

Mr. Hanley and the Associated Press, over time, make this easier and easier. As each of their vitriolic attacks fail, their successive assaults become more disorganized, sloppy, and frankly, good for little beyond amusement. More specifically, and as per their SOP, they employ the technique of the "bait and switch" with evidence constantly, and this letter is a perfect example of that.

Of course, this is not the first time that the largest news organization in all history has tried to silence a single historian who noted that their emperor had a clothing deficiency. See this for example. <http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=c/a/2002/04/07/IN89398.DTL>

And what is worse, it seems that the institution seems to be inclined to falling for fakes... see here. [http://www.nypost.com/seven/12082006/postopinion/opedcolumnists/the\\_not\\_so\\_infallible\\_ap\\_robert\\_opedcolumnists\\_robert\\_bateman.htm?page=1](http://www.nypost.com/seven/12082006/postopinion/opedcolumnists/the_not_so_infallible_ap_robert_opedcolumnists_robert_bateman.htm?page=1)

Still, it is incumbent upon me to present for the readers of *Armchair General* an "Author Responds" segment, to make a direct response to this letter of Hanley's, rather than merely submit something into the forum.

It's too easy really. Let us start with Mr. Hanley's and the Associated Press' presentation of "The Facts." And as we do so, please, let us remember that "bait and switch" technique.

1. Mr. Hanley reports that an official investigation (part of which is reproduced, verbatim, in my book ([http://www.amazon.com/No-Gun-Ri-Military-Incident/dp/0811717631/sr=8-1/qid=1167853551/ref=pd\\_bbs\\_sr\\_1/002-7036076-9773630?ie=UTF8&s=books](http://www.amazon.com/No-Gun-Ri-Military-Incident/dp/0811717631/sr=8-1/qid=1167853551/ref=pd_bbs_sr_1/002-7036076-9773630?ie=UTF8&s=books) ) by the way) discovered that an "undetermined number" were killed at No Gun Ri. Nobody disagrees with this at all, least of all my article in *Armchair General*, but that report supports my version as well, or better, than the AP's blurred attempts at writing history. The report says, "an undetermined number." How does that support the AP's version more than mine? That is a question I'd like to ask Mr. Hanley. But more specifically, do you notice in his comment, that the killing was due to 'strafing,' and that the way it was written makes it look like THAT was the findings of the report? Hmmmmm, keep that in mind for a minute. I'll get back to this, but let's mark this as "Bait and Switch #1" (B&S #1)

2. The AP keeps claiming large numbers of American witnesses (this time they say 15) who said they saw the killing...but in their article only six are named as seeing anything. They never have produced these other witnesses, despite repeated appeals. And of those six witnesses who do say they saw something at No Gun Ri, I demonstrated in my book that three of them were not there, and another one of whom stated to *US News and World Report* that he was taken out of context by the AP, and the final two of whom recount versions of events which are completely in-line with my own findings and whom are quoted at multiple-page length in my book, as opposed to getting one or three sentence quotes in the AP-style of writing.

3. The AP regularly tries to cite their sources anonymously, despite the fact that this is against their own code of ethics and completely unacceptable when writing history. The AP will present you with a rank, but no name, for example, such as citing "a retired Sergeant Major", but for six years has steadfastly refused to donate their interviews (in video or transcript version) to any archive for historians to examine and evaluate in any way. Who, for example, is the "retired command sergeant major" they refer to as testifying to the Army IG? Where is that transcript, and why won't the AP let anyone else see it? And the AP's video link online? Oh yes, please, PLEASE go see that, and all the veterans there. Why would I advocate that? Because their pulling a B&S again (#2 now). See, there are only two veterans on that video site who say they were there, and I proved one of them wasn't there after all. "Two" video testimonies is hardly the multitudes the AP tries to claim, and even then, well, see for yourself.

4. Well, here we are with B&S#3. None of those documents cited by the AP, you see, refer to the 7th Cavalry prior to the events at No Gun Ri, or were received by the 7th Cavalry before No Gun Ri. The AP is, once again, trying a 'bait and switch' with the evidence. As I make clear in my own book, I believe hundreds of South Korean civilians were killed in the early weeks of the war, some by accident, and some deliberately, both of which are tragic. But this is about history, and you do not get to make up facts in history, but must take the evidence as it is, not as you would like to make it to fit your thesis. These documents validate the fact that there were other events, at other times and places, where Korean civilians were shot at by US troops, under orders. My point, which

apparently unbalances Mr. Hanley, is that these orders were not received (because they didn't yet exist) by the 7<sup>th</sup> Cavalry at No Gun Ri on 26 July 1950.

5. The "Harvard historian" is Dr. Sahr Conway-Lanz. This document is a letter from Ambassador Muccio to the State Department, which, while fascinating, is only another account of a meeting at the 8th Army/ROK Government level (on 25 July) which I related, in detail, in my book. Indeed, if you look at the previous "fact", you'll see the Eighth Army document that was transmitted to the Divisions on the morning of the 26<sup>th</sup>, which contains the actual instructions the military units received after that same meeting. So, while that meeting became the basis for a written order from EUSAK to the various Divisions, the idea that a meeting at the absolutely highest levels on the night of the 25th resulted in concrete orders down the on the line-infantry battalion level about something as volatile as shooting at civilians less than 12 hours later is, well, nuts. The written order did come down to the Regiment from the 1<sup>st</sup> Cavalry Division, but not until AFTER the events at No Gun Ri, and it didn't include the lines about shooting civilians, which I noted in my book.

Say, here's an idea...let's look at the documents themselves, courtesy of the AP and their publisher.

Here you will find the Eight Army document, sent the morning of the 26<sup>th</sup> to the multiple divisions...

<http://www.henryholt.com/nogunri/document19.htm>

Ahhhh, and here you find, the next day, the 1<sup>st</sup> Cavalry Division combat order derived from that one. But, oops, the date of the document does not support the AP's thesis, or for that matter, the thesis that the AP ascribes to Dr. Conway-Lanz. See for yourself. It is dated the 27<sup>th</sup> of July!

<http://www.henryholt.com/nogunri/document06.htm>

Like I said, as they become more desperate this becomes all too easy. But don't take this for my formal response please. That would be in more depth. First, I think that Mr. Hanley and the Associated Press need to be challenged on a few things in their letter.

As for his attacks on me, those are even easier (and more fun frankly) to blow away. But it takes a book to do that, and so I wrote one. If you read my book you will see that Mr. Hanley and the AP's comments are ones that are directly and explicitly addressed in detail in the book, but which I could not address in the limited length of a feature-length article. (You only get a few thousand words in a magazine, but Mr. Hanley tries to ignore the fact that my synopsis that appeared in *Armchair General* is backed with almost a thousand footnotes in a 300 page book.)

My personal favorite, in this version of his assault, is the S4 log. This log, I am told, you readers can see here on this site. It shows the weapons being turned in through supply channels in the 7<sup>th</sup> Cavalry, for destruction/disposition at higher headquarters. That's SOP. But Mr. Hanley contends that nobody saw these weapons at No Gun Ri, when there is in reality a lengthy (several pages long), verbatim, first-person eyewitness account of that very thing included in my book. I should also like to note, in contrast to the AP, that the complete transcript of that interview (as well as all of the others) was donated to the Archives at the United States Military Academy so that future historians can mull this same material.

And then the question about the forensics...and the finding of Russian-made cartridges at the site...which is in my book, in a big way, because it was the AP WHICH REPORTED THAT FACT! Yep, the AP reporter Sang-Hun Choe, in reporting on the IG investigation, reported during the course of the investigation, that South Korean researchers had discovered forensic evidence of Russian made weapons being used at No Gun Ri.

Now while I mentioned that the AP report was the source that I used in my book with regard to the "forensics finding Soviet made cartridges". I did that on purpose in the book, so the AP couldn't complain about the source. (Until, it turns out, they forgot about their own reporting. Who would have figured on that though?)

But it's in the Army IG report as well, in the Annex labeled, conveniently, "forensics." For somebody who cites the report, it almost seems as though the AP and Mr. Hanley had not read the darned thing. Why else would he ask such a stupid question?

To wit: <http://www.army.mil/nogunri/AppendixB.pdf>

***"They found 193 items at the double overpass and culvert. The items included .30 caliber empty cartridges, bullets, unfired cartridges, one M1 rifle cartridge clip, one LMG (light machine gun) link, and other fragments. In addition, the DIC team found Soviet-manufactured material. This material included empty cartridges and bullets for the Soviet-made Mosin-Nagant rifle and DP/DT MG (machine gun)." (Page B8)***

and this,

***"The DIC Team stated no enemy bullets were found in the walls. To firmly conclude there were no enemy bullets at the site, CID states all bullets present would have to be removed and analyzed. Further, there were two Soviet type .30 caliber (7.62X54R) bullets included in the bullet sample."***

But perhaps the best line in the AP's most recent assault against me is when they try to re-write what the "official" Army IG investigation found. The letter they sent (to Armchair General) said this: "4. In the final column on page 37, Bateman baselessly states there was no air attack on the refugees. But the Army's own investigation recognized that there was."

Well that seemed egregious, and I thought they knew better, so let's go to the official report the Associated Press cites. It is located at <http://www.army.mil/nogunri/Chapter5.pdf>. Specifically let us look on page 178, which includes the "findings" relating to any air attack at No Gun Ri. What is this? Why Mr. Hanley, this is what we found. Here is the verbatim text from the report which you state "recognizes" that there was an air attack on the civilians at No Gun Ri. (Remember now also Bait and Switch #1)

***"An investigation of the Air Force's documented role during this period of the Korean War yielded no evidence to suggest that Air Force aircraft strafed Korean refugees or enemy soldiers at, or near, No Gun Ri on July 26, 1950. The U.S. Air Force History Team found most mission reports for jet aircraft flying missions over Korea on July 26, 1950. However, the Fifth Air Force final recapitulation report for the day shows no target struck in the vicinity of No Gun Ri on July 26. (Footnote 40)***

***The only documented USAF air strike in the immediate vicinity of Hwanggan area occurred southwest of No Gun Ri on July 27. This was a friendly fire incident in which an F-80 accidentally strafed the 1st Battalion, 7th Cavalry Regiment's command post at 7:15 in the morning. A Fifth Air Force ADVON message acknowledged that the plane was a F-80 from one of the 35th Fighter- Bomber Squadron's first three missions of the day (call sign Contour). The 8th Fighter-Bomber Wing fragmentary order for July 27,1950, matched the F-80 squadron mission summary reports; the requirements and take-off times agreed with each other. The F-80 strafed a "wooden area into which many vehicle tracks were leading", undoubtedly the 1st Battalion, 7th Cavalry's command post.***

***The strafing destroyed two U.S. trucks but claimed no lives. As a result of the careful scheduling of the air assets, as expressed in the daily frag order, 5th Air Force ADVON could, within a half-hour, identify the aircraft involved. If a similar incident occurred on July 26, it would have been detected and reported as was the one on July 27.***

***The Navy discovered no evidence of naval aircraft operating in the vicinity of No Gun Ri on July 26 or 27. However, on July 28, Navy aircraft from the USS Valley Forge were directed into the area and attacked a railroad tunnel and other targets forward of the 7th Cavalry in the direction of Yongdong with bombs and machine guns."***

Now that is from the official Army IG report which, in light of Mr. Hanley's repeated reference to it as a source which, unless you actually read it, you might think supports his casualty figures and his thesis. But let us go back again to item #1, you know, the one where he contends that the substance of this report "confirm the core substance of the AP reporting"...here is the actual report:

<http://www.army.mil/nogunri/AppendixB.pdf>

(Page B-4)

"Based on the available evidence, the U.S. Review Team cannot determine the numbers killed or injured in the vicinity of No Gun Ri. However, the U.S. Review Team concluded that it is unlikely that hundreds of dead bodies were present in the vicinity of No Gun Ri during the last week of July 1950, based on the testimony of U.S. veterans and the examination of the August 6, 1950 aerial photograph by Armed Forces Institute of Pathology (AFIP) and National Imagery and Mapping Agency (NIMA).<sup>17</sup> The U.S. Review Team concluded that some Koreans were killed and injured in the vicinity of No Gun Ri in the last week of July 1950 but that the precise number may never be determined for many reasons."

Yes, Mr. Hanley just keeps racking up those Homer Simpson Moments. You can ask him how this denial of "hundreds" lines up as his "core substance" better than my professional estimate. But perhaps it would be best if you contacted the Pulitzer Prize committee and asked them, "Why does the AP still have their prize?" Their reporting, containing as it did, obfuscations, deliberate omissions, and downright falsehoods (not to mention at least one scam artist presented as the Real McCoy), is sloppy journalism at best, and execrable history when they try to use journalistic techniques and apply them to history. It is a stain upon journalism, and remains so to this day.

You can ask the folks at the Pulitzer themselves by going here: <http://www.pulitzer.org/>

With regards,

Bob Bateman