6-21-1984

Ambassador with Tokyo Shimbun

Mike Mansfield 1903-2001

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.
Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.umt.edu/mansfield_speeches

Recommended Citation
https://scholarworks.umt.edu/mansfield_speeches/1562

This Speech is brought to you for free and open access by the Mike Mansfield Papers at ScholarWorks at University of Montana. It has been accepted for inclusion in Mike Mansfield Speeches by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at University of Montana. For more information, please contact scholarworks@mso.umt.edu.
AMBASSADOR MANSFIELD WITH TOKYO SHIMBUN (Mr. Yoshimura)
June 21, 1984

MR. YOSHIMURA: Mr. Ambassador, thank you very much for your kind cooperation in giving us a chance for an interview with you despite your very heavy schedule just before your going to Hawaii. Our Managing Editor named Atsumi Matsumoto, a veteran political writer, wants us to convey his deep thanks to you.

AMBASSADOR: Well, I hope it will be a pleasure.

2: Anyway, as you may have heard from Carol or from someone else, in commemoration of our company’s centennial, the Tokyo Shim bun just started printing an interview series in the front page of the morning edition, interviews with distinguished figures, big guys in various fields. The first choice, as you see, is Mr. Toshiro Doko, the so-called "father of executive reforms" in Japan, and he has been telling our readers not only his now too famous arguments for executive reforms but also his personal life and opinions behind them in relaxed style. The reaction from readers so far has been very favorable, and we think the readers have been deeply impressed with Mr. Doko’s simple way of life and his straight-talking, and in addition to that his affections towards Japan.
Now, we want you, Mr. Ambassador, to appear in the Tokyo Shimbun after Mr. Doko not only as a very distinguished American Ambassador but also a very humane personality. I think you have been highly admired here as a veteran diplomat who has built a friendly bridge over the Pacific Ocean for the past seven years, as well as a very warm-hearted man with a wide range of experiences in the past. So in this interview we would like to hear your narrations to Japanese friends or Japanese readers over various kinds of topics starting with your inclination towards the Far East in your very early days, thus providing readers with the whole picture of the Ambassador.

Your argument that there is no country more important than Japan is very famous but, at the same time, we would like to introduce your personality as well to our readers on this occasion, first of all, if you don't mind. So we would like to ask questions of you following the time sequence but, first, briefly we would like to touch on your observations of the current situation, then going back to the past.

My first question is you have served as the American Ambassador here for about seven years under two administrations, and during that period it seems to us that many things have happened around you, that is the growing trade frictions between the United States and Japan, Japan's expanding role in the security field, deteriorating relations between the United
States and the Soviet Union, etc. So, having been stationed in Tokyo for seven years, how do you feel now?

A: On the whole, I am very satisfied with the relationship between Japan and the United States. It is, as I have said many times in the past and I will say many times in the future, the most important bilateral relationship in the world--no question about that--and I make this statement on the basis of the fact that over the past 35 years or so, almost 40, we have established a warm, more understanding relationship. We have come to depend upon each other more and to realize that together we can do great things in behalf of the world community as well as ourselves, and that separate and apart our influence will be diminished to that extent.

The reason why I think this is the most important bilateral relationship in the world is, one, we are two democracies, Japan the only real democracy in this part of the world. Secondly, we have an extraordinarily large two-way trade relationship. Last year the figure exceeded 63 billion dollars in trade between our two countries, and that is a remarkable achievement when you consider that only nine years ago in 1975 that our total two-way trade with all of East Asia amounted to only 42 billion dollars, whereas last year with all of East Asia, including the 63 billion dollar
two-way trade with Japan, it amounted to 123 billion dollars, and for the third or fourth year in a row our trade with East Asia has exceeded our trade with Western Europe which used to be our primary trading partner. That upward trend is going to continue, and that disparity between our trade relationship with Western Europe and East Asia is going to become more apparent with each passing year.

Insofar as American investments are concerned, they are very small, 6.9 billion dollars in Japan, maybe 19 billion dollars in the rest of East Asia, roughly 25 or 26 billion dollars American investments in this part of the world out of a total of roughly 221 billion dollars which America has invested worldwide. That figure is increasing and the returns on American investment are the best in this part of the world in comparison with other developed areas.

Furthermore, there is the pattern of the westward trend in our country, because most of our people came from Europe. My father and mother were Irish immigrants, I was the first in my family to be born in the United States. While the pull has been in that direction ever since the founding of the American Republic, the push has always been westward towards the Pacific and towards Asia, and if you look at that pattern you will find that on the day that George Washington was inaugurated as our first President, there were
American clippers in Canton Harbor, and since that time the demographic trend, the population shift, has been westward, first to the old Northwest Territories of Ohio, Indiana and Illinois, then the Midwest, Texas, the Southwest, the Rockies, California, the present-day Northwest, Alaska, Hawaii, the Philippines.

With the shift in our population to the south and the West, a pattern has developed along with a trade picture which has come of age. A developing degree of interest has accompanied that pattern and those shifts and those figures, and the relationship is going to get stronger in the years, decades, and centuries ahead. That is my very firm belief that the next century will be the “Century of the Pacific” and that huge basin on which fronts four South American states, all of Central and North America, Australia, New Zealand, the islands in the Pacific, all of East Asia, including Japan, and will eventually include the PRC, and when times get better the rest of East Asia, In that basin you have over half the world’s population, tremendous natural resources, great potential markets, on the whole friendly peoples and governments, and the development of that basin will depend upon the strength, the durability and the continuity of the Japanese-American relationship because it is in that basin where it all is, what it’s all about and where I think our future lies.
Q: Looking on Japan and the Japanese people at close range here, do you think they have changed drastically during that period?

A: They have changed somewhat on the surface, not so much underneath, and I think that is a good way to bring about changes to accommodate yourself to the world as it is but, at the same time, to retain some of the traditions, the history, the mores and the customs that have made Japan the great nation that it is and so alive the continuity of a civilization and a culture which goes back much further than ours, which has proved itself through trial and error and other methods, and which is in large part worthy of retaining and accommodating itself to the changes which are occurring in the modern world.

The Japanese, of course, have had to change because as the world has shrunk in distance and also in communications it means that we are drawn together, all the nations of the world. Perhaps we could describe ourselves as "neighbors each with the other". We've got to learn to live with the other nations of the world; we've got to develop a greater degree of understanding in my country, and to a greater extent than has been the case up to this time.
But Japan has always been aware of its vulnerability, even in recent years with the changes in the modern sense, occurring. They have accommodated themselves to the vagaries of nature, such as earthquakes, floods, etc., and they have not been the enemies of strategic sense because the relationship is vital to Japan and the United States under which we have agreed to the mutual security relationship. We are in the defense and security of the United States under which we have agreed to the mutual security relationship. And of course, in the field of trade, you are extremely vulnerable because of your lack of natural resources, and so we have to import the raw materials to manufacture the things we use. We have to export to survive. Maybe that statement is a little too strong but it is not very far off the mark, but it does indicate your dependence upon the rest of the world, that basically we are all dependent upon one another, each to varying degrees.
and out of that has come the development of an industrial system which has been the marvel of the postwar world. But the Japanese did what they did because they had to. They are survivors, and the Japanese did what they did despite the lack of natural resources which they compensated for through imports but on a dependence upon the biggest and the best natural resource of all—the Japanese people. So you worked out a good combination. You have become a superpower, economically speaking, and with that status you have also become a great power, generally speaking, because with economic superiority comes responsibility in political, diplomatic and other fields as well, and while Japan doesn't seem anxious to assume that role, in my opinion Japan has no choice but to assume it.

Q: The second question is about your experiences in your home state. We have heard that you have been so interested in the world, not only the world but also the world in general and in Asia specifically in your boyhood that you had wanted to visit the whole world as well as the Far East. What had triggered your interest to the outside world as well as the Far East?

A: Well, in the First War I served in the Navy and all my service was in Europe, but after the war I joined the
Army for a year and then the Marines for two years. In the
Marines I was stationed in the Philippines primarily and
China, incidentally. On my return home from China in 1922, we
stopped at Nagasaki and there I got my first glimpse of Japan.
It was an unusual one because in those days ships were fueled
by coal and not by oil, and we stayed in Nagasaki three days.
During a good part of that period the ship was fueled by
women, Japanese women carrying baskets of coal on their heads,
little baskets, or on their shoulders, and dumping it down the hold
and forming a line to keep the loading constant.

It added to my impressions gathered in the Philipp-
ines and in China. It accentuated my interest in this part
of the world. I was absorbed in their long histories, great
cultures and outstanding civilizations. I liked the people.
They were always kind, thoughtful, considerate, and I developed
an interest in this part of the world, which I pursued. After I
returned to Montana, and at my wife's urging finished my
elementary school education—I hadn't graduated from the
eighth grade—finished my high school education through corre-
spondence courses and attending classes and, thanks to her
urging, her selling her insurance policy to put me through
school, I was able to graduate from the University of Montana,
and in the last quarter to achieve the status of a high
school graduate at the same time.
My fields were the Far East and Latin America. I stayed at the university when I couldn't get a job teaching—it was 1933 and the depression was at its deepest and harshest—and started teaching as a graduate assistant and stayed on as a professor until I went to the Congress in 1943. My Master's thesis was on "Korea-U.S. Relations -- 1866 to 1910".

The courses I taught were primarily in Far Eastern history. As I said, I went to the Congress in 1943 but I ran for Congress in 1941 and was defeated, so it took me two tries to get in, and then I served in the House for five terms and in the Senate for four. In the House I served my full career there on the Foreign Affairs Committee, ten years, and in my 14 years in the Senate I served the whole time on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and was the Chairman of the Committee on Pacific and East Asian Affairs. When I retired voluntarily I ended up in Tokyo, and here I am.

Q: If I understand correctly, when you were sent to China you worked with Japanese soldiers hand in hand. Is it true?

A: Yes. There was a civil war going on between Chiang Tso-lin, the old Manchurian warlord, and Wu Pei-fu, another warlord, and they came together in the vicinity of Tientsin.
I guess, because of the pleas on the part of the missionaries and the businessmen, Britain, the United Kingdom, France and Japan and the U.S. sent in small contingents. I was stationed at Olongapo, now known as Subic Bay, in the Philippines, and they sent a company of 100 from Olongapo and a company of 100 Marines from Cavite just across the bay from Manila on to the U.S.S. Huron, which was the flagship of the American Asiatic Fleet which also had a company of Marines on board. So there were three companies, 100 each, very small, and we disembarked at Taku and went up the Peihho River to Tientsin and there joined a battalion of Sikhs who represented the British, a battalion of Annamites who represented the French from Indochina, and a regiment of Japanese soldiers. The ranking officer was a Japanese general, I understood, so during our short two or three weeks' stay there we were technically and in effect under his command.

One night it rained and the next day Chiang Tso-lin's forces had disappeared to the north, Wu Pei-fu had no one to confront so he left. It was my understanding that some silver bullets passed during the night which brought about an end to this confrontation of sorts and brought about our withdrawal from Tientsin, and as far as I was concerned my return to Olongapo, Subic, in the Philippines. That was the extent of that.
Q: May I take that it was your first encounter with the Japanese?

A: Yes. That was in 1922 and my second encounter that same year was on my way home. We went from the Philippines, to Taku and then we stopped at Nagasaki to coal.

Q: Do you have any personal impression with that Japanese officer?

A: No, never saw him; heard about him, had no contact with the Japanese regiment which was part of the expeditionary force, I guess you'd call it, and, really, I wasn't there long enough to become acquainted even with the Sikhs or the Annamites. We kept pretty much to ourselves, and we were quartered in the barracks of the 15th U.S. Infantry Regiment which had been stationed in Tientsin following the Boxer Rebellion, as was also the Marine Guard at the Legation, as it was then, at Peking. So, no contacts. We just knew what the setup was and spent most of our time on patrol around the outskirts of Tientsin or in the barracks of the 15th Infantry in Tientsin.

Q: You said that you had to call port at Nagasaki.
on your way back, and you referred to Japanese girls, Japanese vendors, women.

A: Yes.

Q: I think at that time not only in China and the Philippines but also Japan were very much backward, in a backward state of development, and what kind of impression did you have with those Japanese women vending some produce?

A: It was hard work. I felt that it was work that men should do, but having a glimmer of the culture of this part of the world understood that it was a carry-over from other times, noticed it, didn't pay too much attention to it, but I am glad that times have changed to such an extent that women now occupy a more equal spot in our civilizations. Not equal enough yet, but progress has been made and better divisions of labor have been established and more opportunities have been offered instead of just the drudgery and the everyday menial work which has always been their lot too much down through the centuries.

Q: How about your impression of the Port of Nagasaki itself?
A: I was impressed with the beauty of the place. We were allowed on shore there. I was impressed with the courtesy and the thoughtfulness of the people that we came in contact with, but my impression was one of physical beauty as far as the topography, the land, was concerned, and I had no idea then of the history of Nagasaki, its old relations with China, its relations with the missionaries, the merchants, and what a role it played in introducing Western culture in so many of its aspects to that part of Japan.

Q: So may I think that the reason why you got interested in the Far East was that first you were dispatched to that area by the Navy?

A: No, by the Marines, which is a part of the Navy.

Q: That's the reason?

A: That's it, and then, of course, I was young enough to be romantically impressed and I had read enough to have some idea about what this part of the world meant, and it captured my imagination and it stayed with me for the rest of my life, and the things which I began to feel then I think I'm beginning to see come to pass—expansion, greater influence, more
freedom for people out here, the end of colonization, and
the emergence of old nations and civilizations and cultures
in new forms, and once again this part of the world taking
its rightful place in relation to other parts of the globe.

Q: Before getting interested in the Far East, I understand
you had had much interest in the outside world outside of the
United States, and according to my friend Tetsuya Ozaki's
footnoted to your book, at the age of 14 you left your home
town and travelled to the Navy recruiting office, the Marine
recruiting office.

A: Navy, not Marine.

Q: Considering the age it seems to be a very courageous
action, unbelievable action. How and why were you able to do
that at the age of 14?

A: Oh, I just wanted to see the world. I tried to enlist
at a number of the recruiting stations but they always turned me
aside as too young, and finally I got to one station which
accepted me.

Q: Knowing your age?
A: No, they thought I was 17, and I told them I was 13. (laughter) so that's how I got in. I wanted to see the world, I didn't care what part, but I did see Europe. It was a way to accomplish that at no cost to me but with a little service to my country.

Q: What were your family's reactions?

A: They didn't like it but they accepted it and in the end raised no objection.

Q: I think that Montana was a rather small country and at that time the outside world must have been seen very far away from your home town. Did the people in Montana think that it was a little strange for someone to be interested in the outside world?

A: No. Most of Montana's people came from the outside world. They were mostly immigrants in those days from the Scandinavian countries, England, France, Spain, Italy, Ireland, so most of them knew something about the outside world, and I think it was natural in those days for a youngster to want to break out and see how other people lived, and especially if he had read plenty of historical novels by A.G. Henty, Sir Walter Scott.
and the others because your imagination was fired up and you want to see new things, try new ways. It's normal, juvenile curiosity. In those days it wasn't easy but that was part of the lure. In these days it's too easy because you can go anywhere in an airplane, and much of the romance and the attraction has been taken out of travel almost all of the adventure.

About the only real adventures he had in recent times has been Naomi Uemura, who really was one of the great men of the world in that respect who, almost always alone except for his trip up to Mt. Everest, undertook and succeeded in remarkable adventures, a man who symbolized to a lot of us what it used to be like and kept alive the aura of romance and adventure which some of us older ones at least appreciated but which some of the younger ones could profit from as well.

Q: Do you remember at that time how appeared in the outside world and especially the Far East were taught in your school days?

A: There wasn't much attention paid to them because our history books then, and still do, though to a lesser degree, concentrate on Europe and our own country, and sometimes our history books make us look and sound better than we really were. We write about the good things and avoid or play over the
things which were not so pleasant, but now it's different. The people of East Asia know a lot more and pay a lot more attention to us than we do to them, but as we are getting more and more Asians into our country we can anticipate that the textbooks will be changed in time to place a greater emphasis in this part of the world. Plus the fact that as this relationship between our two countries especially, and the rest of the region as well, develops, events are going to place more emphasis on the Pacific Basin and the result will be more publicity, more recognition, and more understanding and more space in our history books.

Q: Even if you had had a very romantic yearning for the outside world, didn't you think that it was a very hard thing for such a young boy to work in the Navy?

A: No. When you're young you can accommodate yourself much more easily, and the things that you can do when you're young you don't begin to realize how significant or how important they were until you get much older. You do things as a matter of course. You grasp opportunities, you make opportunities on occasion, you're eager, you're curious, you're going to live forever, you can't wait from one day to the next. It's an amalgam of thoughts, ideas and desires, and something
pushes you on. It was a great time to live because the opportunities we had then for ourselves as young men didn't have today because the world has become too modernized, things come too easily, and we're satiated and saturated with things ready-made, so to speak, and the impetus, initiative, to a large extent I think has been dissipated because the opportunities are no longer there. We know too much about the world. We still have an awful lot to learn.

But, as I said earlier, almost any place in the world is too easy to reach. All you've got to do is get on the plane, and something's gone out of it, but that's the way things evolve, so you make the best of it. I'm just glad that I had the opportunity in what I did to do what I did. I was lucky.

Q: Just after entering the Navy at the age of 14, what kind of things did you do?

A: Well, I was a seaman, I holystoned the decks, cleaned the decks every day. I was part of a gun crew but we never saw any action. It was sort of a humdrum existence. I was a seaman 2nd class when I was discharged. I was a private when I was discharged from the Army, and I was a private 1st class when I was discharged from the Marines after five years of military service in three military branches.
Q: How did your colleagues in the Navy treat you as a 14-year-old boy?

A: Pretty good. No, no, they treated me as one of them, and I did the work.

Q: They were much older than you, of course.

A: No, some of them were older, of course, but most of them were young volunteers, 17, 18, 19, 20, so there wasn't much of an age differential, and there was one, of course, it was a mark that they had an idea I was not as old as I was supposed to be, but they treated me just like one of them.

Q: You referred to your home state—Montana—a few minutes ago, but we don't think there are many Japanese people who know well about the state. My understanding is that its area is as big as Japan itself, that "Montana" is a Spanish word for "mountain", and the state flower is the bitterroot, and the state tree is Ponderosa pine, and the state bird is Western meadowlark and that there are lots of forests and mines. Would you tell us a little more about your home state?

A: You haven't done your homework. It's the state closest in size to Japan. It's 4,800 square miles larger than Japan. The last official
census showed that we had 378,000 people compared to Japan's 119 to 120 million people. Our biggest city is about 65,000. Compared to Japan, which has practically in the way of natural resources, we have much copper, zinc, tungsten, manganese.

We have the biggest coal reserves in the United States. It has been estimated they could last from 400 to 500 years. We have middling amounts of oil and gas, and we will find more of both. We sell about 15 percent of our wheat to Japan. I had nothing to do with it. The Japanese were buying the wheat before I came out here, good wheat.

We have all kinds of timber, national forests, state forests, private forests.

We are a developing state and Japan is a developed nation, and I can't think of a more marked difference than Montana, on the one hand, and Japan, on the other. It's a state which has harsh winters, severe winters, beautiful springs, summers and falls, good hunting, good fishing, lots of room, and we call it the "Big Sky Country".

It has established a sister-state relationship with Kumamoto, and it is working out quite well. There are exchanges of students and professors between our institutions of higher learning and Kumamoto's universities.

Q: Is there any similarity between the state of Montana and Kumamoto?
A: Yes. Kumamoto is basically agricultural and so are we. The big difference, of course, is that Kumamoto is on the ocean, part of it is on the ocean, and we are totally inland in the Rocky Mountains and the Great Plains or High Plains, and Kumamoto, the capital city, has almost as many people as the state of Montana as a whole.

Q: How about the character of the people there?

A: Well, they have to be prepared to battle the elements and they have. History has been one of boom and bust. Our state has been exploited for the benefit of outsiders, but we persevered, we are survivors, and we intend to survive and to develop the potential of that state for our own use more and for outsiders and other states less. We have milked and mined too much. We are going to look after our own more.

Q: Would you tell us a little about your home town itself and your family, if you don’t mind?

A: Well, I was raised in Great Falls, born in New York City of Irish immigrant parents. Moved to Great Falls when I was four, raised there. I went into the Navy from there. When I came back after the war I went to Butte, met my wife who
was a school teacher at the time, worked in the copper mines for nine years, went to the School of Mines there, the Montana School of Mines, after I finished my freshman year '27 and '28, then went down to the university in '31 and finished there in 1933. My wife and I both got our M.A. degrees in 1934. Then I went on the faculty and taught for nine years, then went to the House and the Senate and then came out here.

Q: We understand that after returning from the Marines you spent several years working for a mining company in Montana. Why did you choose working in the mines? Could you tell us a little about that experience?

A: Well, I did work in the mines in Butte for nine years, and I started as a mucker, that was a shoveler, then I became a miner, and then in my last three years after going to the School of Mines I became a mining engineer. So it was a place to get a job, and I liked mining.

Q: I think it must have been a very hard and dangerous work, and what did it contribute to your attitudes toward life?

A: Well, it was usual for a lot of miners to die in their forties and fifties because they would get consumption.
con; they called it from inhaling the copper dust, and it was a factor that you had to contend with, and then you had to contend with "copper water" which ate right into your skin. You had high temperatures to contend with underground, but it was a profession which I enjoyed. It was company that I found pleasant. It was in a town which had a reputation for being wide open, and it was, but with it went a different kind of a spirit, and it was an experience which was extremely valuable and necessary for me to fall back on to get my start in politics.

My wife-to-be did not want me to spend the rest of my life in the mines, so she urged me, and pushed me, and pressured me, to make up the necessary high school credits, to go to the university, and as I have said she cashed in her insurance to put me through, so there is no one I owe a greater debt to and there is no one who has done more and there is no one but her who could have made it possible for me to get the breaks I did and the opportunities which came to me.

Q: Here in Japan miners have been seen sometimes to be very rude people, but I think you are the opposite.

A: Well, miners are free and independent, and they work hard underground and they live hard above ground.
Q: You said that your experience in the mining company helped your career in politics. In what way?

A: Because Butte and Anaconda, which was the smelter city 20 miles away, formed the Democratic Party heart of Montana, and when I ran for office the core of my strength was Butte and Anaconda, and the reason for that was that I had worked in the mines and got to know the people in both cities. That's where my biggest strength came from.

Q: In the mining company how long did you work a day?

A: Eight hours a day.

Q: Underground?

A: Underground, and the pay was $4.25 a day or $4.75 a day, depending on the price of copper, and when I went to Congress in 1931 I was getting $200 a month as an assistant mining engineer, and that wasn't bad money for those times, $2400 a year.

Q: We see all ... refer to Mrs. Mansfield, and again, according to Mr. Ozaki's explanation, then a young and
beautiful school teacher named Miss Maureen Hayes in many ways urged you to enter university, and so first you entered Mining School.

A: Yes, that's right, the Montana School of Mines in Butte. I went to school in the daytime and worked in the mines at night, five days a week.

Q: How did you come to know her?

A: Strangely enough, I hadn't through the School of Mines. When I went to the School of Mines there were 125 students. Twenty-five of them were girls, and... (Note: end of side A)

Q: Maureen Hayes' sister, and through her sister I met Maureen. That's how it happened.

Q: There seems to be no direct connection between working in the mining company and learning in the university. You said that she urged strongly to enter university. Is that all, or did you have any other reasons to study in the university after working in the mining company?

A: The same reason that she had. Too many miners died too young, and if I wanted to live it was better to make plans
to think of another profession, and that was the reason. Evi-
dently it paid off because I have reached ripe old age.

Q: What did you study in the university days?

A: I finished in history and political science and my majors
were Far Eastern and Latin American history. Well, my major was
Far East history, my next best was the minor in Latin American
history.

Q: Didn't you have any difficulties in adapting yourself
to university life after working very hard in the mining company?

A: No. I enjoyed Missoula, which is quite different from
Butte. It was in a beautiful setting, still is. The university
was a very refreshing experience for me. It was small at the
time, about 1300 students, very good relationship between the
faculty and the student body. I enjoyed it. I liked Missoula.

Q: Did you see some professors who were very interested in
Asia?

A: There weren't any, so it was people who were teaching the
courses who really weren't specialists in the field, but it was
indicative, I think, of the status of education in the United
States in relation to this part of the world at that time.

Q: In 1933 you graduated from the university, and then you had difficulty in finding a job in / Did you have any vivid impressions of the Great Depression that you would share with us?

A: No, just couldn’t get a job, went back to the university and got a job as a teaching assistant at $25 a month, and that was it.

Q: After you found your job in the university, what did you teach there?

A: History, the Far East in general, history of the Philippines then under American control, and that was about it. Then I taught the history of Latin America, generally speaking, with emphasis on Mexico and the Caribbean.

Q: Did your experiences in the Far East when you were young help your teaching at the university?

A: Yes, indeed.

Q: What kind of a professor were you?
A: Oh, about average, I guess, but I made a lot of friends there among the students who turned out to be very strong supporters when I went into politics.

Q: Were you very severe to the students?

A: No, no.

Q: As a professor or assistant professor how much did you earn then?

A: How much did I earn? When I went to the Congress I was getting $2400 a month. That was $2800 a year. That was about the average I got after I got my Master's in 1934.

Q: About your entering into politics, I understand Mrs. Mansfield again urged you to enter into politics, but the world of politics and the academic world were quite apart in character. Why and how did you decide to enter into politics?

A: Well, the Irish are naturally inclined towards politics in America. There seemed to be an opportunity to win a race for Congress, so I travelled around the district and talked to any group that would listen to me, made some contacts, lost the first time, not quite too much, and won the second time. That's it.
Q: Why was Mrs. Mansfield so much interested in pushing you into politics?

A: Oh, she wanted to see me make something of myself, and it was just her drive that made all things possible.

Q: In 1940 you ran first for the House of Representatives and then failed.

A: Finished third.

Q: Was it a normal step for young politicians to try to run for a seat of the House of Representatives at first and not for the state council?

A: No, it was an unusual step, but we set our sights pretty high. I think we did the right thing.

Q: What were your platforms then on which you ran for the House of Representatives in 1940?

A: To build a better Montana, to work hard for peace, to keep the U.S. out of war. I was something of an isolationist in those days. That's about all. I haven't thought about those for decades.
Q: Then in Montana how were politicians seen by the ordinary citizens? Were they very much admired?

A: It depends, but in Montana we had no political organizations except in name only, and the people were so few because there were less than half a million in those days, and it was a case of getting out, shaking hands, wearing out shoe leather, and seeing as many people as you could personally. So the campaigns were highly personal. You depended not so much on organizations as you did on individuals and volunteers. It was an unusual situation because once you were elected you would belong to nobody because no organization really got out and did the work that you had to do yourself, as would be the case in the big industrial states or the big cities and the like.

Q: Did you get enough money for running at that time?

A: No. No, but we tried to make up what we lacked in money by shaking hands and wearing out shoe leather and visiting as many groups as possible.

Q: On those occasions you got contributions?

A: Some, not much, not much, but, then, you didn’t have TV in those days and it was much easier to campaign, and I mentioned
that we didn't have any organizations, really, except in name only. I was referring to the state organization, the central organization, but you did have county organizations which were quite helpful and did what they could in the counties which were there as possibilities.

Q: In 1942 you succeeded in the second try for the House of Representatives. What was the feeling then going up to Washington? Here in Japan newcomers to the Parliament seem very happy and proud with gold badges on the lapels. How about you?

A: Oh, very happy, very pleased. Got ready to drive to Washington 3,000 miles away.

Q: Driving yourself?

A: Yes, with my wife and our three-year-old daughter right in the middle of winter, December, crossed the Montana line, Montana-North Dakota line, and the speedometer showed a little over 100,000 miles on the car, Ford. Went across North Dakota and almost froze to death. Fortunately the heater worked, got into Fargo and was able to find a hotel room, kept on going and about seven days later we arrived in Washington. Long trip, good car. The best thing about it was that the heater held up during the entire journey.
Q: Why didn't you take a train?

A: Well, we would have to have a car. Cars were hard to get in 1943. I'm not sure we had enough money to go by train, and I think perhaps we were forced to go by car, which we need anyway.

Q: During the House era, what kind of things did you do for ten years?

A: Well, attended to the business of the House, looked after the needs and requests of my constituents, served on the Foreign Affairs Committee, went to China in 1944 on a special mission for Roosevelt, was there seven weeks, and that's about it.

Q: Here in Japan politicians are regarded as a different species from ordinary citizens because politics is often seen as a very dirty business and the politicians seem to be a very power-oriented or money-seeking, egocentric, aggressive and treacherous ... connected with the politicians here in Japan. So conscientious people seem not to succeed in politics here in Japan. How about in the United States?

A: Well, politics is an honorable profession. Politicians are people. They are elected by people, and the politician
the people elect can be defeated by the people. I think it's an honorable, worthwhile profession. I wish more people, instead of complaining about politicians and politics, would become more interested themselves in politics and in the possibility of their becoming political office holders.

Q: Did you find that you sometimes have moral conflicts in your political career?

A: Oh, there were conflicts. They arose now and again, but so far as I'm aware they were accommodated on an equitable and equable basis because in politics the art is in compromise, not in all yes or all no, all left or all right, but somewhere in the middle.

Q: I think coming to compromise sometimes is a very difficult and it means some backstage maneuvering.

A: Sometimes, sometimes, but compromise, accommodations, if we can't find out right solutions, are the best way to conduct politics, and sometimes, more often than not, they turn out to be the best answers instead of the original solution.

Q: When you try to get various kinds of politicians making compromise, what was your secret?
A: I had no secret. When I was the Majority Leader, I would approach Senator occasionally. I never asked them for their vote. I would say: If you’re in doubt will you consider giving me the benefit of the doubt? That’s all. It made no difference whether they did or not, and I didn’t believe in pressure, still don’t, and I think it’s not the way to operate in a Congress or in diplomacy.

Q: Why did you switch to the Senate after serving in the House of Representatives?

A: I wanted to serve for six years at one time instead of two years. I wanted a little more time to think, to research, do my homework and be under a little less pressure.

Q: I understand switching to the Senate, your senior politician had been Lyndon Johnson...

A: Yes, he was the leader.

Q: ...and we have an impression that he was the very picture of politicians who are very good at backstaging or such kinds of things. Sometimes he was criticized as being very aggressive or arrogant. How about your personal impression?
A: He was, but that's the way he worked, and I was just the opposite to Lyndon Johnson.

Q: How did you get on well with him?

A: I had no trouble in getting along with Lyndon Johnson. He went his way, I went mine. He never tried to pressure me either as Majority Leader or as President, so I got along with him very well. We understood each other perfectly.

Q: Anyway, you climbed up the political ladder to the Senate Majority Leader, and it was so that the late Senator Jackson once said you were the politician or statesman of nobility and fairness. What was the secret of your success?

A: Well, the secret was that there's no secret.

Q: I mean up to the Majority Leader in such a very difficult world.

A: Well, the application of the golden rule: 'Do unto others as you would have done unto you, treat them all alike, to the oldest, the youngest, the most senior, the newest, Republican or Democrat, treat them as you would like to be treated, and it's very beneficial, or you can refer to the negative,
silver rule, as Confucius put it: Do not do unto other as you would not have done unto you. Same thing. One goes back beyond the Bible and the other is supposedly in the Bible somewhere. Just treat people like you'd like to be treated and you'll find they treat you pretty well in return.

Q: Do you think that such a good politician with such character still can succeed in the current political world in the United States?

A: Well, it's more difficult for anybody to succeed because money has become a prime factor, because of TV primarily. The job is more difficult. All the more reason good men should try to get in and women, but it's more difficult, more expensive, and it's a harder job.

Q: Do you think that recently politicians are getting more sensitive to the interests of their constituencies and so it is very difficult for senior politicians to see consensus in their own party?

A: Yes, it's more difficult. You have too many groups, single-issue groups, more lobbying groups, campaigns are more expensive. You depend on groups for financing, political action committees and the like, but as the job becomes more difficult
it's all the more imperative that good people run for it and seek election.

Q: What were the most impressive things in your congressional career both in the House of Representatives and in the Senate?

A: The 26th Amendment, giving the vote to 18-year olds, serving Flathead Lake in Montana in the Second World War, passing the Civil Rights Act of 1964. That's enough.

Q: As the Senator Majority Leader, your image here in Japan was very lavish and many Japanese people remember that you had been against escalating intervention in Vietnam and promoting closer relations with Mainland China. What were your motivations during that period?

A: Well, I didn't think that we should become involved in Southeast Asia which was not in our own best interest, was not tied to our security or our welfare, that it was a mistake, and the time had to come when some recognition had to be accorded to the PRC. President Nixon and I discussed the possibility many times before he went to China in February 1972, and we discussed it at our breakfast at the White House which occurred usually once a week, and it was the main topic of conversation.
Q: At that time you thought that intervening in the Asian mainland wars was a very bad thing.

A: Yes, and I feel that we are basically a Pacific power with interest along the rim of Asia. We are not an Asian land power.

Q: May I think that you thought or you still think that you played a pivotal role in formulating the then U.S.-Asia policies?

A: No, not an unusual role but a consistent role in trying to bring home to our government and our people the importance of this part of the world and the need for our continued interest and involvement. When I say "involvement" I don't mean in a military sense but economically, culturally, exchange-wise and the like.

Q: At that time there were many American leaders who thought that there was China just behind Vietnam and there were still very close relations between the Soviet Union and China, Mainland China, so they were apt to think that the United States shouldn't come closer to Mainland China, but you thought the opposite way.

A: It has been changed. Nixon has changed it and every
successor, Ford, Carter and Reagan have recognized it, so the relationship is on a pretty strong foundation, difficulties now and again, mostly tied to Taiwan but in time that may well be worked out between the Chinese on Taiwan and the Chinese on the Mainland who will get together to work out a Chinese solution to a Chinese issue.

Q: Do you think that such kind of attitude at that time was supported by your experiences in your early days in the Far East or in China?

A: Yes, it goes back to that in an indirect way, but it's based on a continuity of interest since that time.

Q: You once said that Vietnam was the most tragic failure in American diplomacy. What was Vietnam to the United States and the Americans?

A: That's the question. What was it? Why were we involved there? How was it in our interest or in our security? It wasn't. So it still holds. The question answers itself.

Q: You mean what Vietnam was to the United States then hasn't reached a correct answer?
A: We shouldn't have been involved. It was not in our interest. What were the reasons for becoming involved? To hold back China? Now we're friends with China. What was the cost? 360,000 people wounded, 60,000 dead, hundreds of billions of dollars spent. For what?

Q: What kind of aftereffects do you think the experiences in Vietnam have had in American politics and the American people?

A: Hard to say. I'm sure the issue is still retained in memory. Maybe it has taught us a lesson.

Q: I think toward the end of your career in the Senate you had another tragic affair, that is the Watergate incident. As the Majority Leader in the Senate, what kind of impressions did you have about this?

A: Well, it developed into something that I never anticipated, but the matter has been solved, settled, and I hope that the lesson of Watergate will not be forgotten, and maybe out of it has come a strengthening of our system and an appreciation of the fact that we survived such an extremely difficult and important issue.

Q: Do you think that after learning such a severe lesson will any future president or administration repeat such kind of tragedy?
A: I would doubt it, I would doubt it.

Q: When I was stationed in Washington, it was a big question to the Japanese correspondents to scoop the next U.S. ambassador to Japan, and there was once a strong rumor that you have been appointed to the Beijing Liaison Office, but the Washington Post broke the news that you were the choice for Japan in March 1977, and all the Japanese correspondents stationed in Washington were very much surprised.

A: So was I. (Laughter)

Q: Why do you think you were picked up?

A: I don't know because when I retired I had retired. I was enjoying retirement. The President offered me several ambassadorships. I told him I wasn't interested.

Q: Including the Beijing post?

A: No. The President owed me nothing and I didn't owe him anything. I wasn't interested. After he came back the third time he asked me to go to Tokyo. I talked it over with my wife. We accepted, but it's the only post we would have accepted, but we never had any idea that we would be offered it.
In fact, neither of us had any idea that we would be offered any ambassadorship.

Q: Why did you agree to the appointment to Tokyo?

A: Because it was in this part of the world, with the most important country in this part of the world, and it was just a continuation of my lifelong interest in this part of the world, its future and its relationship with us. I wouldn't have accepted any other appointment, and I didn't expect this one.

Q: Back in January 1957, you proposed an early reversion of Okinawa to Japan in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearing, and in August 1974, in your report on your visit to Japan you proposed a new partnership between the United States and Japan and that Japan be made a permanent member state of the United Nations Security Council. In those days such arguments were still very rare in the United States, in the Congress or in the Senate?

A: Not much attention was being paid to this part of the world.

Q: The Japanese mass media played up your statements. Since those days were you very much interested in U.S.-Japan relationship?
A: Yes, very much so.

Q: I think during that period you had to cover the whole world as the Majority Leader, but why were you so specific about relationships with Japan?

A: Because... some to pass [that I had always believed] and that was that the future was cut in this part of the world and the development of the basin would be the foundation on which that future would rest [would lie in the relationship between the U.S. and Japan].

Q: I think before being appointed to the Tokyo Embassy, you had visited Japan and the Far East very often, but for the first time you started living in Tokyo. What kind of impression did you have on arriving here in Tokyo as Ambassador?

A: Nothing that I didn't anticipate. I had been aware of the miraculous economic recovery, the rebuilding of Japan, the increasingly outward look on the part of Japan. I wasn't surprised. It was what I expected to see that I saw.

Q: So there weren't any big differences in the image of Japan before 1977 and after that year?
Q: After being stationed, you seemingly have had many chances to observe the Japanese people at close range, and what kind of feelings do you have about the differences in mentality or character between the Japanese and Americans?

A: Well, the Japanese are more anxious to learn about us than we seem to be to learn about the Japanese. The Japanese have slowly been assuming their responsibilities as a world power, to repeat, based on their status as a superpower, economically speaking. Their prime ministers are becoming more international-minded. As Japan has grown in power and prestige, the Japanese have become outspoken in their views, which is a good thing, and have been willing to express their opinions more and more. We have evolved from a father-son, uncle-nephew relationship into one of brothers based on equality, a greater degree of mutual understanding, not enough on our part as yet, and a recognition of our dependence upon each other, and the world dependence to a large degree on both of us standing together.

Q: Talking about the differences in character or mentality between Americans and Japanese, I think the Japanese people usually do not assert themselves compared with the Americans. Aren't you annoyed by such Japanese attitude?
A: No. As I said, they are beginning to assert themselves more, to express their views, and it's a good thing. If we're equals we should act as equals. If we have ideas or arguments, we should each advance them. One can't be inferior and the other superior, two brothers like that.

Q: But only on the political or diplomatic level the Japanese may be getting more assertive in expressing themselves...

A: That's fine.

Q: ...more clearly, but on the personal level, how about that? They are still shy and bashful.

A: No, no, I think they're speaking up and speaking out, and it's good. They should.

Q: But I think the Japanese still maintain a very different behavior compared with people in the other well developed nations. Don't you notice such kind of things?

A: Well, what I notice is is that they are more polite, more courteous, and I don't find them averse to expressing their opinions. I welcome it. If they are going to be an equal, be an equal and don't let somebody talk down to you or up to you.
Q: So you mean even on a personal level the Japanese are changing rapidly.

A: No, I would say changing rapidly but they are expressing themselves more. They are retaining their courtesy and their politeness, but they are not remaining mute all the time, and if they have a point of view to express, as I see it, they are not averse to expressing it.

Q: It is also said that the recent frictions between our two countries do not stop at the trade issue but go on to the culture gap and behavioral gap. Do you think that both countries can overcome this kind of thing?

A: To a degree, yes, but we've each got different backgrounds. Ours is more diverse, yours is more homogeneous, and those backgrounds will play a very important part in our thinking and in behavior. In the meantime I think that as the world shrinks and communications become more instantaneous that we will be able to draw more closely together and develop a greater degree of understanding and appreciation of each other.

Q: But I think there is a trade system peculiar to Japan and that is a very complicated system of wholesale or retail. I think such kind of things peculiar to Japan is said to have
been hindering the more smooth trade relationship between those two countries, so such kinds of Japanese traditions or culture coming from the culture are barriers to the mutual understanding between those two countries, don’t you think so?

A: No, there are difficulties here, barriers of different kinds, nontariff barriers, but they are gradually being alleviated, corrected, and I think that the Japanese are opening their markets much more than many of us appreciate, and certainly the efforts of the Japanese Government have been quite strong in that respect, but it isn’t a question of just one country changing itself. It’s a question of both our countries doing the things which must be done to bring about an alleviation of these trade difficulties. You’re moving in Japan on standards, certification, liberalization of the capital market, internationalization of the yen, various bilateral agreements covering tariffs and products, all in the right direction.

By the same token, there are things that we have to do because while we want Japan to open its markets more, and Japan should in its own self interest as the chief beneficiary of the international trading system, we’ve got to recognize that there are things we have to do at home: better productivity, better quality products, more competitive pricing, follow-through service. You can’t do that for us. We can only do it ourselves. Our ills are largely of our own making, and only we can cure
those ills. So it doesn't do us any good to point the finger at Japan and say: "You've got to open your markets and in doing so that will wipe out the imbalance in our trade." It won't. The Japanese can open their markets completely and there will still be a favorable balance in Japan's favor in its trade with us. So we can't scapegoat any nation like Japan and expect it to cure our own ills. Our own ills, to repeat, are largely of our own making and will, in large part, be cured by ourselves only. The Japanese can help but that won't cure the imbalance in trade, and out of that has to come an opening of the Japanese market.

Much progress has been made in the right direction, much remains to be done, and our side a looking at the notes in our own eyes and doing the things which only we can do to bring about a correction at home is very essential.

Q: You said that you welcomed the recent changes in Japanese attitude but, at the same time, it is said that the Japanese youngsters are having less work ethics as compared with their elder counterparts and they do not have any poverty experiences in their life. How do you feel about the Japanese youngster's behavior?

A: Well, if they are a problem, and I doubt it, they are your problem, and it is not how I feel, it is how you feel about it. All I know is that these youngsters are increasing on the average of about something in the order of 3 and 3.5 inches in height.
compared with 35 years ago and increasing in weight a little over 13 pounds. That's a part of the statistics put out by your government, but the other factors are purely a Japanese domestic situation.

Q: Do you think that Japan in the near future will lose its productivity or quality control or something like that which have been the secrets of the current Japanese miracle with those youngsters coming into the majority?

A: No, I don't think so. I think they've worked well for the Japanese and they will continue to work well for the Japanese and the Japanese have no choice but to see that they continue to work, if they are going to survive and continue to be competitive.

Q: Thank you very much for such a long time.

A: Thank you.

**********