

# NAPSNet Daily Report 27 January, 1999

---

## Recommended Citation

"NAPSNet Daily Report 27 January, 1999", NAPSNet Daily Report, January 27, 1999,  
<https://nautilus.org/napsnet/napsnet-daily-report/napsnet-daily-report-27-january-1999/>

---

## IN TODAY'S REPORT:

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

- [1. Agreed Framework](#)
- [2. DPRK Underground Construction](#)
- [3. DPRK Missile Development](#)
- [4. Alleged Technology Transfers to PRC](#)
- [5. Taiwan Participation in Theater Missile Defense](#)
- [6. US Missile Defense](#)
- [7. South Asian Nuclear Weapons](#)

### [II. Republic of Korea](#)

- [1. DPRK Underground Construction](#)
- [2. DPRK Views of US Missile Defense](#)
- [3. Fund-raising for DPRK](#)
- [4. Aid to DPRK](#)
- [5. ROK-Japan Fisheries Talks](#)

### [III. Announcements](#)

- [1. Job Opportunity](#)

## **I. United States**

### **1. Agreed Framework**

The Washington Times (Ben Barber, "CLINTON HARDENED POSITION ON NORTH KOREA TO APPEASE CONSERVATIVES," 01/27/99, 11) reported that Robert Gallucci, the former State Department official who negotiated the 1994 Agreed Framework with the DPRK, said that the Clinton administration reneged on its offer to lift trade sanctions against the DPRK because it feared criticism from conservatives in Congress and the media. Gallucci, currently dean of the School of

Foreign Service at Georgetown University, added that the Kim Young-sam government in the ROK also opposed trading with the DPRK. Gallucci stated, "We met the minimum on the embargo because, while we might have wished to be positively regarded in Pyongyang, we did not wish to be negatively regarded in Seoul or at home. We had the perception that both the press and the Congress had an awful lot of skepticism about the Agreed Framework. Putting in gratuitous benefits in the first few months of the deal in order to win the confidence of the North would seem like we were not addressing the political vulnerabilities of the agreement and make it harder to defend over time.... What happened after the Republicans took control of the Congress is that it was harder than before to get congressional support for funding for KEDO (Korean Energy Development Organization) and its activities." Gallucci said, however, that the letter of the accord was fulfilled and the economic embargo was "reduced," even if it was by the minimum amount. He noted that the DPRK also has offered minimal compliance on its commitment in the agreement to engage the ROK "in serious discussions aimed at resolving tensions on the peninsula." Deanna Okun, an aide to Senator Frank Murkowski, R-Alaska, stated, "It would have led to congressional criticism if trade opened with North Korea." She added, "Senator Murkowski was critical of the Agreed Framework, which left open the possibility there could be a significant opening." However, Clinton administration officials "then came and told us they were not going to do it quickly. They were talking very small steps, and it appeased Murkowski. They said, 'We are not opening up the candy store.'" [Ed. note: This article appeared in the US Department of Defense's Early Bird news service for January 27.]

## **2. DPRK Underground Construction**

The Washington Times (Bill Gertz, "U.S. SUSPECTS N. KOREA BUILDING NUCLEAR REACTOR," 01/27/99, 4) reported that White House National Security Adviser Samuel R. Berger said Tuesday that the US suspects that the DPRK is building a graphite nuclear reactor similar to the ones frozen at Yongbyon. Berger stated, "Under paragraph four of the Agreed Framework, the North Koreans agreed not build other graphite reactors and we need to satisfy ourselves that that is not happening." Berger said that the underground construction at Kumchangri "gives us concerns and raises suspicions." He added, "I think we need to satisfy ourselves that that is not a nuclear-related site and it is not leading to a violation of the Agreed Framework." He said, however, that the DPRK has halted work on several nuclear reactors at Yongbyon and stopped work on a related reprocessing facility. Berger said that, before there are any changes in US policy toward the DPRK, "I think we have to have some satisfaction with respect to this nuclear site and I think we're going to insist on that." [Ed. note: This article appeared in the US Department of Defense's Early Bird news service for January 27.]

## **3. DPRK Missile Development**

US Defense Department Spokesman Ken Bacon ("PENTAGON SPOKESMAN'S REGULAR BRIEFING, JANUARY 26," 01/26/99) said that Central Intelligence Agency official Robert Walpole's recent remarks on the DPRK's missile threat to the continental US referred to the Taepodong II missile, which has not been tested yet. Bacon stated, "The fear we have about North Korea is that it's working on such a missile. Without getting into specifics, our fear is primarily of the future, not of today." He added, "North Korea does have a significant missile capability, and our primary response to a missile capability is called deterrence. It's served us well for nearly 50 years, and we continue to maintain a very, very significant deterrence." He concluded, "I don't anticipate North Korea is going to fire missiles any place.... It's something we have to worry about in theory, but I don't think we're worrying about it in fact right now. We don't anticipate that."

#### **4. Alleged Technology Transfers to PRC**

The Washington Times (Bill Gertz, "ISRAEL SUSPECTED OF TRANSFERRING U.S. LASER WEAPON DATA TO CHINA," 01/27/99, 1) reported that anonymous US officials said that the Defense Intelligence Agency suspects that Israel shared with the PRC restricted US weapons technology obtained during a joint US-Israeli effort to build a battlefield laser gun. The officials said that DIA suspicions are based on reports from US contractor employees in Israel who spotted Chinese technicians working secretly with one of the Israeli companies involved in the laser weapon program, and also from a PRC official who knew details about it. Gary Milhollin, director of the Wisconsin Project on Nuclear Arms Control, stated, "If the Chinese are seeking this technology in Israel, it's another episode in their worldwide effort to purloin Western technology." [Ed. note: This article was one of the top stories in the US Department of Defense's Early Bird news service for January 27.]

#### **5. Taiwan Participation in Theater Missile Defense**

Jane's Defence Weekly (Bryan Bender, "USA IS LIKELY TO TREAD SLOWLY ON TAIWAN THEATRE MISSILE DEFENCE," Washington, 01/27/99) reported that US Marine Corps General Charles Bolden, deputy commander of US Forces Japan, said last week that he is against US-Taiwan cooperation on Theater Missile Defense (TMD) because it could cause unwanted friction in the US-PRC relationship. Speaking at the Armed Forces Communications and Electronics Association and US Naval Institute's annual conference and exhibition on January 21, Bolden said that US-Taiwan cooperation on TMD would not only be viewed as a direct threat to the PRC's claim to Taiwan, but would contradict the US "One China" policy. He added that the US must ensure that Japan does not transfer such technology to Taiwan. [Ed. note: This article appeared in the US Department of Defense's Early Bird news service for January 27.]

#### **6. US Missile Defense**

USA Today carried an opinion article by John Pike, director of space policy at the Federation of American Scientists ("ANTI-MISSILE SYSTEM WON'T WORK," 01/27/99, 12) which said that US President Bill Clinton's new missile defense plan will not work. The article stated, "Since [former US President Ronald] Reagan announced his Star Wars vision in 1983, the U.S. has expended more than \$60 billion on missile-defense research ... without producing a single usable weapon. This lavish expenditure has yielded a measly 15 flight tests of technology less sophisticated than needed for national missile defense. A grand total of two of these 15 tests actually succeeded in hitting the incoming missile, and every test since 1992 has failed." It concluded, "It is surely too soon to junk the ABM (Anti-Ballistic Missile) Treaty and risk throwing away other arms-control agreements that will reduce the number of potentially accident-prone Russian nuclear weapons." [Ed. note: This article appeared in the US Department of Defense's Early Bird news service for January 27.]

#### **7. South Asian Nuclear Weapons**

The United States Information Agency (William B. Reinckens, "INDERFURTH STRESSES PROGRESS IN US TALKS WITH INDIA, PAKISTAN," Washington, 01/26/99) reported that Karl F. Inderfurth, US Assistant Secretary of State for South Asian Affairs, said Tuesday that progress is being made in US talks with India and Pakistan on nuclear weapons. Inderfurth stated, "These are not make-or-break sessions." He added, "The Indian and Pakistani governments are approaching these important issues seriously and deliberately." However, Inderfurth stated that "the greatest

degree of restraint is urged" on both countries to refrain from testing missiles capable of carrying nuclear warheads. Inderfurth, along with Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbott and General Joe Ralston, Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, were scheduled to leave Wednesday for India and Pakistan.

## **II. Republic of Korea**

### **1. DPRK Underground Construction**

Chosun Ilbo ("RUSSIA WARNS US OVER DPRK INSPECTION," Seoul, 01/27/99) reported that Russian ambassador to the ROK Evgeny Affannasiev said in an interview on Wednesday that the US should not threaten the DPRK over the Kumchangri development and should seek a peaceful solution to the dispute. Commenting on the result of Foreign Minister Hong Soon-yong's visit to Moscow, Affannasiev said that ROK President Kim Dae-jung will visit Russia before the end of the year. In related news, the Yonhap News Agency reported that Roman Popkovic, head of the Russian Duma's Defense Committee, decisively opposed US pressure for an inspection of the suspected nuclear site in the DPRK.

### **2. DPRK Views of US Missile Defense**

JoongAng Ilbo ("DPRK DENOUNCES US FOR BUILDING NMD," Seoul, 01/27/99) reported that the DPRK insisted that US accusations that the DPRK's missile development poses a threat to the world is only a pretense to build a National Missile Defense (NMD) System. Regarding comments made by US Defense Secretary William Cohen that the NMD is urgently needed in order to protect US citizens both in and out of the US, the DPRK's state-run Pyongyang Broadcasting Company said on January 27, "It is only a quibble to reinforce the war scheme against us by way of deploying the NMD system, which is a Cold War strategy." Referring to the fact that the US raised the budget for the NMD project to US\$10.5 billion from US\$6.6 billion, the broadcast added, "The reason the US is still loudly insisting that our successful satellite launch was a missile launch is only to make an excuse to hurry up deploying its criminal NMD system."

### **3. Fund-raising for DPRK**

JoongAng Ilbo ("FUND RAISING FOR DPRK LEGALIZED," Seoul, 01/27/99) reported that the Seoul High Court ruled on January 27 that fund-raising for the DPRK was legal. The court in its ruling said, "It is well-known that DPRK children are suffering from malnutrition and various diseases. The fund-raising movement that seeks to help them is a form of international humanitarian relief." The Ministry of Government Administration and Home Affairs (MOGAHA) had prohibited civil-rights groups from raising funds for the DPRK by arguing that the ban was needed for a consistent policy approach towards the DPRK. Civilian organizations brought a lawsuit against the MOGAHA to the court. The victory gives groups the right to raise funds without any restrictions from this point forward. Lim Jong- chol, head of one organization said, "We will begin to raise funds to support DPRK children who are dying because they lack medical treatment."

### **4. Aid to DPRK**

Korea Times ("AID TO DPRK AMOUNTS TO US\$1.08 BILLION SINCE 1995," Seoul, 01/27/98) reported that the ROK and the international community have offered aid, including food and

medicine, totaling US\$1.08 billion to the DPRK since 1995, according to data revealed by the government on Tuesday. The Unification Education Institute, under the aegis of the Unification Ministry, reported that aid to the DPRK by ROK government and civil organizations accounted for US\$315.9 million during the period between June 1995 and the end of last year. International efforts provided aid worth US\$757 million during the same period, according to the report. Of the ROK's US\$315.9 million in aid, the government's portion, including 150,000 tons of rice sent in June 1995, amounted to US\$257.2 million, while that of the civil organizations marked US\$43.2 million. The international aid of US\$757 million breaks down to US\$419.8 million or 54.98 percent through the UN, US\$355.1 or 39.9 percent through individual countries and international non-governmental organizations, and US\$49.9 million or 5.3 percent through the Red Cross society, the report said.

## **5. ROK-Japan Fisheries Talks**

Chosun Ilbo ("DETAILED ROK-JAPAN FISHERIES TALKS STILL NEEDED," Seoul, 01/27/99) reported that the ROK government is moving ahead with a plan to convene a meeting between the ROK and Japanese fisheries ministers, with the aim of reaching a breakthrough in the currently deadlocked negotiations on fishing zones between the two countries. A high-ranking official at the Ministry of Maritime Affairs and Fisheries (MMAF) said Wednesday that working-level negotiations for a bilateral fisheries agreement between the two nations is urgent, with fishermen from both countries suffering as a result of the delay. With settlement of the details of the agreement yet to be made, both ROK and Japanese fishermen had to evacuate from the EEZ (exclusive economic zone) of the other country on Friday, when a general agreement took effect.

## **III. Announcements**

### **1. Job Opportunity**

The World Food Programme-DPRK has an opening for Head of Food Aid Liaison Unit (FALU). Under the general supervision of the Senior Program Manager of WFP-DPRK, the Head of FALU will manage the administration of the Food Aid Liaison Unit, including supervision of FALU staff, formulation of budgets and programs, participation in senior staff meetings, and responsibility for the coordination of FALU within the WFP country office. The Head of FALU also serves as a liaison with the relevant government agencies in the DPRK and with international NGOs. Qualified candidates should possess an advanced University Degree and/or equivalent experience, with emphasis in one or more of the following disciplines: health sciences, social sciences, international affairs, development studies, agriculture, economics, business administration, or a field relevant to international humanitarian assistance; at least 3 years post-graduate, progressively responsible job-related experience, preferably in a health-related field, or with non-governmental organizations or humanitarian agencies (international working experience in politically and culturally sensitive environments is an asset); working knowledge of English; and limited knowledge of another official WFP language (Russian, Chinese, Arabic, French, Portuguese, Spanish). Other desirable qualities include good analytical skills; resourcefulness, initiative, maturity of judgement, tact, negotiating skills; ability to communicate clearly both orally and in writing; ability to work in a team setting and establish effective working relationships with persons of different national and cultural backgrounds; ability to cope with stressful situations which may threaten health and safety; flexibility in accepting work assignments outside the framework of this job profile; demonstrated ability to develop and maintain effective work relationships with country counterparts, local staff, host population, donors, NGOs and other UN agencies; ability to establish priorities and to plan, coordinate and monitor own work plan and those under his/her supervision; and computer skills,

including word processing and spreadsheets. The position is available from July 1, 1999. The deadline for application is March 31, 1999. Only non-US citizens are encouraged to apply. All applications should be sent to: Victor Hsu, Convenor, FALU /WFP NGO Steering Committee, Room 616, Church World Service, National Council of Churches USA, 475 Riverside Drive, New York, NY, 10115-0050, USA; Tel. 1-212-870-2371; Fax 1-212-870-2064; E-mail: victor@nccusa.org

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  
[The Center for Global Communications](#), Tokyo, Japan  
[Center for American Studies](#),  
[Fudan University](#), Shanghai, People's Republic of China

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

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

Lee Dong-young: [UNPOL@netsgo.com](mailto:UNPOL@netsgo.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

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

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

---

View this online at: <https://nautilus.org/napsnet/napsnet-daily-report/napsnet-daily-report-27-january-1999/>

Nautilus Institute  
608 San Miguel Ave., Berkeley, CA 94707-1535 | Phone: (510) 423-0372 | Email:  
[nautilus@nautilus.org](mailto:nautilus@nautilus.org)