

NAPSNet Daily Report Friday, February 16, 2007

Recommended Citation

"NAPSNet Daily Report Friday, February 16, 2007", NAPSNet Daily Report, February 16, 2007, <https://nautilus.org/napsnet/napsnet-daily-report/napsnet-daily-report-friday-february-16-2007/>

NAPSNet Daily Report Friday, February 16, 2007

NAPSNet Daily Report Friday, February 16, 2007

Weekly ROK Report for Friday, February 16, 2007

- 1. [IT ALL DEPENDS ON THE U.S.- NORTH KOREA COMPROMISE](#)
- 2. [SIX PARTY TALK ENDED WITHOUT ABROGATING DPRK NUKE](#)
- 3. [THE NUCLEAR WEAPONS OF PAST, PRESENT, FUTURE MUST ALL BE ABROGATED](#)
- 4. [THE TRADE OFFS BETWEEN THE NORTH AND SOUTH BEFORE THE SIX PARTY TALKS](#)
- 5. [KOREAN PENINSULA STILL HAS A LONG WAY TO GO UNTIL DENUCLEARIZATION](#)
- 6. [SIX PARTY TALKS 'WELCOME' 2.13 AGREEMENT](#)
- 7. ['WHAT ABOUT THE PREEXISTENT WEAPONS?' IS MERE NITPICKING BY CONSERVATIVES](#)

[Preceding NAPSNet Report](#)

Weekly ROK Report for Friday, February 16, 2007

1. IT ALL DEPENDS ON THE U.S.- NORTH KOREA COMPROMISE

Joongang Ilbo ("IT ALL DEPENDS ON THE U.S.- NORTH KOREA COMPROMISE", 2007-02-15) wrote that the 2.13 agreement has a critical weak point. Because the agreement does not mention any reference to the nuclear weapons on which the U.S. based its actions toward the DPRK,

Pyongyang can always come up with other agreements asking for more compensation for the abrogation of nuclear weapons and the whole nuclear weapon programs. It must be kept in mind that the DPRK will not easily give up its weapons considering the fact that for it, maintaining its system is more important than its economy. The normalization of US-DPRK relation is crucial in achieving the goal of abrogation of DPRK nuclear weapons. South Korea must also focus on bettering the relation between the two.

[\(return to top\)](#)

2. SIX PARTY TALK ENDED WITHOUT ABROGATING DPRK NUKE

Joongang Ilbo editorial ("SIX PARTY TALK ENDED WITHOUT ABROGATING DPRK NUKE", 2007-0-14) wrote that, fortunately, regardless of the nuclear experiment last October, a compromise was made without the situation being worsened. However the fact that the agreement was made on the same basis as the Geneva Agreement, its weak point is that it leaves a possibility for another non-fulfillment by the DPRK. Also it did not mention about the elimination of the nuclear weapons. Because it is not confirmed whether the DPRK will give up its nuke or not, the possible agreement on "future nuclear activity" might even lead to approval of DPRK nuclear weapons. In succeeding agreements, the ROK government should focus on the "existing nuclear weapons" and connect the issue with aid to DPRK. The government should also keep in mind not to pay for all the compensation.

[\(return to top\)](#)

3. THE NUCLEAR WEAPONS OF PAST, PRESENT, FUTURE MUST ALL BE ABROGATED

Donga Ilbo editorial ("THE NUCLEAR WEAPONS OF PAST, PRESENT, FUTURE MUST ALL BE ABROGATED", 2007-02-13) said that although the agreement 'disabled' the facilities, the DPRK still has all the nuclear weapons and plutonium it already had. The compensation for the agreement is another problem. Giving the DPRK a "Peace Dividend" for an agreement that does not mention nuclear weapons of the past and present obviously arouses skepticism. Plans for other problems must be prepared on the hypothesis that nothing has changed.

[\(return to top\)](#)

4. THE TRADE OFFS BETWEEN THE NORTH AND SOUTH BEFORE THE SIX PARTY TALKS

Chosun Ilbo editorial ("THE TRADE OFFS BETWEEN THE NORTH AND SOUTH BEFORE THE SIX PARTY TALKS", 2007-02-15) said that the government is too anxious to make a hasty decision, while it would not take long to find out if the DPRK will keep its words. The vice-minister of the ministry of National Unification said "The participatory government should bring relations with DPRK to a lasting status within a year. In order for this energy to pass to the next regime, there are many agreements to be made." This implies that the government is planning on making a huge mess which no one can clean up. Not allowing the next regime to determine the relation with the North is nonsense. The government is overly eager to plan the next South-North talks. It is nonsense that the government is actually taking advantage of Korea's national disaster to win more votes. The

government should reveal what kind of trade-offs were made before the six party talks.

[\(return to top\)](#)

5. KOREAN PENINSULA STILL HAS A LONG WAY TO GO UNTIL DENUCLEARIZATION

Chosun Ilbo editorial ("KOREAN PENINSULA STILL HAS A LONG WAY TO GO UNTIL DENUCLEARIZATION", 2007-02-13) said that because there was no mention about nuclear weapons, there are conjectures made about DPRK accepting the agreement not really for the abrogation itself but rather ultimately to unfreeze the 24 million dollars deposited in Banco Delta Asia. Last month in Berlin, the US and DPRK agreed that if DPRK accepted the agreement on the disabling of the nuclear facilities in Young-byun, the US would loosen the BDA bank money in 30 days. The few nuclear weapons DPRK already has are enough to hold the ROK hostage. Unless the weapons, facilities, and nuclear materials are revealed and abrogated, the Korean Peninsula will not be safe.

[\(return to top\)](#)

6. SIX PARTY TALKS 'WELCOME' 2.13 AGREEMENT

Hankyoreh editorial ("SIX PARTY TALKS 'WELCOME' 2.13 AGREEMENT", 2007-02-16) said that the agreement is meaningful in that it is the very beginning and the very first pact for implementing the Sept. 19 declaration. It is realistically impossible for DPRK to continue further development of nuclear weapons after closing its facilities. If the peace treaty forum is added to the five "Working Groups": Anti-nuclearization of the Korean Peninsula, Economy-Energy Cooperation, Northeast Asia Peace-Security structure, Normalization of US-DPRK relations, and Normalization of DPRK-Japan relations, all the contents of the Sept. 19 declaration are included. The US-DPRK normalization is the most urgent one. The ROK, at this talk, had a leading role, actively arbitrating communications between US and the DPRK, and coordinating the different opinions of member nations regarding the period, division, and amount of support for the DPRK. It is time to focus on South-North relations for the progress of the talks.

[\(return to top\)](#)

7. 'WHAT ABOUT THE PREEXISTENT WEAPONS?' IS MERE NITPICKING BY CONSERVATIVES

Ohmynews ("WHAT ABOUT THE PREEXISTENT WEAPONS?' IS MERE NITPICKING BY CONSERVATIVES", 2007-02-14) said the criticism that there was no mention about preexistent weapons is not compelling. First, the Feb. 13 agreement is not designed to replace the Sept. 19 declaration but to implement it. The issues regarding the abrogation of the preexistent nuclear weapons must be slowly brought up. The conservatives are just picking on the government because they are not willing to accept the fact that the government has done something. The abrogation of nuclear weapons will be discussed when US-DPRK relations are fully normalized, which will take a while.

[\(return to top\)](#)

View this online at: <https://nautilus.org/napsnet/napsnet-daily-report/napsnet-daily-report-fiday-february-16-2007/>

Nautilus Institute

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

nautilus@nautilus.org