

## The Puzzling Elements Surrounding the "Self Immolation Incident"

Based on a report from the "Xinsheng.net", Jiang Zemin has issued new orders to escalate his persecution against Falun Gong. The order specifies that no one will be legally liable for injuries or death resulting from beating Falun Gong practitioners. "They would die in vain." This is grimmer than what was reported earlier, when the death of Falun Gong practitioners through torture would be classified; "if they are beaten to death treat it as suicide."

Though this report has not been directly verified, it is quite authentic due to the large amount of data about the maltreatment and killing of Dafa practitioners and the cover story by the Xinhua news agency on the self-immolation incident in Tiananmen Square. Based on a story in Clearwisdom, Wang Yijia, a 45 year old Falun Gong practitioner living in the City of Hengyang, Hunan Province died because of the persecution by the police. He died around midnight on January 22, 2001. The next day when members of his family went to the police station for his body, the police advised them that the Central Authorities had declared there would be no legal liability whatsoever regardless of how Falun Gong practitioners died.

Earlier, an interview of Canadian Dafa practitioner Zhang Kunlun was conducted by "World Daily". In the interview Zhang talked about his experience in the labor camp. "A camp deputy named Zhang told me: 'If you are Falun Gong, we could do anything to you without facing any responsibility. If you were beaten to death, we would simply tell outside people that you committed suicide.' Afterwards, they beat me with electric shock batons."

At least 130 Falun Gong practitioners have been killed. Tens of thousands of practitioners have been jailed or sent to mental hospitals without due legal process. Even though the Chinese government denied numbers in this analysis, they did admit that the "war" against Falun Gong was getting more atrocious.

In their cover story of the self-immolation incident in Tiananmen Square, "Xinhua" and CCTV repeatedly emphasized that these self-immolators were Falun Gong practitioners, thereby attempting to convince the audience and readers that the persecution of Falun Gong was necessary. However, there were so many flaws and inconsistencies in their report that one could not help but suspect that this was a pre-orchestrated event by the government aimed at defaming Falun Gong, paving the way for the next escalation of persecutions. As such, Falun Gong practitioners have appealed to the Chinese government to allow international human rights organizations, United Nations and international media to conduct neutral, third party, independent investigations. We wish the public, organizations, governments and the United Nations would raise their concern regarding the persecution of Falun Gong in China, stopping further escalation of persecution and torturing and death of Falun Gong practitioners by Jiang Zemin.

The following is an analysis of ten suspicious points in the report on the self-immolation incident in Tiananmen Square by Xinhua and CCTV:

### **Mysterious point 1: Police were already in position, when the self-immolator started the fire.**

There was a scene in the "Focal Point Interview": A person on fire was staggering forward. Three policemen were positioned on the left, right, and in front of this person, holding fire extinguishers. The policeman on the left started his fire extinguisher. Almost simultaneously, the policemen in front of and on the right started their fire extinguishers. From the start to finish the entire process took about 2 seconds.

Let us analyze this scene. There are no fire extinguishers in Tiananmen Square. Fire extinguishers can only come from two conceivable sources, 1, The IVECO police patrol cars equipped with fire extinguishers; 2, The fire extinguishers in the People's Great Congress Hall building. Usually a small sedan is equipped with one fire extinguisher, the small variety. A larger car will have two of them. A single INVECO patrol car is never equipped with 3 fire extinguishers. Therefore these 3 extinguishers must have been obtained from different places.

Imagine the situations at that time. When the person started pouring gasoline over his body, the police would not have immediately run to the squad cars to get the extinguishers as there is no self-immolation precedent in Tiananmen Square. Therefore chances are the police wouldn't have caught on to it and tried to get the extinguisher right away seeing someone pouring liquid over him or herself. Only after the person ignited the fire, would the three policemen begin to react and hurry to their patrol cars located at various places some distances away. They would have to pull the fire extinguishers out from under the seats or detach them from the side of the vehicle. They could also get extinguishers from the People's Great Congress Hall. As they ran back towards the person on fire, they could pull off the safety pin, get close to the person and start putting out the fire. The policeman who got there first would start first; followed by the other two who arrived separately to extinguish the fire. When one is on fire, he would fall down quickly and be unable to move too far due to severe pain caused by the burning fire. Yet the cctv footage showed that the person on fire was still staggering forward.

That is to say, the 3 policemen would have had to first react to the fire, get extinguishers from the car[s], race for tens of meters to get to the fire, all in less than 10 seconds; and all three policemen from varying distances would have to arrive at the scene virtually simultaneously. Yet the TV footage showed that the nearest patrol car was located about 10 meters away, with other patrol cars much further away. It was rather strange, then, that the TV footage showed all three of them standing next to the person on fire, in their respective positions, timed it just right to start extinguishing the fire together, and put out the fire in two seconds; rather than as one would expect, the first policeman to arrive at the scene to put out the fire first, to be followed by others from different directions and different distances away.

A more plausible explanation would be that the policemen first took up their positions, and with the camera ready to roll, the person was then cued to set himself on fire.

## **Mysterious point 2: Where did they get the fire extinguishers?**

There were two fire extinguishers on the scene, with one more facing away from the camera that could not be seen. The extinguishers were the type similar to those larger ones used within a building, with the size being about the length of an adult's arm. Extinguishers found in the IVECO patrol car should be the smaller type, about the length of an adult's forearm. Then where could these fire extinguishers have come from? Possibilities are (a). The Great Congress Hall of the People or other buildings along side Tiananmen Square; (b). The police brought them ahead of time in preparation for the incident. If the answer were (a), then based on the scene described above, the contradiction would be even greater. So, very likely these extinguishers were brought there ahead of time in preparation for the staged incident. Even if the police knew about the incident ahead of time, it still would not explain why the three policemen must take up their positions first before extinguishing the fire unless it was all staged.

## **Mysterious point 3: CCTV reporter had to be extraordinarily fortunate.**

CCTV reporters had to be extraordinarily fortunate. They actually were able to capture, on tape, such a sudden and fleeting moment of the burning. I am not referring to those shots taken by

remote cameras, but those taken on the ground in close proximity. Even chancier is that the camera was no more than 20 meters from the scene. Recalling a picture in the "June 4<sup>th</sup>" incident of a man standing in front of some tanks, the tanks were trying to maneuver around him. The shots were taken from the top of a building quite far away and the pictures were not very clear. At the time, the reporters always said before showing that video clip: "please pay attention to the following precious footage." They knew all too well that it was not easy to capture such a fleeting live scene.

Yet, by such co-incidence the "Self Immolation Incident" cinematographer was at the Square at that very moment, no more than 20 meters from the person on fire, and with the camera ready on standby (otherwise within the few seconds of setting on fire to the fire being extinguished, the cameraman could not possibly have time to adjust his camera).

The more plausible explanation is that it was prearranged for the cameraman to film this scene at the Square.

#### **Mysterious point 4: The well-timed announcement of Xinhua likely was prepared with advanced knowledge.**

According to a reporter working for U.S. media, Xinhua historically had been very cautious about politically sensitive news. Usually Xinhua would edit and polish the news release several times, occasionally as many as 5 to 6 times. Yet they reported the self-immolation incident in Tiananmen Square very quickly, in such a way that it raised people's suspicion. It was as though the material had been written ahead of time.

#### **Mysterious point 5: The statements of the self-immolators quoted in the report were not from Falun Gong.**

The statements of immolators quoted in the Xinhua report was not from teachings of Falun Gong. For example, the reference of "Reaching the sky for consummation," etc. cannot be found in any of the Falun Gong books. Even non-Falun Gong practitioners could easily discern the discrepancy after flipping through Falun Gong books. The language used by the self-immolators was not from the contents of Falun Gong.

We can be sure that the plump, middle-aged woman who appeared frequently on the TV segment did not understand Falun Dafa. She was apparently a paid ruse. She said that she saw others starting the fire first, producing black smoke. Yet she felt that when "de" (virtue, a white substance/by ed.) is burned it should produce white smoke, since "de" is a white substance. Only when burning "karma" should it produce black smoke since "karma" is a black substance. There is not a single sentence in Falun Dafa stating that burning "de" will generate white smoke; nor that burning white smoke is "de" and burning black smoke is "karma." Dafa does not say a burning person with more "de" will generate white smoke, and one with more "karma" will produce black smoke. As a matter of fact, Dafa has not linked "de" with combustion. This is ludicrous logic. Even in ordinary society we cannot find such a deduction that white material produces white smoke when burned and black material produces black smoke. This poor woman totally repudiated her faith that she nearly paid for with her life earlier, simply because of this laughable and absurd logic that can not be established anywhere!

#### **Mysterious point 6: Clear and vigorous voice after large-scale burn injuries.**

The "Focal Point Interview" showed several doctors describing the burn status of the self-immolators. They told the audience that the tracheas and bronchi were badly burned and would require tracheotomies. As most people know, when one's body is on fire, the surrounding air temperature would be extremely high. When one breathes such hot air, it would cause burn injuries to the tongue, the vocal cords, and even the tracheo-bronchial tree. The doctors were therefore correct. However, the TV footage showed "Wang Jindong" [one of the self-immolators] sitting in the Square, with the fire extinguished, able to yell loud and clear: "The Law of the Universe is the Great Law that everyone must experience". (Note: this is not what is said in Falun Dafa. On the contrary, Master Li Hongzhi said that it would not be possible for everyone to obtain the Tao.)

The little girl lying on the ground also had a clear voice. From all the shots shown including the later scenes at the hospital, both Wang Jindong and the little girl have full, clear, and loud voices. They showed no sign of any vocal cord or tracheo-bronchial damage. After suffering large area burns they were fully alert, with a healthy and vigorous voice, isn't that extraordinary?

It was stated in the Xinhua report: "The 12 year old girl Liu Yingsi suffered 40% burns over her entire body. Her head and face sustained level 4 burns. Her eyelids were turning outward. She had difficulty breathing and sustained crippling damages on her face and both hands. Hao Huijun, Wang Jindong also suffered burn-induced respiratory impairment and serious burn injuries. Yet, even with such severe injuries, both Liu Guo and Liu Yingsi could carry on interviews with Xinhua reporters. It is no wonder that an American doctor commented after seeing this report: "After tracheotomies it is highly unlikely for people to recover in such a short time and recover their ability to talk. Either Xinhua is telling lies, or they were creating miracles in medical science."

## **Mysterious point 7: No wrapping of the hand with severe burn injury.**

There was another scene at the hospital. It was a close up view of the burnt left hand of the little girl. The footage lasted for several seconds. It showed a "hand" burned beyond recognition, displaying grayish black coloration. Just think about it, everyone, when a burn victim is sent to the hospital, usually they receive immediate attention and treatment before reporters are allowed in for interviews. At the Jishuitan Hospital the doctors there did not wrap this severely burnt hand and left it exposed to infection. From the wrist up to the elbow it was wrapped heavily; it was thick and bulging.

A logical explanation for this scene is that the badly burnt hand on TV was a fake hand. The little girl's real hand was hidden behind the wrist wrapped in layers of gauze. Additionally, there were several close up views of the little girl lying in the Square, showing her face with black or white colored patches. This would suggest that some parts of the face were burned to charcoal, while[amazingly] the adjacent parts were totally undamaged and showing soft, white skin. There was neither erythema nor telangectasia. These are not what one would expect in burn cases.

## **Mysterious point 8: Police confiscated CNN videotape - Destruction of evidence?**

If Xinhua wanted the public to accept their stories, why were CNN reporters not allowed to report on what took place during that emergency? If CNN could confirm the Xinhua report wouldn't it be even more convincing? Why would Xinhua want to destroy the videotape containing the incident? Were they trying to conceal something?

## **Mysterious point 9: Myriad contradictions in the Xinhua report. A fabricated story?**

In the lengthy Xinhua report, one section stated: "Hao Huijun was a music teacher at the Islam High School in Kaifeng City. Her coworkers recalled that she was a good and dedicated teacher. She was very outgoing. She could sing and dance well. After she started practicing Falun Gong in 1997, she gradually became withdrawn and exchanged less with others. She often appeared thoughtless and listless. In December last year, after she participated in 'illegal' activities in Tiananmen Square, she was sent back to school by government authorities. Her 19-year-old daughter Chen Guo was studying music in Beijing at that time. Influenced by her mom, Chen Guo also became devoted to Falun Gong, and went with her mom to Tiananmen Square 'making trouble.'"

Yet in a later section of the same Xinhua report it was said: "19 year old Chen Guo began her quest of music study based on the encouragement and inspiration of her mother. When Chen Guo was just 12 years old, she was a member of the CCTV Galaxy Children's Performing Art Troupe. She participated in their overseas performance in Singapore. She had been a straight A student. She started practicing Falun Gong in 1996. After her beloved father passed away due to illness in 1998 Chen Guo also became rather subdued and reticent. In 1999 the school administration talked to her many times after becoming aware of her Falun Gong activities."

As one can see, one section stated the daughter started practicing Falun Gong in 1996 by herself, yet another section contradicted by saying the daughter started in 1997 under the influence of her mother. This is indeed odd.

## **Mysterious point 10: Quotation of a "veteran practitioner?"**

According to the Xinhua report, Liu Baorong started practicing Falun Gong back in 1995. From a Falun Gong practitioner's perspective, she is considered a "veteran practitioner." She should have a profound understanding about the Falun Gong principle of "Prohibit killing and committing suicide." She should also have an equally deep understanding about the meaning of "Consummation." Falun Gong's interpretation of "Consummation" emphasizes reaching the state of final release of cultivation energy and enlightenment through cultivation of mind and body. There is never any mention of "reaching to the sky," and "body and flesh became sarira after the departure of the essential soul." Even though the Xinhua report cited many statements made by Liu Baorong, anyone who had researched Falun Gong could tell those statements were made by a novice, or worse, a con artist.

Also, as a "veteran practitioner" with five-year "practicing seniority," Liu Baorong laid down a meticulous plan of "sacrificing herself to martyrdom." She was certainly fiercely dedicated to her faith with detailed preparation so that she could carry out the plan. Yet within one week from the incident she renounced her faith with equal zeal. Based on the self contradictions in her statements made before and after the incident, as well as inconsistencies of her actions, people can easily conclude for themselves whether Liu Baorong indeed was a Falun Gong practitioner. She made a confession of her own accord.

All these mysterious points are plainly clear to Falun Gong practitioners, and Xinhua propaganda would only be as effective as a lie. It only deceives ordinary citizens.

Falun Dafa Information Center

Contact person: Xu Kangang 732-841-7936

Falun Dafa Spokesperson: Zhang Erping 917-679-6944, Yuan Feng 917-912-3301

Posting date: 2/6/2001

Original article date: 2/3/2001

Category: Truth Clarification

Translated on 2/4/2001 from <http://minghui.cc/mh/articles/2001/2/3/7637.html>