In 1960 United States-Japanese relations seemed to be in a state of turmoil. The Japanese and United States governments had agreed that it was time to redefine the Japan-United States relationship under a new Mutual Security Treaty, which would more accurately portray the cooperative nature of the future ties between them. Opponents of the special relationship that had been developing between Tokyo and Washington took advantage of this decision to try to stop the signing and implementation of this new agreement. Large street demonstrations were held in Tokyo against the treaty and against the planned visit of United States President Eisenhower to Japan to sign the treaty. While these demonstrations and related acts of violence succeeded in the cancellation of the Eisenhower visit, the Mutual Security Treaty itself was passed by the Diet and subsequently became law. But there remained many in Japan who had doubts about the treaty and questioned the wisdom of Japan being so closely allied to the United States. From the United States' side there has never been any significant opposition to the treaty. Some have called it "one-sided" because, under the terms of the treaty, the United States pledges to come to Japan's aid if she is attacked whereas there is no such pledge from the Japanese side. However, there has always been a strong consensus in the United States that Japan's security is an integral part of American security and, hence, the United States' guarantee to Japan is clearly part and parcel of American defense strategy.

Since 1960 the Japanese attitude toward the Mutual Security Treaty has undergone a striking metamorphosis. Some 70 percent of the Japanese people today support the agreement, if latest polls are to be accepted. The main opposition party, the Socialist Party of Japan, has
for years been staunchly opposed to the treaty. Today the position of the Socialist Party is more ambiguous and seems to be more favorable to some kind of special relationship with the United States that has developed under the treaty.

It is necessary to point out at this point that the treaty of 1960 has been the umbrella under which a very unique and beneficial relationship for both Japan and the United States has taken place and been formed. Today, there are no countries more closely intertwined than the United States and Japan. Both official and unofficial ties are of the closest kind. We witness this in every aspect of human endeavor—economic, defense, political, cultural, and educational. Hundreds, even thousands, of Japanese and Americans are meeting every day to exchange views and/or reach agreements on critical issues involving the present and future lives of our two peoples.

Over the past thirty years the relative strength of the United States and Japan has changed. In 1960 the United States, a global power, was much stronger than Japan. Indeed, American power overshadowed all other countries at that time both in military, economic, and political terms. The world today is a different place. Soviet military strength has become much greater and this is particularly true in the Asia-Pacific area. Western Europe and Japan have assumed major positions at the center of economic and technological development, second only to the United States. The world has become multi-polar instead of the bi-polar configuration that had been the case for so long a time.

Within the Soviet bloc great changes are taking place. Soviet President Gorbachev has been pursuing a policy of perestroika, glasnost, and reform that allows for more openness and self-determination by the peoples of Eastern Europe and, indeed, by citizens of the Soviet Union itself. The Warsaw Pact, which, in the past, represented the vast extent and outreach of
Soviet power is now coming apart at the seams. For some years, the Pact has been of questionable value for it has been doubtful just how loyal troops made up of Eastern European peoples would be if military confrontation with the West occurred as a result of Soviet expansionist policies. Now, however, there is no longer any doubt. Eastern European countries no longer are committed to the principle of Marxism-Leninism and, in fact, are moving away from those beliefs as rapidly as possible. The concept of democracy as we know it in the United States and Japan is becoming the hallmark of present-day Eastern European political thought. And even in the Soviet Union the people are demanding a greater say in their own present and future circumstances. People everywhere have never been content to allow a small coterie of unelected political leaders decide their fate, but many had little choice in the matter. Now, that choice is becoming the pattern, even in many Communist countries, people in overwhelming numbers are expressing their determination to establish lasting democratic institutions in their respective countries.

The United States-Japan Mutual Security Treaty, while designed to protect the security of the United States and Japan also has broader and deeper meaning. In addition to furthering close and strong relations between these two countries in all areas, it was set up to work to ensure peace and stability in the Asian and Pacific region. This meant that the United States and Japan have cooperated and continue to cooperate in many fields of endeavor to further more open economies and freer societies in the region.

Security and democracy, after all, go hand-in-hand. National security issues are best decided upon and implemented by leaders who are truly representatives of the people and who have come to power as a result of free and open elections. This is the case with the United States-Japan security arrangements and, over the years, the support of the Japanese and
American people for those arrangements has grown and become even more firm. One of the most important elements in the Mutual Security Treaty has been the clarity of purpose that the peoples of both countries have about its basic meaning. The treaty is purely defensive. Its existence threatens no one. As a defense mechanism it has served its purpose well. Japan and the United States have acted in concert to strengthen their defensive capabilities and have taken similar stands against aggressors, potential aggressors, and threats to peace and stability in the Asia-Pacific region and around the world. Both countries staunchly opposed the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan and the Vietnamese occupation of Cambodia. Both countries have consistently done everything possible to seek a reduction of tensions on the Korean Peninsula and have urged North Korea to act in accordance with established norms of accepted international behavior. Both countries have denounced international terrorism in all its forms and have sought to end it. Both countries recognize the dangers of drug trafficking to a stable international environment and are acting in tandem ways to control this evil scourge.

By acting together the United States and Japan have contributed mightily to the positive changes taking place in our world. Japan and the United States have shown what great accomplishments can take place in societies driven by democratic beliefs and free economic systems. "The less controls the better" seems now to be the key phrase in countries under extremely tight controls only a few short months ago. The Japanese and American examples of freedom are now being followed in region after region and country after country.

The successes achieved by Japan and the United States in the economic arena have allowed them to very specifically assist other nations in their efforts to improve the quality of living of their citizens. The Japanese and United States governments and people have allotted vast sums over the past number of years in providing economic aid to developing countries. In
addition, private industries in both nations have invested in these same countries and have, as a consequence, greatly contributed to economic development and to a stable environment for such development.

As we move into a changing, less dangerous in some ways perhaps, but unstable world, it is imperative that democratic, developed countries help those that are striving to improve their societies under the banner of democracy and political pluralism. This assistance can best be provided in a coordinated, comparative manner. The United States-Japan alliance structure, under the umbrella of the United States-Japan Mutual Security Treaty, has provided and can continue to provide in the future the frame for the security and safety of both countries so that they can better act to help with the creation of a less threatening and more peaceful environment on our planet.

As momentous events take place throughout the world, one question is what should be done about that aspect of United States-Japan relations that has to do directly with defense requirements. What is the appropriate role of military power in the international sphere now and in the foreseeable future?

In the case of Japan and the United States, military power has been designed and continues to be justified solely on the basis of defense. There has never been since the U.S.-Japan Mutual Security Treaty has been in effect any attempt on the part of these two allies to use military power to threaten or frighten anyone. As we should all remember it was certain leaders of the Communist or Socialist states that used their armed forces against their more peaceful neighbors. So the defensive nature of the United States-Japan security relationship goes back to the very beginning of that relationship and this, of course, will not change. We simply want to protect our countries and our people against any threats from the outside.
One of the major elements in the security arrangement has been the so-called American "nuclear umbrella." The United States has made it clear that any use of nuclear weapons against Japan would be answered in kind. While encouraging steps have been taken by the United States and the Soviet Union to reduce the dangers of nuclear war and, indeed, to reduce the nuclear arsenals themselves, nuclear weapons remain a fact of life. Both the Soviet Union and the United States have large amounts of various kinds of nuclear weapons and this will continue to be true for some years to come. In addition, other countries possess or plan to possess atomic or hydrogen bombs. These include, of course, China, Great Britain, and France. We cannot rule out the possibility of these bombs or other types of nuclear arms being used at some future date. As we move toward a more peaceful international climate and toward negotiated settlements of a number of the world's major problems, we can hope and perhaps expect that the dangers of nuclear war will continue to recede. But these dangers are not yet over and the assurance of a "nuclear umbrella" is a necessary part of Japan-United States security arrangements. We must continue to make it clear that no nation, however great or small, or no group of nations will be able to exercise the threat of nuclear blackmail over Japan and/or the United States.

In terms of weapons of horror, we need not, however, only be concerned about nuclear arms. In most recent years and months we have seen the continued development and use of chemical weapons. During the Iran-Iraq War the chemical weapon came into its own. More recently, we see the possibility of the manufacture of poisonous gases by Libya. These weapons are dangerous to the whole of the civilized world and the presence of them in the hands of those who are known to have no compunction about using them can only be of the gravest of concerns. While we have witnessed them in use during a war situation, they can also be utilized
in a terrorist attack. This necessitates that the United States and Japan be able to act in
concert to make it clear to potential users of such weapons that we will not countenance such
use.

I have written so far about the more exotic forms of weapons of destruction that the
world faces, but we must also look at the so-called "conventional weapons." As in the case of
nuclear weapons, the Soviet Union and the United States have been engaged for years in talks
about ways to cut back on the conventional weapons that each possesses. President Bush has
made certain, rather extraordinary, suggestions for reducing the forces of both the United States
and the Soviet Union in Europe, specifically, outside of the territorial limits of each country.
The Soviet Union has agreed to take a close look at these proposals and President Gorbachev
has made his own proposals. Most important of all, a number of East European nations are
seeking withdrawal of all Soviet forces from their territories within a matter of months. We can
hope that at the summit conference in the summer between President Bush and President
Gorbachev a compact will be concluded that will begin well-coordinated and verifiable Soviet
and United States troop reductions in Europe during this year.

With all of these hopeful signs, however, it is unquestioned that the Soviet Union will
have, for many years to come, massive conventional weaponry at its disposal. While the Soviet
Union under President Gorbachev does not at this time seem to have any desire or wish to use
its military power to achieve political ends or to further political goals, so long as such great
military strength exists we must be prepared to balance it so that no temptations are placed in
front of the Soviet leadership. The Soviet Union still has much more force than it needs for
purely defensive purposes. Some future leadership could put this to uses other than that
perhaps contemplated by the current Kremlin leaders.
In Asia, the Soviet Union has substantial military forces in place, both nuclear and conventional. There is no reason to believe that these forces are being reduced in any substantial manner or that the modernization of Soviet weaponry in the Asia-Pacific region is not continuing apace. Everything indicates otherwise. While the Soviet Union may indeed be reducing its military strength in Camranh Bay in Vietnam, it is not moving these forces out of the Pacific region nor demobilizing them. The Soviet Pacific Fleet is formidable, in particular its submarine component.

And we would be foolhardy not to understand that President Gorbachev's goal is to strengthen not weaken the Soviet Union. He wants to build a Soviet Union that can better compete in the world of the late twentieth century. This means the Soviet economy has got to be strengthened by importing techniques, investment, and technology from the developed world. It also means sustaining Soviet military might with a more compact, less unwieldy military structure and establishment. We see the implementation of this policy in the Pacific and Asian region as the Soviet Union has moved to normalize its relations with China and seek broader and deeper economic and trade relations with Japan and the Republic of Korea, at the same time as it upgrades its Asian and Pacific military forces through making available to them the most up-to-date equipment. Small shifts of troops greater distances from the Chinese border or out of Mongolia have little meaning for Soviet strategy. In political and psychological terms, when the Soviet Union pulls back its ground forces from the border with China, say, or reduces the number of ships it has in Camranh Bay, the neighbors of the Soviet Union breathe a little easier. However, a point that cannot be forgotten is that while we may accept the Soviet assurances that Moscow now has no intention of threatening anyone and no intention of beginning any kind of military action against another country, as I have written earlier, we must
also accept the proposition that Moscow has the military capability to so threaten if it would decide to do so. The will may not be there, but the weapons are. Therefore, until the military arm of the Soviet Union is drastically reduced, it is imperative that the military balance, in both strategic and conventional terms, be at the forefront of the minds of policymakers in the democratic world.

When the United States-Japan Security Treaty was ratified in 1965, America was strong and rich and Japan was, relatively speaking, fragile and just entering the period of growing prosperity. There was no sense of equality between the two nations at that time. Many Japanese commentators of that day spoke of the Japanese-United States relationship in Confucian terms, the United States was the elder brother and Japan was the younger brother. The United States took the leading role, so to speak, and Japan was a secondary player. But there is a difference in perception today. The United States is still a powerful country, in all the ways that one defines power. In a military sense, the United States when measured against the Soviet Union, its nearest competitor, is stronger by far. In an economic sense, the United States, though now a debtor nation, has the largest economy in the world, approximately some 6 trillion dollars a year. In a political sense, there is no country that carries the weight in world councils as does the United States. One simply has to look at the recent dramatic events in Eastern Europe to see how true this is and to listen to the statements of newly emerging democratic leaders in these countries extolling the United States as the beacon of democracy that kept their hopes alive during the darkest periods of Communist repression and fear. While the United States may no longer be the predominant world power, it is certainly the leading one—as perhaps best understood by the phrase "first among equals."

Japan's position in the international community has risen dramatically over the past 30
years since the Japan-United States Security Treaty came into force. Today Japan ranks as the second economic power in the world with an economy of some 2 trillion dollars, with the prospect of major increases in GNP over the next several years. Japan is the world's largest creditor nation and provides larger amounts of overseas aid than any other country. In defense terms, Japan has a very respectable military complex, entirely armed with conventional weapons. In political terms, Japan has more and more influence in the international arena. What Japan has to say about any given issue is listened to by world leaders with great care. The trip by Prime Minister Kaifu to Eastern Europe and by Mr. Shintaro Abe to the Soviet Union symbolizes the growing Japanese commitment to a global role.

In seeking markets around the world, Japan and the United States emerge in intense competition. In more cases than not, the Japanese companies win out over their American competitors. We must anticipate that this vying for world-wide markets will continue. After all both the United States and Japan are free enterprise, Capitalist societies and the continued strength and viability of such societies rests upon competition. Some United States companies complain that Japanese business firms and the Japanese government work together to further Japanese success in reaching lucrative business deals in foreign countries and take unfair advantage of their American counterparts. Whether or not this is true, it is also a fact that United States industrial concerns spend most of their time and effort in building up their domestic sales in the United States. After all, the United States market is, by far, the largest market in the world and this will be true for some time to come. American business does not exert the large amount of time and effort needed to secure sales abroad. They do very well indeed in the United States alone. And, of course, so does Japan do well in the United States market. The continuing strength of the United States market and the demand of the American
consumer for all kinds of quality goods, whether foreign or domestic in origin, is a reflection of the basic excellent health of the United States economy and the belief of businesses, United States and foreign, that this will be the case in the future as well.

As Japan’s economic power increases, and as the United States moves to bring down its budget deficit, there will be more questions raised about why Japan does not do more in "burden sharing" in the area of defense. The United States spends about 6 percent of its GNP on defense, while Japan spends only about 1 percent of its GNP. "What kind of burden sharing is that?" ask many members of the United States Congress and even some in the United States administration. But if we look at the record, Japan has made a real contribution to the common defense objectives of both countries as stated in the Mutual Security Treaty of 1960 and as reiterated on numerous occasions by the highest officials of the two countries.

Japan has increased its support of United States forces in Japan to between $2.5 to $3 billion a year. This is the most generous host nation support arrangement that the United States has anywhere in the world. The United States has said on many recent occasions that Japan should assume an even greater share of support costs for United States forces in Japan. This would help the United States in bringing down its budget deficit, which as Japan points out is a major cause of the trade imbalance between the two countries that, in turn, has been responsible for the increasing acerbity in United States-Japanese relations.

Japanese defense spending has increased over 5 percent a year in real terms for well over a decade. This is considerably above the NATO goal of some 3 percent. Japan’s defense budget approaching $40 billion ranks Japan fifth in the world in defense spending and second among the non-nuclear powers. The United States will continue to urge Japan to maintain its defense budget increases, as is being done for the current year of 1990.
Japan has the primary goal of defending its territory, seas, and skies and sea lanes out to 1,000 nautical miles. Friendly countries accept Japan's defense-oriented military buildup but would be concerned if Japan had offensive power or began to play a regional security role. History, constitutional restraints, potential concerns of neighbors, and the fact that Japan's conventional defense role is neither global nor regional realistically limit what Japan should do in strictly military terms. Japan has, however, agreed to assume greater responsibility in supporting common security issues of the developed world and has done so particularly by increasing its assistance to developing countries in a substantial manner, as I have written earlier.

Also, as we discuss "burden sharing" we should remember that United States deployments in Japan are not there simply for Japan's defense. They are there to serve broad strategic interests. From bases in Japan, the United States 7th Fleet ensures security in the Pacific and as far away as the Persian Gulf. The 3rd Marines in Okinawa can respond rapidly to contingencies that may arise elsewhere in Asia and the Pacific region.

Some commentators in Japan and the United States say that the security treaty is an important factor in checking a resurgence of Japanese militarism and, therefore, is contributing to the maintenance of stability in Northeast Asia. I do not personally subscribe to this point of view. I see no evidence of the revival of militarism in Japan and see no rational reason why this should occur. Japan is doing too well without a unilateral military establishment and her security needs are well taken care of within the terms of the Mutual Security Treaty. Certainly this seems to be the view of the large majority of the Japanese people and also of its political leadership.

As we move into the 1990s there may very well be some changes in the size,
development, and stationing of United States forces in Japan. This change will come about as a result of a less threatening international environment and budgetary requirements in the United States. But whatever these alterations they must take place after joint discussions, negotiations, and agreement between the United States and Japan. They should not, in my view, be unilateral in nature. And I also believe that they should occur within the frame of the current Japan-United States Mutual Security Treaty. In other words, it is essential that the United States and Japan not weaken in their determination to stand together in the area of defense and in their determination to work together for peace and stability in an unstable, but hopefully, more peaceful world. Together, the United States and Japan can accomplish miracles. They have proved this in common endeavors in the past and at present. As momentous events take place in our world, now is not the time to consider weakening our alliance, but, to the contrary, now is the time to fashion new modes of global cooperation for the benefit of our two peoples and societies and for the peoples of the world.