

Pg.1: Building Bridges

Award Recipient

Pg. 1-2: "The Two
Koreas"

Pg. 2-5: Seminar on
Entrepreneurship

Pg. 5-7: Nukes, Missiles

The PCI News



2007 Building Bridges Award Recipient:

Ambassador Ton Nu Thi Nihn



Ambassador Ton-nu-thi Ninh is a member of Vietnam's law-making body, the National Assembly, representing the southern coastal province of Ba Ria-Vung Tau. In her position as Vice-Chair of the National Assembly Foreign Affairs Committee her mission has been to develop and enhance Vietnam's relations with the countries of North America (particularly, the United States) and Western Europe. She travels frequently to the United States and Europe and regularly interacts with senior government and business leaders both abroad and in Vietnam. She has also represented Vietnam in international conferences among world leaders to discuss issues with global implications. She is widely recognized as an effective spokesperson for Vietnam.

Prior to holding her current position, M. Ton served, for over two decades, as a diplomat in Vietnam's Ministry of Foreign Affairs, specializing in multilateral institutions (the United Nations, the Non-Aligned Movement, the Francophonie) and global issues (international peace and security, development, environment, governance, human rights...). As advisor to Vietnam's Minister of Foreign Affairs, she was responsible for key international efforts on behalf of Vietnam, such as the holding of the Summit of French-Speaking Countries in 1997 in Hanoi. From 2000 to 2003, she was Vietnam's Ambassador to Belgium, Luxembourg and Head of Mission to the European Union in Brussels.

Ms. Ton grew up in France, was educated at Sorbonne University and Cambridge University and started her career as an academic. She taught English and English literature at Paris University in the late 1960s and later at Saigon University until 1975.

Born into a traditional family of Central Vietnam, she developed her political commitment to the National Liberation Front for South Vietnam early on during her student days in Paris. Since then she has been consistently active in social issues, with a special interest on gender. She served a term on the Central Executive Committee of the Vietnam Women's Union.



"The Two Koreas"

For a full week starting November 19th, 2006 thirteen students along with their professor, former Korean Country Director David Straub, from the Nitze School of Advanced International Studies (SAIS) at Johns Hopkins University had the opportunity to join in a study abroad program. The participants arrived in Seoul for a week of meetings with



Korean
Officials,
experts and
leading
personalities.

The
2006 students
were: Kaitlin
Bonenberg,
Melanie
Graham,
Seoung Mo
Kang, Eun-Ha Kim, Viktoriya Kim, Manhee Lee, Limin
Laing, Kate Ousley, Junghwa Lynn Pyo, Junko Saito, Nina
Sawyer, Soo Shik Shin, Zhang Lu.

During their visit to Seoul they received briefings as a group on U.S.-Korean relations at the Foreign and Unification Ministries, the National Assembly, the American Embassy, U.S. forces Korea, and the Korean Institute for international Economic Policy. Individual

(continued on page 2)



Two Koreas

(continued from page 1)

students also conducted numerous interviews with Korean and American officials, scholars, and citizen activists as research for the U.S.-Korea Yearbook. The students had done their homework in Washington under Prof. Straub's guidance, and now they were going to test it with personal contacts with important sources.

This is the kind of thing that seasoned and privileged reporters do, but only a few students ever experience. It is an excellent way to learn, combining scholarship with personal exploration.

In the end they were also able to use the opportunity to learn more about the Korean people and Korean culture. The students attended class at Seoul National University and exchanged views with counterpart Korean and international students at SNU's Graduate School of International Studies. They were also able to visit the Demilitarized Zone, enjoy Korean cuisine in traditional settings, learn to use Seoul's superb mass transit system, and explore Korea's beautiful royal palaces and museums.

The SAIS students will write a report on their activities later as a normal part of their assignments, and Director David Straub is planning to write an overall evaluation. They are hoping their extensive research and hard work will be published by SAIS early next year as the U.S.-Korea Yearbook for 2006, and given wide distribution.

Here are two quotes from the students:

"As members of the SAIS class "The Two Koreas" for the fall 2006 semester we wish to express our deep appreciation [to our supporters]. You made it possible for us to spend a full week in Seoul from November 19 conducting intensive research for our contributions to the forthcoming, inaugural edition of the SAIS U.S.-Korea Yearbook."

"Our visit to Seoul not only increased our understanding of U.S. Korean relations but also our appreciation and respect for the Korean people and their history. Through the U.S.-Korean Yearbook and, later, as SAIS graduates, we look forward to doing our part to promote international understanding and cooperation in our increasingly global village."

- "The two Koreas" SAIS class of 2006



The following is an article by Desaix Anderson, U.S. Foreign Service (Retired). Mr. Anderson is a board member of the Pacific Century Institute, and this article are his observations on a recent program sponsored by PCI in the country of Vietnam.

Seminar on Entrepreneurship Hanoi, Vietnam

In a major effort to develop an ongoing relationship with Vietnam, PCI in conjunction with our new partner, the Economics Faculty of the National University of Hanoi (NUH), conducted a one-day seminar November 9, 2006, on entrepreneurship at the Melia Hotel in Hanoi. The seminar exchanged ideas to improve private entrepreneurship, local competitiveness and international economic integration to ensure that Vietnamese entrepreneurs are well equipped to survive the challenges posed by Vietnam's entry into the WTO.

The seminar was a sensational success. Over 100 participants, including fifty students from NUH, top Vietnamese Government economists including Ministry of Planning and Investment's Le Dang Doanh and Government Office leader Ms Pham Chi Lan, relevant other ministries, faculty members from NUH, and US and Vietnamese businesspersons were inspired by Vietnamese and American speakers to look beyond traditional views and realize that entrepreneurship is an individual commitment to identify innovatively a problem or need and to take risks to pursue that goal, and not to be punished by society for failure.

Dr. Phi Manh Hong, Dean of the Faculty of Economics, Dr. Phung Xuan Nha, and Professor Vo Tri Thanh, and Steve Parker, Director of STAR, USAID's "competitiveness initiative" led off discussions of the environment for entrepreneurship in Vietnam. They were followed by outstanding and inspiring keynote address by Jonathan Ortman, President, Public Forum Institute and Kaufman Foundation that focused on "Strengthening the Entrepreneurial Spirit: Mixing Culture and Policy" Ortman ideas on how to capitalize on the potential of entrepreneurship as an engine of economic growth, meet demands for massive infusions of ideas, more quickly than ever, to produce new open-source cultures with a central role for universities established the framework for highly stimulating discussion.

In this vein, Spencer Kim of PCI engaged directly especially the students in a challenging speech and then in inviting anyone interested (all 150 students accepted enthusiastically) to maintain a dialogue of entrepreneurship after the conference. Businessmen Bradley LaLonde, Vietnam Partners, Inc. Gregory Park, Director Asia Pacific Securitisation, Calyon, Hong Kong, and Mark Pedretti, Reed Smith, New York, made excellent contributions from their perspectives. PCI's Don Evans and Desaix Anderson, who co-chaired with Vietnamese two sessions, pursued similar themes.

(continued on page 3)



Entrepreneurship

(continued from page 2)

During the final session devoted to developing an "action plan" for follow-up, former Ambassador to Vietnam and PCI Board member Raymond Burghardt evoked the metaphor of planting seeds of imagination, innovation, and thoughts in soil in which these ideas can take root. He emphasized fostering creativity, strengthening educational systems to encourage intellectual ferment and discussion to learn not to memorize but to think, take risk, and not fear failure, concepts that the students acknowledged afterwards gave a new thrust to their thinking on entrepreneurship.

Dean Phung Xuan Nha, who spearheaded the superb arrangements for the seminar, spoke forcefully of the new spirit advanced in the conference. Responding to significant enthusiasm from students, other government agencies and the Hanoi business community, Dean Nha is organizing a network of academics, business, and concerned-government agencies to promote a new spirit of entrepreneurship in Vietnam. A compilation of many of the excellent papers by Vietnamese and Americans and the results of the seminar will be published to commemorate the seminar as a textbook for promoting entrepreneurship. NUH and PCI heartily agreed that a second seminar should be held in 2007 to strengthen further this new and productive relationship between the Faculty of Economics of the National University of Hanoi and PCI.

Desaix Anderson

The following is the text of a speech given by Spencer H. Kim at the Seminar on Entrepreneurship in Hanoi, Vietnam.

Entrepreneurship With A Human Face - Yours

**For: Center for Economic Development Studies
National University of Hanoi
November 9, 2006**

My Goal

Let me begin with a very immodest statement. I hope you will find this short paper one of the more important of those you will read as you contemplate entrepreneurship and the changes being brought to your country as it moves into a globalized world.

I have started several businesses and made them successful. Therefore, I am an entrepreneur. But I am also a human being, a husband, a father and a citizen of my community. As an immigrant to the United States I have had to leave familiar surroundings and accommodate to new and strange experiences, a new language, new customs, new people and

a new way of living. I have experienced first hand dealing with change.

Many of you are contemplating becoming entrepreneurs, or are deeply interested in knowing how entrepreneurship can be used as a force for bettering your country. Vietnam is moving into a globalized world that is full of new and unfamiliar economic challenges and opportunities. It must operate under a new language of international commerce.

My mission in this paper will be to try to explain to you what I have learned from my journey about what entrepreneurship is, what it isn't, and what its role should be -- both in the individual entrepreneur's life and in the larger society that we all live in.

What An Entrepreneur Is

The dictionary defines an entrepreneur as "one who organizes and assumes the risks of a business or enterprise." Perhaps this definition, while technically correct, is too narrow. The famed Austrian economist Joseph Schumpeter defined entrepreneurship as the "creative destruction" of rigid, existing thinking and therefore the source of innovation and technological change in a nation. Perhaps that is a broader, and better, definition. It applies to business, of course, but the spirit of entrepreneurship can also apply to art, education and government as well. However, I will confine my remarks to entrepreneurship in the business world since that is what I know best. But it is important to recognize, and foster, entrepreneurship in all fields.

Most importantly, I believe being a business entrepreneur is a vocation. It is your calling in life. Not all people can be entrepreneurs. There is a personality component. It is not a calling for loners; you must deal with other people all the time and be flexible in several different settings. You must respond to signals that other people are sending you. Entrepreneurship requires the ability to see the need for new products, services, jobs and benefits which did not exist before, an ability to think outside the "box" that we usually live in. If we stay comfortably in our box then we limit our creativity. In this sense entrepreneurship requires an ability to be focused on the needs of the public, or even on the specific needs of a specific segment of the public, a niche. Perhaps you can say it is the ability to think big about something small. Sometimes the niche can indeed be small, as in finding better packaging for noodles, or huge, as in creating a computer operating system -- ask Bill Gates. Seeing where opportunity lies is the first step, taking advantage of it is the second, and often more difficult, step. Entrepreneurship is a skill set that in the end relies more on desire and persistence than any particular intellectual skill. This process, perceiving human needs and creatively and doggedly working to fulfill them, is the process that creates

(continued on page 4)



Entrepreneurship

(continued from page 3)

new wealth in our modern world. It is important not to see the entrepreneur as accomplishing great things as an individual, however. He or she must usually create a group enterprise – the company or corporation – that can work collectively to accomplish their goal. This enterprise has to be built to last, to be designed to be a bottom-up organization so that crucial insights learned through direct contact with customers can find their way to the top and correct any shortcomings in vision that might creep into top management. The enterprise has to be built with core values and be built to last. In this, the most important element is the ability to feel that there can be a constant sense of surprise, or renewal. It must also be prepared to aggressively initiate action when it sees opportunity. Entrepreneurship is about action, not reaction, and constantly looking at things in fresh ways, fulfilling the human dream of finding opportunity.

The individual scientist can sometimes be a genius and make a magnificent scientific breakthrough. But the entrepreneur, no matter how brilliant his particular insight, can rarely achieve significant change alone. His or her company, sharing an innovative vision and an innovative organizational structure to match the vision, can effect greater change than any specific scientific breakthrough. Even great science usually needs an entrepreneurial application to be successful. Additionally, if necessary, the collective creation of a company allows that company to go to capital markets, whether public or private, and attract the funding to implement the vision, something the individual sometimes cannot do.

The businessperson, the trader, the merchant, have always been important throughout history. But they were often obviously subservient to the king or other people who held political power. As the world has changed, as it has industrialized, innovated, and invested across national boundaries, entrepreneurs and business leaders have acquired great wealth and influence. This has had two great effects. First, in the past business success was often linked to political "connections." Unless a relationship existed with the reigning political power, either directly and formally or through a personal or familial connection, it was difficult to succeed. International business, however, and increasingly national business, deals with partners who are not personally known to each other. These new business partnerships must rely on all partners to follow a reliable code of ethics. Personal integrity, which is the congruence of a person's values with his or her actions, becomes very important in carrying entrepreneurial insights into realities that benefit society. At some point in every entrepreneurial venture a key partner must trust the vision of the entrepreneur. Without credibility, even the most visionary entrepreneur cannot succeed.

There is also some degree of linkage between youth and

entrepreneurship. The young often have both vision and vigor. In my view it is best to start young. Sometimes there is failure. If the entrepreneur starts young enough, he can fail, maybe more than once, and still eventually achieve great success. Entrepreneurial spirit does not necessarily dissipate with age of course, for it is a way of seeing the world. But there is much to be said for starting early.

What An Entrepreneur Is Not

An entrepreneur is able to see the world in terms of unrealized opportunity. He or she sees possibilities all around. But seeing the possibilities and managing the day to day operations of a company set up to meet the opportunities created by those possibilities are two different skill sets. Day to day operations require discipline and business management skills. Some of these skill are innate talent and some are learned – often at business schools such as yours. Business management skills and entrepreneurial skills are not necessarily overlapping. An entrepreneur may also be a good business manager, or he may not. If he is not, then he needs to complement his skills with someone who is. And if he is a terrible business manager, it is important to have that self-knowledge.

In your own futures in business, you might want to keep the business manager – entrepreneur dichotomy in mind. When you make business decisions you should not assume that because a person has demonstrated good management skills that person can succeed where predominantly entrepreneurial skills are needed.

There is also sometimes a tendency to confuse rank or position or inherited wealth or a certain educational background with business acumen, and sometimes even entrepreneurial ability. It is not so. As you seek to find people with entrepreneurial spirit during your careers, you should look not for some special social status or educational background. Look for individuals who see the world with a sense of creativity and originality, not just in terms of products and services in a consumer market, but in terms of seeking new possibilities everywhere.

What Is The Role Of The Entrepreneur?

Society now looks to the business leader to exemplify its values much more than in the past. This puts an ever greater emphasis on business ethics and corporate governance. It is imperative therefore, that today's entrepreneur understand himself as an ethical person connected to society at large, and to also understand himself and his own core values.

While the business of creating wealth is becoming more important, however, the political system must continue to

(continued on page 5)



Entrepreneurship

(continued from page 4)

have priority over the economic system. It must act to preserve human rights and provide the framework for moral values and cultural life if society is to prosper. In this, the political system has to walk a fine line. Unnecessary regulation stifles the entrepreneurial spirit. Slavish capitulation to any demand made in the name of the "business community," however, can lead to excesses that can not only harm the community but can eventually stifle creativity and entrepreneurship because the backlash will be in the form of over-regulation.

The keys are to foster an open society in which open-mindedness, tolerance, and acceptance of diversity provide fertile ground for new ideas and entrepreneurship; where a vigilant and free media act to inform the public, the government and the business community. Knowledge is the key to making the informed decisions that can keep the needs of all portions of society in balance. Above all, an open political system can avoid the upside down situation in which good people are pressured to act less than honorably and good behavior is penalized. Entrepreneurial businesses are the greatest creators of new wealth, but they are the most sensitive to inefficiency. Corruption is the great inefficiency that cannot be overcome and which has the greatest effect on stifling wealth creation.

The entrepreneur also needs a great deal of self-awareness. Success in business is not the same as happiness. It is only one component. Happiness comes only from the practice of trying to be excellent in all phases of life – family, professional, spiritual. I say this because it is my experience that a well-rounded, happy life, well-lived, often is the source of the constant rejuvenation that is necessary to keep an entrepreneurial outlook. Narrow-mindedness leads to rigidity in thought and action. And rigidity is the enemy of entrepreneurship.

Therefore, as he works his way through the stages of envisioning and creating an enterprise, the entrepreneur must remember he is on a lifelong journey. Although the time and energy requirements of building a business enterprise are demanding, it is only part of the equation. Don't forget to balance your life with family, friends and fun, and try to practice the same excellence in all phases that you apply to your entrepreneurial business life.

And finally, if you are going to be an entrepreneur remember you might well be successful. That means you are going to accumulate wealth in excess of your personal needs. Give thought to what that means. What will you do with that wealth? How will you use it to complement your values as you continue on your lifelong journey? Don't wake up one day old and rich, but lost and unhappy.



The following article is by Desaix Anderson, board member of the Pacific Century Institute. Re-printed by permission.

Nukes, Missiles, and Missed Opportunities: Anatomy of a Crisis

**Maureen and Mike Mansfield Foundation Program
Hubert H. Humphrey Institute
Minneapolis, Minnesota, September 15, 2006**

***"Will not tolerate nuclear weapons in North Korea" –
Bush***

The Democratic Peoples Republic of Korea's missile launches and continuous development of nuclear weapons materials are a grave threat to stability in Northeast Asia, a vital region to America's and our allies' security. Rather than show leadership to deal with this crisis, the Bush Administration has, in effect, enabled Kim Jong Il to develop both missile and nuclear capability, despite President Bush's categorical reaffirmation with South Korean President Roh May 14, 2003, that "we will not tolerate nuclear weapons in North Korea."

The track records of the Clinton and Bush administrations in dealing with North Korea reveal the anatomy of the Korean crisis?

The Clinton Era

The Clinton administration concluded the Agreed Framework in October 1994 that froze all known nuclear activities at Yongbyon, North Korea, shut down one reactor and stopped worked on two others, canned the 8000 spent fuel rods to prevent their being reprocessed, allowed IAEA inspections; no rods were re-processed and no fissile material for bombs were produced after the Agreed Framework was signed in October 1994.

The US agreed to end eventually sanctions against North Korea and move to normalization of relations;

In 1998 former Defense Secretary Perry adroitly convinced the North Koreans that America could end the "hostility," long perceived as a dire threat to the regime by Pyongyang. In late 2000 the Clinton Administration was close to an agreement to halt development, production, and deployment of longer range missiles, in conformity with the Missile Technology Control Regime.

North Korea was being brought from its profound isolation and being successfully edged into the international community.

(continued on page 6)



Nukes, Missiles

(continued from page 5)

The Bush Era

In sharp contrast, for ideological reasons, the Bush Administration refused to talk with the North Koreans, demonized Kim Jong Il as a dictator, a tyrant, a terrorist and, most provocatively, included North Korea in President Bush's "axis of evil" in his 2002 State of the Union address. Demonization of a foe is almost always an inept diplomatic too, more useful in a schoolyard squabble than in diplomacy. He thus squandered the hard work of the Clinton Administration by William Perry in ending the perception of implacable American "hostility" toward North Korea;

In late 2002, based on information from Pakistan, the Bush Administration in its first high level meeting with the North Koreans accused Pyongyang of developing, since 1998, a highly enriched uranium facility, violating in spirit at least the Agreed Framework and the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). This secret facility, if successfully developed, would require several years for fruition; the Bush Administration issued demands but made no effort to negotiate the end of this facility, as it might have, based on a precedent established in 1998 regarding previous suspicions;

Instead, the Bush Administration threw the baby out with the bath, abrogated the Agreed Framework. Pyongyang, left the NPT Treaty, threw out the IAEA inspectors, reactivated the three nuclear reactor projects at Yongbyon, recovered the 8000 spent fuel rods and began reprocessing the rods; since that time, Pyongyang has produced enough fissile material for 6 to 10 more nuclear bombs, quadrupling the fissile materials from two they were thought to have in 1994 when the Agreed Framework stopped production;

Under pressure from Asian allies and friends but refusing to engage North Korea directly, Bush proposed Six-Party talks to discuss the nuclear issue. In four meetings engineered by China, starting in 2003, the US used the talks to camouflage its unwillingness to engage genuinely with North Korea or to exercise leadership to devise a diplomatic solution to this threat. Washington outsourced our Korea policy to Beijing, rather than lead the quest for resolution.

Emboldened by Bush's quagmire in Iraq and pre-occupation with the Middle East and Iran, Pyongyang called Bush's bluff, cavalierly quadrupled its nuclear inventory, advanced its intercontinental missile capability, and presumably continues to develop the suspected highly enriched uranium facility;

Only briefly in 2005, US negotiator Ambassador Chris Hill engaged and concluded September 19, 2005 an agreement in principal on a comprehensive solution. No sooner than concluded, neo-cons in Washington and

Pyongyang managed to undercut and destroy the atmosphere for implementation. Administration hard-liners subsequently vetoed invitations from North Korea to Ambassador Hill to meet. Untimely sanctions for North Korean \$24 million of counterfeiting squashed hopes for progress on the much more dangerous nuclear and issues.

While the long-range North Korean Taepo-dong missile fired in July this year fizzled within seconds, Pyongyang's existing medium-range No-Dong missile could devastate Tokyo or the US bases in Japan. North Korea's 11,000 long-range artillery pieces on the DMZ and short and medium range missiles could destroy Seoul. Pyongyang's arrogance in defying China, South Korea, Japan, and the US in firing the seven missiles was stunning. Now an underground nuclear test may be in the offing and would represent a defiant mockery of President Bush's statements and policies. My guess is that President Bush would let Kim Jong Il get away with it and again erase another red line.

Ambassador Hill just toured the region to urge Beijing, Seoul, and Tokyo to enact sanctions against Pyongyang for firing the missiles, and to press for even more stringent sanctions if Pyongyang tests a nuclear weapon. The neo-cons are again driving policy, the North Korea version of "stay the course" - to regime change.

President Bush's policies toward North Korea have been an abysmal failure and are patently counter-productive. Instead of managing or overcoming the crisis, the threat from North Korea has risen sharply. This is Katrina-like incompetence.

Radicalization of American Foreign policy

The Bush administration's performance raises fundamental questions about the effectiveness of the radical approach he uses to deal with international crises:

He has broken with sixty years of American Republican and Democratic Presidents' efforts to construct a more stable, peaceful world through alliances with friendly nations, negotiation to construct an international order based on legal treaties and international laws, strengthening the United Nations, willingness to talk to and negotiate with enemies to reduce tension and bring those nations into the international order, **and** to defend America, if attacked;

Bush jettisoned these traditional approaches to America's international relations:

He chose, instead, to junk international treaties

(continued on page 7)



Nukes, Missiles

(continued from page 6)

such as the ABM treaty, to reject the Kyoto Protocol on the environment, the International Court of Justice, the Geneva Conventions that protect our own servicepersons. He disparaged the United Nations, taunted it, and used it cynically only when it served US tactical purposes

As he has domestically, he also has sought to operate outside the constraints of international law.

He adopted a dangerous new policy of pre-emptive war or preventive war with the few willing to join us.

For ideological reasons, he refuses to talk with or negotiate with enemies, and only attempts to isolate them: Hussein's Iraq, North Korea, Iran, and Syria;

Despite rhetoric to the contrary, he does not appear to know what diplomacy is - except as an arrogant device to pressure nations to bend their wills to ours; he does not see diplomacy as a means to engage and defuse crisis, to negotiate satisfactory compromises, to build a more stable and ordered world; to his administration, diplomacy is essentially weakness.

As he said in October 2001, in effect, "If there is a problem overseas, I will send the US military to take care of it." I thought this was only rhetorical, but he was serious. It meant, "Might is right," and he thought our military was omnipotent.

Now, after the disastrous war in Iraq, he has softened somewhat his voice, talks about resolving issues through diplomacy, working with the UN and allies. But, the bottom line, remains military might, even though he has now discovered that our military is not omnipotent, in fact, is inadequate for the growing challenges President Bush has engendered abroad, and is inappropriate and not trained for the political challenges we face.

Our foes in Pyongyang - and Teheran - know all this and are today repeatedly taking advantage of America's weakened position in the world and its inept, indecisive leadership.

Opportunities: Fantasy vs Reality

I have been challenged today to present opportunities, but opportunities are extremely sparse. What has transpired, instead of providing opportunities, is a proliferation of crises created or exacerbated by the Bush approach to foreign policy;

President Bush's policies toward North Korea have not reflected reality; but fantasy.

The sole realistic opportunity of which I can

conceive would require an epiphany in the White House. President Bush would have to reign in the Vice President and other neo-cons, appoint a full-time, fully-empowered presidential envoy, and send him or her to Pyongyang with maximum flexibility and options to work out urgently, patiently, flexibly and innovatively a comprehensive agreement.

In leading these efforts, the US envoy should work closely with our allies, China and Russia in the Six-Party context. But, the core issue remains Pyongyang's conviction of perfervid hostility from the Bush Administration toward the Democratic Peoples Republic of Korea. That is the reason that Pyongyang insists on resolving this issue in direct talks with the United States. Washington is the threat and it must be dealt with by Washington;

The failure of Washington to resolve the nuclear threat is also creating a dangerous schism in Asia, dividing the United States and Japan from a continent increasingly dominated by China. Such a split is driven by Washington's indifference and the nuclear stand-off and fueled by Japanese-American development of a missile defense system, widely believed to be actually aimed at China. In essence, Washington's failure to provide leadership in managing the threats from North Korea **and** the emerging schism **risk** American strategic pre-eminence in East Asia.

After squandering nearly six years and allowing North Korea repeatedly to cross what were formerly red lines, the perception by Pyongyang of the weakness of America, the odds are increasingly against a satisfactory comprehensive agreement with North Korea to end the nuclear and missile threats.

But, with a genuine American effort to negotiate to end these threats, China, South Korea, and Russia might join the United States and Japan in pressuring Pyongyang to end its dangerous challenge. At a minimum it might rescue our alliances in East Asia and refurbish somewhat American leadership.

Without such an urgent effort, North Korea certainly will soon become a nuclear weapons power with the threat of an intercontinental ballistic delivery system.

The Bush Administration has, for purely ideological reasons, squandered the chance for resolution of North Korean threats and profoundly diminished the national interests and security of America and its allies in Northeast Asia.



Save the Day!

What?

2007 Pacific Century Annual Award Dinner, honoring Ambassador Ton Nu Thi Nihn

When?

February 22, 2007, Reception 6:00pm, Dinner 7:00pm

Where?

Grand Ballroom, InterContinental Los Angeles (formerly the Park Hyatt Los Angeles)
2151 Avenue of the Stars, Los Angeles, California

For more information and reservations, contact:

Rijin Lee

818-337-1630 (tel.)

818-337-1664 (fax)

rijin@cbol.com (email)



Directory

Headquarters:

21300 Victory Blvd. Suite 800
Woodland Hills, CA 91367
(818) 227-6620 (Tel)
(818) 704-4336 (Fax)
pci@pacificcenturyinst.org

Spencer H. Kim
(818) 337-1600 (Tel)
spencer@cbol.com

Regional Office:

Kenneth J. Tuggle, Esq.
Frost Brown Todd LLC
400 West Market Street, 32nd Floor
Louisville, KY 40202
(502) 568-0269 (Tel)
(502) 581-1087 (Fax)
ktuggle@fbtlaw.com

Representative (Korea):

Chung In Moon
Yonsei University
134 Shinchon-dong Seodaemoon-ku
Seoul, 120-749, KOREA
822-2123-3542 (Tel)
822-362-1915 (Fax)
cimoon@yonsei.ac.kr

Representative (Japan):

Ko Shioya
Seta 2-19-1
Setagaya-ku, Tokyo
Japan 158-0095
813-03707-0369 (Tel)(Fax)
koshioya@ybb.ne.jp

PCI Web site:

www.pacificcenturyinst.org
21300 Victory Blvd. Suite 800
Woodland Hills, CA 91367

Rijin Lee

(818) 337-1630 (Tel)
(818) 337-1664 (Fax)
rijin@cbol.com

Denice Gonzalez (PCI Intern)

(818) 337-1630 (Tel)
(818) 337-1664 (Fax)
deniceg@ucla.edu



PACIFIC CENTURY INSTITUTE

21300 Victory Blvd. Suite 800
Woodland Hills, CA 91367-2525

Board of Directors

Kenneth J. Tuggle, Esq.
Leroy Johnson, Ph.D.
Donald Evans, CPA
Ambassador Donald P. Gregg
Desaix Anderson, U.S. Foreign Service (Ret.)
Ko Shioya, Journalist
Ambassador In-Ho Lee
Ambassador Raymond Burghardt