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One Moment Business and One Year Business in the Asia-Pacific Region

Shigeyuki Itow*

Kyushu Sangyo University, Japan

Over twenty years the author has thus far visited many countries in both the eastern and western hemispheres including such all Asia-Pacific countries as the formal members of APEC (Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation) as well as the non-members. He learned that there are great gaps among them in terms of the transfer of information and communication and in terms of national transportation. In this respect, "one moment business" can enjoy much greater success due to greater ease of communication than "one year business" in a business society. His conclusion is that "One moment business" refers to the situation in which messages and information are easily exchanged; on the other hand "one year business" refers to the situation in which communication is problematic.
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Introduction

In this paper the author will examine a certain sort of business action "before" and "after" business people start to contact each other. It is, in principle, similar to human behavior "before" and "after" one gets in touch with, and knows, others in an organization, a community, or a society. In other to be successful whether in business or in human relations, when business in different cultures or with different countries the "before" and "after" of human interactions must be seriously reconsidered. If people in Russia are still enjoying "kitchen talks," they will be unable to demolish such barriers for the time being. Business success, if so, will be far beyond their reach; Japan, Singapore, Hong Kong, Korea, RO, the United States of America, etc. communicate relatively fast with each other. The author will attempt to conclude that the success of business or human relations depends on how fast information and messages can be exchanged after a business or human relationship is initiated. Russia or its Far East, can information and messages be easily exchanged without any barriers after people and business people get to know one and another.

In this respect, "one moment business" can enjoy much greater success due to greater ease of communication than "one year business" in a business society. "One moment business" refers to the situation in which messages and information are easily exchanged; on the other hand "one year business" refers to the situation in which communication is problematic. Business is not charity in non-profit organizations but a social service through money-transaction in profit-oriented organizations.

**Final corrections and rearrangements of this paper have been done, with its great help, at Bellagion Study and Conference Center, Rockefeller Foundation, Villa Serbelloni, Bellagio (Como), Italy in April 30-May 2, 1997.**
1. Background of the Topic: “One Moment Business” and “One Year Business”

Over twenty years the author has thus far visited many countries in both the eastern and western hemispheres including such all Asia-Pacific countries as the formal members of APEC (Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation) as well as the non-members. There are great gaps among them in terms of the transfer of information and communication and in terms of national transportation. The United States, Canada, Chile, New Zealand, Australia, Singapore, Japan, Hong Kong, and Chinese Taipei have developed relatively efficient and easy-to-use systems. These countries can be defined as developed countries in terms of communication and information transfer; in other words, they are part of the so-called information society in all respects. A professor of this kind of society is easily connected from his/her university office by using the telephone, a fax machine, computer electronic mail, and internet: that is to say, his/her office can promptly be connected to his/her party by using them for a moment. This means that people in general who want to do business can do business with the party in a moment.

In any communication-developed countries, information societies, and transportation advanced societies, the exchange of people’s messages, goods, or materials is possible in a moment without any barriers before and after people meet one and another. Thus, in the developed countries, social renovation in social evolution is spontaneous without any fanatic social revolution; business in developed countries can, in turn, be done in a moment.

Concerning the communication and information transfer, how about the rest of the developing countries such as Russia, China, Vietnam, Mexico, Peru, Indonesia, and the Philippines? The question is: how about the Russian Far East. The entire nation of Russia is recognized as a technological giant and advanced country, but the part of Russia, her Far East can not be seen as such a country (Rogers 1994). In 1990, I had a first hand experience with the inefficient Far Eastern Russian communication system when Far Eastern
State University had invited me to the Russian Far East, Khabarovsk, Vladivostok, and others in order to participate in the international meetings. During my stay in both cities, I made direct contacts with Russian experts who could work together with me on an Asia-Pacific research project I had initiated as director in Japan. After returning to Japan, I attempted to contact my collaborators in the Russian Far East who might work together with me. I had a strange experience at my desk: I telephoned them frequently, however, every time the lines were busy. At last I gave up trying to telephone them. I looked for other way to contact my collaborators. I tried to send my messages to them by fax machine from my office. That line was also busy. I could find no other way to contact them. I thought the last method of writing a personal letter to them. For me this method was not convenient and efficient because I lived in an information society and was not patient. It was not good for me that postal communication method took one month per letter. It took one month but it felt like one year. The postal communication method may be too slow for business people living in an information society, and it may be the example of one year business. In the case of the Russian Far East as I mentioned above, I would hesitate to define it as "one year business"; however, it belongs to a pattern of "one year business" that business people operating with computers and instant telecommunications may not be patient enough to accept. Why do these kinds of unbelievable things happen in a technological giant, Russia or the Russian Far East? The question is: do social leaders not like to pursue "public goals" to shape a social consensus rather do they still pursue "private goals" which in the end may lead to escalating social conflicts? After the formation of the Soviet Union, the Communists in Russia failed to integrate public opinion and deepened the social cleavage among peoples the pro-communists only pursued private goals for their own gains, not public goals which could create a positive social consensus among the people and gain their support which could lead to public policies formulated in a fair decision making process. The question of what is socialism or communism, is one that we must once again re-examine. The Soviet historical expe-
rience of communism told us that political power was the same thing in all societies; the power could not be legitimated by the powerless although institutionalized.

Communication developing countries, non-information societies, transportation developing countries can not efficiently exchange people's messages, goods, and materials. Such countries, in turn, exchange them inaccurately in a year or so with barriers before and after people meet each another. Thus, the developing countries can not spontaneously undertake social renovation and then social evolution after social revolution which causes great damage to non-political people or takes a toll on the lives of the intelligenza killed by non-democratic political power. Business in such developing countries can not easily be done except in a year because of the relatively non-free society, which is not open, informative, efficient, natural, different free, non-discriminating, and immoral.

2. Ranking of Telephone Diffusion Rate Per 1,000 Person In The Asia Pacific Region: What Countries Can Do “One Moment Business”

It is scientifically difficult to evaluate which countries are the developed and which countries are developing in the Asia-Pacific region. However, in an attempt to do such an evaluation, let us examine statistical data on the telephone diffusion rate per 1,000 inhabitants in the Asia-Pacific region. In doing so, we can obtain some standards by which we can evaluate which countries are developed and which countries are developing; although such an evaluation, we can predict which countries can do business in a moment or which countries can not, namely which countries are doing “business in a year.”

According to table 1, the telephone diffusion rate in the Asia-Pacific region is that Canada is a top ranking country rather than the U.S.A. In my experience with both countries, there is no significant difference in diffusion of telephones since I have not had any troubles in calling from and to each country. Opposed to telephone, T.V. diffusion rate could not be shown a right way of information
Table 1: Ranking of Telephone & T.V. Diffusion Rate Per 1,000 Person

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
<th>T.V.</th>
<th>Population (in million)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Canada</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>28.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. U.S.A.</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>814</td>
<td>255.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. New Zealand</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Japan</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>124.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Hong Kong</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>5.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Australia</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>17.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Singapore</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Taiwan</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>20.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Brunei Darussalam</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Korea, RO</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>44.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Russia</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>148.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Malaysia</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>18.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Mexico</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>86.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Chile</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>13.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Peru</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>22.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Thailand</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>57.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Philippines</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>65.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. China</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Indonesia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>191.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Vietnam</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>67.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Papua New Guinea</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. North Korea</td>
<td>Elite Only</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Data 95-96, ATLAS, Tokyo: Douhousha, 1995) Diffusion Rate per 1,000 person

This list ranking telephone diffusion tells us that the developed countries fall within number 1 (Canada) and number 8 (Taiwan); the developing countries apparently rank from number 14 (Chile) to number 22 (North Korea). Countries between number 9 (Brunei Darussalam) and number 12 (Mexico) include both developed and develop-
ing countries. Both Brunei Darussalam and Korea, RO might be counted as developed countries in a sense. However, it is difficult to consider Russia as a developed country; the same is true of Malaysia and Mexico. Rather, they might be considered as developing countries in terms of the diffusion rate of telephones.

From table 1, it is possible to conclude that it is quite easy to do business “in a moment” in the developed countries. In these countries, business people never feel frustrated in terms of communication. Among the developing countries, business people never feel such frustration as well. The decisive problem will occur in great gaps of communication and transportation transfer between the developed and the developing countries. Business people in the developed countries cannot wait for late responses or answers from the developing ones, because they face the information explosion every day among or from the developed countries. Such things are business itself done by business men, or “busy-men.” Therefore, it is difficult to do business among Japan, Russia, and China “in a moment.” Each should learn to be patient in doing business among these countries.

3. Causes of Widening Gaps Between One Moment Business and One Year Business

As far as we can see from the list ranking telephone diffusion, the developed countries on the list have at least been called relatively democratic and free societies in politics and economy. Japan, Singapore, and Taiwan are not completely similar and identical to such societies as the U.S.A., Canada, New Zealand, Australia, and Hong Kong in terms of thinking and culture. In my analysis, the former is not a pro-individualist country to the extent the latter is. In my last analysis, the former is defined as a “systemist” country based on “systemism”; while the latter is defined as an “individualist” country grounded by “individualism.”

The rest of systemist and individualist countries belong to such “collectivist” countries as Russia, China, Vietnam including other militarist countries like Indonesia, Chile, and others. In general, the list ranking telephone diffusion in the table have shown that the
collectivist countries are developing countries in terms of communication and transportation transfer. "Why" is my question. My job is to discover "causes" and "effects." The effects that I already discovered caused or have caused collectivist idea, leading the entire country to the less developed one than systemist and individualist ones, under control of collectivism including communism and militarism.

COLLECTIVISM: It is involved in the wider range of Russian Communism, Chinese Maoism, Marx-Leninism, Totalitarian ideas, extreme leftist or rightist ideas, and militarism. As a result of their historical experiment, collectivism could not evolve in any societies in general. Let us ask the reason.
VALUES: Collectivism in general evaluates that the egalitarian-collectivist is the highest values as normative ones. The former Soviet Union was a typical example that it thought people were born equal in a society, and they are an embedded and integral part of society. People could ideally be satisfied by having met their needs by their society, and they should ideally contribute to their own society to the best of their abilities. That is the best way if all human beings can do achieving such an ideal. Societal reality in Russia differed from the ideal. The more political and social leaders could take in political power in Russia, the more they wanted to get valuable things beyond their needs and abilities more than the people. Therefore, as they developed wider contradictions between their needs and abilities, they were not able to construct a conflict-free society but they constructed a conflict-amplifying society although they ideally hoped to construct a conflict-free society believing all people are equal.

POLITICAL GOVERNANCE: Collectivism in general tends to collect and monopolize all powers into one political power holder at the top of the social pyramid, with no official opposition or counterweight to it. This describes all dictatorships from left to right, whatever their ideological justification. Thus, this form of political governance tends to be “unitary power.”

ECONOMIC SYSTEMS: Economic systems in collectivism are characterized by state or “collective” property, output maximization, a regulated market, and the deterministic role of government in all economic affairs, exercised through central planning and administrative allocation of resources.

INDIVIDUALISM: It is involved in the wide range of American Individualism, French and British Individualism, and other European types of Individualism. As a result of their long historical experience, individualism tends to decline in a global civilization. It is a type of human logic, derived from the human idea that man can artificially operate.

VALUES: Individualism in general holds that the individualistic-competitive way is the best as normative values. This may be seen
in the U.S.A. In the U.S., each individual is seen as unique. It is legitimate for each to be concerned with his own needs and aspirations and to seek self-assertion and self-fulfillment.

POLITICAL GOVERNANCE: The American way of political governance is countervailing power. It is representative government with one party in power and one or more in opposition, whose perceived purpose is to prevent abuse and improve the use of power, to "counter-balance." Freedoms are guaranteed by the aspiration of legislative, executive, and judicial powers.

ECONOMIC SYSTEMS: The key point of this system is private property, profit maximization, and a free market, with the government committed to ascertain the above within, and sometimes beyond (war), the rule of law, with predominantly adversarial relation between government, business, and labor. This economic system is managed by free enterprise.

SYSTEMS: It is made in Japan by combining Japanese old culture with Chinese, Korean, European ones. It is not the similar idea to the present China, committed to collectivism. But you can partially see systems in Singapore, Taiwan, Korea, and others.

VALUES: Systems holds that the systemic-cooperative way is the best as normative values. A person is neither unique nor equal. A person is just systemic: one emerging part of creation and one part of the society or organizations. Each person CO-shared with one and another in relationship. Thus, each should seek to play his proper role in them, voluntarily subordinate to higher purposes, to fulfill his obligations and his destiny through systemic-cooperative interaction with others. It partially includes elements of collectivism and individualism, and is supported by current scientific findings.

POLITICAL GOVERNANCE: Systems in general tends to support a shared-consensus power in a conflict-reducing process. Decisions are made by representatives of different sectors of the population, with varied orientations, partaking in the process and subsequently sharing the responsibility for the consequences.

ECONOMIC SYSTEMS: Systems discovered a new economic system of the concerted free enterprise by rearranging the free enterprise in
individualism and the command-state enterprise in collectivism. There are more cooperative relations between government and business or among government, business, and labor. It is advantageous to enable the creation of consensus about national objectives, priorities, the ensuing harmonization of economic endeavors, and the long term economic planning. It also can save a lot of social cost wasted by the over-competition and the over-state control.

4. Conclusion

As we can see above, collectivist countries are developing ones in terms of communication and information transfer. One of the reasons why they can not do “one moment business,” stems from their own idea of collectivism. If they do not wish to do “one year business” but “one moment business,” it is better for them to change collectivism into individualism or. Systems is much better for the Russian future. Because elements of collectivism have at least been included in systems. Collectivism and individualism are hostile to one and another, and are opposite just like heads and tails of a coin. However, one can conclude that developed countries on communication and information transfer are the individualist countries as the top runners in the ranking; the systems countries as the second runners. Both of the first and second runners can do “business in a moment.” The last runner of the collectivist countries is easy to do “business in a year,” but difficult to do “business in a moment.” However, the last runner has the possibility to chase and beat the first and second runner through the collection of high qualified information and know-how, and the fast copy print of both runners. It should learn that the second runner compete against the first one in the Asia Pacific region. (Itow 1995)
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