Thank you very much; and let me note that,

in substance, I agree with what Mr. Ackerman just said and that

is the United States should not rely on China to be a positive player

and rely on that to bring about a situation that is acceptable to

us on the North Korean Peninsula.

However let me note that I certainly disagree with Mr. Ackerman’s

analysis that this Administration should bear the brunt of

the responsibility. Let’s note that the policies that we have been

following in North Korea were put in place during the last Administration,

during the Clinton Administration; and, in fact, we have

subsidized the dictatorship in North Korea with a subsidy level

that was established during the Clinton Administration beyond

anything that any reasonable person could expect. In fact, I believe

that the billion dollars that North Korea has received as part of the

Clinton-initiated policies have made North Korea the biggest re16

cipient of foreign aid of any country in Asia, except for emergency

foreign aid, of course.

So what we have done with a stupid policy of trying to change

the hearts of the North Korean dictatorship by giving them money,

we have done nothing but make the situation worse, while they

have used their own money to develop nuclear weapons.

Back to the China point, I am deeply concerned, as Mr. Ackerman

just suggested, that we are relying somewhat on China to accomplish

our goals. The U.S.-China Economic Security Review

Commission will issue a report tomorrow which will indicate that

there is ample evidence that China has played a significant negative

role when it comes to proliferation of nuclear weapons, especially

those dealing with North Korea. We know, of course, that

China has helped in proliferation of weapons to Pakistan, who then

passed it on to North Korea, I might say, using China—landing in

China as part of their channel to put these weapons at the North

Korean’s disposal.

North Korea is a terrible dictatorship. We should be treating it

as a dictatorship, not trying to have goodwill toward them.

If the South Korean people don’t believe the United States is

playing a positive role here, they should let us know, and we will

go home. But the fact is that, right now, whatever chance for peace

and freedom on that peninsula will deal with the leadership for the

United States; and this Administration should not be relying on

China to accomplish that end.

Thank you very much.

Thank you very much. Have there been any

initiatives begun by this Administration to educate the people of

North Korea as to the nature of their government over the last couple

years? Have we done anything, any specific initiative?

So the people of North Korea have no idea

how oppressed they are and how deprived they are? And a lot of

the strength of the government—in fact, it is a weak government,

but the strength, to the degree they really have strength, is to the

degree that their own people are ignorant?

You talk a lot about initiatives from the outside, from the region,

what about from the inside; have we launched any new program

aimed at trying to support those people from the inside?

I take it you mean the answer is no, then.

Voice of America was before; we have had that all along. Is there

any new initiative?

How have we done that? ‘‘As best we can,’’

what does that mean?

I understand you can’t do it, I understand

you are telling me it is difficult, if not impossible, but we have no

new initiatives by your answer.

In terms of the great—the sanctions. Now, a tough resolution by

the United Nations, I don’t think means anything to the North Koreans,

anything more than condemnation by anybody else. But you

mentioned the harsh sanctions. Maybe you could let me know,

what are—could you give me a specific list of those harsh sanctions?

That was a unilateral action?

Now, in terms of the UN resolution, so we

are all together now, and we are not going to give them defense related

technologies and trade and commercial activity, but we actually

didn’t isolate them from other business activities; is that correct?

Actually, the UN Security Council resolution

did not do that, it only accomplished it in terms of defense-related

relationships, not the overall economic situation. So I would suggest

that harsh sanctions is not a proper designation as to what

the UN resolution did.

Are we ending our subsidies? And are our friends ending the food

subsidies that have been feeding the North Korean people while

their government has used their own money to produce these nuclear

weapons? Have we ended that policy at least?

To be fair to you, I believe what we presented

originally was a very harsh resolution, would have had harsh sanctions,

and the intent was to do that. But when you start acting

multilaterally, things get watered down, and I consider it not

harsh, but a watered-down resolution.

But in terms of, are we still providing the subsidies that we provided

in terms of humanitarian subsidies to permit the North Koreans

to use their own money to develop weapons?

Okay. As long as we can address the last one,

too.

Does that mean we are still continuing to

subsidize these people——

This is absurd, this is totally absurd. And let

me just note for the record, Mr. Chairman, we are taking the pressure

away from the North Korea Government to comply with us in

these other areas by feeding their people and permitting them to

use their own resources, which should be going to feed their people,

to go instead into nuclear weapon development. It is absurd to

think anything else. And that is not just your problem, but it is the

problem of the last Administration as well as this one.

And I find it not only harsh, but totally unrealistic. And we

shouldn’t be surprised when vicious dictators end up not caring

enough about their own people, and then use that money for developing

nuclear weapons.

And one last point, if you would indulge me, Mr. Chairman.

The last point is that multilateral approaches,

including China, after this report that we just received

that China is actually helping the North Koreans develop nuclear

weapons is, again, a very irrational, perhaps hope, but it is not

something that I think is going to bear fruit because China is part

of the problem, not the solution. Thank you.

If the gentleman will yield, we are talking

about a report that will become public tomorrow by the U.S.-China

Economic Security Review Commission, which is a bipartisan commission

established to look at Chinese policy in relationship to the

United States.

If the gentleman would yield, it was a commission

established by the United States Congress Bipartisan Commission.