

## 국가안보패널보고서 11호

## “[제2차 개정본] 북핵문제와 6자회담: 평가와 전망”

## 부/록/목/록

## &lt;부록1&gt; 미 국무부 보도자료

1. Fourth Round of Six-Party Talks: Early Afternoon Transit to St. Regis  
(<http://www.state.gov/p/eap/rls/rm/2005/50869.htm>) pp.3-7
2. Joint Statement of the Fourth Round of the Six-Party Talks Beijing 19 September 2005  
(<http://www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/ps/2005/53490.htm>) pp.8-9
3. Assistant Secretary of State Christopher R. Hill's Statement at the Closing Plenary of the Fourth Round of the Six-Party Talks September 19, 2005  
(<http://www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/ps/2005/53499.htm>) pp.10-11

## &lt;부록2&gt; 콘돌리자 라이스 미 국방부 장관 연설문

1. Opening Remarks by Secretary of State-Destignate Dr. Condoleeza Rice  
(<http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2005/40991.htm>) pp.12-17
2. Remarks at Town Hall Meeting  
(<http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2005/41414.htm>) pp.18-32

## &lt;부록3&gt; 조선중앙통신 기사자료

1. 조선외무성대변인 경수로 제공 즉시 NPT복귀  
조선중앙통신 2005. 9.20자 기사 pp.33-34
2. 조선외무성 대변인 미국측 금융제재해제회담 회피 비난  
조선중앙통신 2005.12.02자 기사 pp.35-36
3. 조선외무성 대변인 버쉬보우의 망발을 규탄

조선중앙통신 2005.12.10일자 기사 pp.37-38

4. 조선중앙통신사 상보 미국은 조미기본합의문과기책임에서 벗어날  
없으며 비싼 대가를 치르게 될 것이다

조선중앙통신 2005.12.19자 기사 pp.39-46

5. 조선외무성 반공화국 《인권》소동에 핵억제력, 자위적국방력 강화  
조선중앙통신 2005.12.19자 기사 pp.47-50

## &lt;부록1&gt; 미 국무부 보도자료

## 1. Fourth Round of Six-Party Talks: Early Afternoon Transit to St. Regis

Christopher R. Hill, Assistant Secretary for East Asian and Pacific Affairs  
Beijing, China  
August 7, 2005  
<http://www.state.gov/p/eap/rls/rm/2005/50869.htm>

**A/S HILL:** I think you heard that the Chinese government today announced that the talks would be put into recess, and this means that they will reconvene toward the end of August. I thought we made a lot of progress. As you know, the Six Party Talks were inexplicably delayed for 13 months, and so during the last 13 days I think we were able to achieve a lot of consensus on some issues, but ultimately we were not able to finish the job and not able to bridge remaining gaps.

I think, on the positive side, it was clear the D.P.R.K. understands it does need to get rid of its nuclear weapons, but the problem in the last few days, it began to emerge that the problem with reaching an agreement was not just the issue of their desire to retain the right to develop commercial or so-called peaceful energy, but also they began to insist on a light water reactor, and indeed wanted to have their desire for a light water reactor included in the agreement. This was an issue on which the D.P.R.K. delegation parted company with the rest of the delegations. So, in these last couple of days it was decided that probably the best thing to do would be to put the talks into recess, and give the D.P.R.K. delegation a chance to go back to Pyongyang, to sit down, to talk to the authorities there, to go through the various issues.

This is a very generous package for the D.P.R.K. This package would virtually solve their energy problems. It would address many of their economic problems. It would address many of their issues in international normalization with the international community, including bilateral normalizations as well as beginning a process of rejoining international organizations. It's a very generous package. So, I think to those of us the issue of getting rid of nuclear weapons should be an obvious one, should be an easy one, but this is a country that has been engaged in nuclear weapons programs for some 20 or 30 years, so it obviously a difficult decision.

I hope they will use this recess time wisely, go back and think hard and long about what to do, and come back in this same month of August ready to make that decision to do away with its weapons and to reach agreement with the rest of us on the text of this agreement. In short, we still have a lot of work to do, but I think there's progress there. And, I think there is a real logic to try to reach this agreement, a logic for everybody, and so I'm still very hopeful that we can ultimately arrive at it. So, I think you can now all go home. [Laughter]

**QUESTION:** It sounds like the onus is completely on North Korea to make a change or come to the table with something new. Does America not feel that it has any wiggle room?

**A/S HILL:** Well, at this point the issue came down to North Korea, the D.P.R.K., wanting not only to preserve their right to have use of nuclear energy, but also specifically to have a right to light water reactors. And, light water reactors are simply not on the table. So, I'm not sure what wiggle room we would have in that regard. I think the Chinese draft that was circulated a few days ago is an excellent basis for reaching an agreement. We can certainly work with it. All the other delegations can work with it. The D.P.R.K. has said they will also work with it. So, I think sometimes these are big decisions, and one shouldn't underestimate the fact that they've been at these programs for some 20 or 30 years. It's not easy to give those up in the course of a 13-day negotiation. So, I hope they go back and take some time to think about it

and come back and maybe we can take care of the finish the job.

**QUESTION:** Mr. Hill would the U.S. be willing to consider to allow North Korea to have the option down the road to exercise that?

**A/S HILL:** Look, our position on this issue is quite clear and I think what we really need to focus everyone on is denuclearization. That is, we need to get these terrible weapons [sound of cell phone ringing] taken off the board, to get these weapons, and these cell phones, [quiet laughter] out of here. So, to be talking about theoretical uses of nuclear weapons of nuclear energy, excuse me, of nuclear energy once the D.P.R.K. eventually returns to the NPT "questions like that" I think it is much better to focus on the task at hand, which is to rid the Korean peninsula of nuclear weapons. These are weapons that the only weapons that nuclear weapons that threaten North Korea's future, are its own nuclear weapons, and so for their benefit and for everyone else's. I hope we can get this agreement and begin the process to bring that country "which has so many problems" to bring that country back into the international system.

**QUESTION:** At the next session do you talk of [inaudible] or do you think it is the wrong time to try to go beyond that?

**A/S HILL:** I think this agreement is we're going to focus on the so-called fourth draft. I guess that's an unlucky number in Chinese terms [laughter] but we're going to focus on that fourth draft. We really do believe it's the basis for an agreement on principles, and as I've said before we have to have very clear principles, so we know what the principles are, we know clearly where we are going. And what you're suggesting is that perhaps we can get to that agreement on principles and move on forward. And what I would encourage is that if we can get this agreement by the end of August, quickly thereafter, in September, we would move to the next stage. We do have in mind the next round of talks- the so-called fifth round of the Six Party Talks. We would anticipate starting very early fall, as early as September we would think, but we have to get through these principles.

Anyone who's been in negotiation, when you spend 12, 13 sleepless nights, you really want to get to an agreement and then move on to the next stage. But, this is a pretty significant deal for North Korea to think about, and so it is quite appropriate that they take some time, go back to their capital, explain to people in their capital that, for example, the light water reactor is simply not on the table. I think their delegation here in the Diaoyutai understood that "in the Chinese guesthouse understand that" but perhaps people in Pyongyang need to hear that directly. So, I don't think we should be surprised that we need a little time to go back to capitals. And again, the Chinese are going to be quite insistent on getting us all back together by the end of the month to finish this job.

**QUESTION:** Mr. Secretary are you basically saying that you can go into a fifth round as early as September? You come back and you get an agreement and you go straight into the talks?

**A/S HILL:** Well, there' re 30 days in September [laughter], and if we get going at the end of August, then I do not anticipate another thirteen-day "thirteen-day marathon" I was going to say something else [laughter] "thirteen-day marathon". I would hope that based on that, we could move rather quickly, within weeks, not months, to negotiate it, to put it all together in an actual agreement which has implementation clauses, which deals with the complex subjects of verification. We have enough clarity from this round, from the Chinese draft, that we know what essentially is agreed and what essentially remains in brackets, to use the jargon of international agreements, that we know what we need to begin to think about. So, we know, for example, that we are going to have to think about verification regimes, and we have an idea of what precise questions need to be asked and what answers need to be achieved. I think we can begin the prep work very early on. So, I don't think it's unrealistic to talk about the fifth round happened

as early as September.

**QUESTION:** If North Korea didn't change their position would you consider other options, such as?

**A/S HILL:** I think there are always other options. I said before that the only options we really don't have it to forget about this problem. We have to solve this problem, so there are always other options, but I think, again, not to be too repetitive, I think we have made some progress here and I think we can continue on this option.

**QUESTION:** Mr. Hill, Mr. Kim just said that he is willing to engage in bilateral contacts with the United States [inaudible] during these three weeks?

**A/S HILL:** Which Mr. Kim? There are a lot of those? [Laughter]

**QUESTION:** The chief negotiator Kim.

**A/S HILL:** I see. Yeah.

**QUESTION:** And he also said the key will persuading the United States to allow North Korea to use peaceful nuclear power.

**A/S HILL:** Is that a question or are you trying to inform me of something? [laughter]

**QUESTION:** Just wondering what your response is to those two points.

**A/S HILL:** Well, I think our position on the latter point is well known, this issue of nuclear power and the light water reactors that they raised. With regard to the contacts, sure, we'll continue to be in contact and we'll continue to share our views. We want to get this done, and we're not going to let issues of protocol and contacts get in the way. We're going to work aggressively to take care of this problem. I think diplomacy does have an aggressive side to it, and I think we're going to work on this. Whether we can get through some of the issues you mention on peaceful use of nuclear energy, well, that's obviously going to be a challenge. But I would caution you not to think that is the only challenge. There are some basic issues we need to get through.

**QUESTION:** Mr. Hill, comparing with the case of Iran and India, with its serious violation of [inaudible] party [inaudible] treaty and potential violation of the treaty, some critics pointing out the inconsistency of the policy of the United States with non-proliferation policy. Could you explain?

**A/S HILL:** Well, you obviously have a much better global strategic sense than I do. I'm just trying to struggle through this draft agreement. I'm just sort of slogging my way through one word at a time, one paragraph at a time. I think we can get there. I think it's an agreement "it's language that will work." I think I'll leave it to people like yourself to determine whether it's consistent with what we are doing with India or Iran, but I do believe it can work for everybody, including for our policy, so I'm not too concerned about that.

**QUESTION:** Also is it the right understanding that the fourth draft is still standing? That?

**A/S HILL:** Yes, the fourth draft is the basis on which we are continuing to work, and as I said there is a lot of consensus on the fourth draft. The issue frankly the D.P.R.K. would like to put in light water reactors in the fourth draft, and no one else wants to do that, including the R.O.K., which has a rather significant energy proposal which would meet North Korea's energy

needs through conventional means. It's on the basis of that proposal that the Republic of Korea has said that it really is not interested in providing light water reactors, because it has solved the problem that is, the problem of supplying energy by other means. Now, if the D.P.R.K. is interested in light water reactors not because of energy, or not because of electricity or need for electricity, but rather for something else, well we've better know what that is.

**QUESTION:** [Inaudible] you said that you will continue to be in contact with the North Koreans. Do you plan you contact them during the recess?

**A/S HILL:** I told the North Korean delegate, head of delegation, Kim Gye Gwan, that I am prepared to be in touch with him, I'm prepared to work on this issue. We are still in the framework of the Six-Party Talks. There is no question about it. We don't have any specific plans, but we really want to solve this. I really want to figure out how we can get to solving this so that when we meet again on the week the 29<sup>th</sup> of August, we will not have to spend thirteen days at it, but more like thirteen hours, or thirteen minutes. [laughter] But what we can't do is spend another thirteen months doing nothing.

**QUESTION:** Over the next 3 weeks, will you go back to Washington to consider other topics to convince the North Koreans to agree, or do you think that the Chinese have something else that they can do?

**A/S HILL:** Well, I had a good discussion with the Chinese, and I think we really see eye to eye on this and we really have the same interests on this. I would say our relationship with China is better as a result of the Six-Party process. This is one of the common areas, and I would hope that China will do all it can and we are certainly doing all we can to try to wrap up this issue and move on to the next issue. Thank you very much.

**QUESTION:** Are you leaving tonight, sir?

**A/S HILL:** I'm leaving tonight. Absolutely.

**QUESTION:** Are you going to Seoul?

**QUESTION:** What time?

**A/S HILL:** I don't know what time. No, actually, I'm going to Washington, D.C. I got to get to work tomorrow. [laughter]

**QUESTION:** Will you be meeting with President Bush? Will you be briefing Pres. Bush right away?

**A/S HILL:** I think he's in Texas, isn't he? Thank you all very much.

**QUESTION:** Sir, may I ask you just one more question?

**A/S HILL:** Yeah, yeah.

**QUESTION:** After 13 days of talk, what is your position about bringing this to the UN Security Council?

**A/S HILL:** Look, we're on this track. That's always an option. I think everyone reserves that option. That's everyone's right to do that, but we are working through the Six-Party process. We deal with that. We made some headway here and we've just got to keep at it. And as I've said as long as we feel there's progress in this process we'll stick with it. And if there isn't, you know, we'll look at some other options. Thank you very much.

**QUESTION:** Do you feel stronger about this, than before?

**A/S HILL:** I feel stronger? Well, I've been a believer in the Six-process for a while. I think it's the best way to go. Certainly these thirteen days have not diminished my belief that the Six-Party process is the right approach. But, we have to see if it gets us there. Thanks very much.

Released on August 8, 2005

## 2. Joint Statement of the Fourth Round of the Six-Party Talks Beijing, September 19, 2005

Joint Statement  
Sean McCormack, Spokesman  
New York City, NY  
September 19, 2005  
<http://www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/ps/2005/53490.htm>

Following is a text of the joint statement at the conclusion of the fourth round of Six-Party Talks, as released in Beijing on September 19, 2005 by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China.

### **Joint Statement of the Fourth Round of the Six-Party Talks Beijing 19 September 2005**

The Fourth Round of the Six-Party Talks was held in Beijing, China among the People's Republic of China, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Japan, the Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation, and the United States of America from July 26th to August 7th, and from September 13th to 19th, 2005.

Mr. Wu Dawei, Vice Minister of Foreign Affairs of the PRC, Mr. Kim Gye Gwan, Vice Minister of Foreign Affairs of the DPRK; Mr. Kenichiro Sasae, Director-General for Asian and Oceanian Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan; Mr. Song Min-soon, Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs and Trade of the ROK; Mr. Alexandr Alekseyev, Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation; and Mr. Christopher Hill, Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs of the United States attended the talks as heads of their respective delegations.

Vice Foreign Minister Wu Dawei chaired the talks.

For the cause of peace and stability on the Korean Peninsula and in Northeast Asia at large, the Six Parties held, in the spirit of mutual respect and equality, serious and practical talks concerning the denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula on the basis of the common understanding of the previous three rounds of talks, and agreed, in this context, to the following:

1. The Six Parties unanimously reaffirmed that the goal of the Six-Party Talks is the verifiable denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula in a peaceful manner.

The DPRK committed to abandoning all nuclear weapons and existing nuclear programs and returning, at an early date, to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and to IAEA safeguards.

The United States affirmed that it has no nuclear weapons on the Korean Peninsula and has no intention to attack or invade the DPRK with nuclear or conventional weapons.

The ROK reaffirmed its commitment not to receive or deploy nuclear weapons in accordance with the 1992 Joint Declaration of the Denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula, while affirming that there exist no nuclear weapons within its territory.

The 1992 Joint Declaration of the Denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula should be observed and implemented.

The DPRK stated that it has the right to peaceful uses of nuclear energy. The other parties



expressed their respect and agreed to discuss, at an appropriate time, the subject of the provision of light water reactor to the DPRK.

2. The Six Parties undertook, in their relations, to abide by the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and recognized norms of international relations.

The DPRK and the United States undertook to respect each other's sovereignty, exist peacefully together, and take steps to normalize their relations subject to their respective bilateral policies.

The DPRK and Japan undertook to take steps to normalize their relations in accordance with the Pyongyang Declaration, on the basis of the settlement of unfortunate past and the outstanding issues of concern.

3. The Six Parties undertook to promote economic cooperation in the fields of energy, trade and investment, bilaterally and/or multilaterally.

China, Japan, ROK, Russia and the US stated their willingness to provide energy assistance to the DPRK.

The ROK reaffirmed its proposal of July 12th 2005 concerning the provision of 2 million kilowatts of electric power to the DPRK.

4. The Six Parties committed to joint efforts for lasting peace and stability in Northeast Asia.

The directly related parties will negotiate a permanent peace regime on the Korean Peninsula at an appropriate separate forum.

The Six Parties agreed to explore ways and means for promoting security cooperation in Northeast Asia.

5. The Six Parties agreed to take coordinated steps to implement the afore-mentioned consensus in a phased manner in line with the principle of "commitment for commitment, action for action".

6. The Six Parties agreed to hold the Fifth Round of the Six-Party Talks in Beijing in early November 2005 at a date to be determined through consultations.

### 3. North Korea -- U.S. Statement

2005/T13-28

Released on September 19, 2005

Press Statement

Sean McCormack, Spokesman

New York City, NY

September 19, 2005

<http://www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/ps/2005/53499.htm>

The following statement by the head of the U.S. delegation to the Six-Party Talks, Christopher R. Hill, was released in Beijing on September 19, 2005

**Assistant Secretary of State Christopher R. Hill's Statement at the  
Closing Plenary of the Fourth Round of the Six-Party Talks  
September 19, 2005**

I would like to join with my colleagues from the ROK and Russian delegations in expressing my deep appreciation for China's leadership in chairing and hosting this fourth round of the Six-Party Talks. The United States is able to join in supporting the Joint Statement on the basis of the following understandings:

Let me start by noting that the goal of the Six-Party Talks is the prompt and verifiable denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula. When this goal is achieved, it will open up a new chapter for all Korean people. We know that the document includes undertakings for all the parties; my government is prepared to fulfill all our undertakings.

All elements of the DPRK's past and present nuclear programs "plutonium and uranium" and all nuclear weapons will be comprehensively declared and completely, verifiably and irreversibly eliminated, and will not be reconstituted in the future. According to these principles, the DPRK will return, at an early date, to the NPT and come into full compliance with IAEA safeguards, including by taking all steps that may be deemed necessary to verify the correctness and completeness of the DPRK's declarations of nuclear materials and activities.

But in addition to these obligations, there are also benefits that the DPRK will accrue. But these benefits will only accrue in the context of the denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula. In the statement of principles, there is a reference to the "appropriate time" to discuss the subject of the DPRK's use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, such as the subject of the provision of a light water reactor, but that "appropriate time" will only come when the DPRK has:

- Promptly eliminated all nuclear weapons and all nuclear programs, and this has been verified to the satisfaction of all parties by credible international means, including the IAEA; and,
- 
- When the DPRK has come into full compliance with the NPT and IAEA safeguards, and has demonstrated a sustained commitment to cooperation and transparency and has ceased proliferating nuclear technology.

When these conditions have been met, I want to be very clear ?we will support such a discussion.

The United States notes that the NPT recognizes the right of parties to the Treaty to pursue peaceful uses of nuclear energy in the context of compliance with Articles I and II of the Treaty. Foremost among the Treaty's obligations is the commitment not to possess or pursue

nuclear weapons. The Treaty also calls for its parties to adhere to safeguards agreements with the IAEA. Thus, the DPRK's statement concerning its "right" to the peaceful uses of nuclear energy should be premised upon the completion of verification of the DPRK's elimination of all nuclear weapons and existing nuclear programs and full compliance with the NPT and IAEA safeguards.

I would like to note also that the United States supports a decision to terminate KEDO by the end of the year.

We should also note for the record that the United States will take concrete actions necessary to protect ourselves and our allies against any illicit and proliferation activities on the part of the DPRK.

The United States desires to completely normalize relations with the DPRK, but as a necessary part of discussions, we look forward to sitting down with the DPRK to address other important issues. These outstanding issues include human rights abuses, biological and chemical weapons programs, ballistic missile programs and proliferation, terrorism, and illicit activities.

The Joint Statement accurately notes the willingness of the United States to respect the DPRK's sovereignty and to exist with the DPRK peacefully together. Of course, in that context the United States continues to have serious concerns about the treatment of people and behavior in areas such as human rights in the DPRK. The U.S. acceptance of the Joint Statement should in no way be interpreted as meaning we accept all aspects of the DPRK's system, human rights situation or treatment of its people. We intend to sit down and make sure that our concerns in these areas are addressed.

The Joint Statement sets out a visionary view of the end-point of the process of the denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula. It is a very important first step to get us to the critical and urgent next phase implementation of DPRK commitments outlined above and the measures the United States and other parties would provide in return, including security assurances, economic and energy cooperation, and taking steps toward normalized relations.

The United States believes that it is imperative to move rapidly on an agreement to implement the goals outlined in the Joint Statement. We look forward to working with all the other parties, including the DPRK, to do so.

2005/T13-29

Released on September 19, 2005

## <부록2> 콘돌리자 라이스 미 국방부 장관 연설문

### 1. Opening Remarks by Secretary of State-Designate Dr. Condoleezza Rice

Secretary Condoleezza Rice  
Senate Foreign Relations Committee  
Washington, DC  
January 18, 2005  
<http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2005/40991.htm>

Thank you Chairman Lugar, Senator Biden, and Members of the Committee. And let me also thank Senator Dianne Feinstein who, as a fellow Californian, I have long admired as a leader on behalf of our state and our nation.

Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, it is an honor to be nominated to lead the State Department at this critical time - a time of challenge and hope and opportunity for America, and for the entire world.

September 11, 2001 was a defining moment for our nation and the world. Under the vision and leadership of President Bush, our nation has risen to meet the challenges of our time: fighting tyranny and terror, and securing the blessings of freedom and prosperity for a new generation. The work that America and our allies have undertaken, and the sacrifices we have made, have been difficult -- and necessary -- and right. Now is the time to build on these achievements -- to make the world safer, and to make the world more free. We must use American diplomacy to help create a balance of power in the world that favors freedom. And the time for diplomacy is now.

I am humbled by President Bush's confidence in me to undertake the great work of leading American diplomacy at such a moment in history. If confirmed, I will work with members of Congress, from both sides of the aisle, to build a strong bipartisan consensus behind America's foreign policy. I will seek to strengthen our alliances, to support our friends, and to make the world safer, and better. I will enlist the great talents of the men and women of the State Department, the Foreign and Civil Services and our Foreign Service Nationals. And if I am confirmed, I will be especially honored to succeed a man I so admire -- my friend and mentor, Colin Powell.

Four years ago, Secretary Powell addressed this committee for the same purpose I do now. Then as now, it was the same week that America celebrates the life and legacy of Doctor Martin Luther King, Jr. It is a time to reflect on the legacy of that great man, on the sacrifices he made, on the courage of the people he led, and on the progress our nation has made in the decades since. I am especially indebted to those who fought and sacrificed in the Civil Rights movement so that I could be here today.

For me, this is a time to remember other heroes as well. I grew up in Birmingham, Alabama -- the old Birmingham of Bull Connor, church bombings, and voter intimidation -- the Birmingham where Dr. King was thrown in jail for demonstrating without a permit. Yet there was another Birmingham, the city where my parents -- John and Angelena Rice -- and their friends built a thriving community in the midst of the most terrible segregation in the country. It would have been so easy for them to give in to despair, and to send that message of hopelessness to their children. But they refused to allow the limits and injustices of their time to limit our horizons.

My friends and I were raised to believe that we could do or become anything -- that the only limits to our aspirations came from within. We were taught not to listen to those who said to us, "No, you can't."

The story of Birmingham's parents and teachers and children is a story of the triumph of universal values over adversity. And those values -- a belief in democracy, and liberty, and the dignity of every life, and the rights of every individual -- unite Americans of all backgrounds, all faiths, and all colors. They provide us a common cause in all times, a rallying point in difficult times, and a source of hope to men and women across the globe who cherish freedom and work to advance freedom's cause. And in these extraordinary times, it is the duty of all of us -- legislators, diplomats, civil servants, and citizens -- to uphold and advance the values that are the core of the American identity, and that have lifted the lives of millions around the world.

One of history's clearest lessons is that America is safer, and the world is more secure, whenever and wherever freedom prevails. It is neither an accident nor a coincidence that the greatest threats of the last century emerged from totalitarian movements. Fascism and Communism differed in many ways, but they shared an implacable hatred of freedom, a fanatical assurance that their way was the only way, and a supreme confidence that history was on their side.

At certain moments, it almost seemed to be so. During the first half of the 20th century much of the democratic and economic progress of earlier decades looked to be swept away by the march of ruthless ideologies armed with terrible military and technological power. Even after the allied victory in World War Two, many feared that Europe, and perhaps the world, would be forced to permanently endure half enslaved and half free. The cause of freedom suffered a series of major strategic setbacks: Communism imposed in Eastern Europe -- Soviet power dominant in East Germany -- the coup in Czechoslovakia -- the victory of the Chinese Communists -- the Soviet nuclear test five years before we predicted -- to name just a few. In those early years, the prospect of a united democratic Germany and a democratic Japan seemed far-fetched.

Yet America and our allies were blessed with visionary leaders who did not lose their way. They created the great NATO alliance to contain and eventually erode Soviet power. They helped to establish the United Nations and created the international legal framework for this and other institutions that have served the world well for more than 50 years. They provided billions in aid to rebuild Europe and much of Asia. They built an international economic system based on free trade and free markets to spread prosperity to every corner of the globe. And they confronted the ideology and propaganda of our enemies with a message of hope, and with the truth. And in the end - though the end was long in coming - their vision prevailed.

The challenges we face today are no less daunting. America and the free world are once again engaged in a long-term struggle against an ideology of tyranny and terror, and against hatred and hopelessness. And we must confront these challenges with the same vision, courage and boldness of thought demonstrated by our post-World War Two leaders.

In these momentous times, American diplomacy has three great tasks. First, we will unite the community of democracies in building an international system that is based on our shared values and the rule of law. Second, we will strengthen the community of democracies to fight the threats to our common security and alleviate the hopelessness that feeds terror. And third, we will spread freedom and democracy throughout the globe. That is the mission that President Bush has set for America in the world -- and the great mission of American diplomacy today.

Let me address each of the three tasks I just mentioned. Every nation that benefits from living on the right side of the freedom divide has an obligation to share freedom's blessings. Our first

challenge, then, is to inspire the American people, and the people of all free nations, to unite in common cause to solve common problems. NATO -- and the European Union -- and our democratic allies in East Asia and around the world will be our strongest partners in this vital work. The United States will also continue to work to support and uphold the system of international rules and treaties that allow us to take advantage of our freedom, to build our economies, and to keep us safe and secure.

We must remain united in insisting that Iran and North Korea abandon their nuclear weapons ambitions, and choose instead the path of peace. New forums that emerge from the Broader Middle East and North Africa Initiative offer the ideal venues to encourage economic, social and democratic reform in the Islamic world. Implementing the Doha Development Agenda and reducing trade barriers will create jobs and reduce poverty in dozens of nations. And by standing with the free peoples of Iraq and Afghanistan, we will continue to bring hope to millions, and democracy to a part of the world where it is sorely lacking.

As President Bush said in our National Security Strategy, America "is guided by the conviction that no nation can build a safer, better world alone. Alliances and multilateral institutions can multiply the strength of freedom-loving nations." If I am confirmed, that core conviction will guide my actions. Yet when judging a course of action, I will never forget that the true measure of its worth is whether it is effective.

Our second great task is to strengthen the community of democracies, so that all free nations are equal to the work before us. Free peoples everywhere are heartened by the success of democracy around the globe. Together, we must build on that success.

We face many challenges. In some parts of the world, an extremist few threaten the very existence of political liberty. Disease and poverty have the potential to destabilize whole nations and regions. Corruption can sap the foundations of democracy. And some elected leaders have taken illiberal steps that, if not corrected, could undermine hard-won democratic progress.

We must do all we can to ensure that nations which make the hard choices and do the hard work to join the free world deliver on the high hopes of their citizens for a better life. From the Philippines to Colombia to the nations of Africa, we are strengthening counterterrorism cooperation with nations that have the will to fight terror, but need help with the means. We are spending billions to fight AIDS, tuberculosis, malaria and other diseases, to alleviate suffering for millions and help end public health crises. America has always been generous in helping countries recover from natural disasters -- and today we are providing money and personnel to ease the suffering of millions afflicted by the tsunami, and to help nations rebuild their infrastructure. We are joining with developing nations to fight corruption, instill the rule of law, and create a culture of transparency. In much of Africa and Latin America, we face the twin challenges of helping to bolster democratic ideals and institutions, and alleviating poverty. We will work with reformers in those regions who are committed to increasing opportunity for their peoples. And we will insist that leaders who are elected democratically have an obligation to govern democratically.

Our third great task is to spread democracy and freedom throughout the world. I spoke earlier of the grave setbacks to democracy in the first half of the 20th century. The second half of the century saw an advance of democracy that was far more dramatic. In the last quarter of that century, the number of democracies in the world tripled. And in the last six months of this new century alone, we have witnessed the peaceful, democratic transfer of power in Malaysia -- a majority Muslim nation -- and in Indonesia -- the country with the world's largest Muslim population. We have seen men and women wait in line for hours to vote in Afghanistan's first ever free and fair presidential election. We -- and I know you Mr. Chairman -- were heartened by the refusal of the people of Ukraine to accept a flawed election, and their insistence that their democratic will be honored. We have watched as the people of the Palestinian Territories

turned out to vote in an orderly and fair election. And soon the people of Iraq will exercise their right to choose their leaders, and set the course of their nation's future. No less than were the last decades of the 20th century, the first decades of this new century can be an era of liberty. And we in America must do everything we can to make it so.

To be sure, in our world there remain outposts of tyranny -- and America stands with oppressed people on every continent -- in Cuba, and Burma, and North Korea, and Iran, and Belarus, and Zimbabwe. The world should apply what Natan Sharansky calls the "town square test": if a person cannot walk into the middle of the town square and express his or her views without fear of arrest, imprisonment, or physical harm, then that person is living in a fear society, not a free society. We cannot rest until every person living in a "fear society" has finally won their freedom.

In the Middle East, President Bush has broken with six decades of excusing and accommodating the lack of freedom in the hope of purchasing stability at the price of liberty. The stakes could not be higher. As long as the broader Middle East remains a region of tyranny and despair and anger, it will produce extremists and movements that threaten the safety of Americans and our friends.

But there are hopeful signs that freedom is on the march. Afghanistan and Iraq are struggling to put dark and terrible pasts behind them and are choosing the path of progress. Just months ago, Afghanistan held a free and fair election, and chose a president who is committed to the success of democracy and to the fight against terror. In Iraq, the people will soon take the next step in their journey toward full, genuine democracy. All Iraqis, whatever their faith or ethnicity - from Shias to Sunnis to Kurds -- must build a common future together. The election later this month will be an important first step as the people of Iraq prepare to draft a constitution and hold the next round of elections -- elections that will create a permanent government.

The success of freedom in Afghanistan and Iraq will give strength and hope to reformers throughout the region, and accelerate the pace of reforms already underway. From Morocco to Jordan to Bahrain, we are seeing elections and new protections for women and minorities, and the beginnings of political pluralism. Political, civil, and business leaders have issued stirring calls for political, economic and social change. Increasingly, the people are speaking, and their message is clear: the future of the region is to live in liberty.

And the establishment of a Palestinian democracy will help to bring an end to the conflict in the Holy Land. Much has changed since June 24, 2002, when President Bush outlined a new approach for America in the quest for peace in the Middle East, and spoke the truth about what will be required to end this conflict. Now we have reached a moment of opportunity -- and we must seize it. We take great encouragement from the elections just held for a new Palestinian leader. And Senators Biden and Sununu, I want to thank you for representing the United States at these historic elections. America seeks justice and dignity and a viable, independent, and democratic state for the Palestinian people. We seek security and peace for the State of Israel. Israel must do its part to improve the conditions under which Palestinians live and seek to build a better future. Arab states must join to help -- and deny any help or solace to those who take the path of violence. I look forward to personally working with the Palestinian and Israeli leaders, and bringing American diplomacy to bear on this difficult but crucial issue. Peace can only come if all parties choose to do the difficult work, and choose to meet their responsibilities. And the time to choose peace is now.

Building a world of hope, prosperity and peace is difficult. As we move forward, America's relations with the world's global powers will be critical. In Russia, we see that the path to democracy is uneven and that its success is not yet assured. Yet recent history shows that we can work closely with Russia on common problems. And as we do so, we will continue to



press the case for democracy, and we will continue to make clear that the protection of democracy in Russia is vital to the future of U.S.-Russia relations. In Asia, we have moved beyond the false assumption that it is impossible to have good relations with all of Asia's powers. Our Asian alliances have never been stronger -- and we will use that strength to help secure the peace and prosperity of the region. Japan, South Korea, and Australia are key partners in our efforts to deter common threats and spur economic growth. We are building a candid, cooperative and constructive relationship with China that embraces our common interests but still recognizes our considerable differences about values. The United States is cooperating with India, the world's largest democracy, across a range of economic and security issues. This, even as we embrace Pakistan as a vital ally in the war on terror, and a state in transition toward a more moderate and democratic future. In our own neighborhood, we are cooperating closely with Canada and Mexico, and working to realize the vision of a fully democratic hemisphere, bound by common values and free trade.

We also must realize that America and all free nations are facing a generational struggle against a new and deadly ideology of hatred that we cannot ignore. We need to do much more to confront hateful propaganda, dispel dangerous myths, and get out the truth. We will increase our exchanges with the rest of the world. And Americans should make a serious effort to understand other cultures and learn foreign languages. Our interaction with the rest of the world must be a conversation, not a monologue. And America must remain open to visitors and workers and students from around the world, without compromising our security standards. If our public diplomacy efforts are to succeed, we cannot close ourselves off from the world. And if I am confirmed, public diplomacy will be a top priority for me and for the professionals I lead.

In all that lies ahead, the primary instrument of American diplomacy will be the Department of State, and the men and women of its Foreign and Civil Services and Foreign Service Nationals. The time for diplomacy is now -- and the President and I will expect great things from America's diplomatic corps. We know from experience how hard they work, the risks they and their families take, and the hardships they endure. We will be asking even more of them, in the service of their country, and of a great cause. They will need to develop new skills, and rise to new challenges. This time of global transformation calls for transformational diplomacy. More than ever, America's diplomats will need to be active in spreading democracy, fighting terror, reducing poverty, and doing our part to protect the American homeland. I will personally work to ensure that America's diplomats have all the tools they need to do their jobs -- from training to budgets to mentoring to embassy security. I also intend to strengthen the recruitment of new personnel, because American diplomacy needs to constantly hire and develop top talent. And I will seek to further diversify the State Department's workforce. This is not just a good cause; it is a necessity. A great strength of our country is our diversity. And the signal sent to the rest of the world when America is represented abroad by people of all cultures, races, and religions is an unsurpassed statement about who we are and what our values mean in practice.

Let me close with a personal recollection. I was in government in Washington in 1989 to 1991. I was the Soviet specialist in the White House at the end of the Cold War. I was lucky to be there, and I knew it. I got to participate in the liberation of Eastern Europe. I got to participate in the unification of Germany and to see the Soviet Union collapse. It was a heady time for us all. But, when I look back, I know that we were merely harvesting the good decisions that had been made in 1947, in 1948, and in 1949, when Truman and Acheson and Vandenberg and Kennan and so many wise and farsighted statesmen -- in the Executive and Legislative branches - recognized that we were not in a limited engagement with communism, we were in the defining struggle of our times.

Democrats and Republicans united around a vision and policies that won the Cold War. The road was not always smooth, but the basic unity of purpose and values was there -- and that unity was essential to our eventual success. No President, and no Secretary of State, could have effectively protected American interests in such momentous times without strong support from the



Congress, and from this Committee. And the same is true today. Our task, and our duty is to unite around a vision and policies that will spread freedom and prosperity around the globe. I have worked directly with many of you. And in this time of great challenge and opportunity, America's co-equal branches of government must work together to advance freedom and prosperity.

In the preface to his memoirs, published in 1969, Dean Acheson wrote of the post-war period that "those who acted in this drama did not know, nor do any of us yet know, the end." Senators, now we know -- and many of us here bore witness to that end. The end was a victory for freedom, the liberation of half a continent, the passing of a despotic empire -- and vindication for the wise and brave decisions made at the beginning. It is my greatest hope -- and my deepest conviction -- that the struggle we face today will some day end in a similar triumph of the human spirit. And working together, we can make it so.

Thank you.

**2005/70**

Released on January 18, 2005

## 2. Remarks at Town Hall Meeting

Secretary Condoleezza Rice  
Dean Acheson Auditorium  
Washington, DC  
January 31, 2005  
<http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2005/41414.htm>

**MS. BEALE:** Good morning. Good morning and welcome to Dr. Rice's first Town Hall meeting as Secretary of State.

My name is Sarah Beale. I'm sure almost all of you might say, "Sarah who," and for good reason. I started at the Department only two weeks ago, as an intern in the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, where Secretary Rice began her State Department career, also as an intern in 1977. I'm sure all of the interns were as thrilled as I was when, in the first few sentences of her welcome address last Thursday morning, she mentioned that fact.

As we departed the Hall on Thursday, Secretary Rice appeared a few feet from me, just before stepping onto the elevator to go up to her new office for the very first time as Secretary of State, and I shook her hand mentioning my internship. She replied, "Well, you never know. Tell them to be nice to you." (Laughter.) Imagine my surprise when I was called on Friday and asked to introduce Secretary Rice today. This was definitely not in the internship job description. (Laughter.)

During the first Administration of President Bush, I was inspired by the accomplishments and calm professionalism of the Secretary. My presence before you today tells me that we have a leader who not only cares deeply about her country, but also about her team at the Department of State. It is my pleasure and unforgettable honor to present to you Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice. (Applause.)

**SECRETARY RICE:** That's wonderful. Thank you. Thank you so much. (Applause.)  
Thank you. Thank you very much.

Well, what a wonderful introduction, and Sarah is absolutely right: The lesson of the day is be good to your interns, you never know what's going to happen. I was, indeed, here and as an intern in 1977 in the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs. I worked on arts programming. It was a great experience. And it's nice to be back. So thank you for that wonderful welcome.

I just wanted to have a few minutes to talk to you about how I see the Department and our role together in promoting the interests and values of the United States at this extraordinary time. I'm going to leave a lot of time for questions and answers because that's really why I'm here, is to hear from you, more than for you to hear from me.

I said the other day when I came into the Department, and also during my congressional hearings, that the time for diplomacy is now and that the State Department will have a key role in that diplomacy. And I want to talk a little bit more about why the time for diplomacy is now.

Now, I know that we've been engaged in diplomacy throughout the United States history and, indeed, those of you who have been working hard must be thinking, "What does she mean, now? Because, after all, we've been engaged in diplomacy for all of these years." I know that. But we're in a very special time in history, a very special time, a rare time in history.

And I want to go back to when I was here the last time, which was 1989 to 1991, and it was

the end of the Cold War. And as I've said a couple of times during this transition, it was an extraordinary time to be lucky enough to be the White House Soviet specialist. The end of the Cold War. I was lucky enough to participate in the liberation of Eastern Europe, the unification of Germany, and to see shortly after the collapse, the peaceful collapse, of the Soviet Union.

Now, as you can imagine, those were incredibly heady times. But I recognize, and I think we must all recognize, that it was really just a matter of harvesting good decisions that had been taken in 1946 and in 1947 and in 1948 and 1949 by people like Harry S. Truman, Senator Vandenberg, George Marshall -- whose portrait looks right into my office, by the way -- and Dean Acheson, for whom this auditorium is named, and many others like them, Paul Nitze and George Kennan and others.

And what did they do? Well, they took a world that really lay asunder at the end of the devastating war of World War II, and they, despite dizzying setbacks for freedom and for liberty, found a way to bring the intellectual capital and energy of this country to bear so that they left a world that was safe -- safer and freer, and, by the time I was here in 1989, ready to make the transition to a truly whole and free Europe.

Now, how did they do that? Especially when you think back to 1946. In 1946, the reconstruction in Germany was still failing. Many Germans were still starving. In 1946, the communists won large minorities in both Italy and France. People actually worried that they elections of 1948 might bring communist governments to power in Italy and France. In 1947, there were civil wars in Greece and Turkey. In 1948, Berlin -- the Berlin crisis permanently split Germany into two halves. In 1948, Czechoslovakia fell to a coup. In 1949, the Soviet Union exploded a nuclear weapons five years ahead of schedule and the Chinese communists won.

Now, looking at that dizzying array of setbacks, you wonder how in the world did they create circumstances that ended up in the world, the Europe and the Asia of 1989 to 1991, or certainly is now. And I think they did it by staying firm about values. They recognized that in order to have a different kind of Europe, you were going to have to have a different kind of Germany, and indeed, against those more realistic powers like Great Britain, they focused hard on what would happen to the German people, they focused hard on building a Germany that was democratic.

They believed that there could be a democratic Japan, despite the fact that there had never been a democratic tradition in Japan, and because they believed in those values and they built institutions like the North Atlantic Treaty Organization that found their foundation in those values, they left a legacy that we now enjoy with a Europe whole and free and an Asia that has many democratic allies. What a tremendous accomplishment.

Well, we are now in a similar period. We have fought two wars in the greater Middle East, in Afghanistan and Iraq. We face a world in which we recognize after September 11th that we have to have change in the Middle East, change based on democratic values, change based on the spread of liberty, because without the dignity and the hope that liberty and freedom bring, we're going to see nothing but the kind of hopelessness that terrorism brings. And we now understand that we have to have a different kind of Middle East. It's a time, again, when America's values and America's interests are completely linked.

Now, we have seen some tremendous steps forward in the last three-and-a-half years, as well as tremendous challenges since September 11th. Of course, the country has come together around our common values; that's something that we all applaud and find and see with pride. But we've also seen people around the world answering this call about freedom and liberty. Just think about the Georgian revolution or the Ukrainian revolution in Europe and in the Caucasus, but also, people voting in huge numbers in Afghanistan, voting in the Palestinian territories, and

yesterday, voting in Iraq, voting in Iraq in large numbers, despite the efforts of the terrorists to intimidate them, to sow fear.

As Zarqawi said, democracy is something for infidels, he said. A vote for democracy is something that we will oppose. Well, the Iraqi people answered that and answered it resoundingly. So this is a time when democracy and freedom can be on the march. This is a time when we can demand good governance for people who are trapped in hopelessness and poverty. That's why even our development assistance programs have a new task to them, to be something like the Millennium Challenge Account, that says you have to govern wisely in order to use development assistance wisely. And it is a time when the United States can reach out to those in need, when the United States is taking on the mantle of wanting to care about those who are afflicted with AIDS, and that's why the President's Emergency Relief Plan for AIDS is a part of who we are as a people.

We are people who believe in values. We believe that there is a moral obligation of the strongest to help the weakest, and that is why AIDS and the Millennium Challenge and all of the things that we're doing in development are so important. And we've showed our heart once again, as we did in tsunami relief, because when Americans saw this great disaster, not only did the United States Government respond, but the American people responded, and they responded in great numbers.

That is the basis of our foreign policy. It's a foreign policy based on values; it's a foreign policy based on the heart of who we are. Yes, we have interests, and we know that there is a world out there that looks a certain way, that we have to deal with the world as it is. But you know, the thing about the Trumans and the Achesons and the Kennans is they didn't just accept the world as it was. They believed that it was possible to change it.

That's why this is an extraordinary time. That's why the Department of State is going to be leading a tremendous effort to use our diplomacy literally to change the world.

Now, I want to talk about a few examples in our midst of transformational diplomacy, meaning that we are doers. We're activists in this effort to change the world. Yes, we'll analyze. And yes, we will report. And yes, we will come up with great ideas. But we also have to be able to really engage and to get it done. That's the new challenge for diplomacy.

Before I speak about these three efforts that are examples of transformational diplomacy, though, I want to say one other thing to each and every person in this room. There is no such thing as an insignificant or unimportant task or an insignificant or unimportant job. Not in the State Department. Every single task is important. Every single job must be done well. It does not matter what job you have, it doesn't matter if you're administration, all the way up to the Secretary, there is no unimportant or insignificant task.

And so we have to have a dedication and a willingness to work hard at whatever it is we do, because everything that we do matters and everything that we do counts.

So I'm counting on all of you, every person in this room and every person beyond listening, to take on the challenge that we have, because if we do what we do well, we, too, will be a part of a legacy that leaves to people 30 or 40 or 50 years from now a transformed world, and they can look back and they can say, it's amazing, the decisions and the actions that were taken in 2005 and 2006 and 2007, so that when a President of the United States sits across now from democratic allies across the world, they'll know that we've done our job well.

Transformational diplomacy is not easy. It means taking on new tasks, breaking old habits, working with people who are trying to make those transformations themselves, being partners

with those around the world who share our values and want to improve their lives.

And we've got some examples right now of transformational diplomacy, and I'm going to ask just three groups of people to stand. The people who were involved in tsunami relief, if you would stand. Are you here? There we are. People involved in tsunami relief. All right. You see before you an example of people who worked enormously long hours and very, very hard over the last few weeks -- some are down here -- to respond to the tsunami. And I can tell you. I've been briefed on what we did.

One of the things that was done very, very well in tsunami relief was that we made common cause with other countries around the world who had something to contribute in tsunami relief. We had a core group early on, as you'll remember: India and Australia and Japan, the United States -- navies that could respond to the disaster there.

It was not, by the way, an organization with an address. It was a coalition of the willing that put itself together to deal with that -- those requirements for that time. And so tsunami relief and the way that we went about it is an example of transformational diplomacy.

How about the people involved in HIV/AIDS? Just there. We've got a few people around the auditorium who have been involved in our efforts in support of HIV/AIDS. And one of the really wonderful things about this program is it's not just the delivery of vaccines or the delivery of antiretrovirals -- although that's very important, too -- but the process is as important as what we're delivering.

I was out in Uganda to see one of the programs on which we modeled this, and what you try to do is to improve the health care delivery system at the same time that you produce the antiretrovirals and other drugs that will help people to be cured or help people to be treated for aids. The important thing is that they're working with individuals in these countries to improve health care at the same time. It's an example, again, of transformational diplomacy. Thank you.

And now if the folks who've been involved in the PSI -- the Proliferation Security Initiative -- some of them would stand. Okay. You've got people around who have been involved in this. What is the Proliferation Security Initiative? Well, again, it is an organization that really doesn't have an address or a building. But what it is doing is it is using interdiction based on current national and international laws to interdict suspicious cargos around the world that may be weapons of mass destruction cargos.

They had a big success in interdicting a cargo on its way from North Korea to Libya that we suspected of being contraband, and, by the way, it helped the Libyans decide that it was time to give up their weapons of mass destruction, so again, an example of transformational diplomacy. It means crossing disciplines. It means crossing regional lines. It means crossing different kinds of expertise together to solve problems. And we will have to do more of that as a Department if we are to meet the tremendous challenges that we have.

So I look forward to working with all of you in this extraordinary time. I want to mention one other thing because I believe strongly that we need to prepare for the challenges of the future. I want to reach out to young officers who want to grow and who aspire to help the Department move in new directions. And so today, I'm going to announce that we will soon be establishing a new fellows program named for my dear friend and our dear immediate past Secretary, Colin Powell, to provide ideas and insights to me and to others on the leadership team and to have a chance to be recognized for their potential.

The Colin Powell Fellows Program will be a group of Civil Service and Foreign Service Specialists and Foreign Service Generalists who have demonstrated the commitment and

dedication that we need. They will represent the best of what the Department of State is and what it must be in the future. And we'll be telling you about the Powell Fellows Programs in the weeks to come.

So thank you very much for your attention. It's a great and exciting time. We have a lot of challenges. A lot of people are making the ultimate sacrifice to make possible the march of freedom and democracy and liberty. And I look forward to being involved with each and every one of you as we work toward these great common goals.

Thank you very much. (Applause.) Thank you.

Now I'm happy to take a few questions, and I understand there's a microphone someplace and that people can go to it.

**QUESTION:** My name is Al Murphy from IIP, the Africa Team.

I just want to thank you. When you talk about being timely, it makes a statement. When you come to us in the beginning, it shows, as far as your priority, as far as the Town Hall meeting. And also, when you talk about your timing for diplomacy when we have different things going on like the tsunami, HIV/AIDS, democracy -- different things like that -- it's really important that we come together as a unit. And it's new for -- it's a good time for a new situation for us to have an impact. And I'm talking about impact and also visibility as far as making a difference, you know, for -- in people's lives; so I think it's very important.

Also, I didn't see any coverage, much coverage, dealing with Somalia on the tsunami relief. So thank you again.

**SECRETARY RICE:** Yes. Well, thank you very much. And let me just say it's a very important point, we are going to be working together on some very difficult issues. I want to assure you that I know, too, that the question of the resources that we have to deal with the difficult issues that we will face will be important to each and every one of us.

These are going to be tough times in terms of budgets and the like, but as we deal with all of these issues, we'll make our case because we want to be sure that we have what we need to carry out our transformational diplomacy.

Yes, ma'am.

**QUESTION:** Hi. My name is Colleen Hinton. I'm with the Cryptological Services branch. And I just wanted to know, how open are you going to be for suggestions from front-line people? I'm not talking about managers of bureaus and all that kind of thing. I think you'd get a much better idea of what needs to be done in the Department to fix systemic problems if you talk more down at a lower level to people that don't have their own agendas, you know, things that -- kingdoms they're trying to protect and that sort of thing. (Laughter.)

(Applause.)

I say this because I'm an operational person. I'm not in diplomacy. But operations is what supports the diplomacy and because we have the shrinking dollar and we have all these things we have to pay for, we need to work as efficient as possible. And I have some suggestions about budget and things like that, but because of the level I'm at, who's going to listen to me?

So I was just wondering if you (laughter) -- if you're going to have, maybe, a suggestion box kind of thing, maybe an e-mail, where people could just say, this is what's happening in my --

not a ratting kind of thing, but a thing of, this is a systemic problem and this is how I think it could be solved.

**SECRETARY RICE:** That's a very good idea. And first of all, let me say you are in diplomacy, because if you're a operation supporting diplomacy, diplomacy won't go on without you. And so that's really what I mean. Each and every one of us is a part of diplomacy.

**QUESTION:** Well, I do travel around the world, so I do have to be diplomatic (laughter) for the State Department.

**SECRETARY RICE:** Yes. And it's a very good idea. Let us look at how we can get suggestions up because I think you're right. Sometimes people have good suggestions and we wouldn't normally hear them. We'll look for a way to do that.

**QUESTION:** Thank you.

**QUESTION:** Madame Secretary, I'm John Limbert. I'm the president of the American Foreign Service Association.

And on behalf of our 13,000 members, let me welcome you here and say how much we appreciated your kind words on Friday and also on Thursday at your entrance about the Foreign Service and about the Civil Service, about our Foreign Service Nationals, and also your citing our fallen colleagues when you came in through the C-Street lobby. Let me assure you, also -- let me wish you great success in your work and assure you that you will certainly have the support of everyone here who works for you.

Since we're a union, I have to ask you about money.

**SECRETARY RICE:** Of course.

(Laughter.)

**QUESTION:** The budget news coming out, what we hear, at least the preliminary news, isn't very good. And how are we going to make sure that we do not repeat the bad days of the '90s, which really -- which crippled, crippled our operations. We were cut -- our offices, our posts were cut below critical mass and left pretty much hanging out to make do as best they could. How are we going to make sure that we don't cripple our -- not just our operations, but our very diplomacy itself?

And second, again, a union issue, same part of this: I would like to hear, we would like to hear very much your views about ensuring pay equity or comparability pay or locality pay for the 95 percent of the Foreign Service who currently take a 16 percent, or \$110 million cut when they go overseas, when they leave Washington to go overseas, whether they go to Barcelona or to Baghdad. Thank you very much.

**SECRETARY RICE:** Thank you very much. Let me take the second question -- first of all, let me thank you very much for the warm reception that I have received from the association and from others here. And I hope to continue those -- that relationship very intensely because I think we have a lot of work to do together.

Let me start with the locality pay issue, which the Department has been working on, I know, year after year, and I will continue to work on that issue. I do think it's an important one. It does have real resource implications, but it's nonetheless an important issue and I've already mentioned to OMB that I'll be coming back at them about it. We'll see how far we can get.



But yes, I do think it's an extremely important issue.

The second point about resources more broadly: We can't afford to go back to the '90s when we were missing whole classes of people. That is really not something that we can countenance. I realize how important the Diplomatic Readiness Initiative is. And we will try to continue it at a pace that meets at least the need to continue to bring fresh blood into the Service and to make sure that people are well trained and well taken care of. So you can be assured that I'm most dedicated to making sure that we have a steady flow of people coming in.

It is going to be a difficult budget time. The country has a difficult budget time. We have a number of demands on the budget, and it means that bringing down deficits and the like will be important, and we're going to have to be good partners for the President in trying to deal with those issues. And I'd just ask you to recognize that as a country, we have a problem and we will need to be a part of the process of dealing with that problem.

But in doing so, we will also make sure that the tremendous charge that we have to lead the diplomatic effort, to support those diplomatic efforts, to train people well, to make sure that people are safe and secure in the embassies, to make sure that our nationals abroad have access to us so that they can be secure in dangerous times, that those will be very high priorities. I know they are very high priorities for me. They are high priorities for the President, as well. We will do everything we can to make sure that we've got the resources that we need. So thank you very much for the question.

Yes.

**QUESTION:** I'm Cheryl Pellerin with International Information Programs.

I'd like to know what you think about Science, as a diplomatic tool.

**SECRETARY RICE:** I think science, as diplomatic tool, is great. I come from Stanford University. And just let me say that, first of all, I'm a huge proponent of exchanges, student exchanges, cultural exchanges, university exchanges. We talk a lot about public diplomacy. It's extremely important that we get our message out, but it's also the case that we should not have a monologue with other people. It has to be a conversation. And you can't do that without exchanges and openness. And so I'm very, very devoted to that, and it gets to the question of science.

At a place like Stanford, the wonderful thing is you look around and you cannot find a more multiethnic, multicultural, multinational endeavor than in the sciences, and the United States has always been in the lead of being at the center of international science. And science and knowledge know no boundaries. They can't know boundaries. What's discovered in Russia, or what's discovered in the United States or what's discovered in India or in Israel, it all forms the base of scientific knowledge.

The other thing is that the United States can lead in problems where science and technology can be the solution. We have been very involved in issues concerning greenhouse gases and climate change, for instance. This is an important issue. And the United States is spending \$5 billion a year on these questions. Eventually, energy and the economy and science and technology have to come together to give us better solutions to these problems.

So yes, we can press on a number of fronts on science: Openness in recognizing that there are no boundaries and therefore keeping ourselves open to other people, making sure that we are at the center of the scientific discourse when it comes to particular issues that science can help, and I think just being representatives of the importance of the international character of science.



Yes.

**QUESTION:** Dr. Rice, thank you very much for meeting us today. My name's John Heffern. I'm from the Human Resources Bureau.

And I had a question, sort of, about your time. Your time and your attention are finite. And to some extent, there is a tradeoff between the time that you spend on policy and diplomacy as opposed to the time that you might spend on, shall we say, taking care of the troops. And so my question is, just where do you see yourself on the continuum of policy and diplomacy on the one hand and taking care of the troops on the other?

**SECRETARY RICE:** Thank you. Well, first of all, always take care of the troops. I <sup>always</sup> take care of the people because you can have the best ideas and the best buildings and the best all that, and if you don't have the people, you're not going to get anything done.

I'm a huge believer in human capital. And I know that my time is finite, and I'm getting on a plane on Thursday and I'm going to go to ten countries in seven days or something like that. I think they're not actually telling me. They don't want me to know. (Laughter.) And I'm going to be, you know, doing this and that. But let me tell you something. I care about the people in this Department, their well-being. The first briefings that I had were from M, in management, because I wanted to know what the issues were in terms of pay and in terms of training and in terms of safety of our people.

You can't do anything unless people are well taken care of. I think if you went back to talk to people who knew me when I was Provost at Stanford, they would tell you that I spent a lot of time -- I was the Chief Operating Officer of Stanford, in effect. The Stanford Provost is really a management job. And I understood in that job that I couldn't get anything done unless I had people and the resources to help them do their jobs and the facilities in which they needed to work and all of those things. So it'll be extremely important to me. And it'll be important to my team.

I'll have good people around me who also pay attention to what's happening to the people. I know very well how important this set of issues was to Colin Powell and his team. You can be certain that we're not going to have any drop off in that regard. And what you do in Human Resources, what you do in nurturing people, in training them and making sure that they have what they need is an extremely important function. I was not kidding when I said we're all involved in diplomacy, because diplomacy will not work unless you do your job.

(Applause.)

**QUESTION:** Secretary Rice, my name is Lee Rainer. I'm in the Bureau of Administration.

There isn't very much that goes on here in the State Department that the Bureau of Administration is not involved in. I don't have a question. I just want to let you know that we've got your back.

(Applause.)

**SECRETARY RICE:** Thank you. Thank you very much.

**QUESTION:** Madame Secretary, my name is Charles Newstead and I'm from the Nonproliferation Bureau.

And I just wanted to mention to you, both a diplomacy problem and a nonproliferation problem and an energy problem, which is all wrapped up together. We've been working on this for the

last 18 years while I've been here. And it's called the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor, ITER, I-T-E-R.

**SECRETARY RICE:** ITER, yes.

**QUESTION:** And the President himself has taken the decision for the United States to reenter ITER. For a while it had to leave because of budget problems. But recently, the United States within the last year or two has gone back into ITER, but we've run into a great roadblock because there are two countries that want to have ITER, France and the Chinese -- sorry, the Japanese.

**SECRETARY RICE:** And the Japanese, right.

**QUESTION:** And unfortunately, they're knocking heads against each other. The United States has been quite open about saying, well, either country would be okay, though we, at the moment have a preference for putting it in China. But unfortunately, because there's six countries involved and it's gotten quite political and difficult, the whole thing is in great danger of going nowhere.

And the reason I'm stressing this is not so much because of a trivial problem or the politics, but because this is our chance, the world's chance, to have an inexhaustible energy source, which is the source of energy the sun uses, only we could build it here on earth. And this would be a major, major accomplishment if we could do it. But we don't want to lose the opportunity because it's only now that we're going to do that.

And the United States would only pay 10 percent of the cost of the project, which is \$5 billion, by the way, over ten years. That's very cheap -- just 10 percent of that. The other countries are paying much more. But we're in danger of losing all of that. And since I've spent so long working on this, I just --

**SECRETARY RICE:** I appreciate that, yes.

**QUESTION:** I just wanted to have you know, personally, about it because you've got so many things to focus on.

**SECRETARY RICE:** No, but you'll be very pleased to know that I do know personally about it and, in fact, have done some work on it. And the ITER project is a very important project and we hope it can move forward. We have backed the Japanese site at this point. But we have said to the EU that if they can work something out with the Japanese, then we will do whatever needs to be done here.

But the scientists, actually, under the direction of Jack Marburger, the Science Advisor to the President, selected the Japanese site as the scientifically best site, and we'll continue to work the problem. I agree with you. It's an important project and we need to try to break through what is currently this logjam, 3 and 3; and I want you to know I do know about it.

**QUESTION:** I'm impressed that you know that much about it. (Laughter.) Because with all the things the Secretary has to know, you know, that's just one minor little thing. But thank you very much for knowing that (laughter) and for saying you're going to do something. And I'll wait to see what happens.

**SECRETARY RICE:** Well, we'll keep working on it. Thank you.

**QUESTION:** Thank you.

(Applause.)

**SECRETARY RICE:** Yes.

**QUESTION:** Good morning, Dr. Secretary Rice. My name is Tory Birks, and I'm actually in A Bureau of Transportation Division.

My question is of a little lighter note, and I intentionally use the word "note." Anyone who has done any research on your background knows that you're a pretty accomplished musician, and I'm a musician as well, so what I would like to know is, during these next four years, do you plan to give us a concert?

(Laughter.)

(Applause.)

**SECRETARY RICE:** Well, thank you very much. I appreciate that invitation and when I'm not on an airplane, I'll try to work and see if I can't do that. I do have to tell you briefly that I was, indeed, a piano major in college. I started piano lessons when I was about three-and-a-half years old because my grandmother taught piano, and I wanted to learn to play, so she taught me to play. I could actually read music before I could read.

But then I went off to college. And about halfway through college I went to a very well known music festival and I encountered 12-year-olds who could play from sight what it had taken me all year to learn. And I thought, I'm going to end up playing a piano bar someplace (laughter) or maybe play at Nordstrom, (laughter) but I'm not going to end up playing at Carnegie Hall. (Applause.)

And so I decided to major in something else. And in one of the great journeys around Denver University's possible majors, finally ended up in a course in International Politics taught by Madeleine Albright's father, Joseph Korbel. And that's what got me into this field, but I do still play. And I play mostly chamber music now, so maybe one of these days I'll try to get it together and play for you.

(Applause.)

**QUESTION:** Good morning, Secretary Rice. Thanks so much for speaking with all of us.

My question's on a slightly more serious note than that one. I work in the Office of the Legal Advisor. And my question is, what is your view of the role of International Law in international diplomacy? Thanks.

**SECRETARY RICE:** Yes. Thank you very much. International law is critical to the proper function of international diplomacy. And not only that, the United States has been the most important voice for international legal norms in international politics. We depend on a world in which there is some international legal order. Because there are so many countries in the world that don't have our own domestic order, legal order, we depend on norms of behavior in international politics. And I want to just be very clear. We are a country of laws. We will be a country of laws. We respect international obligations and treaty obligations and international law. And we're going to continue to make that very clear to the world.

I know that there are those who are concerned by some of the things that happened like, for instance, Abu Ghraib. And that was a horrible, horrible blot on America and on our reputation. The President said what most of us felt, that it made him sick to his stomach when he saw

that.

The United States, though, is a country of laws. And as a result, there have been investigations of what happened there and people are, indeed, being punished for what happened there. But I want to be very clear: This Department, along with the rest of the Administration, will be a strong voice for international legal norms, for living up to our treaty obligations, to recognizing that America's moral authority in international politics also rests on our ability to defend international laws and international treaties. So thank you for the question.

Yes.

(Applause.)

**QUESTION:** Good morning, Madame Secretary. My name is Alisha Earle, and I'm a Presidential Management fellow here in the Office of Intergovernmental Affairs. And if you don't mind, could you just please explain more about transformational diplomacy and how do you see that working in the future with the State Department?

**SECRETARY RICE:** Sure. What I mean by transformational diplomacy is, really, we have to be doers. This is a time in which what we're really doing in our diplomacy is we're partnering with people in other countries to give them capacity to move toward democracy or to move toward prosperity. We aren't what, you know, for most of us in international politics, this is a different world. We're not as much reporting on them or writing analyses of them. We're actually, if you look at what the people in Iraq are doing, our people in Iraq, the Embassy, or what the Embassy is doing in Afghanistan, they're really partnering with people to make their lives better.

The people who are involved in the HIV/AIDS initiative are designing programs to work with the people who are going to be the deliverers of the antiretrovirals. The people who are working in tsunami relief are doing the action of working with those who had to do the relief effort, the organizing of those efforts.

Now, we've done some of this all along. But it's much more the core of what we do now than an auxiliary part of what we do. And we're going to need different skills. We're going to need to work to develop those skills. One of the most interesting things was putting together the senior advisors who went out to Afghanistan or went out to Iraq, these are people who are actually sitting in ministries and helping those people come to terms with how you build an accountability system.

This is a time, it's a great time, because when you're in a period in which many, many countries around the world are trying to shed old habits and learn new ways of doing things, and believe that we have the technical expertise to help, they look to the United States and to other countries to help them make that transformation. So that's what I mean by transformational diplomacy.

It's a time when, if we do our jobs well, we are going to build relationships for a long time into the future with competent, democratic states around the world. I want to just give one other example. In peacekeeping, one of the first questions that's often asked is, well, is the United States going to do it?

What we've been trying to do is to say, we need to build other peoples' capacity, too, so when in Liberia, for instance, we worked with ECOWAS and with the Nigerians and with others to help them do the peacekeeping in Liberia. The United States was there for a short time and then others took over the goals, and so -- took over that work. And so we need to be able to

work with others hand in hand to help train, build capacity, and solve problems so that we can spread this time of extraordinary desire for democracy and prosperity.

Yes.

**QUESTION:** Thank you, Dr. Rice. My name is Dan Scher and I work in the Information Resource Management Bureau. Thanks again for coming here today, really appreciate it.

You were speaking about transformational diplomacy. I was very intrigued by that idea. And I noticed you quoted Dean Acheson, or mentioned Dean Acheson in, I think, every speech you've had. Acheson said when he joined the Department, the Department was completely outdated in its operational ways, a fact of which quite a few people in the Department were unaware at the time. Nevertheless, I think we've made tremendous progress in my area on operational with Internet access, thanks to Colin Powell, which we hadn't had previously. But as we move into this transformational diplomacy, there's a lot of other things -- it sounds like being doers, we're out and about and we're engaged in doing things beyond our desks and that sort of thing.

A lot of our infrastructure on the IT side is still very much in that, perhaps, older format that we're classified, we're closed down, although that certainly has a role, and we're tied to the embassy and to the desk. And the technology, of course, I think, gives us opportunities to move beyond that, but there's a lot of work to be done there. I just wanted to hear your thoughts, perhaps, on that area.

**SECRETARY RICE:** Yes, thank you very much. Yes, I recognize very well what Secretary Powell did in terms of the IT structure. It's extremely important. We'll try to continue that work. I'm glad you mentioned classification. We do need to be certain we are cognizant of and vigilant about security. It's one of our most important obligations.

I think ethics and security are the kind of foundation of what we do. And so it's important -- don't pass classified information to somebody who isn't possibly -- isn't supposed to receive it. Don't put something on your unclassified computer that's classified. I mean, these are really basics and we're going to -- we have to be absolutely vigilant about that.

We also have to take advantage of the kind of open architectures that are out there to communicate. And so now, with some of the hardware investments having been made, I know that the next phase, the next challenge is to put those good resources to use so that we can change our work processes and they can actually help us to do our work.

I was the executive chairman of Stanford's management information systems overhaul. And Stanford, you would think, Stanford University, technologically very sophisticated, right? It's in the middle of the Silicon Valley. David Packard, Bill Hewlett, all -- Google, all of these things come out of Stanford. Stanford had one of the most antiquated information systems you'd ever want to see.

Why? Because in the 1950s it built Legacy systems with very smart people who knew how to build these systems, and by the time we got to 1997 or 1998, none of those people were around anymore. We were going to have to train people in these old-fashioned systems in order to be able to keep them working. And so we put out -- we did a management systems overhaul. But you can buy the hardware, unless you can change the work processes, unless you can convince people to use the technology in real support of their missions, the technology goes to waste.

And so I know in the briefing that I had with the CIO and with the IT people that they're going to be asking all of us to do training and to understand the real power of these

information systems for what we can do in our work. And I want you to try to be cooperative. I know we've all got our ways of doing these things, and we've all got our spreadsheet in the desk drawer, but we'll take advantage of these systems if we really will take the opportunities that will be before us. Thank you.

**QUESTION:** Hi, Secretary Rice. My name is Charlie Hale and I've been working here for about three hours. It's my first day. (Laughter.)

**SECRETARY RICE:** Oh, good for you. (Laughter.) You're even newer than I am. That's great. (Laughter.)

**QUESTION:** I had a specific question about your vision of the role of the U.S. in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, especially after Arafat left, and specifically our relationship with the Palestinian territories.

**SECRETARY RICE:** Yes, sure. Well, in June of 2002, the President laid out a very important vision for how the Israeli-Palestinian conflict could be resolved, but he said that basically the actors are going to have to make some fundamental choices, fundamental choices on the part of the Palestinians about ending terror and building democratic institutions and, at that time, finding new leadership.

He talked about fundamental choices that the Israelis were going to have to make about creating conditions in which a new Palestinian state could emerge, and, indeed, that meant that the Israelis were going to have to recognize that there was going to have to be land for -- contiguous land for this Palestinian state to exist on. And he talked about the responsibility of Arab states to end incitement and to support the peace process and for all of us to recognize that peace and security and democracy and an end to terror all go together.

The good thing about the last couple of months has been that I think you're starting to see the parties make good, fundamental choices. And as they make those good, fundamental choices, it opens up the possibility of getting back on the roadmap toward a two-state solution.

I don't think any of us doubt that without a Palestinian state that is viable, that can represent the aspirations of the Palestinian people, that there really isn't going to be a peace for either the Palestinian people or for the Israelis. And so we're going to be -- over the next several months, I'm going to Israel and to the West Bank on this trip that I'm going on. We're going to be working with the parties, now that they've begun to make those fundamental choices, to push forward toward the date when we have a two-state solution. And I think it's in our grasp, although it's still something that has to be worked toward vigilantly.

Yes.

**QUESTION:** Good morning, Secretary Rice. My name is Eric Nelson. I work in the Bureau of Administration. Last week when you arrived, in your first speech to us, you talked about the importance of diversity and that the State Department reflect the American population as a whole. I wonder if you could talk a little bit about that and tell us what ideas you have for stimulating diversity on all levels of the Department.

**SECRETARY RICE:** Yes, thank you. I'm glad you asked the question. The first thing is to be aware of its importance, aware of the need for diversity. So, you know, if you look around and everybody looks like you, then start thinking maybe I should think a little bit differently about this. And so I'd just ask each and every person to think every day about how you can improve diversity.

No, it's not easy because in -- particularly in foreign affairs, it has not been an area in which there has been great diversity and you have to really work at it. But I'm going to tell you about how I got to Stanford University and I think it will tell you something about how I view diversity.

I got to Stanford University -- I was a Fellow in the Center for International Security and Arms Control. I'd come from the University of Denver. And about halfway through my stay at Stanford, they asked if I was interested in maybe coming on to the faculty in a temporary position. And I thought, well, they have a couple Soviet specialists already, what are they doing? I realized many years later, of course, that what they did was they saw a black woman Soviet specialist and they thought maybe this is a chance to increase our diversity.

Now, the fact of the matter is Stanford didn't get most its faculty from the University of Denver. Okay, let's be realistic. What does that say? That says that sometimes, to increase diversity, you have to look outside your normal channels, outside your normal pools. You can't just look at the same places that everybody else came from. And so like Colin Powell, who was very active with historically black colleges and the colleges serving Hispanics and the like, we are going to look outside our normal channels and our normal pools to identify good people who can be brought into our midst who have the basic -- the basics: you know, they're smart, they're devoted, perhaps haven't had the experiences that some have had inside of those pools. And that's how you increase diversity.

It is not -- and I want to say this five times over -- it is not a matter of lowering standards. And it is not a matter of taking people who are unqualified. (Applause.) That is an insult. That's an insult to people of color. That's an insult to women. Of course there are people who are qualified; you just have to find them. And so a lot of diversity is finding people outside your normal channels, and we'll be making a big effort at doing that. (Applause.)

I can only take one more, I'm told. Okay, you're it. Sorry. Look, if you had questions that you didn't get a chance to ask, just jot them down, get them to -- is Brian over there? -- Brian Gunderson, Chief of Staff, and I'll get you an answer. Okay? Great. Go right ahead.

**QUESTION:** Madame Secretary, my name is Anne Seshadri. I work in EAP Public Diplomacy. And I think we're very heartened by the mention you've made of public diplomacy in your testimony and your meetings to date; however, in EAP, our budget has actually been cut this year and, as you know, EAP includes countries like Indonesia, which is the world's largest Muslim population, and also strategic countries such as China and Japan.

So my question is: How can we continue to engage foreign publics and win support for our policies if our public diplomacy resources are shrinking instead of growing?

**SECRETARY RICE:** Well, thank you for the question. I don't know the specific circumstances, but I will say that obviously we have to be able to reach out to people and we have to have resources to do it. Indonesia is one of several countries that is extremely important, a moderate Islamic population, huge Islamic population. When we talk about outreach to the Muslim world, Indonesia is one of the countries that we talk about.

So let me make the broader point. Public diplomacy -- everybody talks about public diplomacy. We're doing some very good things in public diplomacy. And I just don't want it to be thought that when one talks about the need to improve public diplomacy that one doesn't recognize the many very good things that are already going on.

But we obviously, after the end of the Cold War, we didn't keep in place a number of our strongest assets. We sort of thought, well, we've done that and we've won the Cold War. We



now have the struggle of our lives in trying to -- a struggle of generations -- in trying to overcome the ideologies of hatred that are brewing in parts of the world, ideologies of hatred so great that people drove airplanes into our buildings on a fine September day. That's hatred. Ideologies of hatred so great that young women strap suicide vests onto themselves and blow up other young women of their same age.

Somehow, those ideologies have to be challenged, and they have to be challenged by freedom and liberty. They also have to be challenged by truth-telling. Public diplomacy is not spin. Public diplomacy worked in the Cold War because Voice of America and Radio Free Europe were known to tell the truth. That's why public diplomacy worked.

And so that's what we're going to do. We're going to find the means and the mechanisms to get messages out to people that are true. We're going to find the means and the mechanisms to engage people through cultural diplomacy and through exchanges so that we're going there and they're coming here. We're going to also be a bully pulpit for the rest of America doing its job. People like me were trained to speak Russian because we were told, well, this was a critical language and the best and the brightest speak Russian. We're not doing enough to train Arabic speakers and Farsi speakers and people who know the cultures of the Islamic world.

So this is a broad effort on our part and it's a broad effort on the part of the country. It will be very central to what we do and we can all engage in this effort because there's nothing more important than challenging now these ideologies of hatred that are at the root of our security problem.

So thank you very much for being with me. And again, if you had questions, get them to Brian. I'll answer them.

(Applause.)

**2005/108**

Released on January 31, 2005



### <부록3> 조선중앙통신 기사자료

#### 1. 조선외무성대변인 경수로 제공 즉시 NPT복귀 (조선중앙통신 2005. 9.20자 기사)

(평양 9월 20일발 조선중앙통신)조선민주주의인민공화국 외무성 대변인은 20일 다음과 같은 담화를 발표하였다.

국제사회의 관심이 집중된 가운데 지난 9월 13일부터 베이징에서 열렸던 조미사이의 핵문제에 관한 2단계 4차 6자회담이 19일 결속되었다.

우리의 주동적인 발기로 2003년 8월 첫 시작을 땀 6자회담은 지금까지 2년여에 걸쳐 곡절을 거듭하며 여러차례 진행되었다.

그러나 회담은 조선반도의 비핵화를 바라는 국제사회의 한결같은 기대와 어긋나게 유관국들사이의 상반되는 입장으로 하여 아무런 결과물도 만들어내지 못하고 공회전만을 거듭하였다.

우리는 조선반도비핵화라는 총적목표를 어떻게 하나 실현하려는 원칙적이고 공명정대한 입장과 야량을 가지고 인내성있게 그리고 진지하게 이번 회담에 립합으로써 끝내 모든 도전을 이겨내고 《말 대 말》 공약인 공동성명이 합의되도록 하였다.

공동성명에는 조미사이의 핵문제해결에 관한 우리의 일관한 립장이 반영되었으며 전 조선반도의 비핵화에 책임있는 미국과 남조선의 의무사항들도 명백히 밝혀져있다.

알려진바와 같이 지금까지 조선반도의 비핵화를 위한 《말 대 말》 공약에서 우리와 미국사이에서 가장 심각하게 대치되어온 문제는 우리의 평화적핵활동권리에 대한 문제,구체적으로는 우리에게 대한 경수로제공문제였다.

이 문제로 하여 지난 8월에 있던 제4차 1단계회담도 응당한 결말을 보지 못하고 휴회에 들어가지 않으면 안되었다.

현 미행정부는 주권국가의 자주적권리에 속하는 우리의 평화적핵활동권리를 원천적으로 부인하면서 우리가 핵무기전과방지조약(NPT)에서 탈퇴하였고 국제원자력기구(IAEA)성원국이 아니라는 근거로 어떤 경우에도 경수로를 제공할수 없다고 고집하였다.

우리는 미국의 이러한 부당한 립장에 대처하여 조미사이의 핵문제 해결의 기초는 력사적으로 조성된 두 나라사이의 불신을 청산하는데 있으며 서로의 신뢰조성을 위한 물리적기초는 다름아닌 경수로제공이라는것을 명백히 하였다.

우리는 미국이 경수로제공을 통하여 우리로 하여금 NPT에서 탈퇴하도록 만든 근원을 제거할것을 강력히 요구하였다.

회담에서 미국을 제외한 모든 유관측들은 우리의 평화적핵활동권리를 존중하며 우리에게 경수로를 제공하는 문제를 토의하는데 찬성하였다.

미국대표단은 이번에 대세의 추이에 놀리워 워싱턴과 여러차례 련계한 끝에 마지못해 자기의 고집을 철회하지 않으면 안되었다.

6자는 이번 공동성명을 통해 합의한 사항들을 앞으로 《행동 대 행동》 원칙에 따라 단계별로 리행하기 위한 조화로운 조치들을 취하기로 하였다.

우리는 이번 공동성명에 천명된대로 미국이 우리에게 신뢰조성의 기초로 되는 경수로를 제공하는 즉시 NPT에 복귀하며 IAEA와 담보협정을 체결하고 리행할것이다.

이미 루차 밝힌바와같이 조미관계가 정상화되어 신뢰가 조성되고 우리가 미국의 핵위협을 더이

상 느끼지 않게 되면 우리에게도 단 한개의 핵무기도 필요없게 될 것이다.

따라서 기본은 미국이 우리의 평화적 핵활동을 실질적으로 인정하는 증거로 되는 경수로를 하루빨리 제공하는 것이다.

신뢰조성의 물리적 담보인 경수로제공이 없이는 우리가 이미 보유하고 있는 핵억제력을 포기하는 문제에 대해 꿈도 꾸지 말라는 것이 지심깊이 뿌리박힌 천연바위처럼 굳어진 우리의 정정당당하고 일관한 립장이다.

우리는 지금까지 미국의 강경파를 대상하여 정책을 세웠으며 앞으로도 그렇게 할 것이다.

미국이 앞으로 《행동 대 행동》 단계에서 실지 어떻게 움직이겠는가 하는 것은 두고보아야 하겠지만 또다시 《선 핵무기포기, 후 경수로제공》 주장을 고집해나선다면 조미사이의 핵문제에서는 아무것도 달라질 것이 없을 것이며 그 후과는 매우 심각하고 복잡할 것이다.

만일 미국이 이번에 한 약속을 어기는 길로 나간다면 우리는 우리의 신념이며 표대인 선군로선이 가리키는 길로 단 한치의 드팀도 없이 나아가게 될 것이다.

주체94(2005)년 9월 20일  
평양(끝)

## 2. 조선외무성 대변인 미국측 금융제재해제회담 회피 비난(조선중앙통신 2005.12.02자 기사)

(평양 12월 2일발 조선중앙통신)조선민주주의인민공화국 외무성 대변인은 최근 미국이 우리에게 대한 제재와 압박을 더욱 강화하는 방향으로 나오고있는것과 관련하여 2일 조선중앙통신사 기사가 제기한 질문에 다음과 같이 대답하였다.

지금 세계는 제4차 6자회담에서 조선반도비핵화에 관한 공동성명이 채택된것을 환영하면서 그것이 빈 공약으로 되지 않기를 한결같이 바라고있다.

조선반도비핵화는 우리의 최종목표이며 우리는 공동성명에 따르는 자기의 의무를 성실히 리행하여 비핵화를 실현하자는 립장이다.

우리는 미국도 자기가 한 공약대로 대조선적대시정책을 포기함으로써 조미사이의 핵문제의 근원을 제거하고 대화를 통해 핵문제를 평화적으로 해결하는 길로 나올것을 기대하였다.

그러나 미국은 공동성명발표후 우리의 기대와는 너무도 상반되게 우리에게 대한 압박공세를 계단식으로 확대하고있으며 이로 하여 6자회담의 진전과 공동성명리행에는 커다란 장애가 조성되고있다.

미국은 《화폐위조》요, 《마약밀매》요 뭐요 하면서 신성한 우리 공화국에 《불법국가》 딱지를 붙이고 6자회담도중에도 금융제재를 가하는 등 고립과 압박을 가증시키고있다.

그들이 말하는 《불법거래설》은 우리 식 사회주의제도의 본성과 전혀 인연이 없는것으로서 반공화국모략소동의 일환에 불과하다.

지금 미국은 대화를 통한 문제해결을 표방하고있지만 실지에 있어서는 고립과 압박을 통한 우리의 《제도전복》을 추구하고있다.

우리의 《제도전복》을 노리는 상대와 마주앉아 제도수호를 위해 만든 핵억제력포기문제를 논의한다는것은 말도 안된다.

만일 미국이 끝내 6자가 합의한 공동성명을 뒤집으면서 계속 제재와 압박으로 나온다면 우리도 그에 대응한 모든 자위적조치들을 강구하지 않을수 없게 될것이다.

우리에게 대한 미국의 압박공세는 공동성명의 정신에 위반될뿐아니라 우리가 한 공약도 리행할수 없게 만들고있다.

때문에 금융제재해제는 공동성명리행을 위한 분위기를 마련하는데서 근본문제이며 6자회담의 진전을 위한 필수적인 요구이다.

이러한 상황에서 우리는 지난 5차 6자회담에서 미국이 우리에게 가하는 금융제재부터 철회하여 회담의 진전을 가로막는 장애를 없앨것을 강하게 요구하였다.

회담참가국들은 우리의 정당한 요구에 리해를 표시하면서 이 문제가 확대되어 6자회담에 영향이 미치지 않도록 미국이 조선측과 별도의 쌍무회담을 통해 하루속히 논의해결해야 한다고 주장하였다.

이에 따라 조미쌍방은 6자회담 단장급에서 회담을 열고 금융제재문제를 토의해결하기로 합의하였던것이다.

그러나 미국측은 자기의 언약을 또다시 뒤집고 회담자체를 회피하는 신의없는 행동을 하고있다.

그들은 합의한대로 문제해결을 위한 회담이 아니라 재무성과 비밀경찰국의 실무일군들을 내세워 미국법에 대한 설명이나 하겠다고 하였다.

미국측이 6자회담의 진전을 진실로 바란다면 5자앞에서 언약한대로 자기 할바를 해야 할 것이다.(끝)

### 3. 조선외무성 대변인 버쉬보우의 망발을 규탄 (조선중앙통신 2005.12.10일자 기사)

(평양 12월 10일발 조선중앙통신)조선민주주의인민공화국 외무성대변인은 최근 남조선주재 미국대사 버쉬보우가 우리에게 대한 망발을 늘어놓은것과 관련하여 10 일 조선중앙통신사기자가 제기한 질문에 다음과 같이 대답하였다.

보도에 의하면 남조선주재 미국대사 버쉬보우가 최근 남조선기자구락부와 이른바 《북조선인권대회》 라는데서 우리에게 대해 《범죄정권》 이라느니, 미국은 《금융제재와 관련한 협상을 하지 않을것》 이라느니 하는 험담을 련이어 늘어놓았다고 한다.

우리는 이 발언을 통하여 무엇보다도 버쉬보우가 자기가 대표하는 나라가 어떤 나라인지조차 깨닫지 못하고있는 비극적인 사실에 주목하게 된다.

사실 범죄정권에 대하여 말하자면 먼저 미국을 꼽아야 할것이다.

부쉬행정부는 유엔도 국제법도 안중에 없이 백주에 주권국가를 무력으로 가로타고앉아 테로를 조장시켰고 국제적으로도 문제시되고있는 백린소이탄, 렬화우라니움탄과 같은 대량살륙무기들까지 꺼리낌없이 사용하여 무고한 주민들을 살해하면서 반인륜범죄를 저지르고있는 범죄정권이다.

부쉬행정부하에서 세계도처에 설치한 미국의 비밀수용소들에서 감행된 특대형인권유린행위와 특수기술까지 리용한 혹독한 고문만행들은 파쑈적인 히틀러정권이래 처음있는 극악한 범죄행위이다.

사실이 이러함에도 불구하고 버쉬보우를 포함한 부쉬행정부안의 크고 작은 자들이 모두 떨쳐나 신빙성이 결여된 자료들을 날조하고 남에게 불량감투를 씌우고있는것은 최근 미국 내외에서 벌어지고있는 무수한 비행들로 하여 수세에 몰리고있는 가련한 처지에서 벗어나보려는 부쉬집단의 얄은 술책에 지나지 않는다.

버쉬보우의 발언에서 또하나 강하게 느끼게 되는것은 현 미행정부가 완전한 정치무식쟁이들과 허위날조의 명수들로 꾸려져있다는 사실이다.

우리는 얼마전 우리의 그 무슨 《비법활동》 과 관련하여 미국측이 작성했다는 《자료》 를 면밀하게 검토해보았다.

그에 의하면 모든 《자료》 들이 완전히 날조한 거짓이라는것이 판명되었다.

우리는 화폐를 위조한적도 없으며 그 어떤 불법거래에 관여한것도 없다.

그러한 비법활동은 우리 국가의 성격과 사명에 비추어보아도 도저히 있을수도 상상할수도 없는 일이다.

이 모든 사실은 미국이야말로 거짓의 능수라는것을 명백히 보여주고있다.

자기 행정부가 《범죄정권》, 《불법집단》 이라는것도 모르는 버쉬보우같은 정치무식쟁이가 대사를 한다니 미국에서 무슨 일인들 제대로 될수 없다는것은 자명한 사실이다.

버쉬보우가 금융제재문제는 정치적으로 해결될수 없다고 한것이 이를 실증해준다.

이처럼 무지막지하고 위협천만한 천하 문외한들이 미국에서 정치를 하기에 우리는 자위를 위하여 핵억제력을 만든것이다.

우리의 핵억제력은 바로 버쉬보우 같은 자들에 대한 필요한 수단으로 될것이다.

지금 미국은 6자회담공동성명의 기본원칙들을 하나씩 뒤집어엮고있다.

특히 미국은 조미금융회담을 파탄시킴으로써 6자회담을 무한정 연장시켰으며 공동성명발표이후 우리 나라를 핵무기로 선제타격하기 위한 준비를 다그침으로써 대화를 통한 핵문제해결에는 아무런 관심도 없다는것을 드러내놓았다.

버쉬보우의 망발을 비롯하여 최근 로골화되고있는 부쉬일당의 중상감빠니야들은 우리로 하여금 회담에 나오지 못하게 함으로써 그것을 궁극적인 파탄으로 이끌어가기 위해 의도적으로 꾸며낸 각본이라는것을 실증해줄뿐이다.

미국은 애당초 호상존중하고 신뢰하며 평화적으로 공존하는 기초우에서 핵문제를 풀려는 생각은 조금도 없이 오직 압박정책만을 강행하고있다.

앞으로의 6자회담재개와 진전여부는 전적으로 미국의 태도에 달려있다.(끝)

**4. 조선중앙통신사 상보 미국은 조미기본합의문파기책임에서 벗어날수 없으며 비싼 대가를 치르게 될 것이다 (조선중앙통신 2005.12.19자 기사)**

- 흑연감속로에 기초한 평화적핵활동 강화

- 《금융제재》철회하고 평화공존의 자세로 6자회담장에 나와야

(평양 12월 19일발 조선중앙통신)조선민주주의인민공화국에서 미국의 주도하에 케도(조선반도에네르기개발기구)가 추진하던 경수로건설이 끝내 종말을 고하였다.

지난 11월 미국과 케도는 우리에게 납입하기로 되어있는 경수로의 건설을 완전히 중단하기로 최종결정하였다.

조미기본합의문의 핵심사항인 경수로건설은 조미사이의 신뢰조성의 기초로서 적대관계를 해소하고 조선반도의 핵문제를 평화적으로 풀기 위한 담보조건으로 존재하여왔다.

조미기본합의문에 따라 2003년까지 완공하여 우리에게 열쇠를 넘겨주게 되어있던 경수로는 미국의 방해책동으로 말미암아 완료목표시점으로부터 2년이 지난 오늘까지도 겨우 기초공사단계에 머물러있었다.

경수로를 그 무슨 《선사품》처럼 여기면서 그 건설을 질질 끌어오던 미국이 일방적으로 완전 중단한것은 국가간 합의와 신의를 저버린 란폭한 행위이다.

조선중앙통신사는 경수로건설을 최종적으로 포기하고 조미기본합의문을 전면파기한 미국의 죄행을 조선반도와 아시아태평양지역에서 핵대결을 야기시킨 엄중한 범죄행위로 략인하고 이를 준렬히 단죄규탄하면서 국제사회가 이로부터 심각한 교훈을 찾으도록 하기 위하여 상보를 발표한다.

1

경수로건설의 완전중단은 미국의 대조선적대시정책의 필연적산물이며 부쉬행정부는 조미기본합의문을 력사의 폐기품으로 만든 장본인이다.

미국이 경수로건설을 완전중지하기로 한것은 우리에게 대한 로골적인 도전이고 도발이며 조미기본합의문에 대한 횡포한 파기행위이다.

1994년 10월 21일에 채택된 조미기본합의문의 기본정신은 쌍방이호상 자주권을 존중하고 화해와 신뢰를 조성하여 두 나라사이의 적대관계를 개선하며 조선반도와 아시아태평양지역, 나아가서는 세계의 평화와 안전을 보장하는것이였다.

이러한 숭고한 리념으로부터 조미는 기본합의문을 통해 정치 및 경제관계의 정상화문제, 우리 공화국의 흑연로체계를 경수로체계로 교체하는 문제, 조선반도를 비핵화하며 평화와 안전을 보장하는 문제, 핵전파방지체계를 강화할데 대한 문제 등 쌍방이 해야 할바를 공약하였다.

국제사회는 조미기본합의문채택이 조미관계를 정상화하고 조선반도의 핵문제를 전면적으로 해결할수 있는 국제법적기틀로 된다고 인정하면서 이에 한결같은 지지와 환영을 표시하였다.

그러나 부쉬행정부는 선임정권이 우리와 체결한 조미기본합의문을 비롯한 일련의 합의사항들이 마치도 우리에게만 《리득》을 주고 미국의 리익과 권위를 손상시키는것으로 된다고 하면서 그 리행을 로골적으로 거부하였으며 조미사이의 공식문건들을 전면파기하는 행위를 계획적으로, 체계적으로 감행하였다.



부쉬를 위시한 미국내 강경보수세력은 클린톤행정부시기에 벌써 조미기본합의문의 파기를 주장하면서 반기를 들었다.

미국회에서 다수파를 이루고있던 공화당은 《클린톤정권은 북조선에 끌려만 다니면서 지나친 양보를 하였다》느니, 《백악관이 미조합의와 관련해 공화당과 사전에 충분히 협의하지 않았다》느니 뭐니 하면서 조미기본합의문을 행정부에 대한 공격수단으로 악용하였다.

당시 미국회 상원의교위원회 위원장은 조미기본합의문을 우리에게 대한 《일종의 보수》로 묘사하였으며 공화당 원내총무는 《미국이 지내 많이 양보하였다》고 터무니없이 곁고들었다.

부쉬와 체이니를 선두로 한 미공화당의 강경보수세력은 계기가 있을 때마다 기본합의문을 꺼들며 민주당정권의 대조선정책에 대한 압박의 도수를 높이였으며 조미기본합의문의 순조로운 리행에 여러모로 장애를 조성하였다.

그들은 존재하지도 않는 우리의 이른바 《핵의혹》설과 《미싸일위협》론 등을 들고나오면서 클린톤행정부의 대조선정책을 전면재검토할것을 요구하였는가 하면 저들이 집권하면 조미기본합의문을 파기하고 경수로건설도 건너치우겠다는것을 입버릇처럼 외워냈다.

부쉬행정부는 집권하자마자 대조선정책을 수정하고 조미기본합의문을 전면부정하는 길을 택하였으며 우리와 상대해보기도전에 《불법국가》, 《불량배국가》, 《인권유린국가》, 《테로지원국》 등 별의별 감투를다 씌우면서 강경고압정책을 체계적으로 강행하는 길로 나아갔다.

부쉬는 2000년 12월 19일 클린톤과 정권인계인수문제를 협의하는 자리에서 선임자의 대조선완화정책을 심각한 정책상오류로 낙인하고 기본합의문파기를 주장하였으며 2001년 3월 7일 《북조선에 대해서는 강경로선을 취할것이다.》라고 공공연히 떠벌이면서 조미사이의 합의사항들을 모두 부정하고 우리와의 전면대결을 선언하였다.

결국 부쉬행정부는 1993년 조미공동성명과 1994년 조미기본합의문을 통하여 《조선민주주의인민공화국에 대해 핵무기를 사용하지 않으며 핵무기로 위협도 하지 않는다》고 공약한 핵불사용담보도 헌신짝처럼 쫓어버리고 우리를 《핵선제공격대상》에 포함시키였으며 대조선핵공격계획을 정책화하였다.

조미기본합의문은 조미사이의 핵문제를 호상성의 원칙에서 해결하기위한 정치적의지의 반영으로서 여기에서 기본핵은 경수로제공이다.

미국은 합의문에 따라 우리에게 2003년까지 200만KW능력의 경수로발전소들을 건설하여 넘겨주게 되어있었다.

조미기본합의문에는 《미합중국은 1994년 10월 20일부 미합중국 대통령의 담보서한에 따라 2003년까지 200만KW의 능력을 가진 경수로대상을 조선민주주의인민공화국에 제공하기 위한 조치들을 책임지고 취한다.

\* \*

경수로제공과 대용에네르기보장에 대한 미합중국의 담보들을 받는데 따라 조선민주주의인민공화국은 흑연감속로와 련관시설들을 동결하며 궁극적으로 해체한다.》고 지적되어있다.

우리는 조미기본합의문 채택이후 그에 따라 우리가 지닌 의무사항들을 성실히 리행하였다.

주동적으로 5MW시험원자로와 련관시설들, 2003년까지의 200만KW발전능력조성을 목표로 한 여러 흑연감속로건설을 완전히 동결하고 국제원자력기구가 그에 대해 확인하도록 허용하였으며 필요한 협조도 충분히 제공하였다.

그리고 5MW시험원자로에서 나온 폐연료들을 안전하게 보관하는 작업도 제때에 완료하였다.



조미기본합의문에 따라 미국상품의 우리 나라 반입제한조치와 미국무역선박의 우리 나라 입항 금지조치를 해제하기로 한 합의사항도 선의를 표시하여 합의된 시점보다 앞당겨 시행하였다.

그러나 미국은 경수로건설을 합의한 일정대로 추진하지 않은것은 더 말할것도 없고 쌍방이 정치 및 경제관계를 완전히 정상화하는데로 나아가며 그 사업의 일환으로 통신봉사와 금융결제제한조치의 해소를 포함한 전반적인 무역과 투자의 장벽들을 완화하기로 한 조미기본합의문 제2조도 전혀 리행하지 않았다.

에당초 경수로건설을 하려는 의도가 없었던 부쉬행정부는 경수로건설중단을 정책화하고 중단책임을 우리에게 전가하기 위한 모략행위에 매달리기 시작하였다.

그 대표적인 실례가 이른바 우리의 《비밀핵계획》 설이다.

미국은 우리의 《핵개발의혹》에 관한 허황하기 그지없는 《정보자료》들을 날조하여 언론을 통해 흘리는 한편 그것을 기정사실화하기 위해 2002년 10월초 미국무성 차관보 켈리를 우리 나라에 파견하였다.

대통령특사로 평양을 방문한 켈리는 아닌밤중에 흥두께 내밀듯이 무턱대고 우리가 기본합의문을 위반하고 《우라늄농축》에 의한 《비밀핵계획》을 추진하고있다고 곁고들었다.

우리는 구체적인 《증거》는 내놓지 못하면서도 그 누구에게도 납득이 가지 않는것을 《믿을만한 정보》자료라고 우겨대는 켈리에게 최대의 인내성을 발휘하여 돌부처도 알아들을만큼 충분히 하게 우리의 결백성을 설명해주었다.

덧붙여 말한다면 우리는 우리의 진지한 입장을 무시하고 저들이 고안해낸 《정보자료》만을 넘 불처럼 외위대면서 우리가 굴복하지 않으면 조미관계는 물론 주변나라들과의 관계개선도 있을 수 없다는 식의 강박적인 발언을 곱씹는 켈리에게 미국의 가증되는 압살채동에 대처하여 핵무기보다 더 위력한 무기도 가지게 되어있으며 그것이 무엇인지에 대해서는 구태여 해명해줄 필요조차 느끼지 않는다고 박아주었다.

사실이 이러함에도 불구하고 모략의 능수인 부쉬행정부는 켈리가 돌아가자마자 우리가 《우라늄농축에 의한 핵무기계획》을 《시인》하였다는 거짓소문을 대대적으로 퍼뜨리었다.

미국이 요란스럽게 떠든 이른바 우리의 《우라늄농축계획시인》이란 이렇게 되어 나온것이였다.

그때로부터 3년세월이 지난 지금에 와서도 미국이 《우라늄농축계획》주장을 증명할수 있는 그 어떤 자료도 내놓지 못하고있는 사실은 그들의 주장이 얼마나 허황하게 꾸며낸 날조인가 하는것을 여실히 보여주고있다.

이에 대해 미국을 포함한 서방의 대조선전문가들까지도 부쉬행정부의 《우라늄농축계획》주장은 뒤받침할만한 신빙성있는 증거가 전혀 없으며 순수 조미관계를 대결국면으로 몰아넣고 긍정적 방향으로 움직이던 우리와 주변나라들과의 관계에 제동을 걸려는 의도에서 출발한것이라고 평가하고있는것은 결코 우연하지 않다.

부쉬행정부는 2003년 1월 17일 케도를 통한 《대북조선경수로제공의 중지》를 공식 정책으로 정하고 관계국들과의 협의에 들어가기로 하였으며 2005년 11월 22일에는 그의 완전중지를 최종결정하였다.

제반 사실은 부쉬행정부가 체계적으로,의도적으로 경수로건설을 완전히 중단한 조미기본합의문의 철저한 유린자,파기자라는것을 실증해주고있다.

저들자신이 직접 서명하고 대통령까지 담보한 국제적합의사항도 꺼리낌없이 헌신짝처럼 쫓겨버리는 부쉬행정부의 철면피성은 국제사회에 미국의 진면모를 더욱 똑똑히 드러내보이고있으며 미

국과는 신뢰에 기초한 관계란 있을수 없다는 심각한 교훈을 주고있다.

부쉬행정부야말로 절대로 신뢰할수 없는 집단으로서 저들의 생리적욕구와 한줌도 못되는 극소수 정치세력의 이익을 위해서라면 내외인민들의 평화애호적인 지향과 요구도 국제법도 무참히 짓밟는 불법무도한 불량배무리이다.

우리 제도에 대한 체질적인 거부감과 적대감을 품고있는 부쉬행정부가 경수로건설을 완전히 중단한것은 그들이 추구하고있는 극단적인 대조선정책이 가져온 필연적인 결과이다.

부쉬행정부가 경수로건설을 중단함으로써 조선반도와 지역,세계의 평화와 안전에 기여하여오던 국제적공약인 조미기본합의문이 여지없이 파기된것은 지난 세기 중반기 쏘-도불가침조약을 뒤집고 세계대전의 불길을 확대하여 인류에게 무서운 재난을 들뜨웠던 파쑈히틀러정권이래 처음 보는 최악으로서 세계평화와 안전에 대한 란폭한 도전이고 유린이다.

우리는 미국이 우리의 자립적핵동력공업에 우려를 표시하였기때문에 경수로를 제공받는 대신 그것을 없앨수 있다는데 대하여 합의하였었다.

미국이 신뢰의 기본척도인 경수로건설을 완전히 포기한것만큼 우리로서는 우리 식의 흑연감속로에 기초한 평화적핵활동을 강화하는 사업을 순간도 멈출수 없게 되었다.

부쉬행정부가 경수로제공을 집어치운 조건에서 우리는 5만KW, 20만KW흑연감속로들과 그 련관 시설들에 기초한 자립적핵동력공업을 적극 발전시키며 때가 되면 우리의 기술, 우리의 잠재력에 의거한 우리 식의 경수로를 건설하여 평화적핵활동에 더욱 박차를 가하게 될것이다.

미국은 어떤 경우에도 조미기본합의문을 파기한 책임에서 절대로 벗어날수 없으며 반드시 비싼 대가를 치르게 될것이다.

2

미국은 경수로건설을 전면중단하고 조미기본합의문을 파기함으로써 우리에게 입힌 막대한 정치경제적손실을 보상할 법적,도덕적의무가 있다.

우리가 조미기본합의문에 따르는 의무사항들을 성실히 리행한것과는 상반되게 미국은 합의문에 따르는 자기의 의무사항들을 어느 하나도 제대로 리행한것이 없다.

부쉬행정부가 중유납입중단과 경수로건설의 완전중지 등으로 조미기본합의문을 파기한것으로 하여 우리가 입은 정치경제적손실은 이루 헤아릴수 없이 크다.

경수로제공협정은 조선민주주의인민공화국과 미합중국주도하의 케도사이에 체결되었다.

미국이 협정당사자인 우리와의 사전협의도 없이 협정을 파기한것은 국제법과 규범을 유린한 전례없이 횡포한 행위이다.

부쉬일당의 망동으로 존엄있는 우리 공화국의 자주권은 심히 우롱당하고 손상되었다.

우리가 당한 막중한 정치적손실은 그 무엇으로써도 보상할수 없다.

우리는 또한 경제적으로도 직접 또는 간접적으로 수백억US\$의 물질적손실을 입었다.

무엇보다 자립적핵동력계획을 동결시킨것으로 하여 막대한 손해를 보게 되었으며 그것으로 하여 인민경제 각 부문들에 헤아릴수 없는 악영향을 미치게 되었다.

자립적핵동력공업의 동결대신에 2003년까지 건설하여 정상가동하게되어있던 경수로가 완공되지 못한것으로 하여 우리는 2004년부터 해마다 백수십억KWh의 전력생산손실을 보고있다.

이로부터 우리는 인민경제 각 부문에 대한 늘어나는 전력수요를 보장할수 없게 되었으며 이것은 공업과 농업 등 전반적경제발전과 인민생활에 커다란 저해를 주고있다.

미국은 조미기본합의문 제1조 제2항에 따라 우리의 흑연감속로와 련관시설의 동결에 따르는 에네르기손실에 대한 보상으로 해마다 50만t씩의 중유를 제공하게 되어있는 법적의무도 성실히 리행하지 않았다.

미국은 중유납입이 마치도 그 무슨 《혜택》이나 되는듯이 여론을 오도하면서 마지못해 중유를 납입하군 하였으며 매달 4만여t씩 균등납입하기로 한 합의사항을 언제한번 제대로 준수하지 않았고 장기간 납입을 중단하거나 단번에 많은 량을 들이미는 방법으로 경제적혼란을 조성하군 하였다.

우리는 미국이 조미기본합의문을 파기하고 우리에게 막대한 정치경제적손실을 입힌데 대하여 보상을 받아낼 당당한 권리를 가지고있다.

우리의 보상요구는 억지가 아니며 국제적으로 공인된 법규범과 관례로 보아도 지극히 정당하다.

특히 조미사이의 합의와 경수로제공협정 제16조 《불리행시 조치사항》에 따라서도 우리는 엄청난 손실에 대하여 마지막 한푼까지 기어이 보상을 받아낼 권리가 있다.

미국은 경수로건설을 핵심사항으로 하는 조미기본합의문을 전면파기한것으로 하여 우리에게 끼친 손해에 대하여 지체없이 보상해야 한다.

케도를 조직하고 주도해온 미국은 케도성원국들과의 충분한 합의도 없이 일방적으로 케도를 해산한것만큼 그 성원국들이 입을수 있는 손해에 대해서도 응당 보상해야 할것이다.

조미기본합의문을 체계적으로 위반하고 그 리행을 회피한 미국의 처사를 놓고볼 때 우리가 핵시설을 폐기하지 않고 유지해온것은 참으로 옳은 결단이였다.

오늘의 현실은 우리가 부쉬행정부를 대하면서 조미기본합의문의 파기와 경수로건설의 완전한 중단은 시간상 문제이러는데 대해 미리 내다보고 시기시기 필요한 자위적조치를 취한것이 얼마나 선견지명있는 결심이였는가에 대하여 다시금 절감하게 한다.

부쉬행정부는 출현후 지금까지 정치,경제,군사 등 모든 분야에 걸쳐전면적인 《제재와 봉쇄정책》을 더욱 강도높게 추구하고있다.

부쉬행정부는 《인권문제》, 《화폐위조문제》, 《미싸일문제》, 《마약밀매문제》 등을 증폭시켜 우리에게 압력을 가하고 부정적인 여론을 날조류포시키면서 대화상대방인 우리의 국제적영상을 흐리게 하기 위하여 온갖 책동을 다하고있다.

부쉬행정부의 유일한 목적은 우리를 억지로 《불법국가》로 몰아붙여 국제적으로 고립시키고 압살하려는데 있다.

그들은 유엔을 비롯한 국제기구들과 다른 나라들까지 발동하여 《국제적포위망》으로 우리를 《봉쇄》하며 질식시키려고 시도하고있다.

부쉬행정부는 2003년 4월 《무기전과방지안보발기》라는것을 내놓고 우리 공화국의 면전에서 《해상합동훈련》을 벌리는 등으로 우리에게 대한 《국제적포위망》과 《봉쇄》전략을 본격적인 실행단계에 옮기고있다.

몇해전 예멘부근의 공해상에서 우리 나라 무역집배에 대한 해적행위를 하게 하고 2003년 4월 《북조선의 우라니움농축제조에 필요한 알루미늄관》을 실었다는 허위정보를 내돌려 예짚트의 항구에서 프랑스화물선을 단속하였으며 같은해 8월 중국 대북에서 합법적으로 무역화물을 실은 무역집배 《베개봉》호에 대한 강제수색과 화물압수를 막후에서 조종한 장본인도 바로 미국이었다.

최근 부쉬강경보수세력은 우리 공화국의 영상에 먹칠을 하기 위하여 뒤꼁방에 모여앉아 저저마다 우리를 모해하고 우롱하는 《모략극고안》경쟁에 더욱더 열을 올리고있다.

이와 관련하여 AP, AFP를 비롯한 서방언론기관들은 부쉬일당의 반공화국소동은 국내외적으로는 물론 저들의 지지기반인 공화당에서조차 따돌림을 받고 지지률이 급속히 떨어지는 사태를 수습하기 위한데 목적이 있다고 일치하게 평하고있다.

그러한 속에서도 체면이나 창피를 모르고 《필요한 행동조치》니 뭐니 하는 따위의 망발을 쥘치면서 분수없이 높아대고있는 부쉬일당의 몰골은 어처구니가 없고 가련하다.

지난 9월 19일에 채택발표된 제4차 6자회담 공동성명은 조선민주주의인민공화국이 핵에너그의 평화적리용권리를 가지고있다는데 대하여 천명하면서 조선민주주의인민공화국에 경수로를 제공하는 문제를 토의하기로 합의하였다는것을 밝히고있다.

그러나 미국은 회담탁에서 물러나자마자 경수로제공문제는 협상의제가 아니라고 하면서 뻔뻔스럽게도 종전의 《선택포기》주장을 고집하고있다.

또한 지난 11월에 진행된 제5차 6자회담에서 조미 두 나라가 별도로 마주앉아 우리에게 대한 미국의 《금융제재》를 해소하기 위한 문제를 정치적으로 토의해결하기로 합의하였음에도 불구하고 그를 극구 부인하고있다.

우리는 공개적인 국제회합장소에서 합의한 사항을 잉크도 마르기전에 부정해치우는 이런 시정배집단을 전혀 신뢰할수 없다.

지금 부쉬행정부는 우리에게 대해 《악의 축》, 《핵선제공격대상》, 《폭정의 전초기지》 등으로 규정한 발언을 철회한다고 한 공약을 뒤집고 또다시 악의에 찬 험담들을 마구 내뿜으면서 조미관계를 초진장상태에로 몰아가고있다.

이것은 부쉬행정부가 6자회담마당에서 우리의 《주권을 인정하며 평화적으로 공존》할것을 공약하는 공동성명에 찬성을 표시하였지만 그것은 한갓 국제사회를 속이기 위한 기만극에 불과하였으며 이들의 구태의연하고 뿌리깊은 대조선압살기도가 조금도 변함이 없다는것을 다시금 실증해주고있다.

우리는 미국의 일방적인 조미기본합의문과기와 경수로건설의 완전중단결정을 놓고 미국의 《선택포기》주장이 얼마나 강도적인 요구인가에 대해 더욱더 각성하게 된다.

6자회담에서 우리가 조미사이에 신뢰조성의 물리적기초인 경수로제공문제와 핵계획포기시점을 동시행동으로 맞물릴데 대하여 제기한 요구는 참으로 옳은것이였다.

우리는 앞으로도 미국과는 철두철미 《행동 대 행동》의 원칙에서 동시에 움직이는 거래만을 할것이다.

미국이 우리를 《핵선제공격대상》에 넣고 우리 제도를 압살하기 위한 핵전쟁준비를 발광적으로 다그치고있는 지금의 엄중한 정세는 우리가 핵억제력을 유지강화하고있는것이 천만번 정당하다는것을 확증해주고있다.

조선반도의 비핵화를 념원하고있는 우리 공화국을 핵무기보유에로 떠민 당사자는 다름아닌 미국이다.

미국은 우리 공화국에 대한 적대시정책을 계속 강행하면서 우리가방위수단인 핵억제력을 더욱 강화하는데 대하여 시비하고 문제시할 그 어떤 리유도 명분도 없다.

우리는 기술적으로 미국과 교전관계,전쟁상태에 있다. 때문에 우리로서는 핵불사용담보를 일방적으로 철회하고 핵무기를 휘두르며 우리를 《선제타격》 하겠다고 하는 미국의 공갈에 맞서 정당방위를 위해 핵무기를 만들었고 그를 부단히 강화하고있다.

이것은 너무나도 응당한 조치이며 합법적인 자위적권리행사이다.

우리는 미국의 증대되는 압살책동에 대처하여 자위적조치들을 취할때마다 매년 세상에 공개하고 미국측에도 그시그시 통지하면서 정정당당하게 핵억제력을 마련하였다.

이에 대해 미국 국제정치문제연구소의 기관지 《포린 폴리씨 포커스》도 2005년 2월 22일부론설에서 《부쉬는 집권초기부터 북조선을 군사외교적으로 매우 거칠게 대해옴으로써 결국 북조선을 핵보유국으로 만들어놓았다》고 폭로하였다.

우리는 미국의 핵압살정책에 대처하여 자위를 위해 2003년 1월 10일 핵무기전파방지조약에서 탈퇴하였고 합법적으로 핵무기를 보유한다에 대하여 자부감을 느낀다.

우리가 핵억제력을 제때에 갖추지 않았더라면 이미전에 미국호전광들에 의해 몇번이고 이라크와 같은 처지와 운명을 면할수 없었을것이라는것이 우리 인민은 물론 세계평화애호인민들의 한결같은 반영이다.

《힘》을 만능으로 여기고 오만과 독선,전횡이 체질화된 부쉬일당이 대조선압살정책을 집요하게 추구하고있는 한 우리의 핵억제력은 나라의 자주권수호의 강력한 보검으로, 조선반도에서의 전쟁방지와 아시아와 세계평화를 위한 믿음직한 억제력으로 계속 굳건히 다져질것이다.

자기는 핵몽둥이를 휘두르면서도 상대방더러 핵억제력을 먼저 내놓으라는 강도적요구는 언젠가도 우리에게는 절대로 통할수 없다.

우리에게는 미국의 핵위협을 더이상 느끼지 않게 될 때에 가서야 비로소 핵무기가 필요없게 될 것이다.

\* \*

부쉬행정부가 조미기본합의문을 완전히 파기한것으로 하여 조선반도와 아시아태평양지역의 평화와 안전은 더욱 불안정한 상태에 놓이게 되었으며 핵대결의 위험성은 나날이 커가고있다.

부쉬행정부는 조미기본합의문의 궁극적인 파기로 조성된 엄중한 사태의 책임에서 절대로 벗어날수 없다.

미국은 날로 악화되고있는 현 조미대결국면이 초래할 파국적후과에 대하여 자중하여 심사숙고해보고 승산이 없는 핵대결정책, 시대착오적인 대조선압살정책을 당장 걷어치워야 한다.

지금 부쉬행정부는 백주에 주권국가를 무력으로 가로타고앉아 테로의 악순환을 조장시키고 평화적주민들을 상대로 국제법적으로 금지된 렐화우라니움탄과 백린소이탄과 같은 비인도적인 대량살륙무기까지 꺼리낌없이 사용한 반인륜범죄와 세계도처에 설치한 비밀수용소들에서 히틀러 파쑈도배들도 무색하게 할 극악한 범죄행위를 감행한것으로 하여 국내외적으로 비난과 배격의 대상으로 되고있다.

대조선정책에서도 6자회담공동성명의 기본원칙들을 하나씩 뒤집어엮고 조미기본합의문을 완전히 파기함으로써 국제사회의 저주와 규탄을 받고있다.

부쉬강경보수집단이 오늘의 불우한 위기상황에서 벗어날수 있는 유일한 출로는 우리에게 대한 《금융제재》와 같은 유치한 놀음을 당장 철회하고 호상존중,평화공존의 성근한 자세로 6자회담장에 나오는데 있다.

미국이 우리 군대와 인민의 경고를 무시하고 대조선강경압살정책에 계속 매달린다면 우리는 더욱 강도높은 초강경으로 대응할것이다.

주체94(2005)년 12월 19일  
평양(끝)



## 5. 조선외무성 반공화국 《인권》 소동에 핵억제력, 자위적국방력 강화 (조선중앙통신 2005.12.19자 기사)

(평양 12월 19일발 조선중앙통신)조선민주주의인민공화국 외무성 대변인은 19일 다음과 같은 담화를 발표하였다.

최근 미국의 주도밑에 반공화국 《인권》 소동이 더욱 광란적으로 벌어지고있다.

미국은 올해 유엔총회 제60차회의에서 자기의 추종세력들을 사촉하여 반공화국 《인권결의》가 강압채택되도록 하였으며 얼마전에는 서울에 어중이떠중이들을 모아놓고 《북조선인권국제대회》라는 광대놀음까지 벌려놓았다.

다음해에도 브뤼셀에서 이러한 놀음을 또 벌릴것이라고 한다.

우리는 미국의 이러한 처사를 두고 자기를 어떻게 보든지도 모르고 남의 《인권문제》에 코를 들이밀려는 부수패에 대해 가소로움만을 느낄뿐이다.

세계적인 인권불모지이며 악의 제국인 미국이 감히 《인권》에 대하여 운운하는것은 21세기의 비극이 아닐수 없다.

국제사회는 미국이 애당초 인권에 대하여 론할 초보적인 도덕적 및 법률적권리마저 상실했다고 한결같이 인정하고있다.

이라크사태는 미국이 떠드는 《인권》이 과연 어떤것인가를 웅변적으로 실증해주는 산 고소장이라고 할수있다.

미국은 유엔과 국제법체제를 완전히 무시하고 이른바 《대량살륙무기전과방지》를 구실로 백주에 한 주권국가를 무력으로 타고앉아 이라크인민의 피바다우에 《인권옹호》기발을 내걸었다.

이라크에서 미군은 민간인거주지역과 차량들에 무차별적으로 마구 폭탄을 퍼부어 수만명의 무고한 평화적주민들의 목숨을 빼앗았고 지금도 매일과 같이 인간살륙만행을 일삼고있다.

미국방성 관리들마저 《인간애에 반하는 범죄》라고 자인한 렬화우라니움탄과 같은 대량살륙무기사용이 다름아닌 미군에 의하여 이라크에서 서슴없이 감행되었으며 화학무기에 속하는 백린탄이 주민들의 뼈까지 태우고있다.

오죽하면 미국내에서조차 이 문제를 두고 부쉬행정부의 범행이 전쟁에서 화학 및 생물무기사용을 금지한 1925년 제네바의정서에도 어긋나고 세계여론과 초보적인 도덕적책임도 무시하는 《독선적이고 거만한 행위》라는 규탄의 목소리가 급증되겠는가 하는것이다.

전 미국대통령 카터는 고위인물들이 작성한 미국의 정책은 기본인권존중을 결여시키는것이라고 행정부를 강하게 비난해나섰으며 올해 노벨문학상수상자인 영국작가 해롤드 핀터는 이라크전쟁을 《강도들의 작품, 명백한 국가테로행위》로 락인하고 부쉬를 《대량살륙자, 전범자》로 헤그국제형사재판소에 회부할것을 요구하였다.

미국은 늘 《인권이 국가의 자주권보다 우위에 있다》고 넘불처럼 외우고있지만 오늘 이라크의 현실은 미국이 《보장》하는 《인권》이란 자주적인간으로서의 권리가 아니라 노예적 굴욕과 순종, 죽음뿐이라는것을 명백히 실증해주고있다.

21세기 최대인권유린행위로 다시한번 세계를 경악케한 수감자학대행위도 그렇다.

부쉬행정부는 《심문방법을 엄격히 제한한 제네바협약은 시대에 뒤떨어진것》이라고 로골적



으로 주장하면서 《제네바협약에 대한 해석을 변경하며 보다 엄격한 심문방법을 승인한다》는 공식지시까지 떨어지면서 짐승도 낮을 불힐 중세기적이고문행위를 공공연히 감행하고있다.

그것도 모자라 최근에는 미중앙정보국이 행정부의 승인밑에 해외감옥규정까지 만들어놓고 여러 나라들에서 비밀감옥을 설치 운영하고있으며 수감자들을 마구 학대,처형하고있다.

이에 대해 적십자국제위원회는 《미국은 전 세계로 하여금 미국의 지옥같은 민주주의,법치 국가를 목격하게 하였다》고 비난하였으며 국제적으로 반미여론은 전례없이 급증되었다.

막다른 궁지에 몰린 부쉬는 지난 12일 필라델피아의 한 공식석상에서 지금까지 부인해오던 수만명의 이라크주민들의 살해사실과 이라크감옥들에서의 고문학대사건들에 대해 자인하지 않으면 안되게 되었다.

그러고도 최근 확대되고있는 반미감정을 의식한 미하원이 늦게나마 《고문금지법안》을 채택하자 자기는 고문을 철저히 반대해온듯이 아닌보살하며 너스레를 떨고있다.

여론들은 너무도 뻔뻔스러운 부쉬의 처사에 침을 뱉으며 《부쉬도 인권에 대해 논할 자격이 있는가.》라고 야유하고있다.

제반 사실은 오늘 부쉬행정부가 감히 《인권》에 대해 논할 모든 자격을 상실했다는것을 명백히 보여주고있다.

미국은 인권문제에서 정치화,선택성, 2중기준을 일삼는 전형적인 범죄의 나라이다.

민간인들에게 무차별적인 피해를 주고 군사적용도에 맞지 않게 무서운 고통을 주는 무기를 사용하지 말아야 한다는 제네바의정서의 요구는 그것을 비준하지 않은 나라들에도 구속력을 가지는 국제법적요구로 공인되고있다.

그럼에도 불구하고 미국무성은 이라크에서 백린탄사용이 문제시되자 백린탄은 미국이 당사국으로 되어있는 조약에 의해 금지되지 않은 무기라느니, 미군은 살상용무기가 아니라 조명용으로 드물게 사용하였을뿐이라느니 하며 변명해나서다가 더이상 범죄사실에서 발뺌을 할수 없게 되자 《민간인사상자들을 막기 위해 최대한의 조치를 취하였다》라고 강변해나섰다.

이라크가 생화학무기를 비밀리에 저축하고있다는 혐의를 만들어 정권테로를 단행한 미국이 다름아닌 바로 그 점령지에서 화학무기를 사용했다는 사실은 《미국식인권옹호》의 파렴치성과 2중성을 여실히 증명해주고있다.

미국은 수감자학대사건에 대해서도 그것이 특대형 인권유린사건으로 부각되자 《제네바협약은 모든 수감자들을 전쟁포로로 취급하여야 한다는것으로 해석되지 않는다》고 하면서 철면피하게도 《이라크에서의 미군의 활동은 인권유린으로 될수 없다》고 비호해나서기까지 하였다.

유엔인권고등판무관이 미중앙정보국과 같은 단체가 고문금지에 관한 국제협약준수의 제외대상으로 된다는 미국의 정책에 심각한 우려를 표시하면서 미국은 《인권문제에서 더는 지도적역할을 하기 어렵다》고 락인한것은 너무나도 당연하다.

미국의 기만적인 《인권옹호》 타령은 반미자주적인 나라들,저들의 비위에 거슬리는 나라들에 대한 내정간섭과 무력행사,정부전복의 대명사이다.

바로 그렇기때문에 지금 미국의 《인권타령》을 절대로 받아들일수 없는것으로 반대배격하는 목소리가 이르는 곳마다에서 높이 울려나오고있는것이다.

우리는 최근 전례없이 로골화되고있는 미국의 반공화국 《인권소동》에서도 그것을 명백히 보고있다.

미국이 대조선 《인권공세》에 바짝 열을 올리고있는것은 어떻게 하나 우리의 《정권교체》를 실현해보려는데 그 불순한 목적이 있다.

우리에 대한 체질화된 거부감을 가지고 반공화국고립압살정책을 국시로 선포한 부쉬행정부는 집권하자마자 우리를 반대하는 제2의 핵문제를 만들어 이러한 목적을 달성해보려 하였다.

미국국제정치문제연구소 기관지 《포린 폴리씨 포커스》는 부쉬행정부는 《평양정권이 없는 세계》에 대해 공개적으로 언명하면서 사실상 그 《정권교체를 중착점으로 하는 6자회담을 진행해왔다.》고 폭로하였다.

그러나 거듭되는 6자회담에서 저들의 《선 핵포기》강요가 통하지 않게 되자 이제는 그 무슨 《인권상황》을 소재로 우리를 압박하고 고립질식시키는 새로운 반공화국소동에 매달리고있다.

미행정부 고위인물들이 《북조선인권법》을 《북조선정권을 핵과 인권이라는 두가지 측면에서 압박하는 기틀》, 《탈북자보호의 명분하에 북조선의 체제붕괴를 꾀하는 전략》이라고 규정한것만 보아도 그것을 잘 알수 있다.

미국은 우리에게 온갖 추악한 딱지란 딱지는 다 가져다 붙이며 반공화국 《인권공세》에 매달리고있지만 국제사회가 미국의 의도대로 움직일것이라고 생각하는것은 커다란 오산이다.

여론들이 얼마전 서울에서 진행된 《북조선인권국제대회》를 두고 《북조선정권이 붕괴되어야 하는 이유를 설명》하는데 급급한, 《미국내오콘식의 북조선정권붕괴론》에서 벗어나지 못한 《균형을 잃은 행사》라고 비난하고있는것은 결코 우연치 않다.

부쉬패가 대조선 《인권》소동에 매여달리면 달릴수록 그것은 오히려 저들자체의 저렬성, 추악성만을 드러낼뿐이다.

국제인권무대는 이처럼 인권아닌 《인권》을 외우면서 인민들의 자주적권리를 유린하고 참다운 삶과 행복을 빼앗는 범죄적인 부쉬행정부를 응당 인권재판의 피고석에 앉히고 가장 준렬한 선고를 내려야 한다.

그럼에도 불구하고 인권유린범죄국은 제쳐놓고 인민들의 자주적권리와 창조적생활이 마음껏 향유되는 우리를 거드는것은 미국의 인권유린행위에 동조하는것외에 다른 아무것도 아니다.

우리에게는 미국의 대조선 《인권》공세가 절대로 통할수 없으며 인민대중중심의 우리 식 사회주의제도는 미국의 《인권바람》에 흔들릴 그러한 나약한 제도가 아니다.

우리 인민자신이 선택하고 건설하는 우리의 사회주의는 우리 인민의 운명이며 생활이다.

우리 인민은 사회주의제도에서 자기의 미래를 보고있으며 바로 그것으로 하여 이 고마운 제도를 위해 자신을 기꺼이 바치는것을 가장 커다란 행복으로, 영광으로 여기고있다.

오늘 미국의 악랄한 인권소동앞에서 우리가 다시금 찾게 되는 교훈은 인권이자 국권이며 인권옹호는 곧 국권수호라는것이다.

인류의 전 력사는 국권은 오직 강력한 자위력에 의해서만 담보된다는 진리를 실증해주고있다.

미국이 핵문제와 《인권문제》를 구실로 우리를 고립압살하기 위한 적대시정책을 강화하면 할수록 선군정치에 따라 우리는 핵무기억제력을 포함한 자위적국방력을 더욱 굳건히 다져나가는것으로 대응해나갈것이다.



주체94(2005)년 12월 19일  
평양(끝)