NAPSNet Daily Report Monday, March 07, 2005

Recommended Citation

"NAPSNet Daily Report Monday, March 07, 2005", NAPSNet Daily Report, March 07, 2005, https://nautilus.org/napsnet/napsnet-daily-report/napsnet-daily-report-monday-march-07-2005/

NAPSNet Daily Report Monday, March 07, 2005

NAPSNet Daily Report Monday, March 07, 2005

I. NAPSNet Addendum

- 1. DPRK Issues Rare Foreign Ministry 'Memorandum' on 6-Party Talks

Preceding NAPSNet Report

I. NAPSNet Addendum

1. DPRK Issues Rare Foreign Ministry 'Memorandum' on 6-Party

We bring you a DPRK Foreign Ministry Memorandum [choso'nminjujuu'igonghwaguk oemuso'ng pimangnok]: The United States Will Pay a Due Price for Rupturing the Resolution of the Nuclear Issue Between the DPRK and the United States. DPRK Foreign Ministry Memorandum:

Currently, the international community is more highly raising voices of support and solidarity for the just self-defensive measure [cho'ngdanghan chawijo'k choch'i] we have taken with regard to the DPRK-US nuclear issue and our principled stance related to the six-party talks.

To the contrary, however, the United States is claiming that we must come to the six-party talks

without preconditions, thereby disregarding [oemyo'n] our just demand. Some servile follower forces [ch'ujong seryo'ktu'l] are continuously spreading a series of impure rumors that our response was too hardline even though the United States showed a mild attitude, that we violated international duties, and that pressure must be applied for the resumption of the six-party talks.

It is thoroughly because of the United States that the six-party talks still have not resumed and the resolution of the DPRK-US nuclear issue is being delayed. The DPRK Foreign Ministry issues a memorandum to clearly explain why we are saying that we will attend the talks only if the grounds and conditions for participating in the six-party talks are met [yukchahoedam ch'amga myo'ngbungwa chogo'ni maryo'ndoeo'ya].

1 We do not have any grounds whatsoever [ku'o'tto'n myo'ngbun] to sit face to face with the United States, whether it is at the six-party talks or DPRK-US bilateral talks. The DPRK-US nuclear issue is a product of the Bush administration's extreme hostile policy [ku'ktanhan cho'ktaesi cho'ngch'aek], and the basic key to its resolution lies in the United States changing its hostile policy to a policy of peaceful DPRK-US coexistence.

As it did during the first term, the second-term Bush administration established it as a policy not to coexist with us and overthrow the system chosen by our people, thus completely eliminating the grounds for us to participate in the six-party talks.

Verbally, the Bush administration is saying that it does not antagonize [cho'ktaesi] us and that it does not have the intention of invading. In reality, however, it has set the ultimate goal of overthrowing our system and in order to realize it, it is obstinately clinging to double-faced artifice, which is a combination of hard line and appeasement [kanggyo'nggwa yuhwa].

All this was clearly shown during the second-term Bush administration's policy-making process. Bush, who made a speech during the second-term presidential inaugural ceremony on 20 January, announced that an end to tyranny [p'ogap cho'ngch'i] in our world was the ultimate goal and declared that the United States will spread US-style freedom and democracy to the entire world and that, if necessary, it will not exclude the exercise of military force to that end.

Also, during the State of the Union Address on 2 February, Bush once again stressed an end to tyranny. Without mentioning anything about the six-party talks or the peaceful resolution of the nuclear issue, he declared that the United States will make us abandon our ambition for nuclear weapons.

As for whom his remarks on ending tyranny were indeed targeted at, Secretary of State Rice made that clear during the Senate confirmation hearing at US Congress on 18 January, two days before the presidential inaugural speech. Rice singled out our country as an outpost of tyranny, together with a series of countries that mostly have strong anti-US and pro-independence inclinations, such as Cuba, Iran, and Belarus. She then asserted that the United States is on the side of the people under tyranny and that it will spread US-style freedom and democracy and urge North Korea to abandon its ambition for nuclear weapons.

Some quarters have made poor excuses concerning this, such as that Bush did not flatly single out the DPRK as a country of tyranny, that Rice only spoke in her individual capacity, and that they hoped we would consider her speech within the overall context.

Then, is a policy statement by a US secretary of state indeed a personal remark, and did Bush not define us as an object of tyranny? Bush already clearly termed us an outpost of tyranny during his first term. On 6 November 2003, at the so-called 20th founding anniversary of the US National

Endowment for Democracy, he babbled that commitment to US-style democracy was being tested in Cuba, Myanmar, North Korea, and Zimbabwe, the outposts of oppression [p'ogap].

The United States' true intention in that it will never peacefully coexist with us and that it will pursue overthrowing of our system through disarmament is deeply rooted and has not changed even once. We cannot find anywhere in the remarks recently made by the United States' official figures the expression of coexistence with us [DPRK] or change in the hostile policy.

Regarding the Bush group's theory on expanding freedom, currently, the world's people assess it as a paradox creating a commotion in the world and as an evil remark pushing the world toward a new war. In addition, regarding the tune [t'aryo'ng] about US-style freedom and democracy, US allies are even expressing ridicule and denunciation saying: where indeed is the tyranny that the United States is talking about; the United States is babbling about an outpost of tyranny while counting only a series of anti-US countries that get on their nerves; and that the United States is describing themselves as the master of this planet.

In reality, we have endured as much as we could and showed as much magnanimity as we could during the past four years since the Bush administration came into power. However, the United States consistently carried out hostile policy while recklessly ignoring us -- the other party to dialogue -- in that they cannot coexist with us ideologically, which stems from a sense of constitutional rejection.

It is a well known fact that right after Bush was inaugurated as the President, it suspended all dialogues and negotiations that the former administration had been pursuing with us. Also, in the State of the Union address announced in late January 2002, it designated our country as [a part of] the axis of evil and in March of that year, it put our country on the list as a target of its preemptive nuclear attack.

Instead of taking back the remark of the axis of evil that he [Bush] made, this time, he went further than this remark by saying that the regime that our people elected is an outpost of tyranny and that it is a subject that should be eliminated to the end. As such, under what justification can we sit face to face and hold talks with the United States that denied national sovereignty itself?

The United States itself lost the justification to sit face to face with us due to the wrongdoing it committed. We are under belligerent relations, technically under a state of war with the United States [urinun migukkwa kyojo'ngwangye, kisulcho'guronun cho'njaengsangt'aee noyoitta].

Therefore, it is very natural that we made nuclear weapons and is making them in self-defense to stand up to the Bush administration's policy designed to launch a preemptive strike against us by wielding nuclear weapons [kuromuro haengmugirul hwidurumyo urirul sonjet'agyokhagettanun puswi haengjongburui chongch'aekgidoe matso chongdangbangwirul wihae uriga haengmugirul mandurokko tto mandunungosun nomunado ungdanghangosida].

To cope with the United States' policy to oppress us with nuclear weapons, we withdrew from the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty on 10 January 2003 for self-defense and legitimately made nuclear weapons outside the scope of the international treaty. Whenever we took self-defensive measures to cope with the United States' increasing policy to isolate and oppress us, we made it public to the world each time and transparently provided nuclear deterrent while notifying it to the US side each time.

We do not receive any restraint from international treaty or any international law as far as the missile issue is concerned. Some babble as if our measure on the missile launch still remains valid.

In September 1999, during the former US administration period, we already announced the moratorium on the missile launch while dialogue was under way, but in 2001 when the Bush administration took power, dialogue between the DPRK and the United States was completely suspended. Therefore, we are not bound to the moratorium on the missile launch at present.

As everyone knows, it is none other than the United States' hostile policy toward the DPRK that makes us strengthen our self-defensive nuclear arsenal. [chujihanu'n pawa kach'i uriro hagyo'gu'm chawijo'k haengmugigoru'l kanghwahadorok tto'milgoinnu'n ko'su'n paro migugu'i taejoso'n cho'ktaesi cho'ngch'aegida] Not only the US public but also the international public in general are raising voices of criticism, focusing on the fact that the Bush administration's tyranny remarks on and hostile policy toward the DPRK indeed resulted in the rupture of the six-party talks.

During an interview with the 12 September edition of the US daily New York Times, Senator Kerry, who was a presidential candidate for the Democratic Party in the 2004 US presidential election, openly denounced the Bush administration by saying that after it [Bush administration] took power, it refused to directly deal with North Korea, thus creating a nuclear nightmare.

In its 22 February 2005 commentary, the Foreign Policy in Focus, the organ of the US Institute for International Policy Studies, exposed that from the outset of his office, Bush dealt with North Korea very roughly militarily and diplomatically, thus making North Korea a country that possesses nuclear [weapons].

In its editorial on 11 February 2005, the US daily New York Times rightfully criticized the Bush administration by saying: [The reason for] North Korea's declaration on possession of nuclear [weapons] lies in that the Bush administration made a mistake in the process of pushing North Korea to isolation. Until now, Bush administration's response to North Korea has been irrational, and thus, there must be a fundamental change in future approaches.

Even until today, the United States tries to pretend as if they [the United States] are not carrying out hostile policy by repeating empty talk that they do not have anything hostile against us or any intention to attack us. What can be more hostile than condemning our system, which the people chose, as tyranny and trying to eliminate it to the end?

By nature, [the remark that] there is no intention to attack is only a shameless remark that can only be said by the United States which has not hesitated to overturn and attack another country's regime; and such a violent remark does not mean abandoning of hostile policy.

Thus, in its 22 February 2005 editorial, the US daily Washington Post revealed that, although a breakthrough in resolving the nuclear issue can be opened if the three words -- no hostile intention -- are relayed to the Pyongyang Government, Bush and Rice have never used such an expression; and emphasized that whether or not [the United States] changes its hostile policy is essential [kibon].

Unless the United States has the political intention to change its policy and coexist with us, the nuclear issue can never be resolved. During the past four years since the Bush administration came into power, we have endured as much as we can and showed maximum generosity [aryang] in order to resolve the nuclear issue and improve DPRK-US relations.

The United States must naturally apologize for and take back the end-of-the-tyranny remark, give up the hostile policy aimed at overturning our system, clearly reveal the political will to come to peaceful coexistence, and show this through action.

We can sit face to face with the United States and hold talks only when the United States prepares

the conditions and just cause for holding talks. Showing up at the talks just because the party that completely negates [cho'nmyo'n pujo'ng] us and is trying to overthrow us is telling us to come is something that only a fool [mo'jo'ri] would do.

2 The United States must prepare the conditions and atmosphere for holding the talks by restoring the groundwork of the six-party talks as soon as possible.

Thanks to our sincere and patient effort to realize the denuclearization of the Korean peninsula, the words-for-words and action-for-action principle as well as the freeze-for-reward principle, which is the first-phase measure for resolving the nuclear issue, were agreed upon at the third round of six-party talks held in June 2004. In addition, a common perception that the United States must make a switchover in its hostile policy against us was formed. Such agreement and common perception are the fundamentals for advancing the six-party talks.

At the third round of six-party talks, the US delegation reluctantly agreed upon these principles due to the public opinion in and outside the country and could not help but make a promise, though only verbally [mallonama], that it will not be hostile to us.

On 24 June 2004, Assistant Secretary [of State] Kelly said he will evaluate and seriously examine the DPRK side's freeze-for-reword proposal. At the contact with our foreign minister during the ministerial meeting of the ASEAN Regional Forum held in Jakarta, Indonesia on 2 July 2004, State Secretary Powell said that the United States is prepared to abide by the words-for-words and action-for-action principle and results-for-results principle and promised to seriously examine the DPRK's freeze-for-reward proposal.

However, the United States completely destroyed the groundwork for the talks by overturning all these agreements and common perception not even one month after the talks ended.

The second-term Bush administration is babbling about the so-called resumption of the six-party talks without preconditions while disregarding our demand for restoring the groundwork of the six-party talks, although it has destroyed all the groundwork during its first term.

During the US Senate hearing on 15 July 2004, US Assistant Secretary of State Kelly who was head of the US side to the six-party talks stated that the forward-looking proposal made by the United States during the third round of six-party talks is a proposal envisaging a reward to be offered to the DPRK only after it completely abolishes first all the nuclear programs and that even if its nuclear renunciation [haekp'ogi] is realized, it will not lead to normalization of relations soon, and therefore, all other problems, such as missiles, conventional arms, and human rights, should be resolved at the same time. So he insisted on the United States' call for [DPRK's] nuclear renunciation first. As such, he denied the words-for-words and action-for-action principle. He went so far as to say in public that the United States has no intention of negotiating with North Koreans.

Compensation to North Korea cannot be allowed and the United States will not offer any reward to North Korea in any way. Thus, he comprehensively refused even the reward for freeze proposal. US Undersecretary of State Bolton who visited Seoul on 21 July, a week after Assistant Secretary Kelly's public statement, said that the United States does not trust [DPRK's] nuclear freeze plan. Unless the condition of Washington's demand for complete renunciation of nuclear programs is accomplished, there will be no reward for Pyongyang. Moreover, during a press conference in Tokyo on 23 July, he raved that North Korea must renounce its nuclear program in a Libyan style.

The US secretary of state also said during several press conferences that the United States hopes Pyongyang to follow the Libyan style and called for [DPRK's] nuclear renunciation first. On the other

hand, US Deputy Secretary of State Armitage presented a feverish remark that if the United States makes an affirmative gesture toward North Korea even in a symbolic way, it would be taken as an erroneous signal toward North Korea that compensation will be given even for a delinquent act [pullyang haengwi].

The United States' behavior and conduct that showed clear discrepancy within and outside the talks venue stunned the world's people. The second-term Bush administration kept reiterating its call for nuclear renunciation first through the complete, verifiable, and irreversible dismantlement of nuclear program [CVID], and failed to take any steps showing credible sincerity for providing conditions for the talks.

On 22 February of 2005, the US State Department spokesman said that while the five parties are considering that the conditions for the talks have become ripe, only North Korea claims that the conditions were not created. In the meantime, in a press conference on 3 February 2005, US Secretary of State Rice stressed that all nations participating in the six-party talks should tell the North Koreans at the talks to make a strategic option for dismantling the nuclear program in a verifiable and irreversible manner.

On the same day, the US State Department spokesman said that the proposal put forward by the United States during the third round of six-party talks is valid and it is now time for North Korea to return to the talks venue in order to discuss it.

The so-called proposal made by the United States at the third round of talks is in fact a nuclear renunciation-first assertion merely camouflaged as a forward-looking proposal that failed to reflect the words-for-words and action-for-action principle, which even the United States has accepted. In particular, it did not mention even a word about the public pledge on abandonment of the United States' hostile policy [toward the DPRK]. As this was the case, we turned down the proposal, considering it not worth even a notice, through the statement of Foreign Ministry spokesman on 24 July 2004. After this, we officially notified the US side of our position through the New York DPRK-US contact on 11 August 2004.

The Bush administration reiterated at the third round of six-party talks that it does not pursue a hostile line against us. But, as soon as it turned around, it perpetrated more viciously and without hesitation the hostile acts aimed at overthrowing our system. On 21 July 2004, not even less than a month since the third round of six-party talks ended, US Congress passed the so-called North Korean Human Rights Act and legislated the act of financially and materially ensuring system overthrow.

According to the North Korean Human Rights Act, US Congress allocated two million US dollars each year for shoving small radios into our inner circles and for extending the broadcasting hours of Voice of Free Asia to 12 hours. In addition to this, US Congress is to allot $24 million from the funds each year for individuals and organizations supporting the liberalization wind and improvement of human rights.

On 21 October, the White House spokesman officially stated that the North Korean Human Rights Act which President Bush signed will focus on those who escape from the North Korean regime. Regarding the essence of the North Korean Human Rights Act, the Voice of America laid bare that from the standpoint of the United States which is allowed to use each year for the first time the government's official budget with the maximum value of $24 million, the significance can be found in that a framework is now provided to press the North Korean regime from the two flanks of nuclear and human rights issues and that the North Korean Human Rights Act is a strategy aimed at North Korea's system collapse [ch'eje punggoe] under the pretext of protecting the North Korean escapees.

In an open questionnaire sent to the French Foreign Minister on 15 February 2005, George Hahz, member of the Foreign Affairs Committee in the French Chamber of Deputies frankly pointed out that viewing the DPRK issue, he comes to note that the DPRK's sovereignty has constantly been trampled underfoot and that US Congress passed the bill on expending $24 million each year to bring down the Pyongyang government.

Furthermore, during the working-level talks of the member states of the Proliferation Security Initiative (PSI) held in Norway in early August 2004 when the United States was preparing for the fourth round of six-party talks, the United States decided to stage a naval blockade training in the sea off Japan from 26 to 27 October, and did not conceal that this training was aimed at the DPRK. Upon arrival in Tokyo on 23 October, three days before the beginning of this training, the US secretary of state openly stated that the PSI training is the expression of concerns about North Korea by the international community and is the training intended to block delinquent acts.

Following this, on the day of training, US Undersecretary of State Bolton, even boarding a combat ship, let loose a spate of jargon that North Korea's threat is clear, the training is an effective means for enterprises, which can be tempted to do trade business with nations involved in weapons proliferation including North Korea, to give up such idea, and that the training is of great significance as it is staged for the first time in the Northern Pacific. As such, he openly said that the PSI training is precisely aimed at the DPRK.

The United States' maneuvers for military threat have not ceased at this point. On 29 June 2004, immediately after the third round of six-party talks, the US Defense Department announced that three squadrons of US Air Force F-117 Stealth fighter-bombers will be deployed into South Korea within three months, and began their deployment. Moreover, it officially announced that two Aegis destroyers equipped with a state-of-the-art missile system will be deployed in the East Sea of Korea [Sea of Japan] on a permanent basis, and began their deployment for actual war.

With the beginning of the year 2004, the Bush administration, which already listed the DPRK as the target of its preemptive nuclear attack, opened to the public a new Operations Plan-5026 and Operations Plan 5027-04 it has mapped out, and stepped up South Korea's arms buildup.

In May 2003, the United States announced the arms buildup plan envisaging $11 billion to be invested in South Korea, and in the middle of 2004, the United States increased the amount of funds to $13 billion under the pretext of combat power redeployment, and began to massively supply ultramodern war equipment.

What is even more serious is that the United States announced it will first supply the US forces occupying South Korea with new type of underground-penetrating missiles which are designed to destroy our underground facilities. Regarding this, the 12 July 2004 edition of Defense News, the US weekly specialized in military affairs, laid bare that the United States decided to deploy six Bunker-Buster underground-penetrating missiles by the end of 2005.

The Bush administration has continued to adhere to a psychological smear campaign while constantly hurling abuses at its dialogue partner and finding fault with us in every way. The United States prepares and announces a so-called report every year to find fault with us, while talking about non-existent drug and human trafficking and religious suppression like a Buddhist monk who never stops chanting a prayer, and it is pouring cold water on the atmosphere of dialogue now by inventing even a rumor about the transfer of nuclear substances.

Many times, the United States has spread such fabricated information as that we secretly sold uranium hexafluoride and fluoric gas to Iran, that we are attempting to hand over to it a special

electric motor to be used at a nuclear power plant, and that we had transferred nuclear substances to Libya via Pakistan.

This cannot but be an attempt to tarnish our image and to create an atmosphere of applying international pressure on us by branding us by all means as one that proliferates nuclear weapons. In nuclear field, we have had absolutely no dealings with either Iran or Libya or with any other country.

Major US media, too, fully brought to light the dishonest US attempt by reporting that the US inspectors admitted that there was no way of revealing the source of the contents of the Libya's nuclear container, which were believed to be from North Korea, for there was no sample of North Korea's nuclear substances, and that the US experts expressed suspicions by saying that it was difficult to draw a definite conclusion, for the analysis of the samples of uranium hexafluoride was different from the examination of deoxyribonucleic acid.

In this way, while continuing to escalate the political and diplomatic pressure and military threat toward us, the United States is pressing a boundlessly shameless demand that we should immediately come to the table of the six-party talks, for conditions are ripe. This reminds people of the gunboat diplomacy pursued by big countries to occupy smaller countries in the past 18th and 19th centuries.

The idea that, if such a military pressure is applied, we would come to the table of the talks and would give in itself is endlessly foolish. All these acts committed by the United States are clearly the explicit expressions of the hostile policy toward us. Our demand that the United States drop its hostile policy [toward us] and restore the basis of the talks is not a precondition by any means.

Have conditions for the talks arisen of their own accord only with the passage of time, when the Bush administration has taken absolutely no action or measure to restore the basis for the third round of the six-party talks? And, how nonsensical it is to say that conditions are provided for the talks, when the ideology, system, and our own style of freedom and democracy adopted by our people are completely rejected and when the antagonistic acts aimed at overthrowing [our] system are committed even more blatantly?

All the facts show starkly that, from the beginning, the United States has had no interest in resolving the DPRK-US nuclear issue at the six-party talks, but it is pursuing the objective of creating an environment to apply a phased pressure on us and to isolate and blockade us only by gaining time by carrying on the talks in a wishy-bry manner without seeking any results.

Gallucci, who was the special envoy for negotiations with the DPRK during the former US administration, criticized [the Bush administration] in his interview with Kyodo News on 18 June 2004 that the Bush administration was seeking a change in the North Korea's system as a goal, and thus, it had no desire for full-fledged negotiations.

In a special article carried in its 22 February 2005 issue, the Foreign Policy in Focus, the organ of the US Institute for International Policy Studies, brought to light that Bush had pursued the six-party talks with the replacement of the Pyongyang regime as an end of the line, while openly talking about the world without the Pyongyang regime, and that this was precisely a strategy pursued by Bush.

The sinister objective pursued by the United States can also be clearly realized by the fact that, while it is tenaciously latching onto our nonexistent uranium enrichment program, it is so stubbornly defending South Korea's secret nuclear activities, which have been systematically conducted under its connivance. As for uranium enrichment program, we do not have such a program.

It is nothing more than sleight of hand aimed at shirking responsibility that the United States talks about resolving the nuclear issue in a peaceful manner through dialogue and about the resumption of the talks without any sincerity and efforts to restore the basis of the talks.

If the United States truly desires the resolution of the DPRK-US nuclear issue through dialogue, it should duly restore the basis of the talks, which it had unilaterally destroyed, and should come forward to coexist with us by abandoning the hostile policy -- the policy that is aimed at overthrowing our system -- through implementation and action.

Our demand is that the United States should shift its policy. It is the trickery to realize [our] nuclear disarmament by bringing us to the defendant's seat and ultimately to militarily pounce upon us that the Bush administration, without any will to shift its policy, is demanding that we should unconditionally come forward for the six-party talks. Bush openly raved about disarming us in his election campaign speech in Wisconsin on 18 August 2004 and on many other occasions.

Thus, the United States' true motives are obvious, and to think that we would just give up the nuclear weapons we have manufactured with so much effort is in and of itself a miscalculation. [ich'o'rom migugu'i ponsimi pponhande uriga p'umdu'ryo' mandu'ro' nou'n haengmugiru'l ku'jo' naenou'rirago sanggakhannu'n chach'ega osanida].

Through the answer given by a spokesman for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs on 23 August 2004 and on many other occasions, we have made clear our position that a dream about a so-called disarmament should not even be dreamed of. It had better clearly remember this.

Lately, by dancing to the tune of the United States, Japan is behaving without discretion, while talking about a so-called unconditional return to the talks, sanctions, and so on. By nature, Japan is a thoroughgoing cat's-paw for the United States, and thus, it has absolutely no qualification to attend the six-party talks.

Is it necessary for the cat's-paw to attend the talks, when the participation in the talks by the United States, which is regarded as a master by Japan, is enough? This being the case, Japan is still presumptuously attempting to impose sanctions on us, but we are keeping a sharp eye on the Japan's attempt as well.

Our principled position to maintain the goal for the denuclearization of the Korean peninsula and to resolve the nuclear issue in a peaceful manner through dialogue and negotiations still remains unchanged. If the United States, with a trustworthy sincerity and action, provides the conditions and justifications under which the six-party talks can be held, we will come forward at any time for the talks. Even if the Bush administration were to just play for time by chanting tunes about dialogue as it says this and that about the resumption of the six-party talks -- without showing any sincerity despite our just demand -- we would have nothing to lose.

The acts of the Bush administration, which has blocked the path to the resolution of the nuclear issue by destroying the basis of the six-party talks and by completely getting rid of the conditions and justifications for dialogue by further intensifying the hostile policy toward the DPRK, the policy aimed at overthrowing our system, will certainly be recorded in history, and the United States will have to pay an appropriate price for it. Pyongyang, 2 March 2005, Chuch'e 94

https://www.fbis.gov/portal/server.pt/gateway/PTARGS_0_3121_1238_222_0_43/ [Description of Source: Pyongyang Korean Central Broadcasting Station in Korean -- DPRK-owned central radio network]

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 affiliated with the University of San Francisco, Center for the Pacific Rim and the Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology, in partnership with:

CanKor, Canada http://www.cankor.ca

Scott Bruce: napsnet@nautilus.org University of San Francisco, Center for the Pacific Rim, San Francisco, California, United States (http://www.pacificrim.usfca.edu/)

International Peace Research Institute Meijigakuin University (PRIME)(prime@prime.meijigakuin.ac.jp)

Hyun Myoung Jae (hmjae@korea.ac.kr), Jae Young Park (garasink@dreamwiz.com) Seoul, Republic of Korea

Hibiki Yamaguchi: hibikiy84@hotmail.com Tokyo, Japan

back to top

home | about us | site map | contact us | photogallery

View this online at: https://nautilus.org/napsnet/napsnet-daily-report/napsnet-daily-report-m-nday-march-07-2005/

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