PRESS RELEASE

米国大使館広報・文化交流局報道部 PRESS OFFICE, UNITED STATES INFORMATION SERVICE
AMERICAN EMBASSY, TOKYO TEL. 3224-5264／5265／5266 FAX. 3586-3282

Ambassador Mondale's Speech to The Yomiuri International Economic Society

May 20, 1994
Tokyo, Japan

(As delivered)

Thank you very much for that kind introduction. I am honored to join you today for the 24th Annual Symposium of the Yomiuri Conference on the International Economy and I must say it's nice to have our old friend Mike Armacost with us again here in Tokyo.

The theme of this conference is the importance of building "plus-sum" relations among the economies of the world, especially in the Asia-Pacific region.

The United States is now giving unprecedented attention to this region. As a matter of history and geography, of course, we have been a Pacific nation from our earliest days. And today, no region in the world is more important to the United States than Asia.

As you know, forty percent of our trade is in this region. Almost two and a half million American jobs are directly related to commerce in this region. By the turn of the century it is estimated that trade and investment flows across the Pacific will be double those across the Atlantic. In the years ahead, this region will be the world's center of economic growth, trade, jobs and prosperity.

For the first time, the United States is trying to approach Asia not as a series of bilateral relationships alone, but as a regional community. Economic integration, the information revolution, the spread of democracy and a growing awareness of the need for regional action on global issues -- all of these provide a basis for building a greater awareness of common interests and purposes among the Asia-Pacific nations.

Last July, at Waseda University, President Clinton laid out his vision of a New Pacific Community based on "shared strength, shared prosperity and a shared commitment to democratic values." These are the three pillars that will support a future of "plus-sum" relations among the nations of the Asia-Pacific and between the region and the rest of the world.

They are mutually reinforcing: Security is essential for economic development. Economic progress promotes democratic change. And prosperous democracies make for peaceful neighbors.

I would like to briefly review each of these areas and then explain why I believe the partnership between Japan and my country is essential to their success.

First, there is political and military security.

The Cold War is over, to be sure, but this region is by no means free of potential conflict. All three major wars in my lifetime began in this region. In dealing with present and future security challenges, the United States and Japan will need to continue our alliance relationship and our pattern of close cooperation.

Our alliance remains the foundation of stability throughout the Asia-Pacific region. I can think of no area in which our cooperation has been closer, stronger and

more appropriate than in the case of North Korea. One of the great virtues of our alliance has always been its adaptability. The fact that it is as relevant today as it was in the midst of the Cold War shows the deep interdependence of American and Japanese national interests.

The process of regional cooperation in Asia remains much less structured than in Europe. There is no European Union, or NATO, or CSCE, reflecting the complex history of this region with its economic, political and cultural diversity. We are beginning to build such institutions through APEC, the ASEAN Post-Ministerial Conference and the Northeast Asia Security Dialogue. But this process is evolving at a pace which is prudent and it will take time. For the foreseeable future, the American presence based on the U.S.-Japan Security Treaty will remain essential to the stability and the prosperity of this region.

The second pillar supporting "plus-sum" relations in Asia is freedom and democracy.

Democracy and human rights are not only important values in their own right. They are also important to the prospects for peace because democratic nations tend to settle their disagreements without resort to war. And they are important to economic progress because people living in free societies can better develop their knowledge and talents and, by so doing, contribute more to the productivity and creativity of their societies.

In this respect, Japan is an inspiring example for other nations in the region. This country is, as Edwin O. Reischauer once observed, "the one great extension of democracy the world has witnessed since the end of World War II. Here, before the war, a shallowly-rooted, incomplete democratic system withered under the hot sun of militaristic nationalism. But now this new world giant is a flourishing, smoothly-operating democratic system ardently supported by virtually the whole nation."

While it can be said that America helped Japan make this transition, to suggest that democracy in this nation is simply a "Western import" would be an injustice to the dedicated efforts of the Japanese people. Nobody expects democracy in Asian countries to look exactly like democracy in the United States, or Britain, or France or elsewhere in the Western world. We understand that different historical and cultural realities will lead to different institutional arrangements. It is a remarkable coincidence, however, that authoritarian governments seem to be the ones most eager to protect their citizens from the so-called "cultural imperialism" of human rights.

When President Carter decided to make human rights a priority in our Administration, we were told by the hard-headed devotees of Realpolitik that we were being naive, that we did not understand power, that we were being missionaries, that we were going to mess up the world. But I think history has vindicated us. Just ask the people of the former Soviet Union, or of Eastern Europe, or Chile, or the Philippines, and now at last and unbelievably the people of South Africa. Ask Nelson Mandela. Less than five years ago, he was in prison and had been there for more than two decades. Today, he is the President of that nation. These people remember and, I believe, are grateful that my nation spoke up and stood by them in their struggles for freedom. The world is better off, as well.

Finally, the third pillar to "plus-sum" relations is an open regional and world trading system.

The free flow of trade and commerce among nations is the best guarantor of regional and global prosperity. In the post-World War II period, Japan and the other Asian economies have been among the greatest beneficiaries of an open world trading system and finance. Open markets in the United States have been the essential underpinning of this system.

The United States remains committed to keeping our markets open and we expect that other nations will open theirs. As the

President likes to say: "Americans want to compete -- not retreat or protect."

Recently, there have been several positive developments toward more economic openness:

First, we have finally brought the Uruguay Round of the GATT to a successful conclusion.

Second, the creation of APEC is an important institutional step toward greater economic openness in the Pacific Rim. In turn, this will help underwrite continued economic growth and development for everyone. As you know, last November in Seattle the President hosted the first-ever, historic meeting of leaders from the members of APEC. At the conclusion of that meeting, he said: "If you ask me to summarize in a sentence what we've agreed on, it is this: We've agreed that the Asian-Pacific region should be a united one, not divided. And we've agreed that our economic policies should be opened and not closed."

Finally, there is the "Framework for a New Economic Partnership" which was agreed upon by our two governments last July. The Framework reflects an understanding of our shared responsibilities in the global economy. The United States promised to reduce its deficit and to improve its international competitiveness. We've already made progress in both areas. For its part, Japan promised to improve market access for imports and foreign investment and to reduce its chronic current account surpluses through domestic demand-led economic growth. So far, the Japanese government has made little progress on these commitments. This week, representatives of our two governments are meeting in Washington to see if there is a basis for restarting negotiations. Based on the first reports that I have received, I am hopeful that progress will be made.

Japan's economic problems are not simply bilateral ones with the United States. Virtually every one of Japan's trading partners agrees that there are serious problems with market access here, and the G-7 has been urging Japan to stimulate its economy. The truth is that a growing regional and world economy depends on a growing Japanese economy. An open regional and world trading system depends on a Japan whose own markets are more open. And, of course, a more open, growing Japanese economy is good for the people of Japan as well.

These three pillars of security, democracy and human rights, and economic openness are the foundation on which we can build a future of "plus-sum" relations among the nations of this region, and of the world. Surely, there is no better example of a "plus-sum" relationship in the world than that between Japan and the United States.

How our two nations get along will say a lot about what the world is going to be like in the years ahead. If we handle our affairs right, if we build on the strengths and potential of our partnership, then the chances for peace . . . the chances for prosperity . . . the chances for more democracy . . . the chances for a better environment . . . the chances for poor people around the world -- all of these will improve.

If we can do this, Japan and the United States can truly demonstrate what we mean by "plus-sum". Thank you very much.

■ ■ ■

UNOFFICIAL/UNEDITED
(IODOC\YIESQ&A.JEL)

Q & A Portion of Ambassador Mondale's Speech to the YIES

May 20, 1994
Tokyo, Japan

Q: Professor Tanaka. This framework talk between Japan and the United States will be resumed and I understand that Ambassador hopeful about the resumption. But according to the newspaper report among the various problems between the two countries, the U.S. expectation is more interested in macroeconomic aspect rather than the specific individual issues. What is you thinking about that?

Ambassador Mondale:

I would say that a reading of the Framework would indicate that equal weight was given in the agreement between Japan and the United States on both matters micro and macro. As someone said it's like two blades on a scissors in order to cut, you need both of them. In the agreement the Government of Japan agreed to stimulate the economy to bring about a highly significant reduction of the current account imbalance over the mid-term and in the separate agreement reached in Tokyo with her G-7 partners pledged that she would undertake a program of substantial stimulation of the domestic economy so that it led to domestic growth. There have been several occasions in which the G-7 and the United States have reaffirmed their commitment to that. As you know, the estimates of economic growth in Japan this year are quite modest, somewhere around seven tenths of a percent, nobody knows quite what it is. There's a little pickup going on and there will be some improvement next year but it is still quite slow. So in Frankfurt at the G-7 meeting, the G-7 partners urged Japan to add more stimulation to the economy and we'd made the same point at the IMF meeting last month. The other part of it is the sectoral openings in the economy and I think that's a very very important element as well and that's basically what's being discussed in Washington today. And as I say based on the first reports I am somewhat hopeful that we may be able to finally get past some of those problems that caused the breakdown of the meeting in February between then Prime Minister Hosokawa and the President. It's too early to say yet but there is some movement.

Q: Mr. Hosome. Allow me to remain seated. Ambassador Mondale I'm sure that you give lot's of importance to the relation with Japan which we very much appreciate so I would like to propose to you Mr. Ambassador that our generation went through various opportunities to access the United States such as Fulbright scholarship therefore in our view sometimes we think that even if

the United States does something which sounds unreasonable we still like you. but in the younger generation who do not have as much association with the United States, do not know war, they forget war so they have relatively little understanding of what the United States is particularly at grassroot level. I'm afraid there is less understanding of the United States among the Japanese younger generation. Therefore, although we have plenty of interchange between the two countries the exchange of students, young people between the two countries compared with relation with the European countries is I think is still limited. So I hope and I suggest that you do something to expand the opportunities of exchange maybe Fulbright program as Ambassador Mansfield tried to promote intellectual exchange between the two countries. That what I'd like to hope?

Ambassador Mondale:

Good guestion because I feel very strongly about that. Today there are something like 50,000 young Japanese studying in the United States. We're glad they are there we wish there were a 100,000. But there's only about 1,500 American students studying in Japan. We're making some progress but it's fairly modest to date. Recently I think Todai University announced that it's setting aside a certain number of slots I think it's a hundred positions there for foreign students. Well that's progress. The Fulbright program receives tremendous support privately here in Japan and the Fulbright continues to be one of the most inspiring programs that--I think it's the most successful American legislative program I know of. It's remarkable and continues to be so. I wish it were a much larger program and I wish it effected many more students but it is doing very well and we're very grateful for Japanese private support as well. There are several other smaller programs going on from the private sector to finance scholarships for Japanese students to go to the United States and
vice versa, we're grateful for that. There's a new management program where some fifteen American engineers come over and actually work and learn in factories here where they have advanced manufacturing technics, we appreciate that.

The JET program has proved to be much more of an educational benefit to everybody than I think they originally intended. It was originally going to be a program to bring Americans and others here to teach various languages, and it's that, but what happens is that many of these bright young people that come here to teach English and other languages, get hooked on Japan and they get more interested, they get more engaged and many of them turn into scholars and many of them pursue careers that bring them into much more contact with Japan. There's been a lot of that develop. So I think there may have been an unanticipated but it's a very beneficial dividend that flows from the substantial program. But having said all of that it's still not

enough. We have several branch campuses here, American-run schools and we've been talking with the Ministry of Education and so on of changing the status of those institutions some so they are less tentative. So that they are recognized as educational institutions so that the students are seen as students and not a different status and so on. So I would like to see us continue to work
on expanding the availability of this experience by Americans and by students around the world to come to Japan and to learn here because I agree with the thrust of your question. That is essential to the long-term understanding and friendship between our countries.

Q: Dr. Inoguchi. How you view the current Japanese political confusion? In the recent times in the Japan-U.S. Framework talks the Japanese Government refused to give numerical targets. It refused to look back but now, more recently one of the cabinet ministers refused to look back, refusing to give numerical--he has given some numerican records in a somewhat extreme fashion and the current Japanese mood is to refuse both looking forward or looking backwards that is not try to give numerical targets, neither numerical records. How do you see this current Japanese political confusion or at least inability to look forward or even to look backwards?

Ambassador Mondale:

I've got a four-year old grandson who keeps telling me when I ask him questions he says I don't know. And I'd like to give that answer now if I might. I don't know. I've asked many of the Japanese political leaders the last couple of weeks how I'm supposed to report circumstances to Washington and I haven't gotten very clear answer from them either. This is a time which is clear I think to everybody in this room of political transition in Japanese history. It's a time when a new basic political reform law has been adopted, one more bill remaining, but that has I think changed the dynamics of politics in this country. I believe that the uncertainty in the current structure of politics may reflect some of the uncertainty to be found in Japanese life itself about where Japan wishes to go and the rest and as the Ambassador from another country my job is not to argue with that but to accept it and work with the government that the Japanese people have selected in their way and that's what I'm doing. But I would guess that we may be in for a period, an interval period where there may be more than one election as Japan decides what it wants its new course to be.

On the question of indicators, what we want is what Japan agreed to in the Framework last July. And I ask you to read the words of that agreement because in it the Government of Japan agreed to bring about a significant increase in the purchase of foreign goods in the areas designated. Government procurement,

telecommunications, medical equipment, insurance, autos and auto parts, financial services, and then they agreed to deal with deregulation, intellectual property and some of the other matters. And the agreement further provides that there will be in addition to that goal of increased access and sales there will be quantitative and qualitative measurements or both to determine the progress that's being made toward the achievement of those goals. The debate has been about--how these general words and what these statistics should mean. The Government of Japan has argued that we've been asking for market shares. That we've been trying to interrupt the functioning of an open market and trying to force consumers and businesses to buy a certain percentage of it. There's nothing to that. The President has said repeatedly we don't want market shares, but we want a market that's open so that the consumers here can make a choice in their own best interest. Now the reason I say I'm somewhat hopeful and we're not there yet is that both governments are finally doing what I've been urging them to do for a long time is to get off the metaphysics of what numbers in the sky might mean and down to specific practical negotiations over each of these areas to see what we can agree with--square the circle and come with something that would fulfill the spirit of the agreement which is to open markets and to provide to the world a Japan that is growing in its economy and providing markets.

You know the figures I think are pretty awesome here. We have a hundred and thirty billion dollar current account and trade imbalance. This threatens the world trading system. It fuels protectionism. It exports unemployment and its got to change and I believe there's a powerful argument that Japan would be the main beneficiary. That she would benefit from the virtues and the discipline of more competition in the areas where competition now is being closed off. That the consumer would benefit greatly by broader choice and I think Japan would see that its influence in the world across the board would be enhanced if this major irritant could be reduced and solved. I think everybody would be better off.

Q: Concerning this nuclear suspicion of the North Korea. This matter is important to Japan and it is up to Japan how to cope with it but at the same time, it is something as a friendly nation what kind of role the Americans expect Japan to assume?

Ambassador Mondale:

Remarks in a general way that in the security field I think cooperation between Japan and the United States is excellent. We have very intensive talks, sharing of views, going forward all the time on all aspects of security here and of course one of the key topics for a long time now has been the risks that North Korea would be developing its own nuclear weapons, that it would be trying to break away from its treaty obligations under the

Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty and that it is developing missile delivery systems that would permit them to strike much of Japan and much of this region of East Asia. And as we meet now the IAEA inspectors are in North Korea looking at those facilities. We do not have much to go on yet as to what they are finding but we are at a very sensitive and dangerous stage here and I don't think I want to go into more detail except to say that I believe the United States and Japan has an identical of this thing and we're working very closely on it and we're also working closely with the Government of South Korea and we're discussing this matter with other governments in the region and of course in the United Nations and in the IAEA in Vienna.

Q: Mr. Ambassador thank you very much for a very insightful talk. Recently Asian policy of the United States is receiving various opinions--criticism such as the Americans do not understand the Asian mind or America is trying to push upon us the crusader orientation of the Americans that sort of specific complaints toward America's Asian policy. I'm sure that you have various rebuttals to those criticisms as an Ambassador. In Japan since assuming this post, compared with when you were in Minnesota or in Washington I'm sure that you have come to assume different views about Japan or Asia or viewed from an Ambassador's viewpoint how do you see U.S. official Asian policy or how would you rebutt those criticisms on the part of Asians toward U.S. Asian policy as I have tried elaborate? I appreciate your comments on this.

Ambassador Mondale:

Do you want me to fill in any more details? Up until a few years ago U.S. policy in this region was characterized by basically bilateral focus. We had the U.S.-Japan relationship, the U.S.-China relationship, but we didn't look at it in a regional way, a community way, a basin way. The move toward APEC is a reflection of a new approach by everyone in this region but it was an approach recommended by Japan and we picked up on it and we're now trying to keep our bilateral relationships as strong as we can. The U.S.-Japanese relationship is the fundamental point but we're trying to move now also in a regional way. And I would say that we're feeling our way. That we've made probably some mistakes but that the general direction is one that enjoys the consensus of most of the countries in the region. I think that your question was really getting to human rights. The fact of it is that Japan and the United States agrees that human rights should be an emphasis. The United Nations in its UN Declaration on Human Rights which was endorsed by virtually every member of the body, agrees that these principals are right. And the Vienna conference last year there was wide support for that. Japan is a democracy, human rights are recognized here and in many many areas of Asia, South Korea and others we see democracy elsewhere, we see momentum toward democracy and a shared belief in

fundamental human rights. In my comments I talked about my experience in this field because I went through this once before where we were pressing the Soviet Union to be conscious of human rights, where we confronted Marcos's in the Phillipines, the Hunta in Argentina, the Peneche regime in Chile and the all white apartheid governments of South Africa. We spoke not for an argument that they had to be what we wanted them to be but that there was in these universal principals to which I referred some kind of fundamental basic rights that human beings have a right to expect and that those of us who enjoy stable nations--particularly those of us who understand the importance of human liberty in addition to the other things we do in our lives, ought to be heard speaking out on those matters. Now we received a chorus of criticism from the real solid tough people to get off that stuff. I think history proves that we were right in every one of those countries the tyrants lost out and the people that have taken their place remember the United States as having stood for justice. And I think that the long-term proof is that the realist and the hard-headed leaders of that time were the ones that spoke up for human rights. Now how you do it, what approach you take you know the nuances there are times when you have to let security interests take first place, you have to admit it there is no mechanical, legalistic sort of way of doing this. I'm not arguing that. But the idea that my country should remain silent on human rights is offensive to me.

Q: Mr. Howell. ...speak and we speak in Europe of Japan seeking as it is to assume a wider global role and a wider security role what do you have in mind behind that word security? Are we just talking about expecting Japan to write bigger checks to the United Nations and to the developing world or do you have something of a more military role in mind?

Ambassador Mondale:

My country accepts the constitution as it is. We're not asking Japan to change its approach in a military sense. But we think there's a lot more to be gained by the world from a more energetic Japanese presence in the United Nations as permanent member of the Security Council, in the other international institutions and in a regional sense. Part of it is economic support, that is not a insubstantial thing at all when we look at Russia and it's need for capital, when you look at the funding needs for environmental work and so on this is a very important part of it. But we believe that if Japan could be a permanent member of the Security Council and this would encourage her to be more energetic in the broad political issues that confront that institution that the institution would be stronger and be more credible. We think it's an anocrysm that at this point in the world's history that this nation which may be the most impressive economic nation in the world should not be a member reflecting that reality on the Security Council. In my job I deal with

Japan and Japanese leadership in the whole spectrum of security, political, economic needs and one becomes each day more impressed with the potential of benefit that can flow to the world if Japan could take on this more intensive role. As you know Japan has been hesitant, reluctant to do that. Years ago they used to say it was minimalist nation in terms of asserting itself, but I do not see a need to impose upon Japan a traditional role as a military power and to change the constitution as a condition to perform its performance in the other areas and I don't think our country has ever taken that position, we don't take it now. They've been more helpful of late in peacekeeping, in Cambodia, in Mozambique and we hope that that would be a pattern of activity that they could take in addition to be helpful in peacekeeping efforts.

Q: Dr. Necker. You were mentioning Russia. How would you like Japan to act to Russia which is a very close neighbor to Japan which might not always be felt in Japan? Another question is you were mentioning that America is not imposing on Japan market shares. I have to say in Europe we've got the feeling that at least you are thinking of quotas and how would quotas comply with the GATT rules which have just been agreed upon?

Ambassador Mondale:

Well the only quota--let's see how do you deal with cars in Europe that come from Japan? You have sixteen percent. Is that a quota?

Q: You are pressing....the point of the European industry?

Ambassador Mondale:

Well the point is the United States has an open market for Japanese cars and it strikes me as charming to be criticized for market shares when we're open and you're closed. And I think we need to be clear with each other here. We are not for market shares. When rice opened....from other countries than from the United States. More beef and citrus comes into this country from other nations than from the United States. At least fifty percent of the increased importation of semiconductors comes from other places than the United States. We've been playing it straight. We want an open market.

Q: Mr. Ohta. The United States request rather than question having listened to Mr. Ambassador we certainly learned a great deal. However, the overall comprehensive Asian policy of the United States remains a puzzle to me. In that sense it was several years ago the then Secretary of State Baker contributed to the foreign affairs ..... I think it was written by Mr. Zoellik as it was rumored. But it was a remarkable, outstanding paper on Asian policy that was widely read by Japanese also. If

it is difficult as an Ambassador maybe Secretary of State or some American leader spell out the Asian strategy maybe in ..... like foreign affairs so that we can all share and understand the intent and the other points of the U.S. Asian policy? Any comments Mr. Ambassador?

Ambassador Mondale:

...to your question here in Japan. We're standing shoulder to shoulder with Japan in her defense. We're standing shoulder to shoulder with Japan as she confronts the threat of North Korean difficulties. We have joined with Japan in shaping APEC. We are supporting Japan in its plea to become a permanent member of the Security Council. We have a broad and rich fabric of cooperation in the global issues everyday. Japan and the United States is cooperating in the only area that I know of that we are having any kind of difficulties at all is in trade. So I would say that U.S.-Japan relationships are numer one basically very solid and in one sense, quite traditional. This has been true under Administrations of both political parties since the end of the war. It changes with time but I think that what you see today is consistent with a long tradition. So maybe we've got some explaining to do but I think you have to decide sometimes a difference between legitimate debate and tensions and those who think that if its always quiet things are better. I'm not sure that that's the case. I think these trade differences have to be resolved and I think Japan and the United States would be better off if we did resolve them. I think the world would be better off. And just because there are tensions doesn't mean that the policy is wrong.

You know the figures I think are pretty awesome here. We have a hundred and thirty billion dollar current account and trade imbalance. This threatens the world trading system. It fuels protectionism. It exports unemployment and its got to change and I believe there's a powerful argument that Japan would be the main beneficiary. That she would benefit from the virtues and the discipline of more competition in the areas where competition now is being closed off. That the consumer would benefit greatly by broader choice and I think Japan would see that its influence in the world across the board would be enhanced if this major irritant could be reduced and solved. I think everybody would be better off.

Q: Concerning this nuclear suspicion of the North Korea. This matter is important to Japan and it is up to Japan how to cope with it but at the same time, it is something as a friendly nation what kind of role the Americans expect Japan to assume?

Ambassador Mondale:

Remarks in a general way that in the security field I think

cooperation between Japan and the United States is excellent. We have very intensive talks, sharing of views, going forward all the time on all aspects of security here and of course one of the key topics for a long time now has been the risks that North Korea would be developing its own nuclear weapons, that it would be trying to break away from its treaty obligations under the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty and that it is developing missile delivery systems that would permit them to strike much of Japan and much of this region of East Asia. And as we meet now the IAEA inspectors are in North Korea looking at those facilities. We do not have much to go on yet as to what they are finding but we are at a very sensitive and dangerous stage here and I don't think I want to go into more detail except to say that I believe the United States and Japan has an identical of this thing and we're working very closely on it and we're also working closely with the Government of South Korea and we're discussing this matter with other governments in the region and of course in the United Nations and in the IAEA in Vienna.

Q: Mr. Ambassador thank you very much for a very insightful talk. Recently Asian policy of the United States is receiving various opinions--criticism such as the Americans do not understand the Asian mind or America is trying to push upon us the crusader orientation of the Americans that sort of specific complaints toward America's Asian policy. I'm sure that you have various rebuttals to those criticisms as an Ambassador. In Japan since assuming this post, compared with when you were in Minnesota or in Washington I'm sure that you have come to assume different views about Japan or Asia or viewed from an Ambassador's viewpoint how do you see U.S. official Asian policy or how would you rebutt those criticisms on the part of Asians toward U.S. Asian policy as I have tried elaborate? I appreciate your comments on this.

Ambassador Mondale:

Do you want me to fill in any more details? Up until a few years ago U.S. policy in this region was characterized by basically bilateral focus. We had the U.S.-Japan relationship, the U.S.-China relationship, but we didn't look at it in a regional way, a community way, a basin way. The move toward APEC is a reflection of a new approach by everyone in this region but it was an approach recommended by Japan and we picked up on it and we're now trying to keep our bilateral relationships as strong as we can. The U.S.-Japanese relationship is the fundamental point but we're trying to move now also in a regional way. And I would say that we're feeling our way. That we've made probably some mistakes but that the general direction is one that enjoys the consensus of most of the countries in the region. I think that your question was really getting to human rights. The fact of it is that Japan and the United States agrees that human rights should be an emphasis. The United Nations in its UN Declaration

on Human Rights which was endorsed by virtually every member of the body, agrees that these principals are right. And the Vienna conference last year there was wide support for that. Japan is a democracy, human rights are recognized here and in many many areas of Asia, South Korea and others we see democracy elsewhere, we see momentum toward democracy and a shared belief in fundamental human rights. In my comments I talked about my experience in this field because I went through this once before where we were pressing the Soviet Union to be conscious of human rights, where we confronted Marcos's in the Phillipines, the Hunta in Argentina, the Peneche regime in Chile and the all white apartheid governments of South Africa. We spoke not for an argument that they had to be what we wanted them to be but that there was in these universal principals to which I referred some kind of fundamental basic rights that human beings have a right to expect and that those of us who enjoy stable nations--particularly those of us who understand the importance of human liberty in addition to the other things we do in our lives, ought to be heard speaking out on those matters. Now we received a chorus of criticism from the real solid tough people to get off that stuff. I think history proves that we were right in every one of those countries the tyrants lost out and the people that have taken their place remember the United States as having stood for justice. And I think that the long-term proof is that the realist and the hard-headed leaders of that time were the ones that spoke up for human rights. Now how you do it, what approach you take you know the nuances there are times when you have to let security interests take first place, you have to admit it there is no mechanical, legalistic sort of way of doing this. I'm not arguing that. But the idea that my country should remain silent on human rights is offensive to me.

Q: Mr. Howell. ...speak and we speak in Europe of Japan seeking as it is to assume a wider global role and a wider security role what do you have in mind behind that word security? Are we just talking about expecting Japan to write bigger checks to the United Nations and to the developing world or do you have something of a more military role in mind?

Ambassador Mondale:

My country accepts the constitution as it is. We're not asking Japan to change its approach in a military sense. But we think there's a lot more to be gained by the world from a more energetic Japanese presence in the United Nations as permanent member of the Security Council, in the other international institutions and in a regional sense. Part of it is economic support, that is not a insubstantial thing at all when we look at Russia and it's need for capital, when you look at the funding needs for environmental work and so on this is a very important part of it. But we believe that if Japan could be a permanent member of the Security Council and this would encourage her to be

more energetic in the broad political issues that confront that institution that the institution would be stronger and be more credible. We think it's an anocrysm that at this point in the world's history that this nation which may be the most impressive economic nation in the world should not be a member reflecting that reality on the Security Council. In my job I deal with Japan and Japanese leadership in the whole spectrum of security, political, economic needs and one becomes each day more impressed with the potential of benefit that can flow to the world if Japan could take on this more intensive role. As you know Japan has been hesitant, reluctant to do that. Years ago they used to say it was minimalist nation in terms of asserting itself, but I do not see a need to impose upon Japan a traditional role as a military power and to change the constitution as a condition to perform its performance in the other areas and I don't think our country has ever taken that position, we don't take it now. They've been more helpful of late in peacekeeping, in Cambodia, in Mozambique and we hope that that would be a pattern of activity that they could take in addition to be helpful in peacekeeping efforts.

Q: Dr. Necker. You were mentioning Russia. How would you like Japan to act to Russia which is a very close neighbor to Japan which might not always be felt in Japan? Another question is you were mentioning that America is not imposing on Japan market shares. I have to say in Europe we've got the feeling that at least you are thinking of quotas and how would quotas comply with the GATT rules which have just been agreed upon?

Ambassador Mondale:

Well the only quota--let's see how do you deal with cars in Europe that come from Japan? You have sixteen percent. Is that a quota?

Q: You are pressing....the point of the European industry?

Ambassador Mondale:

Well the point is the United States has an open market for Japanese cars and it strikes me as charming to be criticized for market shares when we're open and you're closed. And I think we need to be clear with each other here. We are not for market shares. When rice opened....from other countries than from the United States. More beef and citrus comes into this country from other nations than from the United States. At least fifty percent of the increased importation of semiconductors comes from other places than the United States. We've been playing it straight. We want an open market.

Q: Mr. Ohta. The United States request rather than question having listened to Mr. Ambassador we certainly learned a great

deal. However, the overall comprehensive Asian policy of the United States remains a puzzle to me. In that sense it was several years ago the then Secretary of State Baker contributed to the foreign affairs ..... I think it was written by Mr. Zoellik as it was rumored. But it was a remarkable, outstanding paper on Asian policy that was widely read by Japanese also. If it is difficult as an Ambassador maybe Secretary of State or some American leader spell out the Asian strategy maybe in ..... like foreign affairs so that we can all share and understand the intent and the other points of the U.S. Asian policy? Any comments Mr. Ambassador?

Ambassador Mondale:

...to your question here in Japan. We're standing shoulder to shoulder with Japan in her defense. We're standing shoulder to shoulder with Japan as she confronts the threat of North Korean difficulties. We have joined with Japan in shaping APEC. We are supporting Japan in its plea to become a permanent member of the Security Council. We have a broad and rich fabric of cooperation in the global issues everyday. Japan and the United States is cooperating in the only area that I know of that we are having any kind of difficulties at all is in trade. So I would say that U.S.-Japan relationships are numer one basically very solid and in one sense, quite traditional. This has been true under Administrations of both political parties since the end of the war. It changes with time but I think that what you see today is consistent with a long tradition. So maybe we've got some explaining to do but I think you have to decide sometimes a difference between legitimate debate and tensions and those who think that if its always quiet things are better. I'm not sure that that's the case. I think these trade differences have to be resolved and I think Japan and the United States would be better off if we did resolve them. I think the world would be better off. And just because there are tensions doesn't mean that the policy is wrong.

■ ■ ■

Minnesota Historical Society

www.mnhs.org