

TOWARD A PACIFIC COMMUNITY

— Who Will Take the Initiative? —

Yozo Yokota

I Introduction

Much has been written in the past two decades on the economic side of the desirability for the creation of some kind of a regional international organization for the Pacific region.⁽¹⁾ Many economic experts on the topic seem to agree that there are good reasons to justify the establishment of a regional international organization of some type for the Pacific area.⁽²⁾

They seem to argue along the following line:⁽³⁾

- a) There has been an impressive economic growth in the Pacific region since the end of World War II whether taken by individual Pacific country or taken by the region as a whole.
- b) There has also been a tremendous move toward higher economic interdependence in the region.
- c) The economic growth and interdependence in the region are expected to continue at a high rate in the future years.
- d) Such economic growth and the increase of intra-regional trade have been, and will continue to be, restricted by the lack of coordination of economic and trade policy among the Pacific countries, oft-asserted claim of self-interest in the name of national sovereignty and independence by the Pacific countries, and the well-coordinated pressure and advance of other economic groupings such as the European Communities, Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (Comecon) and Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC).
- e) In order to overcome such restriction and to achieve a higher level of

coordination and cooperation among the Pacific countries, there is a need to create some kind of institutional scheme.

As the case described above sounded attractive and convincing, the proposal to create a regional international economic organization for the Pacific area has drawn considerable attention, in some cases accompanying moral and material support, of high level government officials in Japan (Miyazawa, Nakasone, Miki, Ohira), Australia (Fraser, Hawke) and other Pacific countries.⁽⁴⁾

However, apart from the moral and some financial support for the general concept of the Pacific community, no concrete initiative has yet been taken by the responsible governments in the region to propose a plan for such a Pacific organization or a plan to hold an international conference to draw up its charter.

In fact, the economists have gone far enough to propose a concrete outline of a possible Pacific organization.⁽⁵⁾ This proposal is still sketchy and does not define in detail the membership, objectives, functions, organs, powers, operations, voting and other decision-making procedures, etc., that are usually included in the final treaty establishing an international organization. It however serves as a good starting point for negotiations between governments concerned which will eventually produce the final draft of such a treaty.

In other words, it seems that the economists have done their homework and now it is time for those in political power to initiate action. Yet, little is being done by such people other than giving general endorsement for the Pacific community concept in any of the Pacific countries.

This fact reminds us of a hard fact in life that ideals, however good they may be, are usually difficult to attain in actuality. To be concrete, we know that, in order to eradicate war and maintain peace, it is best to have one world government through which all conflicts and problems can be resolved without resorting to naked physical power. Yet, it took centuries to achieve the creation of the United Nations which is far short of ideal as a central authority of the world. If we note further that it took almost half a century to create a regional organization for the Americas, that the much celebrated development of the European Com-

munities since the early 50's seems to be facing a number of difficult institutional problems today, and that the Central American and East African regional institutions, which were once considered as successful examples of institutional collaboration, are almost defunct, we realize that it is not an easy task to achieve even a minimum level of organizational set-up for the Pacific region.

In fact, once acclaimed regionalism appears to be facing a serious drawback today not only because of the failure or stagnation of some of the leading regional organizations, but also because of the theoretical difficulty the functionalism (and neo-functionalism),⁽⁶⁾ which gave all the justification for regionalism, is undergoing. To put it more bluntly, it is now being seriously questioned whether a regional grouping is a helpful step to achieve world peace, stability and progress or a harmful barrier for a universal harmony.⁽⁷⁾

We should not, however, be discouraged by the harsh reality regionalism is undergoing today, because, despite all the difficulties, we are observing the sound development of various types of international organizations — whether universal or regional, whether general or functional.⁽⁸⁾ What we should avoid is the two extremes of optimism and pessimism when dealing with the regional institutional collaboration in the Pacific. What we should learn from the experiences of other international organizations are that: (a) The creation of an international organization is a complex matter involving political leadership, social, cultural and historical backgrounds and, to some extent, an element of luck and chance. A simple theoretical justification, whether moral, political, economic, or scientific, would not be sufficient to realize its establishment; (b) In many cases, the establishment of an international organization does not ensure its success and future structural development. It usually requires equal, if not more, amount of efforts and enthusiasm given to its creation, in order to sustain its organization and development; (c) In order for an international organization to be successful in its activities, it is important to find adequate area and power for operational activities — by which we mean proper function of the organization by itself through mainly the provision of goods and services rather

than the regulation of the activities of the member states.⁹¹

With these points in mind, we may conclude that a regional economic organization in the Pacific is not only theoretically desirable but also practically feasible if adequate initiatives are taken by the governments concerned and if the character of the proposed organization is pragmatically determined.

II Who Are the Possible Initiators?

Among the tens of countries in the Pacific region, only a few are potential candidates for taking the initiative for the creation of a Pacific organization. Japan and Australia, which are economically more influential in the region and which have in the past demonstrated conspicuous interest in the creation of a Pacific organization, would come as front-runners. The United States, which is economically and politically powerful and deeply involved in the Pacific affairs, and which has in recent years shown growing interest in the concept of Pacific community,⁹² would not be far behind. Canada and New Zealand, although important and certainly indispensable members of a Pacific organization if it is once created, would not be the potential initiators for its creation because of relatively smaller involvement in the Pacific matters historically (Canada) or smaller economic size (New Zealand).

The ASEAN countries have in recent years attained economic and political recognition through their concerted actions but, when taken as individual nations, their power of influence, economically or politically, would be relatively limited. As far as Papua New Guinea, Fiji and other Pacific island countries are concerned, their power of influence would be more limited and, although they may be almost certainly candidates for membership in a possible Pacific organization, would not be in the position to take initiative for its creation.

There are other countries of substantial size which could be included in the broader concept of the Pacific region, such as China, Soviet Union, North and South Korea, Mexico, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru and Chile. Depending upon the nature of the proposed organization, they could also be members of a Pacific community organization. Nevertheless,

because of their historical, political and geographical ties to other regions or groupings, and in some cases (like Korea), because of the political difficulty, they are not in the position to propose and promote the creation of a Pacific organization, at least for the time being.

Accordingly, it appears that Japan, Australia and the United States are in the best position to take some sort of initiative for the realization of a Pacific community organization. Among these three countries, however, we consider Australia as the best and probably most likely candidate for assuming the leading role in the creation of a Pacific community for a number of reasons.

First of all, the United States, a giant in the Pacific area politically as well as economically, is more than just a Pacific country and it would be difficult for her to commit to and concentrate on the Pacific matters alone in her foreign policy in view of her political and economic position in the world, her historical ties to other regional groupings (particularly in the Americas) and diversity of interests within the American political and business worlds. Although we know that there is a growing awareness among the leading Americans that "[i]t is out here in the Pacific and Asia where the great potential for American overseas development will take place,"¹¹ it is doubtful if the United States would focus in her foreign policy on the creation of, and commitment to, a Pacific economic organization in the near future.¹²

Secondly, Japan, whilst she is clearly an economic power in the Pacific region and finds a greater need for an institutional collaboration in the region, will not assume a leading role alone in creating a Pacific organization. The reasons are multiple: (a) Japan has historically been receptive in her foreign policy and has rarely taken active part in the formulation of international order, whether universally or regionally;¹³ (b) After the failure of the military expansionism in the pre-World War II period, Japan has been particularly sensitive toward the criticism of her aggressive role in Asia; (c) Following the generally accepted principle of equi-distance diplomacy (which is not always strictly adhered to), Japan tries to avoid any confrontation with any neighbouring countries which might consider a Pacific organization unacceptable or even hostile;

and (d) Japan's economic interest has grown far beyond the Pacific region (in a sense, Japan is a world power in economic terms)¹⁶ and it would be difficult to attain consensus among the politicians and business leaders in Japan toward Japan's taking a concrete leading role in the creation of the Pacific organization, although it is admitted that there is a broad agreement among them with regard to the desirability of such an organization.

Thirdly, while Japan and the United States are somewhat handicapped in taking the initiative for the Pacific organization, Australia appears to be in an excellent position to take such initiative, because: (a) Australia, which is historically tied closely to Europe, is more and more aware of her being Asian and Pacific and making conscious efforts to be so; (b) Australia is economically large enough, and politically important enough, to assume a leading role in the creation of a Pacific organization; (c) Australia does not have a history of dominance or expansionism in the area; (d) Australia has already established important economic and political ties with New Zealand, Papua New Guinea and certain other Pacific island countries for permanent cooperation (e.g., the South Pacific Bureau for Economic Cooperation and the South Pacific Forum); (e) politically and economically, Australia's future lies in the future stake of the Pacific region; and (f) in spite of the fact that politics in Australia can sometimes be very bitter, all the games are played on a democratic line and it is one of the stablest democracies in the region.

In summary, it appears that Australia is perhaps in the best position to take leadership for the creation of a Pacific organization, from the viewpoint of general geo-political and economic situations of the region and the relative positions of the respective countries in the area. The next question is whether Australia is ready to do so. Next chapter is an attempt to make some preliminary assessment on this question.

III Australia and the Pacific Community Concept

In order to obtain a general picture of how the idea of the Pacific community is being conceived by the representative Australians in various sectors, we conducted a survey in August of 1981 which is

mainly composed of interviews with prominent figures in the academia, politics, industry, trade unions, government, journalism, and secondary level education. The survey was preliminary and unscientific in the sense that it was not based on a quantitative data analysis of opinion polls or large scale interviews of people in each sector. The people interviewed were selected rather arbitrarily through the introduction or suggestion of those familiar with Australian affairs. Thus, we do not claim that our study accurately presents the general opinions of Australian people towards the Pacific community concept. It is rather intended to make an initial assessment on how well the Pacific community concept is being conceived, positively or negatively, in different sectors of the Australian society and what are the potential problems with respect to the realization of this concept that are identified by some leaders in each sector.

In the academic circle, especially among the economists, political scientists and historians, the Pacific community concept appears to be not only a common knowledge but a notion generally favorably perceived. There exists general awareness that, after the British membership to the EC, Australia is consciously seeking a new position as an Asian and Pacific nation. A Pacific community is a concept that would go parallel to the asianization of Australia. The ever closer economic ties with Japan, the ASEAN and other Asian and Pacific neighbours would, in their eyes, also justify Australia's involvement in the Pacific community concept. However, they are at the same time cautious about the possibility of Australia's playing a leading role in the creation of a Pacific organization for a number of reasons: (a) Australia has never assumed a major political or economic role in its international relations; (b) Australia is more concerned about daily domestic affairs; (c) Achievement of full employment and stable economic growth are high on the current agenda of Australian politics and not many people are convinced yet that a Pacific economic organization would contribute to these priority goals; (d) in her foreign relations, the Asia and Pacific region has undoubtedly become the most important area for Australia's future but the strengthening the bilateral relations with the regional nations such as the United States, Japan, the ASEAN countries, New Zealand and the Pacific

island countries are more imminent; and (e) Australia's historical ties with the United Kingdom and other European countries cannot be ignored.

In the political world, the concept is less known in spite of the fact that top leaders of the government endorsed the idea in public.¹⁵ Some politicians admitted that people occasionally talked about the Pacific community but never very seriously. Both liberals and labors seem to be interested in the idea for an obvious reason that the Pacific area is important to Australia politically as well as economically, but they are not enthusiastic enough to take it up as a major policy issue because there seem to be more urgent matters to tackle such as unemployment and restructuring of Australian economy. They also foresee criticism and opposition if they prepare a concrete proposal for a Pacific community, from other parties, business world, and labor unions, on the one hand, and they do not find enthusiasm in their respective constituencies, on the other. The National Party seems to be even less interested in the idea. They appear to be more concerned about local politics. The Communist Party, which has little role in today's Australian politics, is least interested in the idea because according to them: (a) only multinational companies would benefit from such a Pacific organization; and (b) the concept may increase the already dominant, economic and political role of the United States in the region. Some active party members, however, seem to think that a Pacific organization for increasing the solidarity of workers in the Pacific could be conceivable.

Industrialists are somewhat divided in their views on the Pacific community idea. There are people, particularly those in the larger mineral exploitation and exporting industries, who would welcome the creation of a Pacific organization that would enable them to secure a large market in the region, particularly Japan. On the other hand, there are people, mainly those in the smaller manufacturing industries, who would oppose the creation of such an organization that would put them in a severe competition not only in the regional market but also within the domestic market.¹⁶ With this somewhat divided positions of the

industry with regard to the Pacific community concept, it would not be easy for the business people to be the driving force for the creation of a Pacific organization, at least for the time being. It should be pointed out in this connection that many business people are not totally unhappy with the current approach of bilateralism for the furtherance of international trade. They seem to be cautious about the possibility of the central government in Canberra assuming greater power and responsibility on the matter of industry and trade as a result of the creation of some kind of a regional trade organization.

The position of the trade unions appear to be somewhat negative to the creation of a Pacific organization, at least on theory. The Australian workers in general, while sympathetic with the workers' well being in other countries, are more concerned about their loss of jobs or the worsening of their working conditions (including wages) as a result of severe foreign competition and the introduction of more competitive expatriate workers into Australia which seem to be inevitable if a Pacific organization is created and if Australia becomes its member. However, more recently, some unions, particularly in the fields of mining and agriculture, have become flexible on institutional collaboration in the Pacific region. Yet, generally speaking, Australian workers are mainly concerned with social problems, unemployment, salary increase and other related domestic issues, and the Pacific community idea is not in the picture of their immediate agenda.

In the government bureaucracy, the attitudes towards the Pacific community concept are mixed. There are a group of people of modest size sympathetic to the idea in the Department of Foreign Affairs. They are aware of the importance of the regional cooperation for the future of Australia in terms of economic survival as well as security. However, skepticism seems to be prevalent in the Departments of Treasure and Trade, which are more concerned about domestic economic and financial matters. If we take into account that the Department of Foreign Affairs is relatively less influential in Australia and further that Australia is a federal state and many important matters including some directly involving economic policy are left in the hands of state governments, it

would be difficult to expect that a concrete proposal for a Pacific organization would be prepared by the government bureaucracy.

The Australian journalism, particularly the newspapers, seems to be more open and supportive of the Pacific community concept. There is now a greater interest in the news coverage of regional happenings. Japan, ASEAN, China and South Pacific, in particular, are the parts of the world to which the Australian mass media are giving increasing attention. While this positive attitude of the Australian mass media toward Asia and Pacific cooperation is helpful, and will probably be vital at a critical stage, for arousing public interest and awareness, and possible support for the creation of a Pacific organization, the nature of the journalism is such that it alone cannot initiate an action in that direction.

As we know in the case of the EC and inter-American organizations, the creation of a regional organization sometimes requires decades and generations to prepare therefor. As a part of such preparation, the roles of journalism and scholars are essential. Equally important is the teaching of the topic in public education to prepare the students for future leadership and support. For this reason our survey covered the curriculum of some Australian high schools. The study revealed that only a handful of students interviewed knew or had heard the term "Pacific community." The Pacific community idea is simply not taught or referred to in the formal education up to the high school level. However, there is an encouraging move in progress in Australian schools to stress Asia and Pacific as an important region of the world for Australia in the subjects of geography and history. Asian languages such as Japanese and Indonesian are regularly taught in many high schools and there are a growing number of students taking such languages. So, we can expect that the future generations of Australians, who finish at least high school level education, would be better prepared to understand the issues in the Asian and Pacific region and would be ready to support the idea which would enhance regional cooperation.

IV Concluding Remarks

The establishment of an international organization is not an easy

task. It requires not only the complex, diplomatic negotiation process among the potential member states of such an organization, but also even more difficult and intricate negotiations and adjustment of conflicting interests within each of such potential members. It requires strong, determined and effective leadership on the level of international relations as well as on the level of domestic politics. It requires general public support, morally, politically and financially.

As far as the possibility of a Pacific regional organization is concerned, a good case has been presented on a theoretical level. The question is whether we are ready to move ahead in reality.

As we have observed, in Australia, which is in our view in the best position to initiate such a move, the attitude of the people in different sectors toward the Pacific community concept is mixed from cautious support to reluctance or even skepticism. We have found more positive attitudes in the academic world and journalism than in business and trade unions. Among the politicians and bureaucrats, more cautious approach seems to be prevailing. This appears to suggest that the Pacific community idea is still on the level of theory and discussion, and that it would require a little longer time than anticipated or expected for the Australian government to place the creation of a Pacific organization as a main agenda item and try to take initiative for it. This of course does not necessarily mean that a Pacific organization is hopeless or impossible. On the contrary, as long as there is a legitimate theoretical justification, there is a good chance for such an organization. The point here is that time is not ripe yet.

When the Pacific community concept is more widely known and supported by the public, when the people in business, politicians, and workers identify their interest with the objectives of such a regional organization, when the government and bureaucrats realize that the basic interest of Australia would be better served by an institutional cooperation in the Pacific region, and when the government finds strong enthusiasm among the governments of the potential core members of such an organization including Japan, the United States and the ASEAN countries, then will time be ripe for Australia to move forward

for taking major initiative for its creation.

There are four things those enthusiastic about the creation of a Pacific organization can do to speed up the above-described process. One is to educate and disseminate the concept of a Pacific community through public education system and mass media. Second is to arouse and stimulate scholarly research and discussion among the interested academicians — by “interested academicians” we mean “all-interested,” not limited to those who are regarded as experts on the subject.⁶⁹ Thirdly, similar efforts should be encouraged not only within Australia but also in the potential member countries in the region. Lastly, if it is found that the Australian government is not ready to take the initiative even though the general atmosphere justifies taking such initiative, then, it could be suggested and promoted that such initiative be taken jointly by the leading countries in the region, say together with Japan and the United States. As we have observed, the general international and domestic conditions do not allow Japan or the United States to step up a proposal independently, or at least much less likely than Australia, but these countries would be ready to go along with other countries for a Pacific organization. As the creation of the United Nations was a joint work of several allied governments during the Second World War, joint initiative may be a solution to the question of who will take the initiative for a Pacific organization.

Notes

- (1) For example, John Crawford, *The Pacific Basin Cooperation Concept*, Research Paper No. 70, Australia-Japan Research Centre, The Australian National University, Canberra (1980); Peter Drysdale, *An Organization for Pacific Trade, Aid and Development: Regional Arrangements and the Resource Trade*, Research Paper No. 49, Australia-Japan Economic Relations Research Project, The Australian National University, Canberra (1978); Peter Drysdale, “Pacific Economic Integration: An Australian View,” *Pacific Trade and Development*, ed. by Kiyoshi Kojima, Japan Economic Research Center (1968); Peter Drysdale and Hugh Patrick, *Evaluation of Pro-*

posed *Asian-Pacific Regional Economic Organization*, Research Paper No. 61, Australia-Japan Research Centre, the Australian National University, Canberra (1979); Kiyoshi Kojima, *Japan and a Pacific Free Trade Area*, Macmillan (1971); Kiyoshi Kojima, *An Organization for Pacific Trade, Aid and Development: A Proposal*, Research Paper No. 40, Australia-Japan Economic Relations Research Project, The Australian National University, Canberra (1976); E.G. Whitlan, *A Pacific Community*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass. (1981); and Charlotte Williams, *The Pacific Community: A Modest Proposal*, Research Paper No. 55, Australia-Japan Research Centre, The Australian National University, Canberra (1979). When Kiyoshi Kojima and Hiroshi Kuromoto proposed the Pacific Free Trade Area (PAFTA) for the first time, the idea was to achieve a fairly high-level of economic integration of the five industrial countries in the Pacific (the United States, Japan, Australia, Canada and New Zealand), "which would eliminate completely tariffs between each other but preserve the autonomy of members with respect to their tariff policies *vis-à-vis* non-participants, instead of common tariffs and common trade policy." (Kojima, *An Organization for Pacific Trade, Aid and Development: A Proposal*, *op. cit.*, p. 1). Since then, considering the reality of the situation, particularly the different trade policies of the countries in the region, and political, economic, social and cultural diversity of the region, a much looser, GATT or OECD type organization has been preferred. (Crawford, *op. cit.*, pp. 8-11.)

- (2) The term "Pacific area (or region)," or "Asia-Pacific area (or region)" has been rather loosely used. A helpful attempt was made by Drysdale and Patrick to identify different components of the most broadly defined notion of "Asia-Pacific area." According to them, the broadest notion of Asia-Pacific area would include the following categories (Drysdale and Patrick, *op. cit.*, p. 32):

- (i) The fourteen major Pacific Basin market-oriented economies.
 - a) the five advanced countries: the United States, Japan, Australia, Canada, and New Zealand.
 - b) the five ASEAN nations: Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore, and Thailand.
 - c) the three Northeast Asian developing economies: South Korea, Taiwan, and Hong Kong.
 - d) Papua New Guinea and the small South West Pacific states as a group (the countries of the South Pacific Bureau for Economic Cooperation excluding Australia and New Zealand).
- (ii) The South Asian nations: Bangladesh, Burma, India, Pakistan, and Sri Lanka.

(iii) The Latin American Pacific nations: Mexico, the Central American states, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, Chile, and in terms of economic interaction, Brazil.

(iv) The Communist nations: China, Vietnam, Kampuchea, Laos, North Korea, and the Soviet Union.

For the purpose of this paper, we do not need to define too clearly which countries are covered by the notion of "Pacific area." It is enough to point out that most people, when using this term, refer to those countries in category (i), with possibility of inclusion of some countries in categories (ii), (iii) and (iv), and we follow more or less this common usage of the term.

- (3) See Kojima, "Economic Cooperation in a Pacific Community," *op. cit.*, and Drysdale, *An Organization for Pacific Trade, Aid and Development: Regional Arrangements and the Resource Trade*, *op. cit.*
- (4) For evidence of definite official interest, see footnote 2 on page 10 of Drysdale, *An Organization for Pacific Trade, Aid and Development: Regional Arrangements and the Resource Trade*, *op. cit.*
- (5) See Kojima, "Economic Cooperation in a Pacific Community," *op. cit.*, Drysdale, *An Organization for Pacific Trade, Aid and Development: Regional Arrangements and the Resource Trade*, *op. cit.*, and Williams, *The Pacific Community: A Modest Proposal*, *op. cit.*
- (6) For functionalism, see David Mitrany, *A Working Peace System*, Royal Institute of International Affairs, London (1943); Ernst B. Haas, *Beyond the Nation-State - Functionalism and Organization*, Stanford University Press (1964); and James Patrick Sewell, *Functionalism and World Politics - A Study Based on United Nations Programs Financing Economic Development*, Princeton University Press (1966).
- (7) Clive Archer, *International Organizations*, George Allen and Unwin, London (1983), pp. 43-49; R. Yalem, *Regionalism and World Order*, Public Affairs Press, Washington, D.C. (1965), p. 141.
- (8) For general information on various types of international organizations that exist today, particularly to find some models of regional international economic organizations, see, *inter alia*, D.W. Bowett, *The Law of International Institutions*, second edition, Stevens and Sons, London (1970) and C.H. Alexandrowicz, *World Economic Agencies: Law and Practice*, Stevens and Sons, London (1962).
- (9) See Yokota, "How Useful is the Notion of 'International Public Corporation' Today?" *Essays in International Law in Honour of Judge Manfred Lachs*, ed. by Jerzy Makarczyk, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, The Hague (1984), p. 570.

- (10) Mike Mansfield, *Bonds of the Pacific*, American Policy Series No. 61, United States Information Service, American Embassy, Tokyo (1983) and Richard Holbrooke, *America and the Pacific: 1980*, American Policy Series No. 17, U.S. International Communication Agency, American Embassy, Tokyo (1980). See also footnote 2 on page 10 of Drysdale, *An Organization for Pacific Trade, Aid and Development: Regional Arrangements and the Resource Trade*, *op. cit.*
- (11) Mansfield, *op. cit.*, p. 14.
- (12) Although American economic and business interest in the Pacific region is undoubtedly large, security and political concern appears to overwhelm all others in the American foreign policy toward Asia and the Pacific. See Holbrooke, *op. cit.*
- (13) Michael Yahuda, "The Dragon, the Sun, the Eagle and the Kangaroo: China and the Pacific Region in the 1980's," *Aegis*, vol. 2, No. 1 (1983), p. 36.
- (14) Kojima writes: "Finally, some Pacific countries, especially the USA and Japan, have preferred a more free multilateral international economic order to regional integration." See Kojima, *An Organization for Pacific Trade, Aid and Development: A Proposal*, *op. cit.*, p. 4 and pp. 5-12.
- (15) It is important to note in this connection that "[T]he idea of an Organization for Pacific, Trade, Aid and Development appears to have a measure of bipartisan political support in Australia and was recommended strongly by the Australian Senate's Joint Party Standing Committee on Foreign Relations and Defense." (Drysdale, *An Organization for Pacific Trade, Aid and Development: Regional Arrangements and the Resource Trade*, *op. cit.*, p. 10, note 2).
- (16) One representative manufacturing industry in Australia is automobile manufacturing industry. While visiting Australia for this survey, a one-page advertisement entitled "An Australian Industry Destroyed" appeared in *The Courier-Mail* of August 27, 1981. The ad, which was jointly sponsored by General Motors-Holden's Limited and the Vehicle Builders Employees Federation, in main part reads: "The future of the Australian motor vehicle industry is under Government review. There are critics of the industry who are suggesting policies that would destroy it. They are recommending that protection for Australian vehicle manufacturing be dropped. Imported vehicles would then flood Australia, destroying local industry. Without adequate quotas and import tariffs, *well over 200,000 jobs* in vehicle manufacturing and related industries would be lost." Although this is just one ad by an auto-maker and a workers federation, it seems to represent the mood of the Australian

manufacturing industry in general being critical of lifting protection. To their eyes, a Pacific organization may look to be something unwelcome.

- (17) Academicians should include, in addition to economists who have been the main figures in the study of the Pacific community idea, political scientists, lawyers, sociologists, historians, and so on.

Bibliography

- Alexandrowicz, C.H., *World Economic Agencies: Law and Practice*, Stevens and Sons, London (1962).
- Archer, Clive, *International Organizations*, George Allen and Unwin, London (1970).
- Bowett, D.W., *The Law of International Institutions*, Stevens and Sons, London (1970).
- Crawford, John, *The Pacific Basin Cooperation Concept*, Research Paper No. 70, Australia-Japan Research Centre, The Australian National University, Canberra (1980).
- Drysdale, Peter, *An Organization for Pacific Trade, Aid and Development: Regional Arrangements and the Resource Trade*, Australia-Japan Economic Relations Research Project, The Australian National University, Canberra (1978).
- , "Pacific Economic Integration: An Australian View," *Pacific Trade and Development*, ed. by Kiyoshi Kojima, Japan Economic Research Center (1968).
- Drysdale, Peter and Hugh Patrick, *Evaluation of a Proposed Asian-Pacific Regional Economic Organization*, Research Paper No. 61, Australia-Japan Research Centre, The Australian National University, Canberra (1979).
- Greenwood, Gordon, *The Future of Australian Federalism: A Commentary on the Working of the Constitution*, University of Queensland Press, St. Lucia (1976).
- Haas, E.B., *Beyond the Nation State*, Stanford University Press (1964).
- Heine, Carle, *Micronesian at the Crossroads - A Reappraisal of the Micronesian Political Dilemma*, An East-West Center Book, the University Press of Hawaii, Honolulu (1974).
- Holbrooke, Richard, *America and the Pacific: 1980*, American Policy Series No. 17, United States International Communication Agency, American Embassy, Tokyo (1980).
- Hyde, Jim, *Australia - The Asia Connection*, Kibble Books, Melbourne (1978).
- Kojima, Kiyoshi, *Japan and a Pacific Free Trade Area*, Macmillan, London (1971).

- , "Economic Integration in the Asian-Pacific Region," *Hitotsubashi Journal of Economics*, (1976).
- , *An Organization for Pacific Trade, Aid and Development: A Proposal*, Research Paper No. 40, Australia-Japan Economic Relations Research Project, The Australian National University, Canberra (1976).
- , "Economic Cooperation in a Pacific Community," paper read at a symposium on *The Pacific Region in the 1980's*, held at International Christian University in March, 1981.
- Lane, P.H., *An Introduction to the Australian Constitution*, Second Edition, Law Book Co., Sydney (1977).
- Malmgren, H.B., *Pacific Basin Development: The American Interest*, Overseas Development Council, Lexington Books (1972).
- Mansfield, Mike, *Bonds of the Pacific*, American Policy Series No. 61, United States Information Service, American Embassy, Tokyo (1983).
- Nye, J.S., "Central American Regional Integration," *International Conciliation* (1967).
- , *Peace in Parts*, Little Brown and Company, Boston (1970).
- Osborn, R.F., "Australian Policy towards the South Pacific," paper read at a Symposium on *The Pacific Region in the 1980's*, held at International Christian University in March 1981.
- Sawer, Geoffrey, *Australian Government Today*, Fifth Edition, Melbourne University Press, Melbourne (1977).
- Welfield, John, *Some Diplomatic and Strategic Aspects of Japan's Present and Future Foreign Policies*, Research Paper No. 84, Australia-Japan Research Centre, The Australian National University, Canberra (1981).
- Whitlam, E.G., *A Pacific Community*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass. (1981).
- Williams, Charlotte, *The Pacific Community: A Modest Proposal*, Research Paper No. 55, Australia-Japan Research Centre, The Australian National University, Canberra (1979).
- Yalem, R., *Regionalism and World Order*, Public Affairs Press, Washington, D.C. (1965).