

REMARKS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY  
DEPUTY SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION ELAINE L. CHAO  
SPACE TECHNOLOGY, COMMERCE & COMMUNICATIONS CONFERENCE  
WASHINGTON, D.C.  
JANUARY 9, 1991

Thank you, Stephanie, and good evening. It is a great pleasure to be here. I want to join everyone in congratulating tonight's award winners.

I also want to compliment The Space Foundation, Washington Technology, and *Space Magazine* for sponsoring this Conference and Exposition. It is an exciting opportunity to share information, demonstrate new technology, and advance the goals of all of us interested in the commercial use of space.

Tonight, I would like to talk about some of the developments in U.S. space policy competitiveness and the progress we have made in the past few months. It has been a productive period.

The DOT, as you know, is charged, under the Commercial Space Launch Act, with regulating the commercial space transportation industry and promoting commercial space launches by the private sector.

This is a significant national priority, important to the international competitiveness, technological leadership, and national security of our nation.

It is important to recognize that U.S. space transportation initiatives have matured to the point where they are no longer mere exploration or experimentation. The movement of cargo to, through, and from space is a *business*.

The first commercial launch licensed by the Department of Transportation occurred in March of 1989. Two more launches took place that year, and eight in 1990. There are nineteen prospective launches on the commercial manifest for 1991.

The projects on the commercial manifest reflect only launches for which contracts have been signed, and, therefore do not reflect significant developments in the small, or "light satellite," field. This includes Motorola's proposed 77 satellite "Iridium" constellation to establish a brand new telephone communications network, and the COMET experimental re-entry vehicle being developed by NASA's Office of Commercial Projects.

We have also had a declaration by the President of a Commercial Space Launch Policy, significant changes in legislation affecting commercial space activity, two insightful reports on U.S. space infrastructure and competitiveness, and the Augustine Committee report on the future of the U.S. Space Program.

All of these developments have occurred since August, 1990 and each has considerable significance for the commercial space transportation industry.

First, the Commercial Space Launch Policy announced by President Bush in September, 1990 . . . As you know, the President declared that the long-term goal of the United States is to achieve a free and fair international market in which the U.S. launch industry can compete.

It clearly establishes U.S. Government policy to negotiate and enforce trade agreements which limit unfair competition; to continue using U.S.-made vehicles for launching U.S. government satellites; and, in the long term, to encourage technical improvements, reduce costs, and increase the reliability of American launch vehicles.

The emergence of the PRC and the Soviet Union as competitors in the international launch market is a serious threat to the domestic industry. Since neither country has a market economy, their launch industries are, by definition, government subsidized.

These nations can offer unmatched launch prices if allowed to do so. The DOT opposes foreign space projects that take advantage of government subsidies and non-market pricing strategies to gain unfair advantage over the U.S. launch industry. Left

unchallenged, these projects could undercut not only the U.S. commercial space industry, but that of Europe's as well. The U.S. must be resolute in our current talks with the Europeans and in our dealings with the non-market countries to assure fair trade in space services.

Also in September, the AIA responded to a request from the Transportation Department for industry's perspective on the state of the commercial space launch infrastructure. This report focused primarily on the nation's major launch facility at Cape Canaveral, the site of most U.S. commercial space activity.

While it did not address the needs of small launch vehicles or satellites, it pointed out that Cape Canaveral has serious deficiencies due to aging equipment and lack of modernization. The report also cited the long processing time required to reconfigure facilities in support of different classes of launches, vehicles, and payload designs.

Other concerns centered around policies and perceptions which have a negative impact on customer attitudes. These include security regulations which deny international customers easy access to the pads where their payloads will be launched. Another concern, unsupported by evidence but exploited by our competitors, is the suspicion that commercial launches



have a low priority and may be “bumped” by U. S. government launches.

While the report candidly outlines some of our most persistent problems, it also provides a blueprint for improvements at the Cape and suggests ways to approach them. Since understanding the problem is the first step toward reaching a solution, this AIA report makes a major contribution to improving the competitiveness of the U.S. space transportation industry.

Other related issues were addressed in a report by the Transportation Department’s Commercial Space Transportation Advisory Committee, or “COMSTAC.” This working group included representatives of 11 major aerospace companies, under the chairmanship of Mr. Paul Fuller, Vice President of Rockwell’s Rocketdyne division.

The panel, looking at both short term and long term technological requirements, found that today’s generation of U.S. ELVs can remain competitive through the year 2005 only with an aggressive component technology improvement program .

They concluded that 60 to 70% of NASA’s vehicle component technology program should be used for near-term projects, while the remainder is aimed at

developing a new generation of U.S. launch vehicles to serve commercial *and* U.S. government needs in the next century.

This kind of two-track approach could reduce costs for upgraded vehicles by 25% by the end of this decade. The target is a vehicle able to lift 15,000 pounds to geostationary transfer orbit at a cost of under \$6,000 per pound. It should also require less than 12 months integration time and spend less than 20 days on the launch pad prior to lift off.

This would make it very competitive with the Ariane 5, currently under development by the ESA, as well as the best the Soviets and Chinese have to offer. Meanwhile, the groundwork would be laid with the remaining 30% to 40% to meet future foreign competition with a grand new family of vehicles.

To reach this goal will require cooperation between the government and the aerospace industry. Improvements are needed in propulsion systems, avionics, advanced structures and materials, production processes and launch operations. The commercial launch companies have already invested over \$500 million in improvements. Their continued willingness to spend shareholder money on commercial space

operations depends in large part on future government policies.

This not only involves government willingness to participate in research and development of new technology, but also the government's ability to assure a free and fair trade environment in space services.

I had the opportunity of presenting the COMSTAC report, along with other Transportation Department views, to the Advisory Committee on the Future of the U.S. Space Program, chaired by Norman Augustine. When the Augustine Committee filed its report a few weeks ago, I was pleased to note that it made significant recommendations, very much along the same lines as the COMSTAC report.

Their major recommendation called for the same strategy of adapting and improving current technology for the short-term future, while developing new propulsion and vehicle technology for the longer term. They framed their recommendations in terms of developing new heavy lift capability to supplement the shuttle for major scientific missions. There is little doubt that such a propulsion system could be applied to a range of vehicles to serve the needs of the commercial launch industry.

The Augustine report recognized that America has not developed a new main rocket engine in nearly two decades. It further declared that this country must continue to have fully competitive access to space itself, including launch vehicles essential to the fundamental viability of America's government and commercial space programs. In fact, the Augustine report repeatedly endorses the need to pursue commercialization of space and supports the commercial industry.

Late last year, Congress also made it clear that they support many of these goals and objectives. In the NASA Authorization bill for Fiscal Year 1991, Congress strengthened the mandate for the government to procure commercial launch services, and included new responsibilities for the Transportation Department.

The bill acknowledged the need to develop a strong space transportation infrastructure, in coordination with the private sector. The Transportation Department was directed to facilitate private sector involvement in commercial space, and encourage public/private partnerships between government at all levels and the private sector.

Accordingly, we support the efforts of the newly formed Aerospace States Association to promote the commercial space interests of the U.S. In fact, I was very

pleased to see that the Association is among the exhibitors here at this Conference.

In conclusion, our mission could not be clearer. We are approaching a consensus on the necessary technical, commercial and political decisions. Perhaps most of all, the crucial decisions of the next few years will require government managers to rethink old ways of doing business and adopt new strategies in support of our commercial space industry. The private sector, as well, will be called upon to place even more capital at risk.

But the past four months have provided us with a wealth of information on which to base the decisions which must be made. I am optimistic about the future, and look forward to steady progress as we work together to reach our goals.

Thank you, and God bless you.

REMARKS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY  
DEPUTY SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION ELAINE L. CHAO  
ANNUAL MEETING  
SHIPPERS FOR COMPETITIVE OCEAN TRANSPORTATION  
WASHINGTON, D.C.  
JANUARY 9, 1991

Good afternoon, and thank you, Jim. It is a pleasure to have this opportunity to join you to say a few words about our maritime policies from the public interest point of view.

We at the Department of Transportation have the responsibility of balancing the interests of both our carriers and our shippers. We must also consider the effects of our policies on our competitiveness in world trade as we struggle to reduce the trade deficit.

I know we have had the counsel of SCOT for about eight years now. SCOT has helped to keep us informed about the real world of ocean transport. Although we may not agree all the time, we have found that we can reason together to arrive at accommodating solutions to often difficult shipping problems.

Despite perceptions of some to the contrary, the United States has followed a fundamentally shipper-oriented maritime policy since the Shipping Act of 1916 mandated open conferences in United States trades. The Shipping Act of 1984 continued this policy, giving conferences expedited approval of their agreements

while opening to shippers new ways to bargain with carriers for trade-promoting rates.

Given our need to export, and our legal framework for regulating ocean conference activity, I think it is fair to describe our maritime policy as providing open access to ships of all nations unless forced to do otherwise.

I know that SCOT does not always think that we put enough pressure on those countries trying to restrict our maritime trades, but I remind you that we have maritime bilaterals with only four nations: Brazil, Argentina, the Soviet Union, and China. We have these bilaterals either because the economies in question are socialist and predominantly state-controlled, as in the cases of the Soviet Union and China, or because no other tool was found to mitigate cargo reservation laws, as with Brazil and Argentina.

I think most of you know -- because SCOT was a participant in the debates surrounding them -- that both our agreements with the Soviet Union and China no longer cover bulk cargoes. Neither can they be said to be cargo-sharing agreements in the sense that previous agreements had been.

We are not aware of any major shipper or carrier problems in the cargo-sharing aspects of the agreements. We are, however, having discussions with



the Chinese about the severe restrictions they have placed on our carriers' ability to carry out normal business operations in China. The Soviet Union agreement has only been in effect since last October, so we have little experience with its operation as yet.

I know that our equal access agreement with Brazil is one SCOT members hope passes into history sooner rather than later. This is a goal we both share. In August 1990, Maritime Administrator Warren Leback and I met in Brasilia with Brazil's new Minister of Infrastructure Ozires Silva, whose responsibilities encompass all aspects of transportation policy.

During our exchange -- which was most congenial and forthright -- I laid out our objectives in the U.S./Brazil trades, among which are:

- (1) Elimination of Decree Law 666, or further significant reduction in its scope;
- (2) Permission for carriers to have a greater say in the development of port facilities and delivery of port services;
- (3) Further encouragement of efficient intermodal services; and
- (4) Phase-out of the Merchant Marine Tax.

Taken together, achievement of these objectives would place our trades with Brazil on a solid competitive footing, and I pledge that our delegation will work toward this end as it negotiates with Brazil over the next six months.

Minister Silva and his chief of the maritime transport department, Jose Barreiros, indicated that their first priority in maritime affairs was to improve their ports. Up to now, Brazil has been unwilling to permit U.S. and other carriers to invest in and operate their own facilities in order to maintain the state-owned PORTOBRAS monopoly.

PORTOBRAS has recently been abolished as an agency. However, we do not know what kind of economic and administrative structures will replace it. We believe that a considerable part of the high freight costs to and from Brazil is due to the high port costs in Brazil. We hope the Brazilian government will be successful in dealing with some longstanding institutional and infrastructure problems in its ports in the near future.

One of the main reasons for going to Brazil last summer was to discuss our evolving maritime relations. I pointed out that when we first signed an equal access agreement with Brazil 20 years ago, Brazil exported

primarily agricultural products to the United States. Since then, Brazil has become one of the principal industrial exporting nations of the world. The character of our maritime relations must catch up and reflect this change.

In fact, many changes are taking place in Brazil today -- in all sectors of the economy. President Collor has undertaken an ambitious program of reform, and Minister Silva's far-flung responsibilities place him at the vortex of many of these efforts.

I think it is significant that Brazil has been progressively lifting the shipping restrictions on its exports since 1983. Recently, it has freed coffee and cocoa shipments from the prior requirement that they had to be shipped on conference carriers only. In addition, President Collor has called for the dissolution or privatization of Lloyd Brasileiro.

The U.S. will be meeting with Brazilian officials in Brasilia on January 22-23. I would prefer not to discuss in detail our strategy for the meeting at this time. As I indicated earlier, I can say that we have already told them that we would like repeal of Decree Law 666. Since we have cargo reservation laws of our own, we know that some form of cargo preference law is likely, but we believe that law should not impinge on free

market activities, and should be restricted to truly government cargoes.

Of course, our carriers must continue to have access to Brazilian government cargoes as we grant access to U.S. government cargoes to Brazilian vessels. I sincerely hope that I can report to you before your next annual meeting that we have made significant progress in making our Brazil trades more like the rest of our maritime trades.

Another area of interest is the EC. We are monitoring the EC's moves to a fully integrated common market at the beginning of 1993. We have had no problems as yet. We might have problems, though, if the EC attempts arbitrarily to impose its rules on maritime trade in conflict with ours.

The decision on the Hyundai unfair pricing case in the Australia-to-Europe trades is not reassuring, in that the EC Commission essentially asserted what it believed a fair rate should be, and assessed a per-container penalty roughly equal to the difference. Unlike our FMC proceedings, there was little opportunity for public input to the decision, and there is also little opportunity for appeal.

There may also be a conflict if the EC decides to become a single market for cabotage purposes and

limits participation to EC member-country vessels. My impression is that U.S. carriers do relatively little trading in what could become an EC cabotage market. However, I think they would not like to see their options limited by an EC exclusion from currently open intra-EC trades.

Lastly, I would like to invite your membership's attention to the soon-to-be-launched Advisory Commission on Conferences in Ocean Shipping created by section 18 of the Shipping Act of 1984. Over the next year, the Commission will make a comprehensive study of, and make recommendations concerning, conferences in ocean shipping, addressing the key issue of open versus closed conferences.

In addition, the Commission may also choose to analyze and make recommendations on the other issues raised by section 18. Secretary Skinner was named chairman of the Commission, and he has asked me to look after its work.

I note that one of SCOT's active members, Roger Wigen of 3M, has been selected by the White House as a member of the Advisory Commission. I look forward to working with Roger and to hearing from SCOT, and the individual companies that comprise it, as the Advisory Commission undertakes its important work.

I appreciate this opportunity to discuss our maritime policy with you. It is important that we at the Department of Transportation hear from all parties whose interests are affected by the maritime policies that we develop. SCOT has been an effective representative of shipper's interests for the past eight years. I applaud your efforts and encourage you to continue making your voice heard in the councils of government.

Thank you.

REMARKS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY  
DEPUTY SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION ELAINE L. CHAO  
NEW YORK FOREIGN FREIGHT FORWARDERS & BROKERS ASSOCIATION  
PERSON OF THE YEAR AWARD  
NEW YORK, N.Y.  
JANUARY 30, 1991

Thank you, Steve, and good evening. I am both touched and honored by that very kind introduction. I think it is only appropriate on this occasion to look over my shoulder at the long list of prominent former recipients of this coveted award. It reveals an impressive record of accomplishment, and I am deeply flattered to be included in such distinguished company. So this is a very special day for me, and I treasure the award you are bestowing.

During this night of celebration, I would also like us to take a few moments remembering those who are not here. There is an empty spot among us tonight for the men and women fighting in the Persian Gulf. I sense that these courageous Americans will come to know something that many other Americans never knew -- or have forgotten. It can be summed up in a few lines found in a bunker in World War II: "For those who fight for it, freedom has a flavor that the protected will never know."

Now that war is upon us, every American must contribute not only the power behind their combat, but also the clear sense of America's purpose. We will not



turn our back on our friends -- and we dare not turn our back on our enemies.

It is a time of challenge, too, for your industry. We meet tonight in the midst of great and still unresolved changes. Fundamental relationships between the public and private sectors are undergoing realignment.

We in government are doing our part. President Bush recently completed appointment of the Advisory Commission on Ocean Conferences to explore and make recommendations on some of the policy issues facing the maritime trade. Secretary Skinner has asked me to oversee his chairmanship of the Commission. In accepting this assignment, I do so with the knowledge that my efforts will be so much easier with the advice and counsel of many dedicated individuals in your industry.

Mark Twain once said that predictions are very difficult to make -- especially when they deal with the future. But with leaders like Steve Bernstein, Lou Policastro and others in this room tonight, your industry will have the vision and the wisdom to reach the efficient and prosperous future it so richly deserves.

Thank you again, God bless you, and God bless America.

## TRANSPORTATION AND GLOBAL COMPETITIVENESS

REMARKS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY  
DEPUTY SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION ELAINE L. CHAO

The world has entered a period of profound change -- the scope and pace of which is unique to history. The dramatic international developments we are witnessing today cut across all sectors of human activity -- economic, scientific, political, commercial, military -- and may well lead to an era of unprecedented global economic expansion, and with it, unprecedented challenges.

Consider, for example, the fact that the world's population, now about five billion people, was half that number forty years ago, and will probably double again in another forty years. How will the world find the transportation resources to move ten billion people, with all the goods and services they require? The challenges, and opportunities, facing transportation industries across the board are immense. They will have to surmount many obstacles to keep pace with the times. Some will succeed, and some will fail.

The stakes are likewise high for each nation in the global economy. The countries that will lead the pack in the 21st century will be those with the safest and most efficient transportation infrastructures, and the most

pioneering transportation industries. They will be the countries that capture the future, because they will have best planned for the future.

This is the reason why we spent more than a year preparing the National Transportation Policy that was released last March. It is based on the fundamental assumption that America's success in the world requires a long-term strategic approach as it prepares for the global competition of the next century. No successful corporation would contemplate facing the future without a comprehensive strategy, and the federal government shouldn't either.

Our strategy takes a new look at the nation's transportation agenda, integrating transportation into the Administration's goals of competitiveness and economic growth. It is intermodal in nature, and organized around the major transportation markets.

One of the six overarching objectives we lay out in our strategy is to foster U.S. transportation technology and expertise. Technology alone cannot address all of our transportation challenges. But in combination with sound management of capital and human resources, technological innovation can provide the solutions to many, if not most, of our transportation problems.

Underscoring the critical importance he places on research and development to the future of all U.S. industry, President Bush is committed to allocating about \$71 billion for R&D in fiscal 1991, including \$390 million, a seventeen percent increase for an array of important, innovative transportation technologies. Over time, this investment will yield new knowledge, products, and processes that will enhance economic growth, spur U.S. competitiveness, and improve the quality of life of all Americans.

New transportation systems could dramatically change the way we live. High speed rail or magnetically levitated trains are already in operation or under development in Europe and Japan. Tiltrotor aircraft may change the ways people move between relatively close cities, and help alleviate our need for increased airport capacity. A new generation of aircraft that travels more than five times the speed of sound is now on the drawing boards.

These new systems would supplement, but not replace, present-day systems. We will continue to look to technology to make current systems safer, more fuel efficient, more compatible with the environment, and more economical to operate. Taking us further in these



directions will be advances in microelectronics, computer technology, and new materials.

One of the Administration's top priorities is to encourage the development of intelligent vehicles and highways, an evolving array of advanced electronics and communications technology that can contribute a great deal toward reducing vehicle delay, improving highway capacity and safety. Should we evolve into full scale automated highways, the benefit will be a more efficient, productive, and competitive America.

[cite California example]

IVHS could give drivers immediate traffic information over special navigation units in their cars. It could warn of a major accident, and then provide quick, safe alternative routes. This would be displayed on a small computer screen, or even given to the driver audibly.

A key concern, however, is how well drivers will be able to adapt to sophisticated IVHS electronic systems. Will drivers get too much information, too fast, or in too many distracting forms, and still be able to drive safely? To find the answers, the Department is working with industry to develop a world class driver simulator.

It will help us assess driver responses to a host of dangerous situations without exposing drivers to actual hazards. Acquiring a better understanding of human

capabilities, and the requirements placed on them by increasingly sophisticated equipment, is an important new area of transportation research today called human factors engineering.

Does all this mean that the federal government is, or should be, the primary source of innovation in America? Of course not. Federal spending constitutes about 50 percent of the total national investment in research and development. But the government is not the principal performer of R&D, almost 90 percent of which is performed by industry, universities, and other private entities.

This is the way it should be. And this is the approach of the Administration's transportation strategy. It recognizes the source of America's strength as those pioneers who have already made our transportation system the envy of the world -- the scientists, engineers, and technicians who comprise the front lines of America's economic battlegrounds.

We will continue to look to the private sector for the ingenuity and technological know-how that will enable the United States to compete -- and win. While we will rely on the free market to the maximum extent possible, where the market fails to account for all public costs in transportation, such as safety or environmental

consequences, then federal policy can be used to correct imbalances to improve the general welfare.

The stakes are high. America, however, has faced serious challenges before. And we have shown that we are more than able to meet, and beat, the competition. As the President said in his State of the Union address: "I know this about the American people: We welcome competition. We'll match our ingenuity, our energy, our experience and technology, our spirit and enterprise against anyone."



PROPOSED EDITORIAL COMMENT  
DEPUTY SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION ELAINE L. CHAO

The philosophical core of the Republican Party stresses private action -- strong family units, individual initiative, faith in the free enterprise system, quality education, and a tough stance against crime -- as the driving force for social and economic progress. That is why I believe the Republican Party is the sensible choice for Asian Americans. It has taken the lead on the issues that count most and championed the policies that have helped Asian Americans earn higher wages, buy homes, educate their children, and open businesses.

The unprecedented Asian American success story demonstrates that growth in real wealth and opportunity is not primarily attributable to government action. It disproves the easier view that solving economic and social problems is a function of enacting new federal government programs and regulations. Asian Americans know that individual effort within a democracy created these opportunities, validating the implicitly Republican idea of privately-generated growth and social mobility.

In my view, Asian Americans cannot therefore truly feel at home with any political philosophy inspired by suspicion of business and the market system, tax policies that discourage investment, regulatory policies that hamper productivity, and energy policies that discourage discovery and production. The Republican Party and most Asian Americans realize that society and the individuals in it should be unencumbered enough to flourish and realize their highest potential.

Aside from economics, Republicans are closer to the Asian American point of view on the newly-recognized family issues: the breakdown in discipline, alcohol and drug abuse, street crime, and violence. The Republican Party clearly endorses the Asian American belief in the family as the hub of human life and teacher of the fundamental values that remedy these problems. To us, a strong family is the best safeguard of American liberty because it furnishes the independent and self-reliant citizens upon which a democracy depends. It is vital to reject social and welfare policies which, even if well-intended, destroy neighborhoods without achieving racial integration, and undermine the achievement ethic. In its broadest sense, Republican Party support for family values is part of the Asian American belief that private virtues are important to public life; that self-reliance and discipline, decentralization, and voluntary

associations are the best way to produce the "great society" we all seek.

The Republican Party has an historic commitment to another issue important to Asian Americans: equal rights. Successive GOP Administrations have vigorously enforced statutes to prevent illegal discrimination on account of sex, race, creed, or national origin by taking to court a record number of civil rights and employment discrimination cases. In July of last year, former Labor Secretary Elizabeth Dole announced a program to fight subtle discrimination against minorities in corporate America called the "Glass Ceiling Initiative." The program would penalize any company found to be discriminating at the senior management level. Secretary Dole made this program a top priority of her Department, and it is likely to be a priority under Secretary-designate Martin as well. But in ensuring equal rights, Republicans do not seek to dictate the results of fair competition, and resists efforts to replace equal rights with the discriminatory quota systems which have been so damaging to Asian Americans.

Often arriving in this country in flight from political oppression, many Asian Americans also have a special appreciation for the importance of a strong national defense and the leadership role of the United States in the international community. Like most Asian

Americans, the Republican Party recognizes that whether we are dealing with security challenges in the Persian Gulf, terrorism, or the scourge of drugs, the willingness of other nations to act resolutely may depend on the readiness of America to lead, to remain vigorously engaged, and to shoulder its unique responsibilities in the world.

Given this fundamental rapport, the Republican Party is reaching out to Asian Americans. The Party is actively soliciting Asian American votes and, more than that, seeking our participation in the total political process, from raising money, training party activists, and seeking candidates for local office. At the national level, President Bush has named more than 60 Asian Americans to top management and advisory positions. This is the highest number of Asian Americans ever to serve in a Presidential Administration and the number is growing. These appointments are another example of the Republican Party's commitment to bring more Asian Americans into the political mainstream of America.

There is no question that Asian Americans must take advantage of this opportunity and break new ground in the 1990s. The last decade has been a time of unusually rapid cultural, social, and political change for the Asian American community -- the kind that alters habits and



loyalties and leads to a reexamination of where we have been and where we are going.

If Asian Americans are to emerge as a political force, we must take control of our own future and exert the requisite leadership. The real political issue today for Asian Americans is: "Which party provides us with the best opportunity to achieve this goal?" I believe the answer will be found within the Republican Party because it reflects the values crucial to continued Asian American success. The Republican philosophy is a natural meeting ground for the diversity of the Asian American community, and the logical source of empowerment for our point of view.

Our immigrant ancestors demonstrated that economic progress is possible through commitment to education and the work ethic and by reason of the openness of American society. In fulfilling our political destiny, Asian Americans must maintain these principles that serve us so well by taking our place within the Party that upholds them.