

prosperity and possibly democracy. Japan simply as profiteer or partner, mainly in racial chauvinism, with China could help bring about another world war.

Southeast Asian nations, released from the Vietnam war, will sink into new quagmires if Communist partisans advance from Hanoi and champions of right-wing "discipline" prevail in Djakarta, Manila and even Bangkok. But Thailand is taking an

enlightened approach to popular and the potential for co-operative constructive endeavour by China, and the United States in economic and military fields is high.

The positive elements listed while they have not yet taken shape offer the distinct possibility of a realistic, more hopeful era for Asia years ahead.

Ocean of opportunity?

The Pacific concept in foreign policy

By H. Edward English

During the past eight years, the high policy of the United States in the Western Pacific, for the most part supported by the other industrially-developed countries of the area, has collapsed in the shambles of Vietnam. Efforts at new initiatives in the area have focused on China, and may be said to have ended the unrealistic policies of the past, if not to have established any clearly constructive trends. Meanwhile, both the Chinese and other more global U.S. initiatives have neglected and even offended America's most important Pacific ally, Japan. No one supposes that a warm welcome for Hirohito is an adequate compensation.

In Washington and elsewhere, one thing is now widely accepted — that in the Pacific, whatever the objectives, the most important arenas of policy-making are economic in nature. Japan and Southeast

Asia are still among the most powerful forces in world trade. Collectively the region undoubtedly possesses the unrealized potential for the next generation of trading opportunities, sphere of international private and (aid) investment, the region has several unique features — particularly size of opportunities, relative to most other developing countries, receptivity and pragmatism of the part of most of the countries of the area. Two important questions remain: can be done better to identify and advantage of these opportunities? what extent is it necessary or desirable to think or operate in Pacific region rather than through the maze of international relations that is the inevitable result?

To deal with these questions it is instructive to recount the story of a group, mainly of academic and government economists, who have met several times during the past eight years — at Tokyo (1968, 1973), once each in Honolulu (1969), Sydney (1970), Taipei (1971), Mexico City (1974), and London (1975). The group, called Pacific Trade and Development Commission (PTDC), has attempted to define the nature of Pacific area economic relations and the opportunities for mutual operation.

The origin of the conference is itself of interest. A major role was

Dr. English is Director of the Centre of Canadian Studies at the School of Advanced International Studies, Johns Hopkins University. Before assuming that position, he was Director of the School of International Affairs at Carleton University. Professor English has written widely on economic policy and foreign affairs. His recent books include Telecommunications for Canada and Canada and the Wider Economic Community. He has also contributed to forthcoming works on Canada-U.S. relations. The views expressed in this article are those of the author.