

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

Supplement to People's China
Vol. IV, No. 8, October 16, 1951

INTRODUCTION

The documents in this Supplement on the Kaisung cease-fire and armistice negotiations cover the period September 11 to October 3.

Owing to the series of murderous incidents in the neutral zone of Kaisung perpetrated by the U.N. forces, the Korean-Chinese Delegation was forced to suspend the cease-fire talks on August 23, pending an apology from the U.N. Command and an assurance that such incidents would not occur again.

However, the U.N. forces continued their provocations and attempts to obstruct the progress of the talks. On September 6, General Ridgway in defiance of the facts blamed the incidents on the Korean and Chinese people's forces and proposed a change of the conference site. This proposal the Korean-Chinese Delegation on September 11 rejected as an attempt to evade responsibility for numerous incidents which on September 10 they had listed in a detailed statement.

On September 10 another incident had occurred in which a U.N. aircraft strafed civilian houses in the zone near the conference site. But this time the U.N. Command was forced by the rising resentment of people throughout the world to admit that it was indeed a U.N. pilot who had violated the neutrality of the Kaisung zone.

On receipt of this apology of the U.N. Command, the Korean-Chinese Delegation on September 19, proposed that the armistice talks should be resumed. This was in line with the peaceful policy of the Delegation which had all along maintained that nothing would stand in the way of the progress of negotiations, provided the U.N. Command adopted an attitude of responsibility and promised non-violation of the zone for the future. The U.N. Command having apologised, the liaison officers of both delegations met on September 24.

But again the talks could not be resumed because the U.N. Command now raised a fresh obstacle, namely, insisting that conditions for the resumption of the talks should be first discussed and this by the liaison officers. The Korean-Chinese Delegation on September 24 pointed out the unreasonableness of this demand: there was no reason why the delegations should not immediately resume the talks so that the armistice could be speedily secured and, besides, liaison officers did not have the power to discuss important issues which properly should be discussed at delegation level.

On September 27, General Ridgway again raised the demand to change the conference site. But in a detailed reply reiterating their previous reasons against this, Generals Kim Il Sung and Peng Teh-huai on October 3 proposed resumption of the talks at Kaisung so that steps could be taken at the first meeting to set up appropriate machinery for assuring the neutrality of the zone. However, as a result of the obstructionist attitude of the U.N. delegation, the Kaisung cease-fire talks are still suspended at the moment we go to press.

DOCUMENTS

On September 6, General Ridgway sent a message to Generals Kim Il Sung and Peng Teh-huai denying violations of the neutral zone by U.N. forces. Despite the irrefutable evidence of murder and shootings by the U.N. forces, Ridgway used such terms as "charges . . . without the slightest basis in fact" and "baseless and intentionally false." Although his officers made only a few cursory investigations, Ridgway claimed these were "thorough," and to this he added the insulting charge that if the incidents did occur they were "initiated and perpetrated by your forces (the Korean and Chinese forces—Ed.) in order to provide spurious evidence for false and malevolent accusations against the U.N. Command."

In this letter Ridgway first raised the question of the selection of a new site for the talks. The document below is the reply of the people's generals to Ridgway's message.

FROM GENERAL KIM IL SUNG AND GENERAL PENG TEH-HUAI, September 11, 1951

Commander-in-Chief M. B. Ridgway of the United Nations Forces:

Your letter of September 6 persists in denying and refusing to deal with the series of provocative incidents which have taken place since August 22 in violation of the Kaisung zone neutrality agreement and it still persists in its malicious and slanderous allegation that these incidents either had no basis in fact or were purposely manufactured by our side. At the same time you bring up a proposal for the changing of the conference site, thus trying to run away from your side's unavoidable responsibility for the violation of the Kaisung zone neutrality agreement and for obstructing the progress of the armistice negotiations.

We consider your letter completely unsatisfactory and unacceptable.

The fact that the Kaisung neutral zone is inside the area which is under our command is being used by you to try and cover up the truth about the series of provocative incidents created by your side in violation of the Kaisung zone neutrality agreement and also to try and throw on to our shoulders your own grave responsibility for these incidents.

We have to say that these efforts of yours are futile.

Precisely on this question of the Kaisung zone neutrality our attitude has throughout been one of serious and responsible adherence to the agreement, which was reached as a result of your proposal that "we both agree to refrain from any hostile act within this zone during the entire period of our conference," whereas your side has never kept to it. Let us now, in the sight of all fair-minded people in the world, examine the facts of the past two months. Since the beginning of the Kaisung negotiations, your side has twice declared the meetings suspended, without any consultation, once on the pretext that the press could not enter Kaisung and once on the occasion when our military patrol strayed into the area of the conference site. To prevent the negotiations from being obstructed, we on both occasions promptly found a reasonable solution for your side and immediately agreed to the proposal to make Kaisung a neutral zone. But what about your side? Firstly, ever since the establishment of the Kaisung zone neutrality agreement on July 14, the air force of the United Nations forces has never

ceased flying around at low altitudes over the Kaisung neutral zone. Later although a specific ruling was arrived at on August 16 that no military aircraft was to be allowed over the Kaisung neutral zone, yet United Nations forces aircraft went on with their intrusions over the zone on hostile patrols and reconnoitring.

According to the record in our possession, between August 17 and August 30, the intrusions totalled 31 sorties and between September 1 and September 8, 139 sorties and although we have made repeated protests, you have never ventured to give a straightforward reply on any of these constant hostile violations of the agreement. If the air force is not to be included among the armed forces which are to "refrain from any hostile act within this zone" is there any neutral zone in the world worth talking about? If the air force is to be included, then the hostile acts of the past two months in which United Nations forces aircraft have intruded over the Kaisung neutral zone and carried out patrolling and reconnoitring are violations of the Kaisung zone neutrality agreement.

Quite apart from the irrefutable evidence of witnesses and materials, the logic of the hostile air activities of your forces is in itself sufficient to show that the aircraft which twice dropped bombs in the vicinity of our delegation's living quarters in the Kaisung neutral zone on August 22 and September 1, and dropped a flare over the zone on August 29 beyond any doubt belonged to the United Nations forces. Moreover these provocative actions are still continuing. At 01.35 hours on September 10, a military aircraft of your forces again flew over the Kaisung neutral zone and strafed the conference site. This has been investigated by the liaison officers of both sides and the markings and remains of the bullets were still there, leaving no room for denial. We now again lodge a grave protest with you on these unending provocations. Similarly, ground units of the United Nations forces have, during the past two months, committed premeditated acts of provocation. Armed troops of the United Nations forces twice, on July 16 and August 25, penetrated into Panmunjon and its vicinity, inside the Kaisung neutral zone, and fired at our military patrolmen. On two occasions, on August 19 and 30, the South Korean troops belonging to the United Nations forces penetrated into the Kaisung neutral

zone, and attacked and murdered our military patrolmen. We not only have witnesses and material evidence with regard to these two incidents, but have also captured members of the reconnaissance unit of the South Korean troops who took a direct part in them.

All the above facts are enough to prove that although the proposal for the Kaisung zone neutrality agreement came from you, you are trying to make the agreement binding on us but not on yourselves. Although your present letter once again gives the assurance that your troops could not possibly have violated the Kaisung neutral zone agreement, nevertheless, in fact, constant violations of the agreement have been perpetrated by your troops during the past two months, and yet you have refused to deal with any of them. Is not this assurance merely a deception?

Of course we have the power to exercise control over territory for which we are responsible. But as both sides have agreed to make Kaisung a neutral zone during the period of the negotiations and, furthermore, as we have accepted the obligation involved in the regulations for carrying out the agreement concerning the neutral zone, we have the right to demand that you, too, accept these obligations and refrain from violating the Kaisung zone neutrality agreement.

Now all that you have been doing has been to try and escape your responsibility for all these violations of the agreement by making denials, claiming either that these incidents have no basis whatsoever in fact, or that they have been all deliberately fabricated by our side.

But the facts are crystal clear. The evidence is incontrovertible. Attempts at denial on your part are futile. You have therefore resorted to the device of diverting attention by proposing a change in the conference site so as to evade your responsibility for dealing with the series of provocative violations of the agreement and in order to manufacture a pretext for breaking off the negotiations whenever you want to do so. We must point out that you will not succeed in these attempts. Even if we follow the logic of your slander that all these provocative violations of the agreement were "manufactured" by our side and "spurious," why is it that your side has not dared to demand an inquiry into the truth of all these incidents, or to make suggestions on how the matter should be settled, or even to conduct a re-investigation into these incidents, but instead has left it to our side to make repeated demands for inquiry into and settlement of all these incidents? Since, in your latest letter, you declare that you can still effectively guarantee

that your troops will not possibly violate the terms of the Kaisung zone neutrality agreement, and since our side has in practice all along guaranteed the carrying out of the terms of this agreement, why do you now propose a change in the conference site? These strikingly obvious contradictions are sufficient to prove that your proposal on changing the conference site is in fact directed at evading your responsibility for the violations of the agreement, and at creating a pretext for breaking off the negotiations; it is not intended to facilitate the resumption of the negotiations.

Without the slightest doubt, ever since the talks began and since the Kaisung zone neutrality agreement, our side has been playing its part in a responsible manner to guarantee that Kaisung has every qualification as a negotiation site. This can be proved by the whole record of the Kaisung negotiations regarding these questions. If it were not for the series of provocations recklessly created by your forces in violation of the Kaisung zone neutrality agreement, how could the Kaisung meetings fail to proceed? If only you will conscientiously and responsibly deal with the series of provocative incidents and guarantee that the violations of the Kaisung zone neutrality agreement will not recur, the Kaisung conference site will be well able to serve the purpose of endeavouring to reach a fair and reasonable armistice agreement. If your side does not conscientiously and responsibly deal with these matters, then, no matter what place you move the conference site to, there is no reason for us to believe that similar and even more serious provocations will not occur. Moreover, since it is obvious that your side will not abide by a neutrality agreement, is there any reason to expect that your side will abide by an armistice agreement?

Therefore, we now demand of you once again that you put an end at once to the incessant acts of violation of the agreement and deal with the numerous provocations against which we have lodged protests. Only thus can the negotiations be resumed on a normal and equal basis. Otherwise your side will have to bear the entire responsibility for the delays and obstructions in the progress of the negotiations and their consequences. 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.

On September 10, a military aircraft of the U.N. forces penetrated into the neutral zone and strafed civilian houses at Manwolri, a district near the conference site. The document below is the report on this murderous attempt from General Nam Il, the Korean-Chinese Chief Delegate, to Generals Kim Il Sung and Peng Teh-huai. The conduct of Colonel Darrow, the head of the investigation personnel of the U.N. delegation, merits special attention. In a manner so typical of the so-called "investigation" teams sent by the U.N. Command, Darrow sought to argue away the obvious instead of conducting an objective investigation. But how was he to know that only a few hours later Vice-Admiral Joy would admit that it was indeed a U.N. aircraft that machine-gunned the peaceful homes of Korean civilians?

REPORT BY GENERAL NAM IL TO GENERALS KIM IL SUNG AND PENG TEH-HUAL, September 11, 1951

At 01:35 hours on September 10, a military aircraft of the United Nations forces once again intruded into the Kaisung neutral zone and carried out machine gun strafing, hitting houses of residents at Manwolri near the conference site. Forty-two bullet marks have been found so far. Fourteen of these were actually on the houses, beyond the walls or inside the houses, 13 on roads and 15 in vegetable gardens. More than 10 machine-gun cartridge cases and slugs were found near the bullet marks. In addition, more than 10 machine-gun cartridge cases were discovered near Sungkyunkwan north of Kaisung. Details of the investigation are as follows:

(1) Within one hour of the occurrence of the incident, at 02:25 hours, our liaison officers notified the other side by radio telephone and lodged with them a verbal protest on behalf of our chief delegate. It was not until 03:27 hours that the communication ended owing to a breakdown in the apparatus of the other side. At 06:30 hours, the other side promised by radio telephone that they would come to meet our liaison officers at Panmunjon at 09:00 hours and carry out a joint investigation on the spot. At 09:00 sharp, the investigation personnel of the other side arrived at Panmunjon and were conducted by our interpreters to the conference site to meet our liaison officers, Colonel Chang Chun San and Lieutenant Colonel Chai Cheng-wen. The investigation personnel of the other side were headed by Colonel Darrow. After an initial conversation, both sides set out for Manwolri where the incident occurred and began investigations on the spot.

(2) The liaison officers of both sides first carried out their investigations near and inside the two houses which were hit by the aircraft's machine-guns—house No. 5, Block No. 336, Manwolri and a house in Block No. 309, Manwolri. They examined altogether over 20 bullet marks and inspected the cartridge cases and slugs near the bullet marks. The cartridge cases and slugs, which had hit the walls, gone through the houses and dropped on to the roads and vegetable gardens, as well as the bullet marks at various points, all showed that they were the result of aircraft strafing a few hours earlier.

In this on-the-spot investigation the other side time and again looked for all sorts of excuses to brush aside their obvious responsibility. At the beginning of an investigation of a house hit by bullets, Colonel Darrow stated that perhaps the bullet marks in the house had resulted from someone firing from the roof with a machine gun. The personnel of his delegation also climbed on to the roof and said that there was a crack in the tiles on the roof. Our liaison officers pointed out that the bullet marks in the various places indicated that they obviously could not be the result of machine-gunning from the roof and that the crack in the roof was still more obviously a result of aircraft machine-gun strafing. Colonel Darrow then declared that some individual marks of bullet penetrations through the house could not clearly indicate the direction of the firing, and alleged that not all the bullets were fired from the same direction. Our liaison officers pointed out that on

the whole the direction of firing indicated by all the bullet marks was the same, even though some individual marks of bullets which pierced the house did not show the direction clearly because the bullets had obviously been deflected on hitting the hard walls. Colonel Darrow went on to allege that the angles of firing indicated by the bullet marks were all about 30 to 40 degrees, while the angle of aircraft strafing should be larger. Our liaison officers immediately pointed out that it was completely possible for aircraft strafing to be at angles of 30 to 40 degrees and there were no grounds for saying that aircraft strafing could not make angles of 30 to 40 degrees; and the fact that the angles indicated by the bullet marks were more or less the same showed still more clearly that the strafing came from the same aircraft. While inspecting the bullet marks on the walls, Colonel Darrow discovered some old marks of rifle shooting and alleged that the machine-gun bullet marks could also have been caused by rifle fire. Our officers immediately pointed out that the marks of rifle bullets could be found everywhere in Kaisung, but it did not follow at all from this that the marks of aircraft machine-gun bullets were made by rifle fire. During the examination of the bullet marks in the vegetable gardens, at first, the slugs were not immediately discovered because the bullets lay deep in the loose soil. Colonel Darrow took the opportunity to say that all the other slugs could have been put on the ground and that only by digging up slugs from under the ground could it be proved that the bullets were fired by aircraft machine-guns. But then when slugs were dug up from under bullet marks in another place, Colonel Darrow alleged that he had not himself seen the slugs being dug up from the ground. When our liaison officers suggested digging at other bullet marks, Colonel Darrow declared it was not necessary. Finally Colonel Darrow stated that though it was possible that the evidence all pointed to aircraft strafing, this could not prove it was an aircraft of the United Nations forces and that unless he himself had been there at the time, he could not definitely say it was so. Colonel Chang Chun San, our liaison officer, commented on this "In that case you would have had to drop out of the aircraft at the time and come down right here yourself."

(3) However, the testimony of local residents all answered Colonel Darrow positively and definitely established the irrefutable responsibility of the other side. The liaison officers of both sides questioned several residents, Choi Ki Tseng and Wu Hyng Pok of No. 5, Block No. 336, Manwolri and Kim Pok Sun at Block No. 309, Manwolri, all of whom were selected by Colonel Darrow. All three said that they had been awakened at night by aircraft strafing and that they had clearly heard the sound of aircraft. Kim Pok Sun said that she personally saw flames coming out of a house when it was hit by the aircraft machine-gun fire. Choi Ki Tseng also stated that from the outset of the Kaisung negotiations conference, only American aircraft had come over Kaisung and that these had carried out bombing in the vicinity of the conference site.

As both sides were making these on-the-spot investigations, military aircraft of the United Nations forces again repeatedly came over the Kaisung neutral zone. When our liaison officers drew their serious attention to this fact, the other side nevertheless persisted in denying it. The first time aircraft were seen, they alleged that they were 15 miles away. The second time, they alleged that they were six to eight miles away. The third time, when five aircraft of the other side were actually approaching the scene of the investigations, they alleged that they were at least five miles away. However our liaison officers pointed out that on this latter occasion when the aircraft were flying over they were less than five kilometres away from the scene of the investigations.

The on-the-spot investigations ended at 13:40 hours. Our liaison officers time and again suggested that as many of the local residents as possible should be questioned. But the other side declared that it was unnecessary. The other side took away with them three slugs and a packet of black powder taken from a wall at the point where it was hit by a bullet.

(4) At 15:00 hours when the meeting was resumed at the conference site, our liaison officers took out aircraft machine-gun cartridge cases found in the vicinity of Sungkyunkwan north of Kaisung and demanded that the other side continue to carry out a joint investigation with us on the scene. However, the other side insisted that it was unnecessary to continue the investigation, but merely marked the approximate position on the map and took away one cartridge case. The bottom of the cartridge case bore the inscription LS 43.

(5) Finally, Colonel Darrow still tried to deny the responsibility of the United Nations forces for the present aircraft strafing and declared that he had come here only for the purpose of investigating the facts and that he did not wish to draw any conclusions. He also declared that conclusions could be reached only after analysing the investigated facts and examining the radar reports. Our liaison officers pointed out that all the material evidence and the witnesses had already sufficiently proved the fact that aircraft of the other side had intruded over the Kaisung neutral zone and carried out strafing. They also declared that they had been instructed by their chief delegate to lodge a strong verbal protest with the other side and to reserve all rights to make demands. The meeting concluded at 15:55 hours.

(6) The intrusion by a military aircraft of the United Nations forces at 01:35 hours on September 10 over the Kaisung neutral zone and the machine-gun strafing is another in the series of grave provocative violations of the Kaisung zone neutrality agreement by the United Nations forces. The United Nations forces have not only refused to deal with their serious and repeated violations of the agreement conscientiously and responsibly, but instead have used the fact that Kaisung is within our positions as a pretext for suggesting a change in the conference site, in an attempt to evade their responsibility for these grave provocations, while at the same time, they have continued to violate the neutral zone agreement and have constantly created fresh serious incidents. Their new grave provocation of September 10 has once again proved that they are deliberately violating the Kaisung zone neutrality agreement and obstructing the armistice conference so as to make it impossible to resume the conference.

On September 17, instead of agreeing to the immediate meeting of the armistice delegations, General Ridgway wrote that he would instruct his liaison officers to "discuss conditions that will be mutually satisfactory for the resumption of armistice talks." The following is the reply of Generals Kim Il Sung and Peng Teh-huai to this new obstructionist tactic of General Ridgway.

FROM GENERAL KIM IL SUNG AND GENERAL PENG TEH-HUAI, September 19, 1951

Commander-in-Chief M. B. Ridgway of the United Nations Forces:

Your reply dated September 17 has been received.

Both your letter—and the letter from Vice-Admiral Joy, your chief delegate to General Nam Il, our chief delegate, dated September 11—have admitted the fact that a United Nations forces aircraft strafed the Kaisung neutral zone on September 10. However, you still deny the various incidents which took place before September 10 when the United Nations forces violated the Kaisung zone neutrality agreement from the air and on the ground which made it impossible to proceed with the Kaisung negotiations. However, this kind of denial can by no means alter or do away with all the witnesses and the material evidence which we possess concerning these incidents; and therefore the incidents

which we have drawn attention to and protested about must be dealt with in a responsible way.

In view of the fact that you have expressed regret concerning the latest incident in which the United Nations forces violated the Kaisung neutral zone, and willingness to take a responsible attitude regarding violations of the Kaisung zone neutrality agreement, and in order not to let the question of the settlement of the previously-mentioned incidents continue to obstruct the progress of our negotiations, we therefore propose that the delegates of both sides should immediately resume the armistice negotiations at Kaisung, without any need for further discussion on the conditions for the resumption of the armistice negotiations.

As to the question of the settlement of the previously-mentioned incidents and stipulating and guaranteeing strict agreements on the Kaisung zone

neutrality, we propose that at the first meeting after the resumption of the Kaisung armistice negotiations, appropriate machinery be set up, by arrangement of both sides, to carry out these tasks. Of course, all agreements reached through such appropriate machinery will be valid only after ratification by the delegations of both sides.

If you agree, we hope that you will immediately order your liaison officers to consult with our

liaison officers concerning the date and time for resuming the negotiations at Kaisung.

(Signed)

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

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

On September 23, General Ridgway sent a further message to the people's generals again repeating that his liaison officers would discuss conditions for the resumption of the talks. To the Korean-Chinese proposal that the pre-September 10 incidents be dealt with by special machinery at delegation level Ridgway countered with the suggestion that this serious matter should be dealt with by the liaison officers. The following is the text of the reply of Generals Kim Il Sung and Peng Teh-huai.

FROM GENERAL KIM IL SUNG AND GENERAL PENG TEH-HUAI, September 24, 1951

Commander-in-Chief M. B. Ridgway of the
United Nations Forces:

Your reply dated September 23 has been received.

Although your message still refuses to acknowledge the various air and ground violations of the Kaisung neutrality agreement which were committed by the United Nations forces before September 10 and which made it impossible for the Kaisung armistice negotiations to proceed—pretending that all the incidents have been fully investigated by your side—yet we have every reason and right to go on demanding that your delegation deal responsibly with these incidents because we possess adequate evidence concerning them and your delegation has time and again refused to make re-investigations. We have already instructed our delegates to put forward our demands through the appropriate machinery which should be set up by mutual agreement after the resumption of the Kaisung talks in order to deal with these unsettled incidents.

It is generally known that what directly made it impossible for the Kaisung negotiations to continue was the provocative incident of August 22 and the series of similar incidents that followed, all of which were created by your forces. Naturally therefore your side has to bear the responsibility for it. Only since you expressed regret for the September 10 incident, that is, the latest Kaisung neutrality violation by the United Nations forces, and willingness to deal responsibly with the Kaisung neutrality

agreement violations, we considered that the armistice negotiations should be resumed at Kaisung immediately and these unsettled incidents should not be allowed to go on impeding the progress of the negotiations between both sides.

We have always requested that a strict agreement on the neutrality of the Kaisung area be worked out to obviate future violations and to reduce or even eliminate any possibility of the negotiations being suspended in the future; but the working out of such specific and strict stipulations as will be agreeable to both sides at the same time must be done not by the liaison officers who have never had the power to do this but by the delegates of both sides in discussion. In order that the armistice negotiations may not be affected, we propose that appropriate machinery to deal with such matters be set up by discussion of both sides at the first meeting of the resumed Kaisung armistice negotiations. We hold that this is the most reasonable method.

Therefore, we have ordered our liaison officer to meet your liaison officer at 10 a.m. on September 24 to discuss the date and time for resuming the negotiations in Kaisung.

(Signed)

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

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

The liaison officers met on the morning of September 24, as arranged, and again on the following two mornings. However no headway was made owing to the U.N. officers insisting on discussing "conditions" for resuming the talks and regarding a change of conference site, questions clearly beyond the competence of liaison officers. In a letter of September 27, General Ridgway repeated that he still adhered to this demand for a new site. The following is the text of the reply of the people's generals.

**FROM GENERAL KIM IL SUNG AND GENERAL PENG TEH-HUAI,
October 3, 1951**

Commander-in-Chief M. B. Ridgway of the United Nations Forces:

Your reply of September 27 has been received.

In this message you again bring up the demand for the changing of the conference site, which you raised on September 6 and which was rejected by us in our message of September 11. We consider your demand to be completely unreasonable. You agreed to Kaisung as the conference site, and the proposal to make Kaisung a neutral zone came from your side on July 13 and was decided by mutual consultation. Since then, apart from the unexpected incident that occurred on August 4, which our delegation settled quickly and responsibly to the expressed satisfaction of your delegation, you have not lodged any complaint as regards the neutrality of the Kaisung neutral zone. The suspension of the armistice meetings since August 22 is due solely to your own violation of the Kaisung neutral zone which has made it impossible for the meetings to proceed. Therefore, as soon as your side admitted that the United Nations forces had violated the Kaisung neutral zone on September 10 and expressed willingness to deal with this in a responsible manner, we immediately proposed the resumption of the meetings. Now the question is immediate resumption of the Kaisung armistice negotiations and the drawing up at the meetings of a strict agreement on the neutrality of the Kaisung zone so as to guarantee that no similar agreement violations occur again in the future. It should not in any way be complicated by raising the question of a change of conference site.

Anyone can see clearly that your side has gone as far as to violate at will the very neutrality of the Kaisung zone which your delegation itself proposed. If the conference site is changed in compliance with your demand, what guarantee is there against your violating it again if your side wants

to suspend or break off the negotiations, or that the state of negotiations will not be worsened? For this reason, your raising of this unreasonable demand, if not designed as a threat, must have been intended to create a new pretext for continuing to drag out the negotiations. Our sincere and responsible attitude towards the negotiations is well known to the whole world. However, whether the negotiations can be resumed immediately and whether a satisfactory outcome will be reached cannot be decided by our delegation alone. It is quite obvious that if your delegation adopts a sincere and responsible attitude towards the negotiations similar to ours and does not complicate the matter again with side issues, it should not be difficult for the negotiations to attain the just results which are eagerly awaited by the peoples of the various countries participating in the war.

This being the case, we once again propose to you that our delegations should resume their meetings in Kaisung at once and set up, at the first meeting after the resumption of the conference, appropriate machinery for drawing up a strict agreement on the Kaisung zone neutrality and for guaranteeing its implementation so as to facilitate the progress of the armistice negotiations.

As soon as you give your concurrence to the above proposal, our liaison officers will consult with your liaison officers on the matter of the resumption of the meetings in Kaisung between our two delegations.

(Signed)

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

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