

substantial limitations, particularly concerning the questions left unasked in our 'cooperative security' and 'open regionalism' policy perspectives.

I want to turn now to two dimensions of Australia's new policy agenda with this theme in mind. The first centres on the contribution of Gareth Evans, the former Foreign Minister in the Keating government, in many ways the architect of the 'cooperative security' perspective and someone who deserves great credit for the intellectual energy he brought to the Foreign Affairs portfolio. Evan's more immediate significance is that his major analytical work Cooperating For Peace (1995) represents the most intellectually worked-out statement of the new foreign policy approach to 'cooperative security' in the 1990s. The second dimension I explore here concerns the major focus of Australia's current foreign policy - the Asia/Pacific region - but it concentrates on the silenced other side of the 'open regionalism' policy and some of the themes and issues left out of official and mainstream representations of that policy and its goals. In regard to both of these foreign policy dimensions I argue that Australia is forsaking the opportunity for more innovative and less dangerous approaches to the world, primarily because its claims for new world insight remain firmly embedded in old world (Westphalian) mind-sets.

The Westphalian Model and Australia (2) The Convergence Thesis and 'Cooperating For Peace'

The nature and significance of the 'cooperative security' policy and Evans' contribution to it is best appreciated in the context of Australia's more traditional approach to global affairs. Here, the linkages to the Westphalian model sketched out in the first section of the paper and to the English School articulation of it are most explicit. Australia's traditional foreign policy perspective is familiar enough in this regard. The defining feature of modern global life is taken to be the classical security dilemma, brought on by the actions of states existing in an anarchical environment and following their national interest defined as power. Australia's security dilemma is even starker in this regard - as an isolated and vulnerable Western society in constant danger from alien forces and unable to defend itself. Australia's national interest is best served, therefore, by recourse to the major strategy of traditional power politics - alliance balancing - and the protection of a great and powerful friend. Until WW2 this protector was Great Britain, the 'old country' for the Anglophile majority and the cultural heartland of Government and intellectual elites.

Since 1942, when it became clear that Britain was neither able nor willing to defend Australia should the Japanese continue their southward surge, the USA has been the