

**1993 SUMMER SEMINAR:
LEADERSHIP**

**THE NORTH PACIFIC PROGRAM:
A PEDAGOGICAL PATTERN, A SPECIFIC THEME: LEADERSHIP**

John Curtis Perry
Henry Willard Denison Professor of Diplomatic History,
The Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University

INTRODUCTION

After being introduced by Professor Hirano, the Director of the Seminar, Professor Perry opened the seminar by stating that this was the ninth meeting of the Fletcher School North Pacific Program Seminar. He expressed his deepest appreciation to Professor Kenichiro Hirano and Professor Masato Kimura for their efforts to secure funding for the seminar and for assuming the burden of organizing and directing it. He also introduced and thanked Kathleen Cook Ryan who had coordinated all the seminar-related activities at The Fletcher School during the preceding year. Beyond acknowledging those who were present, Professor Perry suggested that participants in this year's seminar are unknowingly indebted to "all of the past participants in this experience, of whom there are now some 250, who shaped it for your more than they perhaps realize."

Professor Perry then addressed the students and laid out a triad of ideas upon which this seminar rests

1. A Concept of the North Pacific
2. A Pedagogical Pattern, and
3. The Question of Leadership

A CONCEPT OF THE NORTH PACIFIC

Professor Perry proposed that there is special relevance to the study of the place where the world's four greatest powers meet. Only Europe is now absent from this equation, he said, even though Europe was very important to the North Pacific history at least until the middle of the nineteenth century. In some sense, Perry observed, Europe created the concept of the North Pacific as a region.

He said that the idea that the North Pacific itself constitutes a region worthy of study is an idiosyncratic notion. The region cuts across cultural areas and national frontiers. It stretches from Tijuana to Shanghai. Increasingly, according to Professor Perry, the North Pacific has become "a source of initiative in world affairs. From the beginning of the consciousness of this region, it had very long tentacles--one could say that such cities as Boston and St. Petersburg were part of the North Pacific world." Indeed, he said, the North Pacific was

part of a global, geopolitical tension in which rivalries ran high over intercontinental trade routes. The North

Pacific was perceived as the key area in the attempt to capture domination of intercontinental trade routes and the particular prize was China because China was regarded as a key to commercial domination of the world beginning in the late eighteenth century. China was the focus. China was the core of attention.

Within the region, Perry explained, there are four major actors--Russia, the United States, China, and Japan--and three subordinate ones--Mexico, Canada, and Korea. Nevertheless, none is simply a regional state. For example, Canada may be seen to have global reach.

because it is a highly developed nation, because it is rich, because of its size, (it) has an impact beyond North America. British Columbia is growing in importance. The commercial pull of the Pacific is coming to surpass the pull of the North Atlantic--so important traditionally in Canadian history.

Both the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in the north as well as the Republic of Korea in the south of the Korean peninsula have global interests. Perry said that North Koreans might assert that political philosophy of "*juche*, articulated by the 'Great Leader' Kim Il Sung, has potentially universal applicability. It is only our own ignorance of this particular philosophy that prevents us from understanding is "unique within the region because of immigration patterns." He explained that Koreans have moved out in equal numbers to China, Russia, Japan and to the United States." Now, of course, the economic reach of South Korea is global. The Samsung luggage carts in the Frankfurt Airport or in Narita are a palpable spokesman for that phenomenon."

As to the four major actors, Perry suggested that the weaknesses of Russia are now overexaggerated and its power underestimated in much the same fashion that the military power of the Soviet Union was exaggerated during the period of Cold War. Perry said that the long and difficult transition now underway in Russia should not obscure the possibility that the shedding of colonies, as in Eastern Europe and Central Asia, may lead ultimately to greater strength for the core of Russia. Perry noted that

The weakening at the Center may promote more rapid changes at the periphery and this opens new opportunities for international, regional, association both economic and cultural, perhaps even political. Certainly Primorie, the maritime region, is expressing more interest in building relationships across the East Sea (Sea of Japan.) Chukotski and Alaska are building special ties, and this opens new possibilities, new studies worthy of our attention.

In Perry's view, the greatest asset Russia has is not its material resources, but its creative human resources. Perry

reminded the audience that the Russian intelligentsia was responsible for making remarkable contributions to world culture, notably in literature and music. He said that while Chekhov, Dostoevsky, Moussorgsky, and Prokofiev came from Russia, they now belong to all of us, just as do Shakespeare and Beethoven.

Perry continued by saying that China is viewed with new respect because of its outstanding economic performance over the past decade. Now, it is clear to the Chinese and to the world what it is "China can do when China enjoys peace." For the first sustained period since the start of the last century.

the second half of the twentieth century is distinguished for China as a time when the outside world has pretty much left China along. The outside world has not intervened in the processes--political and economic--of China's change. China has been able to establish its own terms for engagement with the outside world.

According to some analysts, China's economy has now grown to rank number three in the world. Perry believes that "this may indicate that we're on the verge of, or are involved in, a macro-historical shift."

Perry cited historian William H. McNeill who suggested that world history may be assessed in increments of five hundred years.

The last five hundred years has been essentially one of North Atlantic, maritime domination of the globe. Perhaps, Perry mused,

we are changing, moving into a period in which East Asia is resurgent and China will have a place in the world not unlike that that it enjoyed in Song and Ming times. Napoleon was the first to point out that the giant was asleep, but when the giant awoke the world would shake, China--the sleeping giant.

However, China's rapid development causes China's neighbors to be apprehensive about the rapidity of change in their world. Much of Southeast Asia carries "the memories of Chinese imperialism--the slow, massive, and sustained drive to the south which was the essential dynamic of China's historical geography."

Perry added that Tibetans, too, would say that the expansionistic urge of China is not dead. He said that China must take greater cognizance, be more sensitive, perhaps, to the feelings of its immediate neighbours.

In Perry's view, China's North Pacific frontier, notably Manchuria," was the cockpit of Asia--the equivalent of Belgium in Western European conflict of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries." He said that while Manchuria was newly developed in the late nineteenth century, it is now but a backwater. "It is associated with smokestack industry, with the past, not with the future. The action in the Chinese economy is occurring along the coast, it is maritime in its orientation." In fact, Perry advised, "the revival of China as a maritime state is one of the most interesting phenomena of contemporary China, and contemporary world affairs." From an historical perspective, however, the big

question related to China is not its economic development, but the nature of the polity. Is China stable or not? Perry believes that the uncertainty about this matter looms over any speculation about the resurgence of China as a massive force in global affairs.

Japan, another of the principal North Pacific powers, is more responsible "than any nation for the singlemost remarkable phenomenon in the North Pacific history over the past fifty years, and that's the shift of the world balance of wealth." In Perry's view, the emergence of the North Pacific as the chief center of global manufacturing and the chief focus of international oceanic trade flows accelerating beyond the level of the North Atlantic region is a reflection of Japan's growth.

Of course the US had a role in this, the benevolence of the American occupation of Japan following the defeat in 1945 set the tone. It was cemented by the perceived threat on the part of Americans and many Japanese of the Soviet Union, the PRC, and the DPRK. Japan certainly benefitted from the openness of the US market and Japan could suck its thumb comfortably under the security blanket provided by the American military.

Perry pointed out that the participants in the seminar had a tangible reminder of this American-provided security as the seminar was taking place under the sound of military aircraft landing and taking off at Tachikawa Air Force Base, one of the largest American military establishments in East Asia.

Perry sees the closeness of the United States and Japan as a really remarkable phenomenon in world history. He marvels at "the peculiar and powerful intimacy between our two nations," considering the big differences that exist between the two cultures. Still, it is Perry's sense that Japan has failed to build healthy relations with any nation other than the U.S. In part, this can be attributed to the burden of history, the reluctance of many Japanese to accept responsibility for causing the Pacific segment of World War II, and the effects of Japanese colonialism in East Asia. Tentatively, Perry also suggested that "the lingering sense of Tennoism, the mystique attached to the Emperor, the imperial institution" may also contribute to the absence of other, healthy relations with states in the region. Perry acknowledged that his last was a provocative statement and welcomed student participants to question or challenge him about it.

Japan's comparatively underdeveloped network of political bonds to other states in the region notwithstanding, its economic success has had a radiating influence.

The influence of Japan and the effect of the Japanese economy partially explain the success enjoyed by California as well as the remarkable shift in the United States from the Atlantic to the Pacific which has characterized the past fifty years. Southeast Asia also most notably now is experiencing

Perry pointed to Singapore's development some time ago and, more recently, that of Malaysia and Thailand--the most rapidly growing economies in the world. In Perry's words:

Japan is exporting capital, technology, and pollution. This contrasts with the failures of the U.S. to exercise comparable influence for economic growth on Mexico and the rest of Pacific Latin America (except, perhaps, with respect to pollution).

Turning to the role of the United States, Perry said that it is worth considering that the U.S. is going through the trauma of domestic crisis--not to be compared with the Russian crisis--but

we are experiencing a socio-cultural revolution, with mixed results. We have a rising Black middle class emerging into great prosperity, but it seems there is a permanent underclass in our cities which have become dangerous and decayed. We are all ashamed of the state of urban America. New York has a feral quality of a third world city, almost like Calcutta-on-the-Hudson.

Perry posed the question whether the series of acute problems affecting the United States will change the North Pacific concept in some fashion? He asked:

is it perhaps more advisable, more accurate for us to look for a significant grouping around Confucian Asia--will this be the center? Will the norther tier (Canada, Russia, Alaska, and the United States) have a real role--a leadership role--in this new international world of the 21st century? Are decisions going to be made there or will they be made further to the south here in Asia?

Perry's response is that the United States does have a role. Maybe, he said, others will feel that he is "guilty of chest-thumping chauvinism," but in his view the US is still "regarded as the only mediating power--not only in East Asia, but globally. The U.S. is still key to the stability of the North Pacific region. The U.S. is the only nation to satisfy all the criteria of a great power." When it comes to wealth, for example, the US is still the world's largest and most productive economy. Citing other strengths of the United States, Perry said "The US is the military hegemon of the world without even close rivals." In addition,

The US has a message which is attractive to others. Each of the other North Pacific nations has its own national mythology. The American one is unique because it is the only one that other people seem to find attractive. Americans have a strong sense of mission which has been very much a part of its history since its beginning. And we proclaim a universality of our values that are

widely accepted by other people. . . values based upon democracy and free market capitalism. Of course, these ideals in reality work out sometimes quite differently than what Americans envision they ought to be, and yet lipservice is paid to these ideals.

In view of the American role in the history of the North Pacific, Perry commented that it is perhaps not surprising that this North Pacific Program seminar itself was founded by an American institution and by an American individual.

**PEDAGOGICAL PATTERN:
HISTORY OF THE NORTH PACIFIC SEMINAR**

Perry explained the history of the North Pacific Seminar. He said that it can be traced to a

splendid dinner on Beacon Hill (in Boston) at the Somerset Club, which is a watering hole of great distinction with a fine wine cellar and a splendid kitchen. The ambiance created by the food and drink of that evening marks the importance of the role of food and drink in the conduct of successful diplomacy.

Perry said that Mr. Seizo Ota, president and CEO of Toho Mutual Life Insurance company, was present at the dinner. Professor Perry described Mr. Ota as a great-hearted and generous man of ideas, and the idea of creating the North Pacific Seminar was his.

Upon the invitation of Governor Yokomichi of Hokkaido, with the generous support of Mr. Ota and others, Professor Perry initiated the summer seminar program in Sapporo in 1985. Reminiscing about the sweep of international political change that has transpired since those first days, Perry remarked that our concerns then and now are quite different. Perry said that the greatest change in the summer seminar has been in the range of nationalities represented by participants. For instance, Perry recalled that when he first arrived at the Fletcher School in 1980, there were no students from the People's Republic of China.

It was not until 1982 that the first Chinese students came to Fletcher, but it was some years after that the first Russians enrolled. Perry said "very few Fletcher students had ever even seen a Russian, let alone ever had a meaningful conversation with a citizen of the Soviet Union." Since 1986, both Chinese and Russians have been active participants in the North Pacific Seminar.

Perry also observed that the American attitude towards its neighbours on the North Pacific has changed. In the first year of the seminar, there were two notable participants whose presentations offered the two extreme views that EuroAmericans then held about the Communist world. Zbigniew Brzezinski, whom Perry characterized as "a sabre rattler," gave a speech at the first forum. The other was Pierre Elliot Trudeau, who served as a statesman-in-residence and spent ten days with the student participants "bouncing around in a bus, making excursions,

participating in workshops, and participating informally. He was a splendid contributor and seemed to enjoy it thoroughly."

Perry said that the two men "embodied the two faces that we showed toward the socialist camp: the belligerent and the conciliatory--the belligerence of Brzezinski, and the conciliation of Trudeau who was always interested in imaginative solutions to diplomatic problems." It was not until the next year, 1986, that the first Soviets participated in the seminar. Perry expressed the feeling that both sides had at that time, saying about the Soviets that

They could have been Martians to us, and we to them. Thereafter, I have joked about their feelings towards us then and our feelings about them when both sides tried to identify who was the intelligence agent in the other team, and I was a prime suspect.

Participants from the Soviet Union were drawn from two institutes that are part of the Soviet Academy of Social Sciences, IMEMO (Institute of World Economy and Affairs) and the US-Canada Institute. Perry expressed pride that

this was a real break-through for the Fletcher School. This was our first encounter with Russians in a serious and sustained way, and it culminated in the 1990 seminar which we held in Vladivostok, two years before that city was officially opened. It was the courage and determination of our Soviet hosts in Moscow that made it possible. We went to the airport not knowing whether we would be allowed to take off. The General Staff had said that they did not want foreigners to enter Vladivostok. But we did anyway, once we were airborne, we could relax. So we had ten days in Vladivostok in 1990 and this was one small step toward lessening the isolation between the U.S. and the world's largest Asian nation.

Perry said that another first for the North Pacific Seminar came in 1988 when the first participants joined us from the North Korean community in Japan. The seminar was host to two students and a professor from Korea University, which is at the top of the pyramid of the North Korean educational structure in Japan.

In April 1989, following this first contact with the North Koreans here in Japan, six faculty participants from the North Pacific Seminar visited North Korea, three Japanese, one Canadian, and two Americans. Then, in 1989 and 1990, North Koreans came from Pyongyang expressly for the purpose of engaging in the seminar. Perry remarked that that was "the first such experience in history: the first time North Korea has sent students to engage with other students for such a protracted period of time--North Koreans and South Koreans together with others from the North Pacific nations."

Regrettably, this year it was not possible to persuade people from Pyongyang to come. Perry noted that, "as always these

decisions are mysterious--wrapped in considerations of international politics." Still, on Wednesday, July 14, the day before Professor Perry left the United States he received a telephone call from the DPRK mission in New York from an official who expressed continuing interest in speaking with Perry about the future of exchanges. "So they are still interested and when the political climate improves, as we hope it will soon, we may enjoy a freer interchange."

Perry summed up by saying that the North Pacific seminar has served to open new avenues of exchange and communication among scholars and students from states that would not, ordinarily, encourage such interaction. He said that he is fond of quoting a Russian friend who said "let's crash our stereotypes." This is symbolic of what the seminar aims to achieve. He added, "we like to put people together in new ways."

NATURE OF THE SEMINAR

Addressing himself to the pedagogical style of the seminar, Perry asked "once we are all together, what then?" He then explained the central theme of the seminar experience by saying

We are a company of learners--by that I mean that we are an intellectual democracy, no one is just a teacher or just a student. We are all teachers, we are all students. This is essentially an American notion, this pedagogical pattern we have evolved, but it is characteristically multi-cultural in derivation.

The seminar as an institution is, after all, a nineteenth century invention which originated in Germany. It was taken up by American universities and used as a mechanism to develop research under the guidance of professors. In American liberal arts colleges, it has been used as a way to encourage faculty to engage in creative teaching.

However, while the seminar style is partly American, Perry assured the participants that "we have drawn on Asia as well as Europe in the design of this seminar. I like to think that the spirit of Basho, the haiku poet, is inspiring us. His teaching ideal was to elicit rather than to impose."

The Motto of the Hachioji Inter-University Seminar House, in which the first week of the Seminar was held, is "plain living and high thinking." This prompted Perry to ask whether the seminar this summer would be characterized by those qualities. He offered that the students would have to be the judges of this, "but we have found the perfect environment here, thanks to Professor Hirano. This could not be surpassed as a place for us to work and play together over the next few days."

Perry added that the seminar also draws from Confucius in its veneration of learning and our appreciation of the lessons of history and our sense that this is not just a classroom experience. For we are concerned with the overall individual, as the master himself said, "Set your heart

upon the way, and seek distractions in the arts. Man is perfected by music.'

You will find as you go through the next few days that we pay some attention to this. Lectures, of course, are valuable and we will all learn from each other in this fashion. It is a wonderful way of inspiring and inculcating information. But the lectures yield primacy to the key mechanism in our seminar which is the workshop. This is the key medium of our interaction.

In addition to the formal mechanism of the seminar, there is also the informal, which is just as--if not more--important. Perry urged participants to see the value of the serendipitous. In other words, "what you create in the way of your conversations and diversions--what we're striving for is the total experience."

THE QUESTION OF LEADERSHIP

Professor Perry explained that the 1992 North Pacific Seminar at Vladivostok was the first in a series to focus on leadership. The central question, what is a leader, is frequently asked, but rarely answered to anybody's satisfaction. Leadership itself is a well-worn theme of study and the literature about it is voluminous, more than any person could or probably would want to read.

However, Perry observed,

all too often, leadership is defined and understood only within the context of a single culture and here a whiff of cultural imperialism can be detected. We, here in the seminar, are trying to look beyond culture as we think about leadership. We are trying to look into a multi-cultural dimension of this vast, North Pacific world--at individuals within their own cultures and people who are at the same time international . . . who have a strong interest in international affairs and who have a sympathy for other cultures. Those people who are not culture bound.

The problem is posed in the context of the North Pacific region where, as it is elsewhere, there are significant shifts underway in the style of leadership. The concern with leadership is one that cuts across national boundaries and across subnational cultures. Perry explained:

Let us not forget about indigenous cultures of the north, for example. In Seoul, in 1991, we greatly benefitted from the participation of an Inuit woman from Alaska who opened our eyes to matters about which we had not thought very much before.

As to the approach the seminar takes to leadership, Perry said that he hopes participants will try to understand leadership in

its confusingly vast dimensions. "We are concerned with personality and power, the dynamic of interaction between individuals and institutions, individuals and culture." He cited the American nineteenth century philosopher, Ralph Waldo Emerson, who said that the institution is simply the shadow of an individual. In the same vein, the English historian, Carlyle, flatly asserted that "history is biography."

Perry acknowledged that these assertions are controversial, but he suggested that the participants accept them as hypotheses with which to work" even though they go against the grain of current scholarship." Perry went on to say that

My hypothesis as an historian and a humanist, not a social scientist, would be that each case of leadership is unique. I must say that I am skeptical about models, I'm doubtful of generalizations. Oliver Wendell Holmes, a wise man of Boston, once said no generalization is correct including this one.' Certainly none seems adequate to cover all cases. So, what I see us studying together is biography--the attempt to capture the essence of a life, the lives of people who have been shapers of opinion as well as formers or executors of policy.

Perry encouraged participants to look beyond those who were prominent in the formulation or execution of policy to consider also those who think about policy and make the recommendations. "These people are reflective of their times but they are also determinants, shapers--definers of those times." He said that regardless whether one adopts the approach of the humanist or the social scientist, "we can learn a lot from the study of remarkable individuals--both the successes and the failures." In some ways, he said, studying the failures is more interesting than studying the successes. Professor Perry concluded his remarks by inviting student participants to see the study of leadership as a guide to personal behavior.

Our study has some practical application. Our study is more than abstract intellectual exercise. It can be inspirational, and I hope that it will be because you are leaders. As we talk and listen together, I expect each of you to be asking of our specific study as well as of our total experience together: what does this mean for me? The challenge is yours.