I have one I would like to submit for the record.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE DAN BURTON, A REPRESENTATIVE IN

CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF INDIANA

Mr. Chairmen, Kim Jong Il is attempting to blackmail his neighbors by withdrawing

from the Six-Party Talks indefinitely and playing the nuclear card. In recent

weeks we have learned that North Korea sold uranium hexaflouride—which

can be used to enrich uranium for nuclear weapons—to Libya in 2001. Last week

North Korea announced that it had ‘‘manufactured nukes,’’ and that these weapons

would be kept ‘‘for self-defense under any circumstances.’’ In the past North Korea

has made repeated claims that its nuclear arsenal is purely defensive. That was

clearly not true.

Now more than ever we need to have five parties talking to North Korea: South

Korea, Japan, Russia, China, and the United States. President Bush has argued

that we need to have five voices talking to Kim Jong Il because if Kim breaks commitments

to one party, he is not only doing injustice to America, but the other parties

as well. I support the determination that President Bush has made that it

would be a mistake to open up a separate, bilateral dialogue between the United

States and North Korea. Staying unified in a five-nation coalition is the most effective

way to send a clear message to Kim Jong Il.

The bilateral approach taken by President Clinton between 1993 and 2000 did not

bring about desirable results. Kim Jong Il failed to honor agreements signed with

the Clinton Administration and with South Korea. We learned this in October 2002,

when North Korea admitted it was conducting a major clandestine nuclear weapons

program in violation of the 1994 Agreed Framework. We were reminded of Kim

Jong Il’s ambitions in January 2003 when Pyongyang served notice of its intention

to withdraw from the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. The following month, it declared

it had reactivated its Yongbyon reactor.

What we are watching unfold on the Korean Peninsula now is familiar

brinksmanship between a paranoid tyrant and the outside world. This threatens to

escalate tensions with the North to a dangerous new level. Pyongyang’s statement

last week referred to The ‘‘Bush Doctrine’’ calls for the use of pre-emptive force to

prevent an imminent attack on the United States, but President Bush has made it

clear on several occasions that he wants a peaceful, negotiated settlement on the

Korean Peninsula and has no intention of initiating the use of force against North

Korea.

Mr. Chairman, complete, irreversible, verifiable dismantlement of the North’s nuclear

arsenal and weapons program must remain non-negotiable. I believe the

framework of the Six-Party Talks is the way to proceed. More active involvement

of China, one of the few countries to have any influence over the North, is essential.

The longer there is no progress on talks, the more time North Korea has to add to

its nuclear arsenal. Thank you.

I am going to be brief, Mr. Chairman, and I apologize

profusely for leaving the chamber, because I probably missed

some things and may ask some questions that you have already answered.

The thing that bothered me the most, I guess, was Mr. Eberstadt

in particular, it was like not a dark cloud, but a black cloud has

descended over our foreign policy, regarding North Korea.

What I would like to hear, if any of you can tell me, or our friend

in Hawaii, and I envy you being in Hawaii where the sun is still

shining and it is so beautiful and they have beautiful golf courses,

but what I would like for you to do is give me and the remaining

Members of the Committee some idea on what you think—and you

may have already done this so I apologize if I am being redundant—

what you think the Administration can do to solve the problem.

When I listened to you, Mr. Eberstadt, it sounded like there is

no solution. The guy wants nuclear capability so he can literally

blackmail the United States. He can blackmail South Korea and he

is not going to change no matter what we do, and appeasing him,

as we appeased Hitler in World War II, could only lead to more of

a problem.

Do you have any kinds of proposed solutions to the problem? We

know what it is now. We understand the gravity of it, but what can

the Administration or the State Department or the Defense Department

do to make this thing work?

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will read with great

interest the documents that you have submitted. Thank you very

much.