

attempt by the Mongolians to develop an independent diplomatic profile in Asia Pacific. This double evolution was evident in Ulan Bator's changing stance on regional security issues. At the time of the Second Vladivostok Conference in September 1990, Mongolia fully supported the Soviet Union's regional security agenda, an attitude which led many observers to discount Mongolia's own 1989 initiative to establish an eight country forum (Mongolia, USSR, USA, China, North and South Korea, Japan, and Canada) to create:

"A mechanism of political dialogue between the countries of the region as well as the development of effective and mutually advantageous cooperation in the fields of economy, science and technology, culture and education, ecology and humanitarian links."¹⁰

After hosting a small regional security conference in Ulan Bator in the fall of 1990, and participating in the Second Vladivostok Conference and the Canadian North Pacific Cooperative Security Dialogue (NPCSD) Colloquium in April 1991, there appeared a hiatus in Mongolian strategic thinking. Ulan Bator, understandably preoccupied by domestic concerns, now seems to place emphasis on being a consultative party rather than an initiator of policy.¹¹

Australia

Australian strategic thinkers have for some time been concerned with political, economic and social trends in Asia Pacific; particularly about the potential for a power vacuum to develop which emerging regional powers may seek to fill. An additional concern was the increased sophistication of weapons being acquired by countries in the region and the emergence of new sub-regional power relationships. The latter development was seen as a result of a reduced American security profile in Asia Pacific. Under Foreign Ministers Bill Haydon and, later, Gareth Evans, Australia had also embarked on a more activist foreign policy agenda designed to raise Canberra's profile in the region and to prove Australia's credentials as an Asia Pacific country.

In his 12 August 1987 speech to the Conference on Security and Arms Control in the North Pacific,¹² Foreign Minister Haydon suggested the time was ripe for regional CBMs, serious examination of naval arms limitations proposals, and "a superpower dialogue on Pacific issues". This speech was followed by a number of semi-official conferences and seminars dealing specifically with Asia Pacific and North Pacific military CBMs. On 27 July 1990, Foreign Minister Evans submitted to the International Herald Tribune an article entitled "What Asia Needs is a Europe-Style CSCA" which included the statement: