

typified by the NAACP leadership's efforts must join together now around the forthcoming Bonn Summit to ensure that we avoid the alternatives of a deep world depression and probable thermonuclear war. If these

forces cease vacillating, and join openly with me now, we have the best chance we have had since World War II to win the peace and to secure the next century for ourselves and our posterity.

Miki: Bonn Summit Must Take Responsibility For Entire World Economy

On July 3 Takeo Miki, Japan's Prime Minister from November 1974 to December 1976, gave this news service his views on the "perspectives for the Bonn summit" in an exclusive interview.

Miki is best known in the West for the international development proposals which he brought to the fall 1975 Rambouillet summit, proposals which were a precedent for those Japan is bringing to Bonn. These included: (1) joint development of fusion power; (2) a new international body to fund and coordinate capital-intensive development projects in the developing countries; and (3) willingness to seriously consider developing-country proposals for moratoria on international debt. These proposals were made in coordination with many of the businessmen who promoted the Pacific Basin development proposal (for details, see our Japan coverage in our SPECIAL REPORT).

Today, Miki's deputy in his faction of the ruling Liberal-Democratic Party, Toshio Komoto, is Minister of International Trade and Industry. Komoto has played a leading role in pushing Japan to fight for joint development efforts at the Bonn summit, including the Mitsubishi proposal and Premier Fukuda's earlier proposal for joint research on fusion power.

The interview was conducted during Miki's trip to Sweden by Clifford Gaddy and Joseph Cohen of our Stockholm bureau.

Q: In view of your own previous advocacy of fusion energy and of global cooperation in that field, do you regard the energy question in general and fusion in particular as as urgent today as at the time you advanced your proposals in the international context?

Miki: Of course you know that I am not in government and therefore all the opinions that I will express will be purely my own.

At the risk of stating the obvious, if I confine my remarks to the situation surrounding Japan, Japan does not have any oil and yet she is a highly industrialized society. Therefore, the question of energy is of vital importance, and no other country in the world is as dependent on energy as Japan.

Now with respect to oil, again as you know, Japan has to depend upon external sources of oil to almost 100 percent. Therefore, it is not only in the interests of the entire world, but perhaps also in the selfish interests of Japan that the Middle East situation should be brought to a successful settlement, because Japan is chiefly

dependent on Mideast oil. And that is an area in which Japan should cooperate with the rest of the world to solve the crisis situation in the Mideast.

And, at the end of this month, I am planning to visit the Middle East to explore possible avenues for whatever Japan might be able to do to resolve this question.

Now, the second area is of course coal. And new technologies for gasification and liquification of coal should be developed. Japan produces only about 20 million tons of coal annually, which means we will have to continue to import most of our coal.

The third area perhaps is, as you indicated, nuclear. We have been trying to do our best to develop nuclear power, but the level of public understanding of the need for such development is far from adequate and this calls for greater effort to secure better public understanding of the necessity of nuclear generation in the future. *(Japan currently has 14 units of nuclear power generation in operation, producing 8 million kilowatts of energy — ed.)*

The fourth area perhaps — although this is somewhat in the remote future — is the discovery of possibility for generation of alternative sources of energy such as the better use of solar energy and so on.

Q: Referring to your comment on the Mideast: In our view one of the most constructive approaches to the Mideast problem is the simple, almost self-evident statement that any peace in the Mideast will have to be based on the economic development of the area, utilizing Israeli know-how together with Arab manpower and liquidity. At the same time, this will require outside participation, specifically of the industrialized countries of Western Europe, the United States, and Japan. Will your talks with Mideast representatives also follow this approach?

Miki: My trip is going to be an "exploratory" one, so to speak, now that I am no longer in government. I am going to meet with several Arab leaders to find out what they have in mind as to the possible avenue for the settlement of the Mideast situation, including, yes, discussions along the lines that you suggested.

Several years ago, immediately after the oil crisis, I toured the Mideast — I was Deputy Prime Minister at that time — and I personally am acquainted with all the Arab leaders there. So I'm going to deepen my discussions with them.

Q: Further on this energy question, what is your view of the necessity and the perspectives of the development

of oil in Siberia, both with the Soviets and together with other capitalist countries?

Miki: We did engage in negotiations with the Soviets on oil resources in Siberia, in the Tyumen area for instance. But our negotiations turned out to be abortive, and no concrete plans were laid out for Japan to participate in the development of oil resources there.

In respect to natural gas, yes, we did engage and still are engaged in negotiations there.

Admittedly, Siberia abounds with oil, yet we are not totally convinced as to the exact amount of the oil deposits there and the possibility of their development.

Q: Was then the reason for the stalling of the negotiations one of the hesitance from the Japanese side as to the economic feasibility of the deal rather than anything to do with political considerations?

Miki: Not necessarily political complications. The basic reason was that we were not assured of the amount that the Russians would supply us.

Q: On the question of global development: Some people have, in discussing models of development, pointed to the obvious success of Japan's own economic development in past decades and indicated that there are lessons to be drawn for developing countries today. They refer specifically to the concentration on high-technology development in both industry and agriculture, etc. Would you support this view?

Miki: It may appear to the outsider that Japan has made spectacular economic and industrial strides over the past two to three decades. But I would say that it has taken over a century to bring the economic might of Japan to what it is today.

At the very beginning we expended a great deal of effort and time and energy on the development of agriculture, and later on, on the development of agriculture-related light industry. And then, still later, heavy and chemical industry.

So this has been a long, drawn out process. And considering the fact that each nation differs from other nations in various manners, I wonder if the past developmental pattern in Japan could be applied to other nations. So I don't think that the wholesale "dumping" so to speak of the Japanese model on other developing countries might or might not be valid.

Also, at the very beginning of Japan's process of modernization, the Japanese government did earmark disproportionate sums of money for education. And I think we in contemporary Japan are terribly indebted to our forefathers for their foresight in placing such a high priority on mass education. We are now reaping the fruits of those efforts in the area of education, mass education, that is.

Of course, developing countries in today's world need not repeat the same long, drawn out process of industrialization that Japan has gone through. There are many benefits that do exist today that did not exist in those days for developing countries. And yet, the situation varies from one country to the other. Considering this, I wonder if the Japanese experience could be applicable to all of the developing countries. We don't like to give the impression that Japan is exporting a model for the rest of the world to copycat.

Q: There are clearly divergent approaches being suggested for the development of the Third World sector. One broad group — ranging from "leftists" to old-style imperialists — claim that labor-intensive development is the only suitable model for the developing sector: They can't "handle" advanced technology, etc. The other view is the direct opposite: That development is most effective when it centers on "nuclei" of the highest technology available, with the effects then radiating out to the society as a whole. What's your view on this?

Miki: I wouldn't subscribe to an "either/or" approach to this sort of question. I'm a good oriental, and I am a great believer in "both/and." That is to say, labor-intensive industries should be given emphasis in developing countries in that there, labor-intensive industries may be more competitive than the labor-intensive industries of developed countries. Therefore, the developing countries should take full advantage of the competitive edge that their labor-intensive industries may have over the labor-intensive industries of the developed nations.

But, nonetheless, this does not rule out, in my opinion, the possibility of developing countries engaging in modern, technology-intensive industry. And for understandable political and other reasons, the leaders of developing countries are now trying to expedite the process of modernization and industrialization, carrying out prestige projects, for very understandable reasons. And to this end, I think it will be very important for developed countries to render technological and economic assistance to the developing countries.

In the good old days, when Japan was on the road to becoming an industrialized nation, the one or the other, the "either/or" approach might have been possible, but the "either/or" approach is no longer possible in this day and age, when the pace of change is so rapid and exposure to developed countries on the part of developing countries is so full.

I think it would be egotistical of the developed countries to impose *only* labor-intensive industry on developing countries, because labor-intensive industries in the developing countries simply mean taking advantage of lower wage levels, and the perpetuation of lower wage levels and inferior working conditions would naturally incur anger and frustration on the part of the developing countries.

I think that human history is moving in the direction of eventual equalization of levels between different countries, and I think that the developing countries should also be given the opportunity not only of taking advantage of their lower wage scales but also of earning more value-added to whatever commodities they turn out.

Q: Let me conclude by asking how you, on the basis of your own past experience of previous summits, see the perspectives for the upcoming summit meeting in Bonn on July 16-17?

Miki: I personally attach much utility and importance to summit conferences such as the one in Bonn. The reason being that, after all, the seven nations represent a little over 50 percent of total world trade, including the communist world, and again the seven countries

represent over 60 percent of the gross national product on a worldwide basis. As such, these seven nations do assume a very important, vital role in the world economy as a whole. And I think that these seven nations should hold themselves responsible not only for their own national economies but also for the entire world economy.

And this, I think, is especially relevant and important in these days of increasing mutual dependency. What I think is extremely important for the seven leaders to keep in mind is that the world economy should not be geared in the direction of shrinkage but that it should be geared in the direction of expansion, and that with this broad target in mind, the aim must be to stem the tide of protectionism and to devise more effective means of aid to the developing countries.

Therefore, to repeat, I personally attach much importance to summits such as the one in Bonn.

Now, a second value of such forums would be for top leaders to get acquainted with one another, in informal circumstances as well as in the formal meetings. If these leaders can, among themselves, develop a sense of trust and credibility, then this in itself will represent a kind of "early warning system" in the event that negative tendencies do arise.

Of course, I'm not implying that previous summits

have not functioned in this manner, but I simply want to underline that these aspects are especially important to be continued and developed.

Q: Recognizing, then, this function of the "early warning system" against negative tendencies, would you say that the time has now arrived for summitry to go beyond this stage? That is, that such meetings must serve as forums for positive, constructive cooperation in the spirit of the "Grand Design" as I outlined in the beginning?

Miki: I do not know if summitry is actually moving in this direction, but I am convinced that this is the way it should go. All effort should be made today to avoid a situation as we had in the 1930s, where each country tended to confine itself and shrink from global cooperation. This blunder must not be repeated.

Therefore, these leaders at the summit today, representing as they do such a high proportion of the world economy, should hold themselves personally responsible for the state of the world economy. They are really morally obligated to feel that. Of course, the question of the restoration of the world economy is not only their responsibility. But nonetheless, as I said, representing as they do such a high proportion of the world economy, they should really do their best to avoid the blunder that we jointly committed back in the 1930s.

U.S. Labor Party Convention: Rule The World With Reason

The agenda for the upcoming economic summit of the industrialized capitalist nations was derived from the U.S. Labor Party's well known program — nuclear power, high-technological development, and the industrialization of the Third World. This was one of the major themes struck during the party's June 30-July 1 weekend National Convention, as Labor Party National Chairman and presidential candidate Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. told 500 delegates and party supporters that the international financial and political currents leading into the Bonn Summit have been significantly shaped by the USLP's "international network of reason."

"We rule the world," said LaRouche during his keynote address in New York City, "not as dictators, not as tyrants, but by reason. We have created the most important network in the history of humanity — an international network of reason. Like Italy, Mexico, Germany, and as the Arabs are now doing, reason begins to rule international relations. The Grand Design is the way to bring the world to reason."

By bringing the world's populations to willful use of reason, the Labor Party will lay the basis for putting Lyndon H. LaRouche into the White House in 1981. That was the determination resolved at the Party's National convention.

This conference, titled "The Humanist Purpose of America," established that if the global Grand Design is to be realized, Lyndon LaRouche must be in the White House in 1981. The alternative, LaRouche stated in his opening address to the conference, is World War III. "The process of the Bonn summit," the world leader said, "has occurred because the countries of western Europe and Japan perceive this danger of war. At the highest levels, there is an understanding that the world faces two options in the immediate future: The implementation of the Grand Design must in fact become irreversible this year in order to secure the world from war. Twice in our century, the failure of those forces who knew what had to be done and yet failed to act, led to the process of World War I and World War II.

"The British monarchy is the jewel of everything that has been wretched during the past 3,000 years of Mediterranean-centered civilization. The monarchy is insisting on maintaining its feudal utopia in its historical alliance with usurious tax farmers speculating on the debts of nations. Who are the allies of this parasitical landlord class and its financial bankers? The declassé middle class, the urban rabble, the liberals, the environmentalists, and the rural idiots. This is the social composition of *fascism*, the forces shaped by the oligarchy over the centuries, and now by the British crown,