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TOKYO SHIMBUN: We would like to start with the question connected with the differences in U.S. politics and Japanese politics. As a former politician it seems to us that you are in a good position to compare the ways politics is done in the United States and in Japan. Generally speaking, what are the major differences or similarities, if any, between those two countries?

AMBASSADOR: I think they are similar in many respects: elections to the two Houses, nowadays heavy campaign expenditures for those running for election in both countries. We have, of course, elections at stated times, and under your parliamentary system your Diet can be dissolved and the time structure changed as a result. We have a President who is the head of state and the chief of state. You have a Prime Minister who is the chief of state and an Emperor who is the head of state. You have two Houses, the House of Councillors and the House of Representatives. The powers between the two are somewhat different. We have two Houses, the House of Representatives and the Senate, and the powers between the two are very equal.

We have three branches of government, the executive, the legislative and the judicial. You have, in effect, two branches of government, really primarily one, the Diet which includes the Prime Minister, and the Supreme Court which I do not think
undertakes the same heavy responsibilities, nor does it have the great powers which our Supreme Court has under the Constitution.

But outside of some of these differences I think we're operating pretty much on the same wave length.

Q: As we see there are only two major parties in the United States which have taken power alternately, while there is one same permanent ruling party here which has been in power all the time since the end of World War II. The opposition parties here have very little chance to get the majority. How do you see these wholly different pictures?

A: Well, the Japanese have to organize their political system as they see best. It is true that you have a number of opposition parties compared to the majority party which has been in office for a long time. It makes it a little more difficult to operate, I think, whereas with two parties as in our country it makes it a little easier.

Furthermore, in many respects the differences between the two parties are not so apparent, and it's a system which has worked quite well. It's a system which I'm glad we have, and I am very pleased that we operate on the two-party system and not on a multi-party system which I think causes difficulties.
because it takes an awful lot of time to bring about an accommodation, a compromise or, as you referred to, with a consensus.

Q: I see. In connection with the United States policy to Japan, until recently there had been some kind of feeling or perception here that the Democrats were the more favorite party to Japan because its approaches were seen progressive and generous while the Republicans were the most unfavorable one because its approaches were conservative and power-oriented to some extent. However, this kind of perception seems to have changed these days I think here, and do you think right now there have been no big differences between those two parties in their approaches to Japan?

A: I think on the whole they have both been very well inclined towards Japan, but until recent years not paying enough attention to Japan, in effect taking it for granted. I suppose that is one of the results of the postwar period. But as the world has changed, as Japan has developed into a superpower, economically speaking, it has become a great power, generally speaking -- I believe I mentioned this the last time we met--and with that goes the assumption of additional responsibilities in the political and diplomatic spheres.

The American political system is sometimes extremely difficult to understand especially for Americans because we find
some of the Democratic candidates this year talking about protectionism, and this is the party, the Democratic Party, has been the party of free trade. On the other hand, the Republican Party, which has been often symbolized as the party of high tariffs, has turned out to be the party which is trying to hold the dike, the ramparts, against protectionist legislation.

It's a matter of facing up to reality once you get into office and realizing that some of the things you have advocated in the campaign will not hold up, will not be valid once you achieve the reins of responsibility.

So I would say that the relationship between our two countries, and in the eyes of both parties, has matured, that a greater degree of interest is being taken by the present administration in relation to Japan and East Asia, than has been the case in previous administrations, and I believe events have sort of forced that attitude. This attitude of equality and recognition towards Japan and East Asia has been furthered by a President who is Pacific-Asian oriented and who has established a very close relationship with your Prime Minister, which I think has been beneficial to both countries, and while it hasn't given much recognition a similarly very close relationship has been established between our Secretary of State and your Foreign Minister, Shultz and Abe, and I think the meeting now going on at Jakarta of the
ASEAN states being attended by both, at which meeting they will meet separately once again, is about the 13th time they have met in the two-year period that Mr. Shultz has been in office.

We're having a greater exchange on the basis of equality between the President, the Secretary of State, and also the Departments of Defense, and we had hoped to establish a similar relationship between our Departments of Education. This year an invitation had been extended to Minister Mori to meet with Mr. Bell, our Defense Minister, in Washington this summer, accepted but because of the extension of the Diet it could not be put into effect.

So I think we're reaching a higher plateau based on equality, based on a greater degree of understanding, much more I think on the part of Japan than on the part of the United States, but that's gradually coming up, and I would say that that relationship is sound, is stable, will endure and will become stronger in the years ahead as we go into the Century of the Pacific.

Q: While a party's rein on its member politicians seems rather loose in the United States, it is not so here, although there are many factions within each party here. Would you compare the functions of parties between those two countries briefly?
A: Well, we have factions within both parties in the States, but we seem to be able to cope with them and to bring about an accommodation of differences and achieve compromises and solutions. In this country you have a more rigid party setup and much more discipline, democratic discipline I would call it.

In our country the cohesion in the parties has decreased, and the result is that we have a great deal of individualism emerging and less party discipline—we never had too much—and more of the members of both Houses going off in every direction on the basis of their own impulse or impetus.

So you have a well disciplined political party membership going all the way through the Diet. We have a situation in the United States where discipline is becoming less apparent and individualism more apparent.

Q: Do you see much difference in the style of the politicians between the United States and Japan?

A: Basically, pretty much the same, very expensive, based primarily on an increasing use of TV, which in itself is very expensive, but I would say fundamentally not too much difference, and both representing well the democracies which they represent. Incidentally, Japan has the only real democracy in this part of the world in Asia.
Q: You must have dealt with a large number of Japanese politicians over the years. Which of them most impressed you?

A: It's hard to pick out anyone, but in Washington I was impressed with the late Speaker Funada from Tochigi Prefecture, I believe. His son, the Governor, there now, I believe, but I was impressed, generally speaking, with all of them. They were interested, they were a little modest in presenting their cases, but I think that's changed now.

Q: In what sense were you impressed by Mr. Funada?

A: Well, his knowledge, his desire as Speaker to establish—I think it was Mr. Funada—but I'll have to check—and the impression he made which I think helped to deepen, speaking personally, my understanding of what the Japanese political system was, how it operated, what it hoped to achieve.

Q: We understand that Prime Minister Nakasone has been very popular in the United States and also in the European countries also. Why is he so popular abroad especially in the United States? Has he departed very far from the traditional style of Japanese leaders in the eyes of Americans?

A: Well, he is held in high esteem in the United States,
but so were his predecessors, at least the ones with whom I worked: Mr. Miki whom I met in my last year as the Majority Leader before coming out here; Mr. Fukuda who was the Prime Minister when I arrived, a man of great vision who could see what was developing economically, and the dangers which could be seen ahead for both our countries; Mr. Ohira who developed the idea of a "Pacific Community"; Mr. Suzuki who initiated the idea of Japan undertaking the defense of its sea lanes to a distance of 1,000 nautical miles southeastward, originating in Tokyo Bay and going almost as far as Guam, a lot of Japanese territory on the way, and the second line southwestward originating in the Bay of Osaka and going down to the Basāi Channel which separates the northern Philippines from Taiwan, again with a lot of Japanese territory on the way, Kyushu, Southern Honshu, the Ryukyus, Shikoku, was a good Prime Minister as were his predecessors, who was the only one I know of who didn't seek the prime ministership but who had it bestowed on him, so to speak—he didn't seek power, power came to him—and he gave it up as soon as he possibly could; and then Nakasone. So he has continued the building process. He has emerged as a different, new type of Japanese leader because he has endeavored to lead rather than to follow. In doing so, he has stepped out in the field of foreign affairs. He has done a superb job, in my opinion.
When he was selected as Prime Minister, the first thing he did was to contact all the chiefs of state in East Asia, and in addition, before going to Washington to meet with President Reagan, he made an official visit to Korea, first time ever by a prime minister, very significant. I don't think its significance has as yet been appreciated, and a move which I think could bring about, in the normal sense, the establishment of a better relationship between the Republic of Korea and Japan.

He has made himself known and felt at the summits at Geneva and Williamsburg and London, and under him you don't have to look at the end of the line or in the background to find out where the Japanese Prime Minister is at these summit meetings. He is up there front and center, which is good for Nakasone, naturally, but it is also good for Japan because the Prime Minister on these overseas trips is the symbol of Japan, and that is a factor which I think should be recognized, is being recognized, and what he has done has been to bring Japan front and center on the world stage, and that was long overdue.

So you had a series of prime ministers, each of whom has made his contribution and all of which has been added to by Nakasone and has enhanced Japan's standing and prestige as a great power—not a superpower except economically—but as a great power on the same level with all the other powers in that respect.
Q: The second question, the peace-oriented tendency in Japan. Memories of the defeat in World War II and miserable life in the postwar period were so bad that the Japanese people, as you may know, tended to turn away from anything connected with nationalism or security affairs and to concentrate on economic development. As a consequence, an economic giant with substantial armaments has emerged. This is a very rare case, we think, in human history and we are very sincere, I think, in this approach. But this tendency is often seen as a free ride in the field of security. Could you comment on this?

A: Yes. First, let me say I noted with interest the meeting between your Defense Minister and the PRC's Defense Minister earlier this week, and the newspapers carried a statement to the effect that he approved of the Security Treaty between Japan and the United States and the significant part was when he said that every country has the right to defend itself. The Japanese are making steady and significant progress in that respect and have been for the past 13 years. We are very appreciative. It's not been an easy task for any of the prime ministers or the Diets because of Article 9 in the Constitution under which the Japanese renounced war and the creation of any kind of an armed force, difficult because of the reactions of their Asian
neighbors of whom they occupied wholly or in part during the Pacific War, the need for a consensus on the part of the Japanese people so that what the Diet did the Japanese people would, by a majority, approve, the recognition of the fact that the Japanese are anti-militaristic minded because they blame the military for getting them involved in the Pacific War, and on the basis of a very austere budget which has been in heavy deficit more often than not in recent years, and I would say for the past six or seven years especially.

So they have done very well, and I do not agree wholeheartedly with the allegation that because they spend less than one percent of their GNP on defense they have enjoyed a free ride. In part it's true, but you have to go back to Article 9, its neighbors, the need for a consensus, the Japanese feeling about the military, and the sparseness under which the government budget operates, and while it helped, you helped with our full approval because, like the Phoenix, had to rise from the ashes after the Pacific War, start from nothing, start from scratch, and it needed protection in the trade sense.

So I would say that the Japanese, instead of spending less than one percent of their GNP on defense, if they figured their budgets as we and NATO do and included pensions and survivors' benefits, that they're spending somewhere around 1.6 percent of their budget on defense because that includes,
to repeat, pensions and survivors' benefits which we include in our budgets and you have in your Welfare Ministry here.

The Mutual Security Treaty I think is very beneficial for both countries and under it we are here as the guests of the Japanese Government and people. You have placed at our disposal a number of bases rent-free, and Japan contributes well over a billion dollars for the upkeep of U.S. forces in Japan numbering 49,000 approximately.

In comparison, the Federal Republic contributes about 1.3 billion for the upkeep of about 245,000 U.S. military personnel in Western Germany.

We have under that treaty agreed to come to the defense of Japan if it's attacked, and we will. We would like to see Japan—but this is entirely a Japanese responsibility and subject to a Japanese decision only—do more in its own self defense. We don't want Japan to become a regional power. Its neighbors do not want it to become a regional power. The Japanese people don't want to become a regional power, but we hope that they will continue to move in that direction, which I think has been satisfactory and significant, not that we will do less as a result—as a matter of fact, we're doing more—but that we will have a greater degree of freedom to operate with the Seventh Fleet, for example, in its area of responsibility, the Indian and Pacific Oceans which comprises 70 percent of the water surface
of the globe and 50 percent of the combined land and water surface which extends as far as the Western Indian Ocean, the front door to the richest oil producing region in the world on which Japan depends tremendously, and the back door to the Arab-Israeli region which is a combustible area and can flare up, as it has, at any time.

We are not only out here to defend Japan if it's attacked, and we will, to repeat, but we are out here in our own defense as well, and the bases which Japan allows us to use, plus the bases in the Philippines, form the outermost limit of our defense perimeter, and if we didn't have this Mutual Security Treaty with Japan with its bases and the bases in the Philippines, we would have to ask ourselves a couple of questions. How far back would we have to withdraw? How much in the tens of billions of dollars would it cost us to establish a new defense perimeter? And how effective would that new defense perimeter be?

So I think that the treaty is mutually beneficial, that both countries are beginning to recognize that fact, and based on what the Japanese have been doing and are doing in their own defense--own defense, period--that a greater acceptance of what Japan is doing in that area and the mutual security is becoming more apparent in the United States, and one of the results is that we are hearing less and less about Japan having
a free ride, economically speaking, because of those two factors.

Q: Very recently the prefecture of Kanagawa adopted the so-called "Non-Nuclear Declaration" in connection with the Tomahawk missiles. How about the so-called three sets of principles of anti-nuclear here in Japan?

A: We are aware of them, we have assured the Japanese Government that we are aware of them constantly and we have acted in accord with them.

Q: So you understand how those feelings or how those principles are having popular hearing among the Japanese people.

A: Well, it's democracy, yes.

Q: Although there is growing recognition about the Japanese people that the Soviet Union is the main source of world instability, we are not so hostile towards them as Americans are, we think. Don't you think the United States overevaluates the threat of the Soviet Union, or don't you think that the Americans may now be committing the same kind of mistake that they have seen on Mainland China as an evil empire in the 1950s or 1960s?
A: I would say that we are aware of the potential Soviet threat on a worldwide basis. The Japanese see it from their particular geographic area, and on that basis to a large extent, although they did become more aware of it at the time of the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. But it is my belief that the Japanese are becoming increasingly aware of what's happening out in this part of the world because they know that about 25 percent of the Soviet ground forces are located on the Sino-Soviet border, plus some north of Vladivostok. They know that 26 percent of the Soviet air force is located in those same areas, and both the ground forces and the air forces first rate, modern and up to date.

They are aware of the strength of the Soviet Pacific Fleet operating out of Vladivostok, the biggest and the best of the four Soviet fleets, and getting bigger and better all the time. They are aware of the Soviet penetration into Southeast Asia because their ships out of Vladivostok ply the Japan Sea north and south, and their planes over the Japan Sea north and south. They are cognizant that there is increasing Soviet strength in Vietnam based on the treaty between the two, and that for the first time the Soviets have, in effect, direct access to the Indian Ocean the year round because of the use of Da Nang, Haiphong, Cam Ranh Bay and other anchorages and the airfields adjacent thereto.
The Japanese are aware of the fact that in the Northern Territories, which are unquestionably Japanese but occupied by the Soviets, that they have increased their strength from roughly 2,000 to about somewhere between 10,000 to 12,000, we estimate, and that there is, at least one MIG-25 air wing on one of the islands—maybe two, we're not certain about that.

So the Japanese I think are aware but they're taking it in stride, so to speak. We're looking at it in this area, which is a tremendously significant, strategic area, the North Pacific, but it's only part of the worldwide outlook. We differ in our comprehension—that's understandable—but I think we both know that the potential for danger is there.

Q: As for Japanese culture, we think you have been an unusually active ambassador here in Tokyo participating in many aspects of Japanese life. What are your observations on Japanese culture, modern or traditional, and what are your favorite things?

A: Well, I like the kabuki theater, I like the ballet, I like the tea ceremony—sometimes a little too long. I've seen the martial arts, and while ballet is modern all the rest is traditional, and it impresses me and pleases me that the
traditional cultural aspects of Japanese history are being retained, like sumo, too, and I hope that in the process of modernization that the Japanese will not lose too much of their culture because it goes back a long way. Japan has a great history, it's an old nation with an old civilization being born again in a modern sense, and on the surface they are accommodating themselves to it, but I think underneath they are trying to retain as much of the old as possible, and I think that's the way it should be.

Q: Nowadays Japanese culture is increasingly making inroads into ordinary Americans. We understand sushi or the name of the Japanese fashion designer Issey Miyake are said to be household words in the United States, while Takamiyama and Konishiki have done well in sumo here. How do you see this fusion or phenomena?

A: I think they're steps in the right direction. Not only is Issey Miyake becoming extremely well known in the United States, but you have Hanae Mori, you have Jun Ashida, you have others in the field of high fashion who have achieved world recognition. We're delighted. You have your sumo teams going to the United States, Mexico, and one went to Hawaii at the time of Jesse's retirement. We think it's good. You've
got your kabuki going to the Knoxville World Fair, your calligraphers holding exhibitions, your painters becoming more recognized throughout the world. It's good.

In return, we have shifted some of our culture to Japan—baseball, which has achieved a major status in this country—some of our fast food chains like Kentucky Colonel, is it, MacDonald's and others, and there is an interchange. I think we're getting the best of it, but it's something which I would hope would develop and become more apparent with the passage of time because there are exchanges we can make which will be beneficial and helpful to both.

Q: Do you think the Japanese lifestyle is essentially different from the American lifestyle?

A: I think it's becoming more like ours. I'm not too happy about that, but I think you have to change with events and face up to realities and do what has to be done. But you have a country that's going up as far as habitations and dwellings are concerned, not spreading out as you used to, and in the process you are losing some of the familial concept because of changes of that nature which denote an increased population, less land on which to build, a greying population, and the older citizenry are going to be a factor in the years ahead, and that is one of
the results which has given Japan the presentday record for longevity, and great changes are occurring not only in that respect but in the increase in the average height of the Japanese and the increase in weight.

Times are changing. You will have to make accommodations--you are--but I hope in the process you'll keep as much of the old traditions and customs as possible.

Q: Are you happy that growing numbers of American companies have been adopting Japanese methods in personnel management or production fields?

A: I certainly am. I think it's long overdue, but I don't think they're Japanese methods they are, objecting, I think they are old-time American methods that they are resurrecting. We are still the most productive people in the world, but in recent years our rate of productivity has not been increasing as fast as Japan, the West German's or others. Now it's beginning to come back again because of the recession we've had, and our productivity is on the upswing. We're becoming more quality conscious and we're becoming so because of the Japanese example in the United States in the exports they ship to us. We are using more robots. Although Japan produces most of them, by far, we introduced them into Japan in the first place.
We're returning to quality control councils which we introduced in Japan but let them drop by the wayside. Now we're going back to them. The purpose is to increase productivity, reduce cost, and better quality.

Well, there are some things we can learn from Japan because Japan is a very innovative nation, contrary to what many people think. As far as we're concerned it's a case of returning to the old-time ways. We're doing it, not very fast and under great stress on occasion, and it emphasizes one fact, and that is that it's about time that we do what we're doing because it's a return to a set of old-time circumstances which made our country great and which can do it again. What I'm saying in effect is that instead of pointing the finger at Japan or some other country and expect Japan in opening its markets—which it is and which it must do in its own self-interest—that our economic difficulties are largely of our own making and will be largely cured by us. Japan can help by opening its markets, but the main responsibility lies with us.

That means that just as labor and industry work cooperatively in Japan and industry and government likewise, so I think that we're going to have to move in the direction of less adversarial relations in our own country between labor and industry and industry and government and more cooperation. There we can learn something from the way the Japanese operate.
Q: I see. As for future relations between the United States and Japan, I think there seems to be a sense of resignation here in Japan to some extent that as long as the United States and Japan remain the world's two biggest economic giants, with Japan a little bit more aggressive in exports, and as long as there is some gap in perception of security matters between the two nations, some forms of frictions and tensions will continue to prevail over the Pacific Ocean. Where do you think the U.S.-Japan relationship is going in the remaining years of the 20th Century?

A: It will continue to go in the right direction. When you have a two-way trade with Japan exceeding 63 billion dollars, as you did in calendar '83, you are bound to have difficulties and frictions just because of the size, and magnitude and complexity of the trade. There has never been a two-way overseas trade like this in the history of mankind. It's going to get bigger, and as it gets bigger the problems will increase, but so far we have been able to cope with them, and I would anticipate that as we each develop a better understanding of the other in the years and decades ahead, that we will continue to be able to cope with them because it's in our own interest to do so, and this partnership, this relationship, which I think is the most important relationship in the world, bar none, is of such
significance that it's in our own best interest to recognize that we are in effect mutually dependent each upon the other, that we control a great deal of the world trade and the foreign aid and investments, and that together we can do much for the Pacific Basin on which four continents impinge, that separately we will do much less, and that it's not only in our own interest but in the interest of the basin and the interest of the world that this relation be strengthened and made more durable so that it can last into time immemorial.

Q: What do you think will be a wise course for Japan to follow in the relationship with the United States as well as in the world scene?

A: I think that Japan ought to open its markets much more. It is my feeling, incidentally, that if Japan opened its markets completely it would still have a sizable surplus with us. But we would like to be given the same opportunities in Japan, generally speaking, that we give the Japanese in our own country. We think events are moving in that direction. We think our objectives are the same, but if one word could describe the differential in both trade and defense it would be the "pace". We Americans are an impetuous people. We would like to have things done yesterday, figuratively speaking, even though we
only ask for it today, and the Japanese would like to have until tomorrow to do it, again figuratively speaking, even though they probably think they're moving pretty fast, and for Japan and its system they are.

But the objectives in all fields that I'm aware of are the same. The "pace" is the key word which means we're going in the right direction, but is it fast enough to achieve a satisfactory agreement on both sides?

Q: The so-called "quiet approaches" in Honolulu recently are seen here with much interest. What do you think the U.S. should do for better relations with Japan? You should be more patient?

A: We should be more patient, but not too patient, a little more understanding and much more understanding, really, a recognition that we are treating with an equal, both ways, that the trends are in the right direction, that we have developed a relationship with Japan which is unexcelled in the annals of our history, and I'm certain unexcelled in the annals of Japanese history, that we each have a great potential, that we each have a great responsibility, that we can take nothing for granted, and that on the basis of our shared responsibilities and their Pacific application, the future of the Basin and much of the rest of the world depends.
Q: My final question is how do you think you have changed as a person because of your connection with the Far East over the years?

A: I don't think I've changed as a person much because I have maintained a steady interest in this part of the world since I first came out here in 1922. I could always see a great future. I have always felt that our future was in the Pacific, and that meant all the areas surrounding that ocean.

We're glad to see the end of the colonial period in Asia, the emergence of new governments, the coming into being of democratic processes, though the only real democracy in this part of the world is Japan, but the others are making it.

I am happy to see coming to pass in my lifetime some of the dreams and the expectations that I had hoped for, and I am very happy that the American administration is showing a greater interest in the Pacific and East Asia, that a solid personal relationship has been established between our President and your Prime Minister, that we have a Secretary of State Mr. Shultz, the first one, I believe, who has ever been Pacific and Asian-oriented, and I think if you will look at the facts and the figures that these dreams and expectations will bear out, what I think is the fact but what I will refer to as the "possibility" of what is going to happen in the next century.
If my memory is correct, in 1975, nine years ago, our two-way trade with all of East Asia amounted to 42 billion dollars. Last year our trade with Japan alone exceeded 63 billion dollars, and with all of East Asia 133 billion dollars. Think of it. For the past four years we have, each year, exceeded Western Europe which used to be our primary trading partner, by our trade with all of East Asia, including Japan.

We have in East Asia about 6.9 billion dollars, the U.S. has, invested in Japan, and probably 18 to 19 billion dollars thereabouts in the rest of East Asia, say, 26 billion out of 223 billion dollars invested worldwide by American industry, business, but the returns out here are the best, and have been consistently the best, among all the developed regions in the world.

You've got in return a decided increase in Japanese investment, the official direct investment. The official figure is about 8.6 billion dollars in the United States, and much of it over the last two or three years. I think a better figure would be somewhere around 10.8 billion dollars, and increasing. I like to see it. We need more Japanese investment in the U.S. It brings about better understanding, gives jobs to people, broadens the tax base, is mutually beneficial, and brings us good products domestically made.

If you look at the history of my own country—and I may have told you this the last time I met with you—on the day
that George Washington was inaugurated as our first President, there were 13 American clippers in Canton Harbor, and while the pull has been across the Atlantic where most of our people came from, the push has been westward, and from the founding of the republic it has been in that direction, first the old Northwest Territories of Ohio, Indiana and Illinois, the Midwest, Texas, the Southwest, California, the Rockies, the Northwest, Alaska, Hawaii, the Philippines.

Walt Whitman, one of our great poets in the last century, used the phrase in one of his poems "Westward, ever westward, to Oregon!" If he were alive today, he would say, "Westward, ever westward, to the Orient!" because the pattern, the demographics, the trend of population to the south and to the west, has always been in this direction. It is continuing and, in the meantime, we're getting a reverse trend from this part of the world / our own country, probably 700,000 Americans of Japanese descent, two senators out of 100, last year they had three out of 100--Hayakawa didn't run--one governor, three, maybe four, members of the House of Representatives. Just think, out of a population of 700,000, compared to a total of 240 million! Remarkable! The best citizens we have.

Chinese more, Filipinos more, Vietnamese growing in numbers because of our unfortunate involvement in Southeast Asia, others are coming in so you're having Asian-American elements,
which is good, and that element will continue to keep alive for a while its relationship with the countries from which they or their ancestors came, but eventually they will all be amalgamated, and that's what America is.

So if you look at the demographic trends, if you will look at the trade figures, if you will look at the investment figures and their returns, you can't escape the conclusion that the next century will be the "Century of the Pacific", and the basis for the development of that area where more than half the world's people live, tremendous natural resources, great markets and friendly peoples and governments. That's where it all is. That's where it's all about and that's where our future lies, and that depends upon the strength of the Japan-U.S. relationship.