

THE KOREAN WAR

Peking's propaganda on the Korean war continues to focus attention on negotiations issues, proffering the immediate conclusion of an armistice in exchange for U.N. acceptance of essentially unaltered Communist terms on the POW issue. However, comment is becoming more pessimistic concerning the fate of the negotiations, with an increasingly intense campaign underway to establish American guilt for a possible rupture in the talks at Panmunjom. U.N. military pressure continues to elicit sensitive reactions from Peking, which, while scoring the atrocious character of U.N. bombing operations, avows the attempted military pressure will prove no more effective than in the past but will only intensify Communist resolve to destroy the aggressors. The meeting of the International Red Cross at Toronto is reported as having been manipulated by the United States to frustrate Communist attempts to present evidence of American atrocities in Korea.

Propaganda Themes Merged in General Attention To Negotiations: Peking's propaganda on the Korean war has evidenced few distinctive developments during the past two weeks. The most notable characteristic of present comment is the weaving together in individual commentaries of various themes formerly given separate propaganda treatment. This amalgamation of propaganda lines centers on the current situation at Panmunjom. For instance, a typical commentary will discuss the POW issue, scoring the U.N. position on voluntary repatriation and the U.N. proposals for solution of the problem, while defending the principles and proposals of the Communists concerning the prisoner question. The same commentary will also discuss alleged American atrocities and provocations, including BW, mistreatment of prisoners, and violations of the neutral zone and of the territorial air of Communist China as well as military pressure in the form of barbarous bombardment of peaceful towns in Korea, and will interpret these charges as indicating American intent to wreck the negotiations and extend the war. This amalgamation of topics blurs the emphasis of Korean war comment, other than pointing general attention to the negotiations, and resembles Moscow broadcast behavior immediately after the initiation of the negotiations last year, when Soviet propaganda was apparently marking time.

U.S. Balks At Final Step To an Armistice: Discussion of the POW issue stresses, on the one hand, how Communist efforts during the long arduous course of the negotiations have produced virtually full agreement on a complete draft armistice agreement, with only the problem of implementing the articles dealing with repatriation remaining. On the other hand, Peking stresses American insincerity throughout the course of the truce talks, and charges that the failure of U.N. negotiators to take the "final step toward an armistice" proves that the Americans don't want a truce because it would disrupt the U.S. war economy. Latest comment charges that the Korean war is being forced to the back pages of the American press to minimize hopes for peace and to allay resistance to an expansion of the war as U.N. negotiators attempt to recess

the talks out of existence. London DAILY WORKER correspondent Alan Winnington declares that "the problem of whether the Americans will break off the negotiations is being replaced by a simple question: "when"? This juxtaposing of an emphasis on the near attainment of a truce with the promotion of pessimism concerning its realization is typical Communist propaganda behavior. It prepares for alternative developments at Panmunjom without hardfast propaganda commitments.

Communist Position Remains Unchanged: The Peking line concerning actual measures to resolve the repatriation issue remains essentially the same. The Communists demand a solution based on the Geneva Conventions of 1949 which will to a reasonable degree meet the requirements of both sides. This means, Peking declares, that the U.N. Command must give up its insistence on the principle of "no forced repatriation," and accept the principle, for which the Communists will "fight to the last," that "all prisoners be released and repatriated and enabled to return home and resume peaceful occupations." This proposal is said to be the only reasonable proposal for translating the agreed-upon paragraphs of the draft armistice agreement pertaining to POW repatriation into reality. Their proposal, the Communists declare, is a compromise which meets the requirements of both sides and which conforms with the Geneva Conventions.

110,000 Repatriation Figure Advanced: Although most comment reiterates the demand for revised U.N. prisoner lists registering approximately 116,000 prisoners for repatriation, including 20,000 Chinese, a few mentions have been made of an acceptable figure "approaching 110,000," including all Chinese prisoners. Increasingly frequent references to the number of POWs allegedly slain in U.N. prisoner camps could serve to document a possible Communist rationale for settling on a repatriation figure lower than that which they presently demand. The current total of POWs allegedly killed while in U.N. custody is in the neighborhood of 8,000.

Secret Sessions Were Prompted By U.N. Statement: The failure of the secret sessions to reach a solution on the prisoner question is attributed to an American refusal to negotiate. Peking implies that the executive sessions were prompted by U.N. initiative in declaring that it was ready to negotiate a settlement which reasonably met the requirements of both sides, and that the Communists entered the sessions in expectation of new U.N. proposals. Peking commentators quote Nam Il's summation of the matter declaring: "you broke your promise" to negotiate.

The U.N. efforts to reach a settlement during the secret sessions are characterized as "trickery" and as attempts to implement the unacceptable principle of "no forced repatriation" by devious manipulations of the prisoner lists. U.N. proposals to reclassify prisoners as "prisoners," "captured personnel," "deserters," etc., and to include parolees on repatriation lists are all renounced, and the basic repatriation figure of 83,000 offered by the U.N. rejected as unacceptable. A major point of disagreement with the U.N. proposal concerns the number of Chinese to be repatriated, who, Peking charges, obviously can not return home and live in peace unless they are repatriated. Another basic attack on the U.N. position is that prisoners not repatriated will be handed over to Syngman Rhee and Chiang Kai-shek.

Military Pressure Designed to Disrupt Negotiations: U.N. military pressure in the form of extensive bombing operations evokes considerable response from Peking which charges that these atrocities are but a forceful indication of American intent to destroy the armistice negotiations. With U.N. ground forces impotent against the Communist armies, Peking states, the Americans are left with only their air force with which to force the collapse of the truce talks. The maliciously fostered misconception of military pressure as a stimulant to the conclusion of an armistice is declared belied by the increased hatred for the Americans and intensified resolve to defeat the aggressors provoked by these atrocities.

A number of alleged incidents, such as violations of Chinese air space, infiltration of spies into the truce area, and artillery bombardment of Kaesong, have also been publicized as American attempts at military pressure aimed at scuttling the truce talks. Most of this comment has been concerned with the alleged bombardment of Kaesong, and indicts the U.N. staff officer for refusing to investigate the incident. Peking ominously recalls that last year's breakdown of the talks resulted from controversy over violations and American refusals to investigate.

IRC Conference Suppresses Evidence of U.S. Atrocities: Although Peking reports on the proceedings of the International Red Cross Conference recently held in Toronto, it fails to exploit the event extensively, even to bolster its waning BW campaign. Most of the comment attacks the IRC for failing to include charges of American atrocities in Korea in its resolutions. The United States is said to have manipulated the conference to prevent a consideration of Communist China's evidence that American forces have waged BW and committed other atrocities in Korea. The British amendment to the Soviet motion on the prohibition of atomic warfare which referred the question to the United Nations Disarmament Commission is attacked as a scurrilous tactic to prevent the passage of any resolution on the subject, since the U.N. commission has delayed action on the matter for almost a year. One NCNA item asserts that the need for such a resolution is urgent since the use of barbaric weapons in the Korean war is but the prelude to the introduction of another formidable weapon, the atomic bomb. There is no further comment on this subject. Collateral comment scores the International Committee of the Red Cross for its whitewash of Nazi crimes against POWs during World War II and states that no organization is less fit to investigate Chinese charges of germ warfare.