

# NAPSNet Daily Report 16 July, 2001

---

## Recommended Citation

"NAPSNet Daily Report 16 July, 2001", NAPSNet Daily Report, July 16, 2001,  
<https://nautilus.org/napsnet/napsnet-daily-report/napsnet-daily-report-16-july-2001/>

---

## CONTENTS

### I. [United States](#)

1. [PRC Military Development](#)
  2. [PRC-Russian Talks](#)
  3. [Submarine Sales to Taiwan](#)
  4. [US Bases on Okinawa](#)
  5. [US-Philippines Military Relationship](#)
- ### II. [Republic of Korea](#)
1. [US Bases in ROK](#)

## I. United States

### 1. PRC Military Development

U.S. News & World Report (Richard J. Newman and Kevin Whitelaw, "CHINA: HOW BIG A THREAT?" 7/23/01) reported that RAND, a think tank based in Santa Monica, California, was fired on June 8 by the National Intelligence Council (NIC), a group that reports directly to US Central Intelligence Agency chief George Tenet, from a classified project ordered by US Congress to assess the future military capabilities of the PRC. It was reported that as Rand held conferences with experts and conducted its analysis, it seemed that the eventual report would depict the PRC as a growing military power, but as no match for the US in the near future. However, the NIC reportedly appeared to be looking for a different, more alarming conclusion. At one point, for instance, the NIC pressured Rand to add several specific PRC hard-liners to its conference roster. One analyst familiar with the project said, "They want China to be 10 feet tall. They're cooking the books." According to some sources, faced with resistance from Rand, the NIC decided to seek a more compliant contractor. A senior US intelligence official denies that the NIC was shopping for a predetermined result. The US Congress has shown growing interest in matters dealing with the PRC, including requesting alternative assessments to those of the CIA. However, US intelligence analysts view the US Congress's new activism as an alarming effort to bully the CIA into producing analyses consistent with conservative ideology. Arthur Waldron of the University of Pennsylvania said, "No one disputes

the basic fact of China's military buildup. The argument is about its significance." [Ed. note: This article was included in the US Department of Defense's Early Bird news service for July 16, 2001.]

## **2. PRC-Russian Talks**

Agence France Presse ("RUSSIA, CHINA PRESENT COMMON FRONT ON US MISSILE DEFENCE," Moscow, 7/16/01) and Reuters (Ron Popeski, "RUSSIA, CHINA REVIVE FRIENDSHIP, SUPPORT ABM," Moscow, 7/16/01) reported that PRC President Jiang Zemin and Russian President Vladimir Putin signed the first friendship treaty between the two countries for half a century. Putin told journalists after the talks, "In our opinion this agreement opens up a new level of cooperation between our two countries." He added, "Of course this agreement most of all touches our two nations, but we presume this document will form the basis for stability in international relations as a whole." In their joint statement, Jiang and Putin underlined that the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) treaty plans was a "cornerstone of strategic stability, and the "foundation for the reduction of strategic offensive weapons." They added that it was essential to prevent an arms race developing in space. Both countries also condemned the weekend test of the US missile defense system over the Pacific Ocean.

Agence France Presse ("SUMMARY OF NEW SINO-RUSSIA FRIENDSHIP TREATY," Moscow, 7/16/01) reported that the 25-point Good Neighborly Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation signed by Russia and the PRC must still be ratified by the two countries' parliaments to go into effect. The following are excerpts from the document. On security cooperation: "The two sides agree not to use force, or threaten to use force, nor to use economic or other forms of pressure against one another, and agree to solve joint disputes exclusively through peaceful means. The two sides confirm their commitment not to use, or aim, nuclear weapons against one another." On Taiwan and territorial integrity: "The Russian side supports the Chinese political position on questions concerning the territorial and national integrity of the People's Republic of China. The Chinese side supports the politics of Russia on questions concerning its defense of the national unity and territorial integrity of the Russian Federation. The Russian side confirms that its position concerning the question of Taiwan remains unchanged. The Russian side believes that there is only one China, and that the People's Republic of China is the only legitimate government that represents all of China, and that Taiwan is an inalienable part of China. The Russian side speaks out against the independence of Taiwan in any form." On the Sino-Russian border: "The two signatories agree to continue negotiations to resolve questions concerning the disputed portions of the Sino-Russian border." On global stability: "The military and military-technological cooperation between the two sides is not directed against any third party. The agreed sides support global strategic balance and stability, and unequivocally back treaties that support strategic stability. The two sides also support measure to speed up nuclear and chemical arms disarmament."

## **3. Submarine Sales to Taiwan**

The Los Angeles Times (Jim Mann, "U.S. PROMISED SUBS TO TAIWAN IT DOESN'T HAVE," Washington, 7/15/01) reported that the US has still not found a supplier for the eight diesel submarines promised to Taiwan in April. Jonathan Pollack, chairman of strategic research at the U.S. Naval War College, said, "I don't get any sense at all that in making this decision the administration gamed it out in advance." Mary Ellen Countryman, the White House spokeswoman for national security affairs, said on July 13, "The Department of Defense is looking at several different options." Former US Ambassador to the PRC James Lilley, who served in the first Bush administration, said, "My sense is that they [the Bush administration] thought that there was a chance the Dutch or the Germans might go along. Or that maybe we could do it on our own. Or if that didn't work, maybe the

problem would disappear." Damon Bristow, an Asian defense specialist at the Royal United Services Institute in London, said, "I have my doubts those submarines will ever be delivered." [Ed. note: This article was included in the US Department of Defense's Early Bird news service for July 16, 2001.]

#### **4. US Bases on Okinawa**

Pacific Stars and Stripes (Mark Oliva and Chiyomi Sumida, "US SUPPORTS MORE COURTESY PATROLS, BUT NOT CURFEWS ON OKINAWA," Chatan, 7/15/01) reported that the US military on Okinawa agreed on July 13 to step up military courtesy patrols in the island's entertainment districts. The decision to increase military presence in the area was reached by the Joint Working Team, a group of local Okinawa elected officials, local business owners and US military representatives. A spokesman said the Joint Working Team discussed other measures to curb troop behavior off base, such as a curfew, but only agreed on the issue of patrols. The spokesman said that US military leaders rebuffed requests for imposing a curfew. [Ed. note: This article was included in the US Department of Defense's Early Bird news service for July 16, 2001.]

#### **5. US-Philippines Military Relationship**

Philippine Star (Paolo Romero, "US SEEKS RETURN OF TROOPS TO RP BUT NOT OF BASES," 7/14/01) reported that according to the US commander-in-chief of the Pacific Command (CINCPAC), Adm. Dennis Blair, the US is seeking a return of its troops in the Philippines because of new regional security threats, but without permanent bases. Blair told a news conference after a meeting with Armed Forces chief General Diomedio Villanueva, "We are not looking for the re-establishment of US bases in the Philippines where you have US forces." The two met at Camp Aguinaldo for the 43rd meeting of the Mutual Defense Board, the coordinating agency for the 50-year-old RP-US Mutual Defense Treaty. Blair said, "What we are looking for are flexible arrangements so we can work together on the challenges of the future. This has got to do primarily with being able to operate together quickly, share intelligence so that we have the same picture of the environment and the operation and for realistic exercises." The US remains interested in forging a new arrangement with Manila to allow its aircraft and warships to be serviced or repaired at the Subic Bay Freeport in Zambales and Clark Field in Pampanga - both former US military facilities. Villanueva said the region faces new security threats, such as drug trafficking, terrorism, ethnic conflicts, separatism and natural disasters forcing the two traditional allies to rethink the security agreements. He said the armed forces of both countries are also now more frequently tapped to engage in non-traditional military roles, such as peacekeeping. [Ed. note: This article was included in the US Department of Defense's Early Bird news service for July 16, 2001.]

## **II. Republic of Korea**

### **1. US Bases in ROK**

The Korea Times (Soh Ji-young, "JOINT CIVIC BODY FOR USFK ISSUES TO BE ESTABLISHED LATE JULY," 7/16/01) reported that a unified body of ROK civic groups devoted to tackling US Forces in Korea (USFK)-related issues will be launched on July 28. The participating civil organizations include the National Action Committee for the Closure of the Maehyang-ri US Armed Forces International Bombing Range, and the Civilian Gathering for Regaining the Territorial Rights of US Military Bases. An official of the People's Action for Reform of the Unjust SOFA said on July 15, "Civic groups felt the need to deal more systematically with problems related to U.S. military personnel ahead of U.S.

President Bush's visit in October." [Ed. note: This article was included in the US Department of Defense's Early Bird news service for July 16, 2001.]

The NAPSNet Daily Report aims to serve as a forum for dialogue and exchange among peace and security specialists. Conventions for readers and a list of acronyms and abbreviations are available to all recipients. For descriptions of the world wide web sites used to gather information for this report, or for more information on web sites with related information, see the collection of [other NAPSNet resources](#).

We invite you to reply to today's report, and we welcome commentary or papers for distribution to the network.

Produced by [the Nautilus Institute for Security and Sustainable Development](#) in partnership with:  
International Policy Studies Institute Seoul, Republic of Korea  
Center for American Studies,  
[Fudan University](#), Shanghai, People's Republic of China  
[Monash Asia Institute](#),  
[Monash University](#), Clayton, Australia

Gee Gee Wong: [napsnet@nautilus.org](mailto:napsnet@nautilus.org)  
Berkeley, California, United States

Timothy L. Savage: [napsnet@nautilus.org](mailto:napsnet@nautilus.org)  
Berkeley, California, United States

Robert Brown: [napsnet@nautilus.org](mailto:napsnet@nautilus.org)  
Berkeley, California, United States

Kim Hee-sun: [khs688@hotmail.com](mailto:khs688@hotmail.com)  
Seoul, Republic of Korea

Hiroyasu Akutsu: [akutsu@glocomnet.or.jp](mailto:akutsu@glocomnet.or.jp)  
Tokyo, Japan

Peter Razvin: [icipu@glas.apc.org](mailto:icipu@glas.apc.org)  
Moscow, Russian Federation

Yunxia Cao: [yule111@sina.com](mailto:yule111@sina.com)  
Shanghai, People's Republic of China

Dingli Shen: [dlshen@fudan.ac.cn](mailto:dlshen@fudan.ac.cn)  
Shanghai, People's Republic of China

John McKay: [John.McKay@adm.monash.edu.au](mailto:John.McKay@adm.monash.edu.au)  
Clayton, Australia

---

View this online at: <https://nautilus.org/napsnet/napsnet-daily-report/napsnet-daily-report-1-july-2001/>

Nautilus Institute

608 San Miguel Ave., Berkeley, CA 94707-1535 | Phone: (510) 423-0372 | Email:

[nautilus@nautilus.org](mailto:nautilus@nautilus.org)