

position in APEC (rather than in an ASEAN-PMC, CSCA, or NPCSD framework) to influence the security agenda; that participation by the USSR and Indo-China could be timed to coincide with Western interests. The down side of this approach is that ASEAN may well view any such proposal as running directly contrary to ASEAN's stated preferences, which have received public support from both Australia and Japan, and that China (who with Hong Kong and "Chinese Taipei" have recently become members of APEC) may be unwilling to see the three Chinas involved in multilateral security issues. The United States may well determine that its interests would be best served if it was to support, or at least not to criticize, the ASEAN-PMC forum idea.

Conclusions

It appears that Asia Pacific (or at least Southeast Asia and the North Pacific) will soon be engaged in a formal multilateral dialogue which will consider both traditional and non-traditional security issues. No one country can take credit for this. The Soviet Union, by its handling of relations with the United States more than its various Asia Pacific initiatives, contributed most to the relaxation of tensions in the region. The initiatives by Mongolia and Korea show that countries often considered peripheral (the dangers of the DMZ notwithstanding) can play a catalytic role in regional affairs. And Canberra and Ottawa can each claim authorship of many of the principles taken on board by ASEAN. Japan, while slow and appearing at times inflexible in the past, has accepted that open discussion of Japanese security concerns is, for its neighbours, a serious and far-reaching CBM. The participation of the United States, the paramount military, economic, and diplomatic power in Asia Pacific, will be essential to the success of the emerging regional cooperative security dialogue.

V North Pacific Multilateral Institutional Cooperation

The seven countries of the North Pacific share membership in fifteen multilateral institutions (see annex) yet the sub-region remains virtually undefined in institutional terms, particularly in comparison with the South Asia, South East Asia, and South Pacific sub-regions, and with the Asia Pacific region as a whole.

Only two international governmental institutions are designed specifically to address North Pacific issues. Of these, the International North Pacific Fisheries Commission, is comprised of only three countries (the United States, Japan, Canada) while the North Pacific Maritime Sciences Organisation (PICES), was established only in 1990. In contrast, international governmental institutions span a number of functional areas in each of the neighbouring Asia Pacific sub-regions.

Most regional international governmental institutions in which the North Pacific countries are members include a significant number of countries from outside the sub-region, and no institution includes all of the seven North Pacific states. Many are