretext that it was not convenient to examine things at night and they suggested coming the next day. We agreed. They not only failed to come the next day, but instead tried to foist on us the false charge that we refused to let them come.

When we asked them for an immediate investigation, they said they could not come because it was too late at night. Well, we said, come in daylight then and they agreed, but still they did not come for a further investigation. Thus, if the early time won't do, will a later time do? But still they failed to come. We raised the demand twice, on the 26th and the 27th, that they come, but again they refused. What did they say? They said it was too late and not worth coming.

If the truth is told, the purpose of the U.N. Command Public Information Office in issuing its tangled and confused document on the 28th is to spread absurd lies and avoid the series of just and blunt questions put to General Ridgway on the 27th by Supreme Commander Kim Il Sung and Commander Peng Teh-huai. Its main point is to find a pretext for refusing a re-investigation of this grave incident.

What pretext have they found? They allege that the evidence seen by their liaison officers on

the night of the 22nd was fabricated by our side and, therefore, unreliable; that now after the lapse of a few days, we may have manufactured more convincing evidence, and that therefore they cannot come to re-investigate. Here I would ask the officers of that Public Information Office why, since they are so confident that the evidence we have preserved was fabricated by us, have they not the courage to come and examine it again? Can it be that, in your

### STATEMENT BY THREE PRESSMEN, August 29, 1951

*Chinese and foreign correspondents in Kaisung have issued a signed statement denouncing the false American version of the August 22 American air raid on Kaisung neutral zone and detailing their eyewitness account of the incident as it actually occurred. The text of the statement reads:*

We, the undersigned correspondents of the *Ta Kung Pao* of Shanghai, Chungking and Hongkong, the *Daily Worker* of London and *Ce Soir* of Paris, disgusted at the monstrous lies that have been issued by the Americans regarding the August 22 bombing raid on Kaisung, feel impelled to issue the following joint statement.

We were all less than 200 yards from the place where the bombs fell. We were all within a few feet of Colonels Kinney and Murray during their so-called "investigation." The notes we made at the time are still in our possession. We vouch absolutely for the accuracy of the official factual report given by the Chinese and Koreans and are ourselves determined to expose the extreme flippancy with which the Americans treated the whole affair and their outrageous insulting behaviour. A mere repetition of their words cannot possibly convey their unbearable attitude towards their Korean and Chinese opposite numbers on the latter's extreme patience.

On arrival in Kaisung some three hours after the bombs dropped, Kinney was informed that the aircraft had bombed the conference area and shrapnel had fallen on Nam Il's jeep, that the aircraft later machine-gunned the delegates' living quarters. Kinney immediately began rapid-fire questions in a very hostile fashion. "What is the effect of the bombing? How many planes? Who saw the planes? Any eyewitnesses?" Colonel Chang replied: "This will become clear during the investigation. Every one here (meaning some 30 journalists and delegation staff) are witnesses." Kinney instructed his assistant to record that no one knew how many planes or bombs there had been.

Everybody then left in jeeps. About 90 yards from the empty United Nations house was a shallow crater and nearby a crumpled napalm container. Splashes of napalm lay around. Colonel Chang said: "What is this?" Kinney sneered: "Is that a bomb? That could be anything." He did not handle that object. He refused to go near or look at the crater and said: "I have seen enough. I've dropped plenty of bombs myself. That's nothing." He called his interpreter and said: "Tell them. If this is the sort of thing they are going to show us, I am getting impatient—very impatient."

country, there is no distinction between things that are fabricated and things that are real? Come, come; such an attitude on your part, turning down a re-investigation under any circumstances, simply proves that the evidence and the eyewitnesses of the incident fully confirm that you, and nobody but you, are the manufacturer of the August 22 incident and you therefore have not the courage to come to Kaisung and face the crime committed by your side.

All the foregoing occurred within a few minutes of the start of the investigation. We then went to the hillside about 200 yards from the delegation headquarters. At that time only six craters had been located in the dark. At the first spot where bomb fins lay embedded in the soil, Kinney without going close, immediately said: "That is neither a bomb nor any part of a bomb." Colonel Chang asked: "What is it? How did it get there?" Kinney said: "You should know better than I." He then turned to bystanders most of whom had relatives killed by American bombs and said in a most sneering and hectoring voice: "Has anyone here ever seen the results of American bombing?" No one replied. Ten paces away near the shrapnel-pitted rock lay another crater and Kinney refused to examine it, saying: "It's nothing. Let's get back, Jim" (This to Colonel Murray). Murray mumbled: "We better have a look."

We moved to the next crater, Kinney hanging behind. He was asked to come closer and look but said: "No. I have seen enough." Colonel Chang said: "We demand that you continue this investigation." "You what?" shouted Kinney, "Who gave you any rights? You have no right to demand anything." While Murray was looking, Kinney kept saying: "Come on, Jim, let's go home." There were still three craters and fins nearby which Kinney refused to see.

Back at the conference site Colonel Chang registered the strongest verbal protest and said: "Meetings for tomorrow are cancelled." Kinney asked: "What meetings?" and Chang replied: "All meetings" (meaning the meetings of the liaison officers as well as the sub-committee scheduled for August 23). Kinney said: "I will relay your ridiculous protest," and left.

Meanwhile further napalms had been found and Korean and Chinese liaison officers went after the Americans who returned after many objections about the rain and the dark. The cameramen and some journalists, thinking that the investigation was not to continue, had gone home by this time. Kinney apparently felt safe in handling the next napalm bomb (which was identical with the first) without having a photo taken. There was an acrid smell of burned napalm, burned patches of grass and spots of unburned napalm. Kinney turned the twisted metal over and said: "Flush rivetted—not our stuff."

We then met a Chinese soldier doing police duties. He had observed the plane, saw and heard napalm bombs dropping.

Kinney started a rapid cross-questioning, "Did you see the plane?" Soldier: "Yes, it came in in this direction," indicating with his hands. "How many engines?" Soldier: "I couldn't see but I saw two lights." Kinney: "Did the plane have its lights on before or after it dropped bombs?" Soldier: "I saw lights before." Kinney turned to his assistant and dictated: "Soldier says that he saw the plane switch on its lights before dropping bombs." At this point Burchett of *Ce Soir* interjected: "The soldier said he saw two lights, Colonel, not that the plane had lights switched on. They could have been from exhausts or bomb bays." Kinney shouted: "I am not talking to you, feller. You keep outta this." He then turned his back on the soldier, ceased questioning the only eyewitness he had spoken to and stalked away. Burchett followed and said: "That was a deliberate distortion, Colonel. The soldier said he saw two lights, not that lights were switched on."

Kinney: "You keep quiet or I will order you out of the area. You have no right be here." Burchett: "I have every right to be here as a journalist and an eyewitness of the bombing." Kinney called Colonel Chang and said, flashing his torch at Burchett, "Colonel, remove this man from the area. This one I am shining my flashlight on." When Chang demanded to know if Burchett committed any breaches, Kinney demanded that all pressmen leave immediately. "I told you before it's impossible to conduct investigations with newspapermen around," he said, and when Chang asked what was the real objection, Kinney stalked off and said:

"I am going home. I will return tomorrow with our own press."

Murray in the meantime had gone to look at patches of unburned napalm still in a jelly state. Kinney called him back and repeated his demand that the enquiry be called off until the American press could be on spot. It was agreed that in the interests of continuing the investigation that journalists leave the area, and Kinney eventually agreed to continue the enquiry.

This is an eyewitness account. We were informed a little later that Kinney looked at one more piece of evidence and then refused to carry on because it was too dark. He agreed to return the next day with American journalists.

The agreed arrangement we were told was that Kinney would telephone and say what time he was coming. Until today he has never telephoned.

In his report, Kinney stated that no evidence of napalm canisters could be found, that the bomb fins were "parts of an American plane or rocket fins," that Colonel Chang called off all talks, "from this time," that Chang refused a further investigation and added a galaxy of other lesser falsehoods.

*The foregoing statement was signed by Chu Chi-ping of Ta Kung Pao, former war correspondent with the American forces in the Pacific area, Wilfred Burchett of Ce Soir, former war correspondent with the American forces in the Pacific area, and Alan Winnington of the London Daily Worker, war correspondent in China and Korea and former London Air Raid Warden.*

---

The following documents relate to a U.N. military aircraft intruding into the Kaisung neutral zone at 02:40 hours on August 29. The plane circled at a low altitude and dropped a flare near the conference site.

## FROM GENERAL NAM IL, August 30, 1951

Vice-Admiral Joy, Chief of the United Nations Forces Delegation:

At 02:40 hours on August 29, a military aircraft belonging to your side intruded into the Kaisung neutral zone. It circled at low altitude and dropped a flare near the conference site. This is obviously another illegal act of provocation following the bombing of the Kaisung neutral zone by a military plane belonging to your side on August 22. Your military aircraft have continuously intruded into the Kaisung neutral zone since the inception of the Kaisung negotiations, creating a threatening atmosphere at the meetings. After the conclusion of the agreement to make Kaisung a neutral zone your aircraft have repeatedly violated the agreement by continually and illegally intruding into the neutral zone. At the liaison officers' meetings between August 13 and 16, our liaison officers drew the attention of your side to these incidents which violated the agreement. On August 16, your liaison officers specifically agreed that no armed forces, including the air force, should intrude into the neutral zone. Although your side has agreed on the principle of neutrality of the air over the Kaisung neutral zone, military aircraft of your side, in deliberate violation

of this principle, have nevertheless continuously intruded into the air over the Kaisung neutral zone. The record of the illegal intrusions by your military aircraft into the air over the Kaisung neutral zone during the period from August 17 to 22 proves that your side has never had any intention of abiding by the agreement so explicitly entered into by your side. After the bombing and strafing by your military aircraft of the residence of our delegation on the night of August 22, you still showed no intention of restraining your military aircraft from intruding into the air over the Kaisung neutral zone, and you vehemently denied your grave responsibility in regard to this serious incident. The entire record concerning the repeated intrusions by your military aircraft over the Kaisung neutral zone from August 23 to 28, both by day and night, proves you to be a reckless and unscrupulous breaker of the agreement in the true sense of the term. At 02.40 hours on August 29, your military aircraft went so far as to drop a flare near the conference site in the neutral zone. This unbridled, unrepentant provocative act on the part of your side has once more testified that your side has in no way given up the plot of continuing to create incidents. With regard

to these provocative acts—the dropping of a flare into the Kaisung neutral zone by your military aircraft which intruded into the Kaisung neutral zone at 02:40 hours on August 29, and the continuous intrusions into the Kaisung neutral zone by your military aircraft—I hereby lodge a strong protest with you and demand severe punishment for the culprits and your full assurance against any repeti-

tion of incidents in violation of the neutral zone agreement on the part of your side.

(Signed)

NAM IL,

*General, Chief of the Delegation of the Korean People's Army and the Chinese people's volunteers.*

*Vice-Admiral Joy on Sept. 2 rejected the charge that U.N. planes had dropped a flare over the 5-mile Kaisung neutral zone on Aug. 29. Joy contended that a full investigation showed that U.N. aircraft dropped photographic flash bombs at two points, one 20 miles and another 25 miles north of the neutral zone. Joy added in his message to General Nam Il: "You are fully aware that no agreement concerning an air space reservation over the Kaisung neutral areas has ever been considered, much less ratified by our two delegations."*

### FROM GENERAL NAM IL, September 3, 1951

Vice-Admiral Joy, Chief of the United Nations Forces Delegation:

I have received your reply dated September 2 to my protest of August 30 against the violation of the agreement on the Kaisung neutral zone by your military aircraft which intruded over the Kaisung neutral zone and dropped a flare. Your reply completely distorts the facts and denies your responsibility and therefore cannot be regarded as satisfactory. You stated that on receiving my protest, your side immediately ordered that investigations be made as to whether your military aircraft had dropped a flare over the Kaisung neutral zone. It was said that the result of the investigations was negative.

You used this very trick to deny that your military aircraft had invaded the neutral zone and dropped a flare, thereby brushing aside the responsibility which should be borne by your side. I must point out that this so-called investigation of yours is nothing but ridiculous child's play to deceive yourselves and others. You admitted that at 02:40 hours on August 29, your military aircraft dropped photographic flash bombs in the vicinity of the Kaisung neutral zone. You imagine that this can prove that it was not your military aircraft that flew over the Kaisung neutral zone and dropped the flare.

In reality what you have admitted precisely proves that it was your military aircraft which dropped the flare. Since according to the fact which you have admitted, only your military aircraft were operating in the vicinity of Kaisung at that time, it would be impossible that the flare dropped over the neutral zone and personally witnessed by the Kaisung residents was not dropped by military aircraft of your side. In order to defend the "legality" of the intrusion of your military aircraft over the Kaisung neutral zone, you state that no agreement has ever been reached between our two sides concerning the neutralisation of the air space over the Kaisung neutral zone. In stating this you should not forget what your superior, General Ridgway, had proposed on July 13 in his message to Supreme Commander Kim Il Sung and Commander Peng Teh-huai, that "we both agree to refrain from any hostile act within

this zone during the entire period of our conference." In reality, the basic contents of the neutralisation of Kaisung are nothing other than agreement between both sides to refrain from any hostile act within the Kaisung neutral zone.

According to international convention, everyone knows that the hostile act referred to signifies acts of any kind carried out by any armed force, and that the circling and reconnoitring over the Kaisung neutral zone by your air force is all the more clearly a hostile act which should be stopped.

It was based on this as the only possible interpretation of the cessation of all hostile acts by both sides, about which international convention leaves no room for misinterpretation, that Supreme Commander Kim Il Sung and Commander Peng Teh-huai agreed on July 14 to General Ridgway's proposal concerning the neutralisation of Kaisung. Once the agreement was reached, any invasion into the Kaisung neutral zone by your military aircraft constituted a violation of the agreement and was therefore illegal.

But the illegal invasions of the Kaisung neutral zone by your military aircraft have never ceased since July 15. It was only when your military aircraft unceasingly violated the neutral zone agreement, frequently made illegal invasions of the Kaisung neutral zone and no indications could be found of their being discontinued and only when our side found it difficult to maintain its patience that our liaison officers drew the attention of your side to this fact on August 13.

They also proposed to your liaison officers that specific regulations be made so that your side could carefully observe them. It can be seen that this is not any new agreement but a set of specific regulations the formulation of which was found necessary since your side was not strictly observing the neutrality agreement. These specific regulations would have been completely unnecessary if your side had, from the very beginning, strictly observed the agreement on the neutrality of Kaisung which was first proposed by General Ridgway and consented to by our side. Now you

neither admit that it was illegal for your military aircraft to intrude over the Kaisung neutral zone since July 15, nor do you acknowledge that it is a conscious violation when your military aircraft continue to intrude over the Kaisung neutral zone after your liaison officers clearly agreed on August 16 to the specific regulations on the neutrality of the air space over Kaisung. On the contrary, using the pretext that these specific regulations have not yet been approved by the delegation, you try to prove the legality of the continuous intrusions over the Kaisung neutral zone by your military aircraft since July 15 in order to brush aside your responsibility for the consistent violations of the neutral zone agreement by your side. This proves that right from the very beginning you have no intention of observing the agreement on the neutrality of Kaisung which was proposed by your side.

Not only that, but since you considered as lawful the hostile act of your military aircraft illegally intruding over the Kaisung neutral zone, it is therefore only a natural development from one hostile act of your military aircraft intruding into the air space of the Kaisung neutral zone to the other hostile act of your military aircraft bombing the Kaisung neutral zone. In fact, your perverse refusal to include the activities of your air force into

#### **FROM GENERAL NAM IL, September 6, 1951**

Vice-Admiral Joy, Chief of the United Nations Forces Delegation:

Your message dated September 4, concerning the incessant penetration over the Kaisung neutral zone and the dropping of flares over the neutral zone on August 29 by military aircraft of your side has been received. Your side's grave responsibility for these incidents can by no means be turned aside by your message which disregards the facts and denies everything. Moreover, your side must also accept the

---

**The following documents relate to the illegal entry into the neutral zone and the murder of two more military patrolmen of the people's forces by uniformed South Korean troops under the U.N. Command at 06:00 hours on August 30. Provocations of U.N. armed men continually firing into the neutral zone were pointed out by General Nam Il as further violations of the agreement.**

#### **FROM GENERAL NAM IL, August 31, 1951**

Vice-Admiral Joy, Chief of the United Nations Forces Delegation:

At 06:00 hours on August 30, when our military patrolmen Cheng Chung-nan, Yang Hsien-tse and Chang Jen-feng were resting at Tamtongri within the Kaisung neutral zone, they were attacked by more than 10 uniformed South Korean troops of your side and taken by force in the direction of the positions of your side. While crossing a hill near the railway between Kaisung and Munsan, the South Korean troops of your side fired at them and murdered Yang Hsien-tse and Chang Jen-feng, while Cheng Chung-nan escaped though wounded. When our military patrol pursued the South Korean troops of your side, another group of armed men of your side, which had penetrated into the Kaisung neutral

the category of the hostile acts to be forbidden cannot but lead to the suspicion that your side intentionally makes use of the threat of your air force, including bombing of the Kaisung neutral zone, as a means of exercising pressure upon the armistice negotiations. The series of incidents on August 22, August 29 and September 1 respectively is the inevitable and logical development of the preposterous policy by which you demand the cessation of all hostile acts by our side in the Kaisung neutral zone, while in fact reserving freedom for your own air force to carry on hostile acts. The pretexts that you advance in defence of the illegal acts of your military aircraft in dropping a flare over the Kaisung neutral zone and continually intruding over the Kaisung neutral zone cannot hold water. I hereby once more demand that you severely punish the culprits, and give absolute assurances against any repetition of such incidents, and strictly observe the entire agreement concerning the neutrality of Kaisung.

(Signed)

NAM IL,

*General, Chief of the Delegation of the Korean People's Army and the Chinese people's volunteers.*

heavy responsibility for the fact that from August 29 up to the present, your military aircraft have persisted in unscrupulous and incessant penetration over the Kaisung neutral zone. Your message is absolutely unsatisfactory.

(Signed)

NAM IL,

*General, Chief of the Delegation of the Korean People's Army and the Chinese people's volunteers.*

zone, covered with machine guns the South Korean troops' retreat in a southeastern direction along the railway. The armed men of your side did not withdraw from the neutral zone to your positions until 14:30 hours.

After the serious incident on August 19 when a military patrolman of ours was murdered by your armed men, your side distorted the facts and doctored the results of the investigations by the liaison officers in an attempt to represent the uniformed South Korean troops as irregulars who were not connected with your side, and thus to evade the inescapable and grave responsibility which falls on your side. At the same time, your armed men are still going on with their unscrupulous and continual provocations, and the intrusions into and firing on

the neutral zone by your armed men are increasing daily. Now at 06:10 hours on August 30, your armed men opened fire at Panmunjon within the neutral zone, and later on the same day, your armed men committed another murder, killing our military patrolmen. These endless and intolerable provocations again bear witness to the fact that your side is determined to wreck the agreement and continue to manufacture incidents.

I hereby lodge with you the most severe protest regarding the serious incident, in which your armed men illegally penetrated into the neutral zone and murdered our military patrolmen Yang

### FROM GENERAL NAM IL, September 3, 1951

Vice-Admiral Joy, Chief of the United Nations Forces Delegation:

Your message of September 2 concerning the illegal entry into the neutral zone and the murder of our military patrolmen by the South Korean troops of your side on August 30 once again proves that your side still has no intention of adopting a serious and responsible attitude for the settlement of this violation of the neutral zone by your side but is determined to continue to carry out unscrupulous provocative actions.

On August 30, South Korean troops of your side, taking advantage of the fact that our military patrolmen who, in strict observance of the neutral zone agreement, were carrying weapons suitable only for police duties, forced their way into the neutral zone and by carrying offensive weapons and under the cover and support of your frontline positions murdered our military patrolmen.

In your letter, however, you adopted your usual methods to distort all the facts and deny everything, attempting to present the South Korean troops of your side, who withdrew to your area after illegally intruding into the neutral zone and murdering our military patrolmen, as local irregulars and to present this serious incident as a security problem in the neutral zone.

This irresponsible and absurd argument which is a travesty of all the facts can lead people to only one conclusion: that the South Korean troops of your side are bent on continuing such base and

*On Sept. 4, Vice-Admiral Joy denied that an armed band of 10 men from the U.N. side had staged an attack on Aug. 30. He had claimed that no U.N. troops had been in the area and said that the incident might have been caused by "partisan or guerilla activity."*

### FROM GENERAL NAM IL, September 6, 1951

Vice-Admiral Joy, Chief of the United Nations Forces Delegation:

Your letter of September 4 concerning the repeated murders by your South Korean troops of our military patrolmen on August 19 and on August 30 has been received.

No denial of facts can free your side from the serious responsibility that you must bear for these two incidents. Our side has adequate witnesses and material evidence to confirm the inescapable responsibility of your side.

Hsien-tse and Chang Jen-feng and wounded Cheng Chung-nan on August 30, as well as regarding the provocations by your armed men in continually firing into the neutral zone. I firmly demand that the murderers be severely punished and full assurances be given against the occurrence of any further incidents by your side in violation of the agreement.

(Signed)

NAM IL,  
General, Chief of the Delegation of  
the Korean People's Army and the  
Chinese people's volunteers.

shameless acts with the object of undermining the Kaisung armistice negotiations. To eliminate the disputes on minor questions so as to enable the armistice negotiations to proceed smoothly, we agreed on July 14 to your proposal for fixing the Kaisung area as a neutral zone. Nevertheless, following closely on the neutral zone agreement, an incident took place in which your armed personnel opened fire in the direction of Panmunjon in the neutral zone on July 16, and subsequently repeated incidents have occurred in which your armed personnel have fired into the neutral zone.

Following your refusal to deal with these incidents in a serious and responsible manner, the South Korean troops of your side illegally forced their way into the neutral zone on two occasions—August 19 and 30—and murdered our military patrolmen. I must point out to you that under no circumstances will we tolerate your armed personnel making use of the neutral zone agreement to continue schemes for murder. I hereby once again lodge a most serious protest with you and demand that the culprits be seriously punished, and that we have your full assurance against any repetition of incidents in violation of the agreement on the part of your side.

(Signed)

NAM IL,  
General, Chief of the Delegation of the  
Korean People's Army and the Chinese  
people's volunteers.

Since your letter proves once again that your side has as yet no intention whatever to deal with these serious incidents earnestly and responsibly, it is absolutely unsatisfactory.

(Signed)

NAM IL,  
General, Chief of the Delegation of the  
Korean People's Army and the Chinese  
people's volunteers.

The following documents relate to the illegal invasion and bombing of the Kaisung neutral zone by a U.N. military aircraft at 00:30 hours on Sept. 1. Two bombs were dropped only 500 to 600 metres from the residence of General Nam Il.

## FROM GENERAL KIM IL SUNG AND GENERAL PENG TEH-HUAI, Sept. 1, 1951

General Ridgway:

At 00:30 hours on September 1, one of your military aircraft again illegally intruded into the air over the Kaisung neutral zone and carried out bombing. It has now been established through investigation that two bombs were dropped on places only 500 to 600 metres from the residence of General Nam Il, our chief delegate. This is a further act of an extremely serious and provocative nature by your military aircraft following the bombing of the residence of our delegation on the night of August 22. We lodge a grave protest with you.

Following the August 22 incident, your side has not only shown utter irresponsibility in dealing on that occasion with that act of provocation, and also, in your reply of August 29, rejected our demand for a re-investigation. Moreover, your side continued to send South Korean troops to illegally invade the Kaisung neutral zone and on August 30 again murdered two of our military police. At the same time, you continued to send military aircraft to intrude incessantly over the Kaisung neutral zone, carrying out 25 raids during the eight days from August 23 to 30, and at 02:40 hours on August 29 dropped a flare near the conference site in Kaisung. Although the series of provocative acts on the part of your side has on each successive occasion been protested against by our chief delegate General Nam Il, yet your delegation and yourself, on the one hand, have made shameless denials in complete defiance of the facts, while on the other, your armed forces have flagrantly and unscrupulously continued the provocations and carried out the bombing of the Kaisung neutral zone for the second time on September 1. Even while your liaison officers were carrying out investigations in Kaisung today, one of your military aircraft illegally flew over the Kaisung neutral zone. This was witnessed by all personnel on the scene, including press correspondents of both sides. The aim of these endless actions on your part in undermining the agreement for the neutralisation of Kaisung, can certainly not be explained away by any pretext, but only by the intention to undermine the Korean armistice negotiations, making it impossible for the Kaisung conference to continue.

Following upon their investigations on the scene in Kaisung today, your liaison officers were unable

to deny the actual results of the bombing of the Kaisung neutral zone by your military aircraft at 00:30 hours on September 1. Nevertheless, just as with the August 22 incident, they shamelessly denied that it was an aircraft of the United Nations forces. It is irrefutable that, since this bombing was confirmed by your liaison officers, the previous bombing which your liaison officers had investigated, but dared not return to re-investigate, was obviously also an iron-clad fact. Your side shamelessly denies that it was an aircraft of the United Nations forces, but is it conceivable that our aircraft could possibly have bombed our own delegation?

All just and decent people in the world will not believe such preposterous denials and lies on your part. In fact, immediately after the bombing of the Kaisung neutral zone by one of your military aircraft at 00:30 hours on September 1, your military aircraft continued to carry out reconnaissance over the Kaisung neutral zone through the whole night, and bombed the perimeter of the Kaisung neutral zone. Is this not the clearest proof of the inescapable implication of the aircraft of the United Nations forces?

We hereby solemnly point out to you: If you are determined to break up the negotiations, you should openly and formally declare your determination to do so, instead of ceaselessly carrying out such base provocations. If you still have the intention to resume the Kaisung talks in order to seek a just and reasonable armistice agreement, you should agree to the following demands of our side, namely: your side must conscientiously and responsibly deal with the series of grave, provocative incidents from August 22 to September 1, and must thoroughly guarantee that there will be no recurrence of similar acts which violate the Kaisung neutralisation agreement, so that the Kaisung armistice meetings can be resumed.

We await your reply.

(Signed)

KIM IL SUNG,  
*Supreme Commander of the Korean  
People's Army.*

PENG TEH-HUAI,  
*Commander of the Chinese people's  
volunteers.*

## REPORT FROM GENERAL NAM IL TO SUPREME COMMANDER KIM IL SUNG AND COMMANDER PENG TEH-HUAI, September 1, 1951

At 00:30 hours on September 1, a United Nations forces military aircraft illegally flew over the neutral zone to make a bombing attack. Two bombs were dropped about 600 metres from my living quarters. After the bombing the aircraft continued its intrusion over the neutral zone, by

circling and reconnoitring until 05:15 hours. There were altogether eight intrusions as follows: at 01:35 hours, 01:50 hours, 02:05 hours, 02:10 hours, 02:55 hours, 03:00 hours, 03:10 hours and 05:15 hours.

1. At 05:45 hours, our side notified the other side of the incident by radio telephone, asking them

to send liaison officers immediately for a joint investigation. At first, the other side stated that an answer would be given to our side at 06:30 hours. But at 06:30 they stated they could not find Colonel Kinney and were unable to give an answer. After our side pressed the matter three times, the other side at 08:00 hours arranged to meet our liaison officers at Panmunjon before 09:00 hours and carry out investigations. After our liaison officers, Colonel Chang Chun San and Lieutenant Colonel Si Sung Mun, met Colonel Kinney and Colonel Murray, the other side's liaison officers, and had a preliminary talk with them, they all went to the scene of the incident in the area of Pingkotong, and began investigations on the spot at 10:40 hours.

2. The liaison officers of both sides first inspected the two bomb craters and the surrounding marks of air bombing. They discovered that each of the two craters was some five metres in diameter and one metre in depth. The bomb splinters were some two centimetres thick, most of the crops within 10 metres around the bomb craters had been destroyed, and trees and rocks on the mountain slope had been pierced by bomb splinters. At the very beginning of the inspection of the first bomb crater, Colonel Kinney came out with the irresponsible statement that the effect of an explosion caused by explosives buried underground is the same as that of bombs dropped by planes. Our liaison officers pointed out that the shapes of the bomb craters and the bomb splinters scattered all over the ground were obviously the consequence of bombs dropped by a plane, and they asked Colonel Kinney how splinters coming from explosives buried underground could pierce through the trunks of trees. Colonel Kinney avoided a direct reply. After repeated questioning by our liaison officers, he stated that the splinters were possibly caused by bombardment by guns.

Colonel Kinney also affected ignorance concerning the new living quarters of our delegation since the August 22 bombing and strafing by a United Nations military aircraft. He argued in this way: "Since we did not know the new living quarters of your delegation, which was known only to your personnel and since the bombing target, as you have said, was the residence of your delegation, therefore it must have been your aircraft if the bombs were dropped from a plane."

Soon after this, he remarked that the two bomb craters were not in a straight line with our chief delegate's residence and so tried to prove that the bombing target was not the residence of our delegation. Our liaison officers pointed out that they have no right to bomb any place in the neutral zone and that the frequent reconnoitring intrusions into the neutral zone by their aircraft have given us good reason to believe that though they did not necessarily know which rooms our chief delegate occupied, they must have known his living quarters. At this very moment a United Nations military aircraft flew over the neutral zone and our liaison officers immediately interrogated the other side about it. The other side could not deny it, but dismissed it by shrugging their shoulders. Before they

left the bomb craters, the personnel of the other side picked up some bomb splinters with our liaison officers' consent.

3. After the inspection of the bomb craters by the liaison officers of both sides, Kinney immediately asked that the interviewing of the local inhabitants begin. All local residents interviewed said that they heard the air bombing. Their replies bore out to the full that the plane which dropped the bombs was a military aircraft of the U.N. forces. As he went along, Colonel Kinney first questioned an old man, named Ryu Un Sun, who carried a baby on his back, who said that he had been awakened at midnight by two explosions and had heard the plane circling around. He also stated that planes had constantly flown over Kaisung since the Kaisung armistice negotiations began. The second witness, Cho Tai Pok, also declared he heard two explosions and the noise of the plane, which he identified as an American aircraft. The window panes on one side of Cho Tai Pok's house were smashed by bomb splinters. Colonel Murray questioned a third witness, Li Kyung Chun, who said that he had heard explosions and the plane circling and flying southward after bombing. Li further pointed out that American planes flew constantly across the neutral zone. The fourth witness, Li Hak Ki, also said he heard the explosions and the plane flying. After interviewing the witnesses, Colonel Kinney asked for one hour's recess. The liaison officers of both sides resumed their talks at 13:30 hours.

4. In the talks during the afternoon, though Colonel Kinney had to admit that the craters were the work of heavy bombs and that the shrapnel was part of the bombs, he stated that on the basis of not altogether sufficient evidence, it might be surmised that an aircraft had been near the area at the time of the explosions. Resorting to a common device of the United Nations forces, he went on to say that there was a so-called radar report of an unidentified aircraft at the place and at the time of the attack. Colonel Kinney repeated his absurd nonsense of the morning, which got him nowhere, that since our personnel were the only ones who knew the location of our delegation's quarters, they must be the ones who did the bombing. Colonel Kinney also declared dogmatically that no one of the United Nations forces had anything to do with the bombing. This absurd self-contradiction of the other side was instantly refuted by our liaison officers—that United Nations forces military aircraft continuously flew over the Kaisung neutral zone before dawn on September 1 was sufficient proof that the so-called "unidentified aircraft" was in fact an aircraft of the United Nations forces; that the frequent reconnoitring by United Nations forces' military aircraft over the Kaisung neutral zone proved that the United Nations forces knew full well where the quarters of our delegation was, and that they intended and were determined to murder our delegation. Our liaison officers pointed out that the material evidence and the eyewitness accounts which came up in the joint investigation definitely and conclusively proved that the aircraft which bombed our chief delegate's residence at 00:30

hours on September 1, was a military aircraft of the United Nations forces. Finally our liaison officers lodged a solemn verbal protest with the other side against this serious incident in which the other side again violated the neutral zone agree-

ment, and declared that our side reserved all rights to make demands. They also said that our side would preserve all the evidence in its original state, and that the other side could come at any time they liked to make a further investigation.

---

The following is a statement on the question of the public disclosure of communications that have passed between two sides.

## STATEMENT BY THE SPOKESMAN OF THE KOREAN-CHINESE DELEGATION, September 6, 1951

One of the most glaring examples of the efforts by the United Nations forces to evade their responsibility for the recent series of wrecking actions in the Kaisung armistice negotiations—hiding the full picture and the truth of the incidents so as to deceive the world—is their shirking of their duty to issue in full all the official documents, which convey the true picture, as sent to them by our side in the course of the exchange of messages and cables.

In their reply of August 27 to General Ridgway, Generals Kim Il Sung and Peng Teh-huai stated: "In order to enable people throughout the world to understand the full and true picture of the incident, we demand that the full text of the communications exchanged between both sides be made public, following the example of our side, and that your news agencies and press everywhere be permitted to release and publish them in full." To this point, General Ridgway made no reply. The U.N. Command, in a statement on September 3, asserted that the United Nations forces side has never withheld documents pertaining to the charges of Kaisung neutrality violations, but it evaded the main point at issue. The question is not whether the documents concerned have been withheld or not, but whether the United Nations Command has performed its duty of publishing the full texts through its own machinery for the release of news of all the communications exchanged between both sides.

In the majority of cases up to the present, according to the facts which can be vindicated by records, the U.N. Command, in dealing with our official documents, has either cut up or doctored our messages or cables instead of publishing them in full. In other cases, it has either published only some of them in full after strict selection or has not made them public at all.

The U.N. Command's statement itself proves that it has not published the full texts of all the documents of our side. This statement of the U.N. Command mentions that all 25 official messages that passed between both sides from August 4 to September 1, including three messages from General Kim Il Sung and General Peng Teh-huai to General Ridgway, "had been made public" by the U.N. Command. Now, irrespective of whether the U.N. Command published the full texts of these 25 documents since August 4, and leaving aside the question of why the U.N. Command avoids mention of any before

August 4, there are at least two of our documents which they have not published even in the period referred to by the U.N. Command. Between August 4 and September 1, the number of messages sent by General Kim Il Sung and General Peng Teh-huai to General Ridgway is not three but five (sent on August 6, 9, 23, 27 and September 1).

On the question of the U.N. forces not publishing the full texts of our messages and cables, the following is a typical illustration. The notice from General Kim Il Sung and General Peng Teh-huai to General Ridgway on July 14, permitting the entry of reporters into the Kaisung area so as to avoid obstructing the progress of the armistice negotiations through minor questions, has never been published in full by the U.N. Command.

According to the United States Armed Forces Radio in Tokyo on July 15, the officials at the advance camp of the United Nations forces were kept in the dark about the reply broadcast by Pyongyang Radio until they were told the news by correspondents who learned it from their Tokyo offices. The American *United Press* admitted still more openly, in its July 15 despatch, that the high command of the United Nations forces had issued instructions not to disclose to the troops the news concerning the Communist acceptance of the condition laid down by General Ridgway for the admission of pressmen into the Kaisung area.

These examples, which are based on facts available to the whole world, should be sufficient to prove that the U.N. Command has evaded its responsibility to release in full all messages exchanged between both sides.

Fair-minded people will naturally draw the conclusion from this that the U.N. Command, while devising ways of creating provocative incidents to wreck the armistice negotiations, at the same time deliberately and maliciously shirk their duty to release in full all the messages and cables exchanged between both sides. They misrepresent the standpoint and views of our side by using various methods of either cutting up, deleting or abridging our documents, or releasing the full texts only after strict selection, or even withholding them entirely from the public, with the aim of hiding the picture as a whole and the truth concerning the provocative incidents which they create. However, in fact they cannot hush these things up.

The following document lists the invasions by U.N. aircraft over the Kaisung neutral zone between September 1 and 8, 1951.

**FROM GENERAL NAM IL, September 9, 1951**

Vice-Admiral Joy, Chief of the United Nations Forces Delegation:

Since the neutralisation of Kaisung, military aircraft of your side have incessantly violated the agreement and intruded over the neutral zone. I have repeatedly lodged verbal and written protests with your side since August 13, but your side has consistently refused to deal in a sincere and responsible manner with these incidents of flagrant violation of the agreement. The military aircraft of your side have persisted in unscrupulously intruding over the neutral zone. From 00:30 hours on September 1, when a military aircraft of your side dropped bombs in the neutral zone, to September 8, military aircraft of your side intruded over the neutral zone and carried out such hostile activities as patrolling and reconnoitring. Such sorties have totalled 139 in number. These include 18 sorties on September 1,

18 sorties on September 2, 23 sorties on September 3, 13 sorties on September 4, 13 sorties on September 5, 2 sorties on September 6, 28 sorties on September 7 and 24 sorties on September 8.

Once again I lodge a grave protest with you against the violation of the agreement on the neutralisation of Kaisung by military aircraft of your side which have incessantly intruded over the neutral zone and have unscrupulously carried out hostile activities. I demand that your side strictly abide by the agreement on the neutralisation of Kaisung and ensure that no similar incident will occur.

(Signed)

NAM IL,  
*General, Chief of the Delegation of the  
Korean People's Army and the Chinese  
people's volunteers.*

