The Belt and Road Forum for International Cooperation (BRF), held in Beijing from 14 to 15 May 2017, was a great success. It is the largest and highest-level international event ever initiated and hosted by China since the founding of the People’s Republic. Its success demonstrates China’s rising international standing and growing global influence. President Xi Jinping delivered a keynote speech at the opening session and chaired the Leaders Roundtable, which was attended by 29 heads of state or government and representatives of three major international organizations. Many countries sent senior officials to the opening session, the High-Level Dialogue and other BRF events. The forum brought together around 1,500 participants from over 130 countries of five continents and some 70 international organizations, making it one of the most broadly represented international gatherings in recent years. Its success is also a strong indication of the international community’s warm response to China’s

* Wang Yi is Minister of Foreign Affairs of China.
Belt and Road Initiative of cooperation and mutual benefit for all. The BRF is without any doubt a milestone for Belt and Road cooperation.

I. A globally influential and highly productive event

The BRF is held at a time when the world is grappling with weak global growth, headwinds against economic globalization, deep changes in the global governance system and growing uncertainty in the international situation. Against this backdrop, China set the BRF theme as “Belt and Road: Cooperation for Common Prosperity”. The theme is a call for openness, inclusiveness, cooperation and mutual benefit and also an appeal for joint efforts to boost global economic growth, strengthen confidence in economic globalization and find ways for building a community of shared future for all mankind. The fact that the theme has been warmly received by the international community speaks volumes for China’s leading role in improving global governance and promoting international cooperation.

The BRF has served to broaden international consensus. Since President Xi first put forward the Belt and Road Initiative in 2013, more than 100 countries and international organizations have expressed support or participated in the initiative, making it the most popular public good worldwide. That said, there are still countries that do not fully understand what the initiative is about and a very few others even have misgivings about China’s intention. At the forum, President Xi called on all parties to promote the Silk Road Spirit of peace and cooperation, openness and inclusiveness, mutual learning and win-win cooperation. He reviewed the fruitful results of Belt and Road cooperation over
the past four years and elaborated on the guiding principles of extensive consultation, joint contribution and shared benefits for Belt and Road cooperation. He also recalled the historical roots of the initiative and shared his views on its future prospects. His statements helped reduce misunderstanding and expand consensus.

The Joint Communiqué of the Leaders Roundtable released at the end of the forum is the first authoritative international document on the building of the Belt and Road. The communiqué encompasses both general concepts and principles, and plans of action on the ground. It highlights the internationally agreed goals, principles and measures for Belt and Road cooperation. Russian President Vladimir Putin emphasized that President Xi’s envisaged blueprint for Belt and Road cooperation responds to the call of the times and heralds bright prospects. Leaders of other countries, including Indonesia, Uzbekistan and Belarus, described the Belt and Road Initiative as an ambitious, long-term and historic undertaking and the BRF an event of great practical significance and far-reaching historical impact. According to UN Secretary-General Antonio Guterres, the Belt and Road Initiative shows great strategic wisdom and foresight and will not only help achieve sustainable development but also help sustain peace. President Xi’s speech at the opening session was like a torch that lit up the world. In their speeches, many leaders quoted Chinese sayings cited by President Xi, such as “building the road is the first step toward prosperity” and “people of one mind can remove Mount Tai”, to show their appreciation and support for the Belt and Road Initiative. Prior to the forum, China had already signed cooperation agreements on jointly implementing the Belt and Road Initiative with more than 40 countries and international
organizations. During the forum, China signed similar documents with another 20-plus countries and international organizations, thus enlarging the circle of friends for the initiative and creating strong momentum for jointly building the Belt and Road.

The BRF has identified the way forward for collective efforts. As the initiative gets fully rolled out, it is imperative to set a correct course and draw a good roadmap. President Xi pointed out the overarching objective is to build the Belt and Road into a road of peace, prosperity, opening up, innovation and inter-civilization connection. He underscored the need to build a new type of international relations featuring win-win cooperation and foster a security environment built and shared by all. He reiterated the importance of deepening cooperation on industrial, financial and infrastructure connectivity so that integrated economies and interconnected development will bring benefits to all parties. He called on all parties to build an open platform of cooperation and foster a broad community of shared interests, pursue innovation-driven development and build a digital Silk Road of the 21st century. President Xi also urged all parties to establish multi-tiered mechanisms for cultural and people-to-people exchanges so that inter-civilization exchanges will replace estrangement, mutual learning will replace clashes, and coexistence will replace a sense of superiority. His proposals respond to the call of our times and to the development needs of countries involved. They represent the way forward for Belt and Road cooperation in the long run and are widely commended by BRF participants. During the forum, China and many participating countries had reached important consensus on priorities and pathways for future cooperation under the Belt and Road Initiative, spelling out specific actions and setting out a
clear roadmap to make this vision a reality.

The BRF has made more cooperation projects possible. Thanks to the collective efforts of all parties involved, the forum produced more than 270 cooperation outcomes under five categories and 76 sub-categories, with a focus on policy, infrastructure, trade, financial and people-to-people connectivity. This fully shows that the Belt and Road Initiative is action-oriented and project-based, which is its defining feature. China has signed agreements on infrastructure and transportation cooperation with countries such as Cambodia, Turkey, and Pakistan. Good progress has been made in major projects like the China-Europe Container Block Trains, the Jakarta-Bandung railway, and the Belgrade-Budapest railway. A connectivity network on the Eurasian continent is taking shape. China also signed inter-governmental agreements on economic cooperation and trade with 30 countries and a bilateral free trade agreement with Georgia. China is working with relevant countries to build business and industrial parks and cross-border economic cooperation zones, thus adding fresh vitality to global trade and the world economy. China also signed cooperation agreements with Thailand, Malaysia, Poland, Afghanistan, UNESCO and UNEP in such areas as nuclear power, water resources, telecommunications, science and technology, environmental protection, education, culture, health and medical care. All this will expand areas of Belt and Road cooperation so that peoples of participating countries will have a true sense of involvement and enjoy benefits that the initiative brings. BRF participants applaud the fact that China does deliver on its commitment under the Belt and Road Initiative instead of simply paying lip service. They
also speak highly of the Belt and Road cooperation model which features coordination, innovation, connectivity of development strategies and leveraging of complementarity and focuses on development and prosperity for all.

The BRF has served to strengthen the support system for Belt and Road cooperation. Belt and Road cooperation is a long-term endeavor that requires a solid and reliable support system. President Xi announced that China will host the second BRF in 2019 and set up a liaison office for that purpose. This among others will lay a solid foundation for the long-term development of Belt and Road cooperation. China pledged an additional RMB 100 billion to the Silk Road Fund and encouraged financial institutions to conduct RMB overseas fund business with an estimated amount of RMB 300 billion. The China Development Bank and the Export-Import Bank of China will set up special lending schemes worth RMB 250 billion equivalent and RMB 130 billion equivalent respectively. China will establish a Multilateral Development Financial Cooperation Center together with multilateral development banks and an IMF-China Capacity Building Center. China will work with relevant parties to formulate guidelines for financing development projects under the framework of Belt and Road cooperation. These measures and mechanisms are a strong boost to confidence and enthusiasm of all parties involved in Belt and Road cooperation.

To provide long-term support for Belt and Road cooperation, China is building platforms for comprehensive services related to science and technology, environmental protection and media. The above measures are widely appraised at the forum. World leaders attending the BRF indicated that the measures demonstrate the
historical commitment and firm resolve of China, which was the first to put forward the initiative, to jointly build the Belt and Road with other interested countries. The leaders also agree that Belt and Road cooperation is a joint endeavor that requires more actions on the ground by all participating countries.

The BRF has served to expand China’s global network of partnerships. During the forum, President Xi had bilateral talks or meetings with all participating heads of state or government, effectively expanding China’s network of partnerships, especially with countries along the Belt and Road. At their meeting, President Xi and President Putin agreed to strengthen China-Russia cooperation in all areas, speed up connectivity between the Belt and Road Initiative and the Eurasian Economic Union and further enrich the China-Russia comprehensive strategic partnership of coordination. When President Xi met with Italian and other European leaders, they reached an important consensus on supporting multilateralism and advancing China-EU partnerships for peace, growth, innovation and progress of civilizations. President Xi also worked on the leaders of China’s neighboring countries and called for stronger mutual trust and greater cooperation between China and the countries they represent, hoping Belt and Road cooperation will help maintain good momentum of stability and development in the vicinity of China. President Xi also had cordial meetings with leaders of African and Latin American developing nations and conducted in-depth exchanges of views on cooperation opportunities under the framework of the Belt and Road Initiative and on how to promote China’s relations with these countries.
II. The Belt and Road Initiative is of great practical significance and far-reaching impact

The Belt and Road Initiative embodies President Xi’s thinking on China’s diplomatic work and represents a great practice of China’s distinctive major-country diplomacy. The BRF reviewed the fruitful results of Belt and Road development, lay out the vision of cooperation among countries along the Belt and Road and reaffirmed the practical significance and far-reaching impact of the initiative in tackling development challenges facing mankind and in advancing world peace and prosperity.

The Belt and Road Initiative is a new launch pad for international economic cooperation. In a world that has long suffered sluggish economic growth, there is an urgent need to stimulate demand, find new areas of growth and identify new engines of development. The Belt and Road runs through Asia, Europe and Africa, linking the East Asian economic circle and the European economic circle. With an initial focus on infrastructure connectivity, the initiative aims to improve resource allocation and market integration by advancing connectivity of policy, infrastructure, trade, finance and people, and provide an open and effective platform where all parties can work together to promote mutual complementarity and interconnected development. Since the initiative was announced four years ago, interested countries and parties have taken steps to synergize their development strategies and launched a number of major cooperation projects. Regional trade and investment have increased at an annual rate which doubles the global average. A series of “early harvests” have been achieved and produced a demonstration effect. More and more countries are
optimistic about the immense opportunities and promising future that Belt and Road cooperation may bring. They are willing to join the initiative and jointly build the Belt and Road for shared benefits. Building on what had been achieved in Belt and Road cooperation, the BRF has announced several additional measures to upgrade, deepen and expand international cooperation in the context of the Belt and Road, hopefully the measures will help promote world economic recovery and drive economic growth of all participating countries. The IMF estimates that by 2020, the total amount of trade in goods of the countries and regions along the Belt and Road will reach US$19.6 trillion, or 38.9% of the world’s total.

Under the framework of Belt and Road cooperation, China’s own development will impact countries along the Belt and Road in a positive way and such impact will increase. From 2014 to 2016, trade between China and those countries exceeded US$3 trillion and Chinese investment amounted to over US$50 billion. Chinese businesses have set up 56 business cooperation zones in more than 20 countries, which has generated nearly US$1.1 billion of tax revenues and created 180,000 jobs for these countries. The interconnected development of Chinese and other economies are gathering a strong momentum.

The Belt and Road Initiative will help rebalance economic globalization. Currently, with a growing backlash against globalization, countries are facing a critical choice between development behind closed doors or through openness and cooperation. The Belt and Road Initiative follows the trend of our times toward growing interdependence of human society. It helps improve allocation of economic factors by breaking
down geographical barriers, and advance a sustainable economic globalization by creating new demand through more effective supply and reshaping the global structure of industrial production, investment and consumption. The Belt and Road Initiative is open, inclusive and aims to tackle global issues such as unbalanced growth, governance dilemma, digital divide and income disparities. The initiative sets the course for more open, inclusive and balanced economic globalization that benefits all. It also provides a new blueprint for a more fair and equitable system of global governance.

BRF participants spoke highly of the Belt and Road Initiative, calling it China’s formula for an open world economy, a balanced economic globalization and a better global governance. According to leaders of developing countries, the initiative will bring unprecedented opportunities to less developed countries that have been marginalized in the process of economic globalization to move faster toward industrialization and modernization. Representatives of developed countries indicated that the Belt and Road Initiative rejects the outdated, conservative, closed and exclusive approach and provides a new way forward that features openness, inter-connectivity and integration. It presents a new model of economic globalization, a massive “revolution in economic geography” in a globalized world, and a great example of how oriental wisdom can be applied for global benefit.

The Belt and Road Initiative helps further boost China’s international standing. The Belt and Road is China’s project of the century. It takes into account China’s overall interests at home and abroad and promotes interconnected development of China
and the world. The success of the BRF marks the beginning of a new round of China’s opening up and international cooperation. During the BRF, participants representing 16 Chinese provinces, autonomous regions and municipalities discussed cooperation opportunities with senior officials and entrepreneurs from over 100 countries. The Belt and Road Initiative offers a great opportunity for local regions to open wider to the outside world and promote economic and social development. As China implements its cooperation agreements with relevant countries and international organizations, there will be more opportunities for China’s equipment, know-how, investment and standards to “go global” and enormous space for its economic growth, and transformation and upgrading of all sectors. The Belt and Road Initiative, fully in line with China’s regional development strategies such as the coordinated development of the Beijing-Tianjin-Hebei region and the Yangtze River Economic Belt, will inject strong impetus to China’s economic growth under the new normal conditions and the interconnected development among China’s eastern, central and western regions.

The success of the BRF also marks a start for China to play a greater and more influential role globally. China’s vision of innovation-driven, coordinated, green, open and inclusive development is fully reflected in the BRF outcome document. The China vision has been conveyed to and appreciated by more countries and peoples worldwide. China’s vision on security, development, cooperation, inter-civilization exchanges and global governance, which runs through President Xi Jinping’s statements and remarks at the BRF, resonates with members of the international community. It is yet another example of China’s greater say in global affairs. The development of the Belt and
Road is increasingly becoming a leverage and practice ground for China’s major-country diplomacy with its own distinct features. More and more China’s ideas and visions will become international consensus through Belt and Road cooperation. More and more Chinese proposals will become global action through the building of the Belt and Road. China’s leading role in improving global governance and managing international affairs will also rise to a new level.

III. Belt and Road international cooperation has broad prospects

Once a goal is set, action is what is needed. The BRF is a call for action in pursuing Belt and Road cooperation. Building on the BRF success, we will pool the visions and strengths of all parties and work together to promote win-win cooperation through greater openness, and deliver more benefits to Chinese and other peoples under the Belt and Road Initiative.

We will fully implement the BRF outcomes to accelerate the building of the Belt and Road. We will strengthen policy coordination and development strategy connectivity with relevant countries and deliver on action plans and cooperation projects. We will take solid steps in building economic corridors, engage in deeper international cooperation in industrial capacity and equipment manufacturing and promote cross-border connectivity. We will work to enhance the quality of trade and investment cooperation, build more industrial belts, develop more areas of growth and establish more economic circles, promote interconnected growth between countries in Europe and Asia, and boost steady recovery of the global economy. We will
promote a sustainable development of the Belt and Road and make greater efforts in such areas as policy-making, economic and financial support, institution-building and security safeguards so that the initiative will advance on a rock-solid foundation of comprehensive and multi-tiered support systems. We will pool the resources of the governments, businesses, think tanks, media organizations and civil society so that all sectors will work together to bring about a steady and sustained development of the Belt and Road.

The Belt and Road Initiative serves as a platform for building a network of closer partnerships. We will promote dialogue and reject confrontation, and build partnership, not alliance. We will strengthen equal and mutually beneficial cooperation with other countries and international organizations under the principle of extensive consultation, joint contribution and shared benefits, hopefully China’s economic restructuring and upgrading will contribute to the development of other countries and our efforts on these two fronts will reinforce each other so that China’s partnerships with other countries will be more robust and further enriched. We will expand our network of partnerships with countries along the Belt and Road, starting with our neighbors and then reaching out to the rest of Asia and Europe and eventually to other parts of the world to build a closer and stronger global “circle of friends”.

We will take the vision of win-win cooperation as a guiding principle in building a community of shared future for mankind. The Belt and Road Initiative is defined by openness, inclusiveness and win-win cooperation. Such vision will also guide China’s distinctive major-country diplomacy. While building the Belt and
Road, we will endeavor to turn China’s envisaged new type of international relations, which features win-win cooperation, into an international pursuit and practice. We will work with other members of the international community to jointly address global issues and challenges, explore a new model of global governance and promote a global governance system that is more fair and equitable so that we will make new contribution to building a community of shared future for mankind.

The Belt and Road Initiative is like a splendid symphony in two movements, one focusing on the past, the other the present. It also represents a dream of Chinese and other peoples. The dream will come true if we continue to explore the best possible way to advance the initiative and strengthen cooperation with all parties. The BRF has brought us a good opportunity to make the Belt and Road a reality. The Belt and Road Initiative is also like a giant ship powered by our aspirations of peace and development. I am convinced that with all its stakeholders on board, the ship will ride the wind of cooperation and mutual benefit, break the waves and sail to its destination of greater peace and prosperity.
The world is in the middle of profound development, transformation and adjustment. The international situation features volatility and turbulence, as evidenced by an obvious increase of uncertainties and destabilizing factors. Against this backdrop, China, as the biggest developing country, the second largest economy and a permanent member of the UN Security Council, has resolutely safeguarded its legitimate rights and interests, shouldered its international responsibilities, and become an anchor of international stability, an engine of global growth, a champion of peace and development and an active participant in global governance.

I. The world is fraught with volatility and turbulence

Following a series of “Black Swan” events last year, the trend toward volatility and turbulence continues.
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to unfold in 2017, giving rise to concerns over the elusive security, the ineffective governance and the sluggish economy.

**Ineffective governance.** Since the outbreak of the global financial crisis, the negative impact of economic stagnation has spilled over to social and political areas. The immediate result is the emergence of populism, protectionism and anti-globalization sentiments in developed countries.

The new US administration clamors for “America first”, pursuing a hard-line immigration policy, planning to erect a wall along the US-Mexico border and renegotiate the North America Free Trade Agreement, and backsliding on the multilateral trading regime, climate change and other issues. The European integration process trudges ahead amid difficulties, with the UK officially kicking off the Brexit negotiations and the EU bringing up the idea of a “Multi-speed Europe” for the first time at its summit. With Europe entangled in economic malaise, refugee crisis, terrorist attacks and other problems, the general public there are more and more disappointed with conventional politics and the elite groups. Some fringe parties that preach populism are expanding rapidly, exerting huge impact on political changes. Plagued by mounting economic, social and political problems, developed countries tend to be more inward-looking and play a diminishing role in shaping economic globalization and global governance.

**Complex and intertwined security challenges.** Since the beginning of this year, the interplay between geopolitical maneuvering and hotspot issues has increased. The situation in Syria is still turbulent. The United States attacked Syria with its alleged use of chemical weapons as an excuse, making the prospect of a political
settlement even more unpredictable. Forces within and outside the region vie for leverage over Syria and the Middle East. The situation in Ukraine is generally stable, but conflicts keep flaring up in the eastern part of the country. The United States and Europe and Russia are still significantly divided over how to solve the Ukrainian issue through political means, particularly over matters like sanctions, anti-missile plans in East Europe and military deployment in the Baltic region. Following the multiple ballistic missile tests by the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea (DPRK) in violation of the UN Security Council resolutions, the United States turned from strategic patience to maximum pressure when dealing with the DPRK and scaled up its military deployment and exercises with the Republic of Korea (ROK). Such provocations between the United States and the ROK and the DPRK have fueled the tensions on the Korean Peninsula. Exploiting the situation, the United States advanced the deployment of the Terminal High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) system in the ROK, bringing grave challenges to regional strategic balance and stability. Japan keeps breaking the bounds of the pacifist Constitution by accelerating its rightist tendency and militarization. Non-traditional security challenges in the areas of counter-terrorism and cyber security remain serious. According to incomplete statistics, there were 728 terrorist attacks around the world in the first quarter of this year alone. While terrorists and extremists in the Middle East are losing ground thanks to the efforts of the relevant parties, violent extremist forces seek survival by breaking up into smaller groups and are spreading to Asia, Europe and other regions, posing new challenges to peace and stability of relevant regions.

**Sluggish economic recovery.** The world economy is recovering, but its foundation remains weak. The IMF upgraded this year’s
growth forecasts for the world economy, the developed economies, and the emerging economies and developing countries to 3.5%, 2% and 4.5% respectively. Nevertheless, there are still many risks and challenges. First, the Federal Reserve’s interest rate hikes have caused capital outflows from some countries and rising risks of financial market volatility, exerting tremendous difficulties on the economic structural reforms of many countries, and casting a shadow on the world economic growth. Second, with global trade growth lagging behind economic growth, anti-globalization sentiments gaining ground, developed countries frequently resorting to protectionist measures and free trade arrangements becoming more fragmented, the world economy is under more downward pressure. Third, regional turbulence and economic sanctions caused by hotspot issues add an extra layer of complexity to the world economic recovery.

II. China’s diplomacy is playing an increasingly important role in maintaining global stability

In the face of global turbulence and volatility, under the strong leadership of the CPC Central Committee with Comrade Xi Jinping at its core, China has championed the concept of a community of shared future for mankind, stayed confident and focused, assumed its due responsibilities and forged ahead against all odds. China’s commitment to world peace and stability and its efforts to promote common development and advance reform of the global governance system have won more and more recognition and acclaim from the international community.

**China is an engine of the world economy.** Since the outbreak of the international financial crisis in 2008, China’s contribution to
the global economy has averaged over 30% every year, the largest in the world. In response to the sluggish world economic recovery and increasing challenges from protectionism, the Chinese people have rolled up their sleeves and worked vigorously to move forward the supply-side structural reform. Outcomes have been achieved in their efforts to cut overcapacity, reduce excess inventory, deleverage, lower costs, and shore up weak links. In addition to attaining a fairly high growth rate of 6.9% in the first quarter of this year, China has promoted industrial transformation and upgrading, maintained the momentum of sound and stable economic performance, and made great contribution to global growth. The IMF upgraded its forecast for China’s economic growth this year, demonstrating its confidence in the robust Chinese economy.

As an old Chinese saying goes, one should treat his neighbors with sincerity and bring benefits to them. China pursues a neighborhood diplomacy of amity, sincerity, mutual benefit and inclusiveness, and is ready to share its development dividends and strengthen win-win cooperation with its neighbors. It has worked actively with ASEAN countries to ensure the success of the upgraded China-ASEAN FTA and further advanced the Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership negotiations. Substantial progress has been made under the Lancang-Mekong Cooperation framework jointly initiated by China and countries in the Mekong sub-region, with 45 “early harvest” projects and initiatives well under way. China has launched the first round of negotiations on an upgraded China-New Zealand FTA and reached agreement with Australia on more effective implementation of China-Australia FTA, giving a strong boost to peace, stability and prosperity of the Asia-Pacific region.
The Belt and Road Initiative was proposed by China, yet its benefits are shared by all. China is advancing the China-Pakistan Economic Corridor and its industrial capacity cooperation with Kazakhstan as a paradigm for international cooperation along the Belt and Road. During the visits by the King of Saudi Arabia and the Prime Minister of Israel to China, President Xi Jinping witnessed the signing of agreements on major industrial capacity and investment cooperation projects with the Saudi King, and announced the establishment of an innovative China-Israel comprehensive partnership with the Israeli Prime Minister, which signify new breakthroughs in building the Belt and Road in the Middle East. More examples include the launch of the Doraleh Multi-Purpose Port in Djibouti and the trial operation of the Mombasa-Narobi Standard Gauge Railway. In advancing the Belt and Road Initiative with countries along the routes, China follows the principles of extensive consultation, joint contribution and shared benefits, and promotes policy, infrastructure, trade, financial and people-to-people connectivity to bring benefits to relevant countries and meet their needs for infrastructure development and financing, thus setting a fine example of win-win cooperation and common development.

As President Xi puts it, the common development we pursue delivers benefits to both China and other countries. China’s ten cooperation plans with Africa has yielded bountiful early harvests, including investment and cooperation projects totaling almost 60 billion dollars. China is taking solid steps to advance practical cooperation with Latin American countries under the “1+3+6” framework, and cooperation with Arab countries following the “1+2+3” format. Our vision for common development is reflected in the investment we made and the railways and industrial parks we built. Our efforts are consistent driving forces for development of
China and other countries.

**China is an anchor of stability amid global turbulence.** As a major country, it is our due responsibility to uphold world peace and stability. China is actively exploring new approaches to major-country relations, committed to maintaining a sound and stable framework for such relations, and facilitating what is conducive to world peace. Last April, President Xi met with President Trump at Mar-a-Lago. The two leaders established a sound working relationship, made plans for high-level exchanges and announced the establishment of four high-level dialogue mechanisms focusing on diplomacy and security, economy, law enforcement and cyber security, and social and cultural exchanges. They also agreed on a 100-day plan to boost economic cooperation. This meeting charted the course, drew the blueprint and laid a constructive foundation for China-US relations, sending a positive signal of stability to a world beset by turbulence. China puts great emphasis on the China-Russia comprehensive strategic partnership of coordination. Since the beginning of this year, there have been frequent meetings between the two heads of state and close exchanges between high-level officials, which deepened the two countries’ political trust and strategic coordination, and injected strong impetus into regional stability and world peace. China actively advances its partnerships for peace, growth, reform and civilization with the EU, firmly supports European integration and works with the EU for multilateralism and democracy in international relations. China is committed to strengthening its solidarity and cooperation with emerging economies. It is making preparatory work for the ninth BRICS Summit to be held in Xiamen this September, in an effort to make BRICS cooperation a premier platform with global influence for South-South cooperation.
A country’s peace comes from and depends on its neighbors. On the Korean Peninsula nuclear issue, China stays committed to the goals of denuclearization, stability on the Peninsula and peaceful settlement, and has played an important role in maintaining peace and stability on the Peninsula. It has strictly implemented the relevant UN Security Council resolutions imposing sanctions on the DPRK. It has put forward the “parallel” approach and “suspension for suspension” initiative, urging the DPRK to curb its provocative behavior, and encouraging the United States to take concrete actions to fulfill its commitment of achieving denuclearization on the Peninsula without seeking regime change, regime collapse, an accelerated reunification of the Peninsula or an excuse to come north of the 38th Parallel. China has worked with ASEAN countries to facilitate the full and effective implementation of the Declaration on the Conduct of Parties in the South China Sea, deliberate on and adopt the framework of a Code of Conduct in the South China Sea, formulate maritime rules acceptable to all parties and jointly uphold peace, stability and freedom of navigation in the South China Sea. China firmly supports the political reconciliation and peaceful reconstruction of Afghanistan. On the issue of Syria, China condemn the use of chemical weapons, respects and upholds Syria’s sovereignty and territorial integrity, and views political settlement as the only viable way to peace.

**China is a positive force in the changing international landscape.** Against the backdrop of rising global uncertainties, protectionism and anti-globalization sentiments, President Xi Jinping articulated China’s position and vision in the speeches he made in Davos and Geneva. He explicitly reaffirmed China’s support for economic globalization and multilateralism, and put forward propositions on rebalancing economic globalization and building
a community of shared future for mankind, reflecting the trend of peace and development in the world, and the common aspiration of people in most countries. He called on all countries to develop a model of dynamic growth, open and win-win cooperation, fair and equitable governance, and balanced, equitable and inclusive development to deal with global economic difficulties. His remarks set the goal for global growth and economic globalization and presented China’s vision for better global governance, which received wide acclaim from the international community.

As a saying goes, “If you want to go fast, walk alone; if you want to go far, walk together.” China has actively contributed to global economic governance in a spirit of openness, inclusiveness and win-win cooperation. Since President Xi put forward the Belt and Road Initiative four years ago, it has been well received and supported by over 100 countries and international organizations. It is a new effort that China has made to promote rebalancing of economic globalization and the most important public good that China provides to the international community. This May, 29 heads of state and government and over 1,500 representatives from more than 130 countries and 70 international organizations gathered in Beijing for the Belt and Road Forum for International Cooperation (BRF). The BRF released the Joint Communiqué of the Leaders Roundtable and a List of Deliverables, which includes 76 items comprising more than 270 concrete results in five key areas. China’s propositions, including the community of shared future, the Silk Road spirit, the principles of extensive consultation, joint contribution and shared benefits, and the vision of innovative, coordinated, green, open and shared development, have been written into the Joint Communiqué, which demonstrates the important role China plays in shaping global development and governance.
III. Major-country diplomacy with Chinese characteristics provides a new perspective on international relations

Vision guides action, and direction determines the path forward. Since the 18th CPC National Congress, the CPC Central Committee with Comrade Xi Jinping at its core has kept to the course of peaceful development and grasped the overall trend of the changing international landscape. While maintaining the consistency and continuity of China’s foreign policy, the Central Committee has been actively advancing new ideas and practices, and leading us onto a new path of major-country diplomacy with Chinese characteristics. Compared with traditional Western theories of international relations, it has distinct Chinese features, which can be summed up with the following key words:

The first key word is vision. As an ancient Chinese poem puts it, “The old leaves are always replaced by the new, and the waves in front always give way to the ones behind.” In the 21st century, sharing converging interests and facing intertwined and interconnected challenges, countries live in a global village where they increasingly depend on each other and rise and fall together. With a keen understanding of the trend of the times and the course of history, President Xi has initiated a series of new ideas and new thinking. He calls for fostering relationships based on dialogue and partnership rather than confrontation and alliance, which will lead to the pursuit of a new type of international relations featuring win-win cooperation, and on this basis, a community of shared future for mankind. These new ideas and thinking reject the old mentality of alliance and confrontation, and rise above the outmoded approach of zero-sum games. They have distinct Chinese characteristics and
significant implications for the world. They are the guide to action for China’s diplomacy in the new era and will exert far-reaching influence on human development and progress.

The second key word is initiative. As an ancient Chinese teaching goes, “All good principles should adapt to changing times to remain relevant.” Chinese diplomats are shouldering heavier tasks of safeguarding the legitimate and lawful rights and interests of Chinese businesses and people as they “go global” in a larger number. In the face of new circumstances and tasks, Chinese diplomats have worked vigorously and creatively to advance the interests of our country and people. We have established a global web of partnerships and provided an enabling environment and strategic support for domestic development. We have advanced the Belt and Road Initiative and opened a new chapter of openness and win-win cooperation. Putting people at the heart of diplomacy, we have improved consular services as a way to protect the rights and interests of Chinese citizens and businesses abroad.

The third key word is consistency. As we Chinese often say, “Despite the storms and waves, we will sit tight in the fishing boat.” In the face of instability and conflicts in many parts of the world, China has adhered to the path of peaceful development. In the face of skepticism over the existing international order and system, China has called for maintaining it and, where necessary, improving it. In the face of growing backlashes against globalization and rising protectionism, China has upheld multilateralism, openness and inclusiveness. It is China’s responsibility as a major country to maintain consistency and continuity in its foreign policy, which can offset various uncertainties and is a demonstration of China’s confidence and firmness of purpose.
In the second half of this year, the CPC will hold its 19th National Congress. Guided by the diplomatic thinking of General Secretary Xi Jinping, China’s diplomacy will continue to forge ahead and create a favorable environment for the meeting. China will continue to make contribution to and leave its mark on the great cause of advancing world peace and development.
The traditional regional order in the Middle East has been introduced and dominated by outside powers and based on the nation states in the region. It reflects the different levels of relations between outside powers and countries in the region. The competition between them is the major driver of the evolution of the regional order. In the post-Arab Spring era, regional countries have come back to the center. Elements such as outside powers and Non-state actors in the region will be constrained. A new regional order based on nation states is emerging.

I. The Origin of the Modern Regional Order in the Middle East

The modern order in the Middle East and the emergence of non-state actors in the region can be traced back to the Sykes-Picot Agreement signed by Britain and France 100 years ago to divide the Ottoman
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Empire. The agreement officially established a vertical ruling order by the West to divide and rule in the Middle East. This not only profoundly transformed the geopolitical landscape in the region, but also started the history of the separation and parallel evolution of regimes and societies in the region.

Without the shelter of the empire, the regional environment of religious tolerance where diverse cultures coexisted came to the end. Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, as the inheritor of the empire, embarked on the path of modern transition characterized by secularization. Levant and the Arab parts of the Gulf region were ceded and included in the West-dominated colonization system in the name of international trusteeship. The elites of traditional regimes became agents for the Western rule. They managed national economic and security affairs in dislocation of society. Religions and tribes, the two pillars of traditional social governance, were excluded from the global colonization system and, in turn, started to embrace the masses at the bottom, who had been marginalized but still accounted for the majority of society. The Islamism that had developed after the collapse of the Ottoman Empire grew into two categories. One tends to learn from outside cultures and system, as represented by political Islam and the Muslim Brotherhood. The other prefers to seek answers from historical traditions. The extreme forms are fundamentalism and extremist organizations.

After the Russian Revolution of 1917, the ideological competition among outside powers spread into the region and was interwoven with long-standing regional geopolitical conflicts. This triggered the competition for survival among regional countries. The Muslim Brotherhood grew fast in Egypt and Syria, countries
that shared basic conditions with Russia. These countries had big populations and scarce resources. If they wanted to expand tax bases, strengthen defenses and gain policy autonomy, they had no other options than take the lead to, albeit to different degrees, undertake democratic and constitutional reforms and pursue industrialization, and resort to nationalism or socialism from the outside as tools to mobilize society. Therefore, these societies were more open. On the other hand, fundamentalism became more popular in the Gulf and sparsely populated North African countries. One major reason was that it was hard for foreign influences to penetrate into these countries geographically. They didn’t receive attention from outside powers until oil was discovered there. Yet, the massive oil wealth and the far distance from the competition of foreign hegemons diluted the necessity for political and economic reforms as well as social mobilization.

After the end of the Second World War, the Palestine-Israel issue and the hegemonic competition in the Gulf became a tussle ground for the Cold War between the US and the Soviet Union and regional proxy wars. On the former, the Arab world was divided into two camps: the radical and the moderate. In radical countries such as Syria and Iraq, frequent military coups have taken place in the context of outside wars and domestic curfews. The regimes have become increasingly centralized. The Muslim Brotherhood and other social mobilization tools are forced to go underground. On the latter, there was competition between Iran and Iraq for hegemony. The monarchy Iran, as it turned out, saw the outbreak of the Islamic revolution because of the lack of social support. Later, it exported revolution to resist the control of the United States and Soviet Union, which sowed the seeds for social revolutions in the region and led to the Iran-Iraq war. In the early
days of the Iran-Iraq war, Saudi Arabia and other Gulf states joined hands to establish the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) to make unified arrangements for foreign affairs and defense to counter the invasion of Iran and Iraq and the threat of social revolutions within their borders. Saddam was able to organize a million-strong troop at the end of the Iran-Iraq war, thanks to his social mobilization skills. But he also faced the risk of fiscal collapse. To defuse the crisis, he took the bold step to invade Kuwait, which sparked the Gulf War and the Iraq War. At the end, the US forces were brought into the Gulf and a US-dominated regional order was established in the Middle East.

II. The Rise and Fall of the US-dominated Regional Order

The Gulf War established the dominance of the US and sped up the end of the Cold War. The US displayed its exceptional capabilities in air-space wars and long-distance projection. As the ally of Iraq, the Soviet Union, in a way, cemented the presence of the US and saw its own reputation nosedived in the Middle East. In the wake of the war, the US, the GCC, Egypt and other moderate states established a regional order that had two prominent features: first, it is dominated by security; second, it puts US interests first. These features also explain the inherent deficiencies and contradictions in such an order. It aggravates the dislocation of the regime and society and, undoubtedly, will not last for long.

The first apparent deficiency of the US-dominated regional order is that “US interests first” amplified the conflicts between regimes and societies. The Middle East is included in the global strategy of the US, providing support to the US dominance through its geographical and energy value. Saudi Arabia supported oil trade
settled in US dollars and used the dollar specifically to buy the US treasury bills and prop up the US financial hegemony. In return, it got US support for its pricing right in OPEC and US commitment to ensure the security of the regimes of GCC states. Egypt and other countries accepted the US military and economic assistance. In exchange, they compromised on the Palestine-Israel issue, recognized the survival right of the Israel state and dropped their position of supporting regional radicalists to wipe out Israel. The surprising end of the Cold War and the “end of history” argument of Francis Fukuyama made these countries disoriented and subordinated to the US. They traded away their economic interests or national sentiments. As a result, they tried to get external support for the legitimacy of their regimes, and their economies became overly dependent on the outside world. At the same time, as their populations grew fast without adequate resources to support social development, pressure for social changes has built up inside these countries.

The second deficiency of the US-dominated regional order is that it uncompromisingly excludes the radical states and thus escalated conflicts among countries in the region. After the Gulf War, the Rafsanjani government in Iran made goodwill gestures to the Gulf states, Europe and the US. The Clinton administration, however, still listed Iran as a supporter of terrorism because the Iranian government assassinated the opposition overseas. The US adopted the policy of promoting peace talks in the west and resisting Iraq and Iran in the east. It tried to negate the influence of Iran on the Palestine-Israel issue and use the threat of Iran to bolster its legitimacy in the region and maintain the dependence of the Gulf states on the US. Provoked by the uncompromising policy of the US, there emerged a consensus in Iran to pursue nuclear
weapons and develop asymmetrical tactics for potential military confrontation with the US, such as developing shore-based missile technologies and blocking the Hormuz Strait. Moreover, Iran stepped up support to countries and organizations, which boycotted the Palestine-Israel peace talks. As a result of the uncompromising policy of the US, the Palestine-Israel issue and the Gulf issue became highly interconnected and more complicated. The hegemonic presence of the US breeds anti-American sentiments and provides continuous social support for regional radicalists to resist the peaceful settlement of the Palestine-Israel issue. The long-standing Palestine-Israel issue, on the other hand, has undermined the relations between regimes and societies in moderate regions and countries, which, in turn, undercuts the stability of the regional order dominated by the US.

After the 911 attacks, the balance of power between regions and societies in the region has shifted. The US-led regional order collapsed at a faster pace. The wars in Afghanistan and Iraq greatly consumed US power and gave rise to rampant anti-American sentiments. In addition, with the rise of emerging countries and the shift of global geopolitical gravity, the regional order has, once again, moved to the stage of accelerated evolution. Under huge social pressure, the GCC states no longer completely followed the lead of the US. After closing the BBC Arabic channel which had just been brought in but was found to be in contradiction with traditional social values in 1995, Saudi Arabia canceled the US air base in the country for similar reasons in 2001. That said, the GCC is not monolithic. The BBC Arabic channel and the US air base were soon invited by Qatar. Al Jazeera and Al Udeid Air Base were then established. Qatar was the first to be diplomatically independent in the GCC and embarked on a path of diversified
diplomacy. Apart from expanding its relations with other big powers, it made goodwill gestures to regional radicalists, providing funding assistance to Hamas, Muslim Brotherhood and other radical organizations.

To eliminate the breeding ground for terrorism in the region, the Bush Jr. administration started to rebuild the Afghan and Iraqi governments and asked its Middle East allies to pursue democratic transformation, promote democracy in a top-down manner, and expand the basis for social support. The results, unfortunately, were less than desirable. First, the regimes which were comfortable with the status quo had no other choice but to make some superficial reforms from the top to the bottom, which divided the invested interests. Second, it set the stage for the legitimazation and politicalization of radical organizations in the region. Hamas was elected in the next year. The Iranian nuclear crisis and the Israel-Lebanon conflict soon broke out. The radicalists climbed to the peak in their regional popularity. Third, the former Iraqi security forces were disbanded, creating space for the infiltration of Al Qaeda. For the first time, fundamentalists got the chance to establish a state. The Obama administration started to pull out of the Middle East to get rid of the liabilities in the Middle East and tackle the financial crisis at home. In his speech at the University of Cairo in 2009, Obama responded to the call for social change among the local people who had been upset by the stalled development. But he produced a prescription for regime change in the name of human rights, which gave green light to bottom-up social revolution. Obama may have alluded to Iran, where green revolution had just erupted in protest of unfair elections. To stoke up the revolution in Iran, he went so far as to endorse all regional revolutions of social scales in the region. Unexpectedly, it was in
Tunis and Egypt, the US allies in the region, that regimes were overthrown.

Obama’s speech gave people in the region expectations that the US would give unconditional support to social revolutions in the region. The Turkish model of Islamic revolution in tandem with social and economic development added to the drive of regional organizations of political Islam for revolution. During the Arab Spring, political Islam organizations, in partnerships with populism, used social media to mobilize and organize mass protests. Extremist organizations fished in the troubled water and escalated the street protests into violent revolutions. Al Jazeera confused populism and democracy in its reports and put a cloak of legitimacy on the Arab Spring. Western countries suffered from self-inflicted damage, as they pursued the fabricated principle of political correctness and had undefined geopolitical interests. They threatened to suspend assistance to prevent their allies from cracking down on the revolutions. Due to the failure of the international security mechanism and for the sake of self security and power competition, countries in the region started to support non-state actors in penetrating into regional hotspot security issues, which fueled the spread of the Arab spring in the region. For all the above reasons, the security alliance of the US and its allies in the region was breached from within. Social revolutions easily took down many regimes in the region.

**III. Regional Competitions in the Post Arab-Spring Era**

Due to the Arab Spring social revolution, governments in the region had to face non-traditional security challenges and new competitions for survival among countries. However, dwindling
demands for energy, structural problems in those governments and homogeneous competitions in the region further restricted the space for reform and transformation in regional countries. Exporting security crises and instigation of confrontations among religious sects only temporarily froze the demands for economic reform. They fell short of tackling economic challenges and meeting the needs for social progress.

The fact that countries such as Tunisia and Egypt suffered grave setbacks during the Arab Spring testified two points. First, the isolated moderate countries were more vulnerable to the social revolution in the region because such revolution mainly pursued social development and political participation, which were exactly what has been long overlooked by regional allies of the United States who focused on traditional security. Second, restricted by its own fiscal difficulty and political righteousness of human rights values, the United States had no capability or willingness to interfere in the social revolution in the region. Thus, the US commitment to its allies on ensuring the security of their regimes did not hold anymore. Because of the traditionally high mobility of the people, widely spread regional organizations and unimpeded information dissemination by Al Jazeera and social media, countries in the region had actually entered into new competitions centering on social governance abilities. The most vulnerable countries would very likely be the first to be knocked out by the social revolution. The US allies in the region were generally caught in a difficult situation. The explosive growth of population and information transparency resulted in diversified demands, which significantly impacted the previous single-product economy and closed social structure. When endeavoring to secure their ruling status, the governments in the region must create conditions to
advance economic development and broaden the participation of the general public in state affairs.

Countries in the region will face serious difficulty in their efforts to push for economic transformation and reform for three reasons. First, global demands for energy consumption have declined. After reaching its peak in 2005, the carbon emissions in Europe have been dropping on an annual basis as it turned increasingly to photovoltaic, nuclear and other new energy sources. The debt and refugee crises, terrorist attacks, rising populism and Brexit not only dragged down Europe’s economic growth, but also challenged its integration. Since the financial crisis, the United States has exported its inflation risks through quantitative easing and thus further curbed global consumption. In 2014, the application of shale oil technology on a market scale turned the United States into a net energy exporter and shale oil will take away part of global energy market share. Emerging countries have seen their economic growth slide and in the meantime face the needs for economic transformation and upgrading and safeguarding financial security. Therefore, it will be difficult for them to absorb on their own the newly added energy supply. Oil revenues of gulf countries have decreased and their service sectors such as trade, shipping and tourism, which rely on energy processing and exports, have shrunk. Cross-border management, remittances from migrant workers and the tourism sector of countries like the UAE and Egypt will be harmed as well. Inflation and losses of foreign reserves brought by quantitative easing have undoubtedly added more pains to the people and made reforms more urgent. However, the tools for the governments in the region to regulate their economies have been seriously limited.
Second, advancement of reforms faces structural obstacles. The social crisis in single-product economies relying on resources such as Saudi Arabia has mainly stemmed from the demands by its minorities for equal rights and its youths for participation in the governance. The areas where Shias are concentrated in Saudi Arabia much overlap with those rich in oil. The legitimacy of the royal authority is bound with the doctrines of Wahhabis who refuse to share power with Shias. Therefore, issues relating to Shias are highly sensitive in the country and it is quite difficult to find compromises. The participation of the young people is another standing obstacle. In Saudi Arabia’s population of around 30 million, a staggering 70% are those under the age of 30. Information has resulted in more diversified needs of the youths and women. However, employment provided by the oil industry is far from adequate. Due to shrinking oil revenues, Saudi Arabia will not only exit from its system of high social welfare and privatize public service sectors, but also levy an income tax. Egypt, a populous country with little resources, has long been faced with shortfalls in fiscal payment. Young people under the age of 30 make up for 40% of its population of over 80 million. Daily resident spending nearly consumes the majority of revenues from remittances, the Suez Canal, tourism and natural gas from the Mediterranean. After the revolution, revenues from the above-mentioned sources have dwindled significantly. In addition, the Egyptian military has controlled around 40% of the national economy, and the 700,000-troop standing army is the major beneficiary of international aids, which have been the main source of daily government spending. As the military is important for countering terrorists and maintaining stability, military-related industries have actually become an untouchable independent kingdom.
Third, gloomy prospects due to homogenous competitions of the region. Saudi Arabia has been the most steadfast protester to the Iran nuclear deal. For one reason, removing sanctions on Iran would challenge Saudi’s market share and its dominant role in OPEC. Upon the deal, Iran did raise its daily output of crude oil by around 2 million barrels. It also makes new breakthroughs in its natural gas exports. In 2016, Iran began to export gas by ground pipeline to Iraq, Syria and Oman. To maintain its market share, Saudis tried to edge out major competitors by increasing its production and selling at low prices. But this tactic failed, because the shale oil producers in the US reduced their average cost per barrel from 40 dollars to around 20 dollars, while the Iranians, during the years under sever sanctions, had accumulated hundreds of millions of barrels in stock which they would dump at any low prices for cash. Quite to the contrary, Saudi Arabia received the most damages by its own tactics, as the oil revenue fell, its foreign exchange reserve shrank at a pace so alarming as to threaten the safety of the regime itself. To reverse the trend, at the end of November 2016, the OPEC headed by Saudi Arabia and Russia reached a deal to lower production, which, in May 2017, was allowed to extend for another half year, but the oil price was still hovering at low levels. Saudi Aramco’s plan for listing also fell victim to the low oil price. The biggest IPO in the world had to face the embarrassment of continuous value shrinking. Secondly, leasing out Iran would make Saudi’s economic prospects even more pessimistic. Iran has a larger and more competent labor force, better endowment of natural resources, a self reliant economic system and a democratic election. Its authority is supported by the minority and the young people. More importantly, contrary to Saudis, after years of embargo and sanction, the Iranians are very optimistic about their future after the lifting of sanctions.
Confronted with newly installed competition rules, regional regimes made different endeavors in accordance with different advantages in resources and priority concerns. The Egyptians cleaned the biggest opposition force the Muslim Brotherhood in the name of counter-terrorism. At the same time, they tried every means to attract FDI into huge infrastructure projects like the new Cairo city and New Suez canal to boost economy and employment. In Turkey, apart from attacking his oppositions on the one hand, they championed the flag of Islam to accommodate and consolidate populist support, on the other, promoted constitution amendment to consolidate the presidential power. For Saudi Arabia, with the difficulties in domestic reform, they had to turn to the export of security crisis to the outside. During the Arab spring, the Saudis sided with the oppositions in Iraq, Libya and Syria, intervened militarily to quell Shiite rebellion in Bahrain and Yemen, backed Abdel Fattah el-Sisi's coup in Egypt. They also tried to persuade the Americans and Israelis to solve the Iranian nuclear crisis with force, killed ayatollah Nimr al-Nimr and finally cut diplomatic ties with Iran. Recently it also united with the VAE and other countries to create the crisis of breaking diplomatic relations with Qatar. All these attempts were aimed at bringing up conventional security issues like sectarian conflicts in the region and to trigger the response mechanism of the US-led regional security arrangement or to help to forge a Saudi-dominated security alliance for the Sunnis, thus forestall potential threats from Shiite camp, and provide cover for internal political reform aimed at power consolidation. Iran, to maintain its regional assets, was forced to make counter moves and invest precious resources into almost all regional hot spot issues, especially Syrian civil war.
IV. Building Regional Order From the Perspective of Saudi Arabia

The security crisis transferred from Saudi Arabia resulted in sectarian conflicts in the region and made regional hotspot issues chronic and complicated, becoming the source of a host of security headaches in the region. By remaking regional links and economic ties through security efforts, Saudi Arabia has partly reinstated the U.S.-dominated regional security order in form, yet it is still exposed to potential risks of domestic social crises.

Despite the partial success, its effects are to be examined for the following reasons.

First, hotspot issues in the region have been protracted by the security crisis and sectarian animosity transferred from Saudi Arabia. Dissolution of sectarian powers during their conflicts has opened up a power vacuum, prolonging crises in Syria, Yemen and Libya, and facilitating the permeation and growth of non-state actors including extremist groups. On the other hand, the involvement of extremist groups has in turn complicated hotspot issues even further. Extending its influence in Iraq and Syria and exploiting the weak balance of power in their civil wars, the Islamic State (IS) took over troops and large swathes of territory, and finally declared the establishment of a “caliphate”. Saudi Arabia’s military operations in Yemen turned out to be costly and unsatisfactory, but persistent hotspot issues have kept security the top concern of the region. Saudi Arabia’s ground operations also interrupted the economic development plans of Iran and other rivals in the region. The rise and spread of IS resulted in Saudi Arabia’s unprecedented isolation by the U.S. and Europe, and also
provided grounds for successive events in 2015, the U.S. lifting Iran sanctions, Russia’s military return to the Middle East and the creation of a Shiite counter-terrorism alliance. Outstanding security issues sustained the geopolitical significance of the Middle East despite declining oil prices, and it was exactly geopolitical competition that brought back the U.S., which had prepared for a withdrawal. The U.S. declared in a high-profile manner that it wouldn’t give up its leadership in the global fight against terrorism: it hit an airbase of Syria this April under the pretext that Syria launched a chemical attack on civilians from that airbase, and later dropped the “Mother of All Bombs” in Afghanistan.

Second, Saudi Arabia has shifted the region’s security focus from Levant to the Gulf by bundling regional hotspot issues with counter-terrorism and economic interests. The Islamic Military Alliance to Fight Terrorism (Sunni-dominated) that was established in December 2015 is the Version 2.0 of the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) and the Arab alliance created in May 2015, in that all three are dominated by Saudi Arabia and all three sent troops to Yemen. Another upgrade of these Sunni regional alliances came during April’s Arab Islamic American Summit. The Shiite counter-terrorism alliance set up under the dominance of Russia and Iran is more of a temporary security alliance formed upon war-time needs. In contrast, the Sunni alliance dominated by Saudi Arabia is mainly a community of interests formed through economic ties, which can be seen from the Qatar diplomatic rift. To the United Arab Emirates, lifting the sanction on Iran means ending the prosperous transit trade of Dubai, so it has no choice but to bet on Saudi’s future international investment and funding plan. To Egypt, Saudi Arabia is not only a supporter of Sisi’s military coup, but also its largest funder and a bridge to U.S. aid. To Bahrain,
the security or fall of its government entirely depends on the GCC headed by Saudi Arabia, and its pillar tourism industry is in need of the markets of neighboring countries. To Libya and Yemen, Saudi Arabia is the major supporter of their central governments, while Qatar and Iran side with their opposition forces. Even when the U.S. came onboard, it looked like an exchange of interests. Through a $110 billion arms deal, Saudi Arabia redirected America to its Clinton-era Middle East policy, which is to contain Iran and resolve the Palestine-Israel conflict at the same time.

Third, Saudi Arabia orients its regional order towards containing Iran, and has built a broad alliance of interests upon this basis. Inciting sectarian conflicts is but a Saudi Arabian tactic to transfer its security crisis and to unite the majority in the region, and under the surface, fear of Iran and restraining Iran are what’s really in the mind of Saudi Arabia. During the Iran nuclear talks, Saudi Arabia plotted with Israel for joint military actions against Iran, and together they lobbied the U.S. Congress for barriers to lifting sanctions on Iran. During Donald Trump’s Middle East visit, Saudi Arabia played up its intimate relationship with the U.S. on a high profile, and even used 1/5 of its foreign exchange reserve on U.S. arms and U.S. jobs when it was suffering economically. However, after the GCC junior Qatar expressed goodwill to Iran by suggesting joint development of a shared gas field, and paid a huge sum of ransom to Shiite militant groups, Saudi Arabia and its allies cut their ties with Qatar and severed land, air, and sea travel to the country. The siege laid to Qatar and Muslim Brotherhood will repress activist groups in the region, help region states repair relations between their regimes and the society, and then help them return to the role of modern nation states. Sunni countries focus on domestic affairs and keep aloof from the Palestine-Israel
issue, while Iran and Hezbollah are mired in the Syrian war, and the helpless Hamas has indirectly expressed its willingness to recognize the right to exist of Israel.

Hotspot issues in the region have provided conditions for building a new regional security cooperation mechanism. For the moment, Saudi Arabia’s regional security policies are undoubtedly conducive to settling the Palestine-Israel conflict, the root cause of all problems in the region. Once the conflict is ended, most of Iran’s regional influence would be lost, so would Iran’s threats to countries including Saudi Arabia. However, the security of Israel is only part of the conflict. Before the conflict is solved, everything in the region is likely to backslide into their prior states. From a historical perspective, enriching nation states and strengthening the functionality and inclusiveness of regional mechanisms will remain the direction in building the future order of the Middle East.
Global Thoughts Provoked by the Munich Security Conference Entitled “Post-truth, Post-west, Post-order”

By Wang Yusheng*

The Munich Security Conference (MSC) in mid-February this year is themed as “Post-truth, Post-west, Post-order”.

The Munich Security Report 2017 points out that, Western countries believe less and less that their systems are able to deliver positive outcomes. According to Wolfgang Ischinger, Chairman of the Munich Security Conference, “the international security environment is arguably more volatile today than at any point since World War II. Some of the fundamental pillars of the West and of the liberal international order are weakening.” He also goes straight to the point by asking, “Are we entering a post-order world?”

The fact that the MSC never had such themes before and that the organizer declared its position at the very beginning calls for deep thoughts. Some in the West believe that, such theme is a sign of anxiety
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and reflection of the established developed countries (especially their sensitive elites), and it makes sense as it relates to the global situation, the international order, and their so-called “political correctness”.

Ever since the new century unfolds, “the international balance of power has been undergoing historic changes, featured by accelerating quantitative changes”, and the U.S. “cannot help seeking to gain the upper hand in spite of its declining supremacy”. This conclusion is a fair reflection of realities since qualitative changes are preceded by quantitative changes: despite its decline, the U.S. has not lost its power and still retains its international clout to some extent.

Last year witnessed drastic and unexpected changes in the world, which could be characterized as confusion, transformation, and governance. And the key contributor comes from the U.S., since it refuses to face the reality of a changed world, persists that “the United States is and remains the one indispensable nation… it will be true for the century to come” and holds on to its role as the “world’s policeman”.

A “total chaos” is bound to require “fundamental change”. Last year, the “change of times” seemed to have reached a “tipping point” although change has always been absolute and prevalent. The Duterte Phenomenon and the Trump Phenomenon, the “Two Black Swans”, are not accidental, and foreshadow progress towards “qualitative changes”. “Adversity gives rise to the desire for changes”: this proverb was used on developing countries which sought to turn around their economies. Now “prosperity also gives rise to the desire for changes” when most of them have succeeded
and some have even had a rapid rise in their global standing. A most representative case is that BRICS leaders are demanding a more just and reasonable order in international politics and economy, which means the order set by the U.S. no longer works well. In essence, “fundamental change” relates to the general direction for the change of times.

In view of this, some experts and scholars at home and abroad argue that, “quantitative process” is no longer a precise wording since the change of times has already taken place or, in other word, is at least close to qualitative change. Many Americans, to varying degrees, agree with or have come near the understanding that the change of times has reached a tipping point. A representative of them is the renowned scholar Francis Fukuyama. When the Soviet Union collapsed, he predicted the universalization of Western liberal democracy in his landmark essay “The End of History”, affirming that the United States and its value will dominate the globe, yet he was ridiculed by historical and societal development. Mr. Fukuyama, as a serious scholar, has had to admit that he was so idealistic to have reached a misjudgment despite his continued praise for the so-called American democracy and liberty. He has had to acknowledge the failure of the so-called American democracy and the merits of the political systems in countries like China. An increasing number of scholars in the U.S. now seem to be holding the same opinion, and another one who has left me a deep impression is the top expert David Lampton. At the mention of him, people would immediately think of his 2015 article “A Tipping Point in U.S.-China Relations is Upon Us”. Seemingly, he maintains “there will be an inevitable war between the US and China”. But a careful read would then reveal his emphasis on the underlying causes of the difficulties in China-U.S. relations and
that fundamentally, America has to rethink its objective of primacy. This view is rather valuable.

When “total chaos” requires “fundamental change”, “fundamental change” also calls for governance as this is a rule of social development. For example, during the age of warfare and turbulence, the mainstream obviously desires stability and governance. People crave for a peaceful, stable and harmonious world. And the world at large is considering and exploring new ways to get along with each other, and is looking forward to a beautiful prospect. In such a context, the grand issue of “global governance” made it to the global agenda. It has been almost 10 years if the 2008 U.S. Financial Crisis should be seen as the start for the rising importance of global governance. And it is fair to say that a lot has been achieved while a lot remains to be done.

As a systemic endeavor, “global governance” requires “top-level design” in strategy and social development directions.

First, a clear agreement or at least understanding of the MSC’s theme of “Post truth, Post-West and Post-order. “Post-truth” means that, the “political correctness” extolled by the established developed countries is but a false claim, and their so-called “values” are definitely not one-size-fits-all solutions. The meaning of “post-west” is self-evident. The G7 is still powerful, but could no longer have the final say in global affairs. Instead, they need to consult emerging economies represented by the BRICS. As with “post-order”, the “order” should be upheld and safeguarded (with development and necessary modification of course) if it refers to the spirit of the UN Charter and its related orders, and should be abandoned if it refers to the so-called “order”, which is a twisted
one (President George W. Bush once expressed his belittlement of the UN in praise of the US dominance). In June 2009, the 16-point Joint Statement issued at the First BRIC Summit stated the BRIC’s support for the UN’s central role.

Second, a wisdom-pooling “prescription” to champion “global governance” from a strategic perspective. The G20 consensus reached in Hangzhou last year has to a large extent reflected the necessity of global governance since it advocates cooperation and win-win spirit and objects trade and investment protectionism, and advocates inclusiveness and interconnectivity.

Third, the agreed Shanghai Spirit of “mutual trust, mutual benefit, equality, consultation, respect for diverse civilizations and shared development” upheld by the Shanghai Cooperation Organization can be a reference to the “prescription for global governance” since it conforms to the trend of the times.

Lastly and most importantly, valuable public goods and wisdom are needed in the context of “post-truth, post-west, post-order” and “global governance”. China has no intention for the laureate of a “world leader”, and is willing to jointly explore solutions with other countries and contribute China’s proposal and wisdom. China’s ready-to-use proposals are the “community of shared future” and the Belt and Road Initiative.

Last year, a pair of Black Swans took flight from the Philippines (Duterte) and the United States (Trump). The combustive pair is not as superficial as they seem; instead, they each represent certain interests and iconic features. Those “politically right” are discontented and are battling hard to hold
them back. However, “global governance” and the “post-truth, post-west, post-order” reality require them to behave themselves and “fly with the trend of times”, which is the right direction. A rising China, which is also a responsible large nation, is already moving towards the direction of the trend of times. It is a sincere hope that we can meet each other halfway, proceed to the same direction, and write a new chapter for a global community of shared future.
Global Governance in the Era of Globalization

By Jiang Zhenxi*

Global governance has become a hot topic in the international community and captured wide attention. Against the backdrop of globalization, it is of great significance to explore the impact of global governance on the international landscape, strengthen governance reform of international economic and security institutions and enhance the status and voice of developing countries in international affairs.

I. Basic Idea of Global Governance

The concept of global governance was put forward in the context of globalization. In 1992, Willy Brandt, former President of Socialist International and Chairman of the Independent Commission on International Development Issues, called for the establishment of the Commission on Global Governance, which issued a special report entitled Our
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Global Neighborhood in 1995 when the United Nations celebrated its 50th anniversary. The report called on the international community to carry out extensive cooperation and jointly tackle public issues that emerge around the world.

As global governance is a theoretical concept, different schools of thoughts worldwide have different understandings, which have kept changing as well. Detailed illustration has been made on global governance in Our Global Neighborhood, and many scholars have put forward different thinking on it. The author of this article believes that global governance refers to actions of governance adopted by sovereign states, international organizations and non-governmental institutions to address global issues and such actions include negotiations and consultations, formulation of international treaties, establishment of laws and regulations and implementation of compulsory measures. Global governance covers multiple areas such as international security, economic development and the environment and ecology. The core of global governance should be the universal participation and shared benefits by all parties concerned in the international community and better use of multilateral institutions such as the United Nations so as to achieve win-win outcomes and common development.

Global governance is a wide-ranging global agenda aimed at addressing global issues in political, economic, security and other fields. First, it refers to global security governance, including settlement of armed conflicts between/among nations or at regional level, cessation of civil wars and turmoil in certain countries, prevention of global proliferation of nuclear weapons and control of international trade and illegal flow of conventional
weapons. Second, it refers to promotion of economic globalization, including protection of global trade, circulation of financial markets and handling economic crisis. Third, it covers protection of the environment and ecology, including reasonable use and development of resources, preservation of biodiversity and tackling climate change. Fourth, it includes countering international terrorist activities and transnational crimes such as smuggling and drug trafficking. Fifth, it covers protection of basic human rights, provision of humanitarian assistance and prevention of epidemics.

There are three tiers of players in global governance. The first tier is the governments and administrative authorities of sovereign states. This is the basic tier in global governance and the most important player globally. Government institutions are in possession of power and resources for national governance and shoulder the responsibility and obligation of global governance. The second tier is inter-governmental organizations, including international organizations and special organizations such as the United Nations, World Bank, World Trade Organization and International Monetary Fund, etc. It also includes regional organizations composed of countries in certain regions such as the European Union, African Union and APEC. These international and regional organizations, by putting various countries into inter-connected networks, have played their unique role and exerted distinctive influence in different fields. The third tier is non-governmental institutions composed of non-state actors, including private business institutions, non-governmental organizations and social organizations. According to the statistics of the Union of International Organization, there are over 67,000 international organizations in more than 300 countries and regions. Most of them are non-governmental ones, including academic institutions,
research institutes, special associations and transnational business organizations. The most well-known ones include the International Committee of the Red Cross and Green Peace. Some of these organizations hold global forums to pool elites around the world, produce research results and provide ideas and solutions to governments. Some work with the general public to organize large events and become important forces for humanitarian assistance and environmental protection. Some events are co-organized by non-governmental organizations and governments such as the World Economic Forum held annually in Davos, Switzerland, which invites both top economists around the world and government officials to share views and provide prescriptions to the world economic development.

The goal of global governance is to put in place a sound international regime, formulate effective international rules and achieve fair and effective governance. Global governance puts special emphasis on participation, negotiation and coordination instead of resorting to forces and maintains that international treaties and rules such as the UN Charter should be observed to settle international disputes and regulate behaviors of parties concerned. Many scholars of international politics believe that the world is actually in a state of “Anarchy”, namely, there is no supragovernment that stands above governments of individual countries. Therefore, advocates of global governance underline that the goal of global governance is not to create a “world government”. Instead, it pursues the establishment of a more democratic, transparent and effective international regime and greater international cooperation so that various forces can be mobilized to exercise plural and multi-tiered governance of global affairs.
As globalization is evolving, global governance has made visible progress and played an important role: first, it is conducive to the development of globalization. Globalization has closely connected various regions and countries in the world and has been the context in which global governance is growing. Both developed and developing countries have shown greater interest in the agenda and goal of global governance. Second, it is conducive to jointly coping with global issues. Global governance has promoted the processes of restructuring world economic order, advancing the UN reform, tackling climate change and protecting the environment. Currently, the scope of global governance keeps expanding to new areas such as the cyberspace, polar areas, the aerospace and the sea. These global issues cannot possibly be solved by any single country, no matter how strong it might be and can only be jointly tackled through strengthened international cooperation. Third, it is conducive to enhancing international cooperation. The key to global governance is to step up international coordination and cooperation. Sovereign states are of fundamental and crucial significance to solve global issues. Their participation in international organizations and efforts to strengthen regional cooperation have put in place a multi-tiered and wide-ranging international network and provided extensive platforms and channels for global governance. Fourth, it is conducive to establishing a new international order. Global governance follows universally recognized international laws and regulations, norms governing international relations and international practice to properly handle global issues, while reflecting fairness and efficiency and safeguarding rights of countries and the international order. In a nutshell, global governance maintains that through multilateral governance mechanisms represented by the United Nations, members of the international community should
be mobilized to participate on a broad basis to realize win-win outcomes through equal-footed consultation.

II. Some Thinkings on Global Governance

Global governance, as an internationally recognized concept, is feasible for the following reasons: first, global governance serves the fundamental interests of all countries so they can benefit from it. Second, after years of efforts, the existing international system is still running in a reliable way. For instance, the Bretton Woods system composed of the World Bank and International Monetary Fund has kept improving, the World Trade Organization has made remarkable achievements and the World Health Organization has made indelible contribution to epidemics prevention. Third, international treaties have played an important role in global governance. The UN Charter has set rules for international relations and safeguarded world peace and security. The Non-Proliferation Treaty, the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change and the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea have played a major role in upholding the international order and will continue to do so in future.

Global governance, however, is not aimed at establishing a “world government”. Though some scholars are in favor of establishing such a government for global governance, the mainstream thought does not recognize it, neither is it realistic. Many scholars emphasize that global governance is not to establish a world government or world federation. Despite its crucial role in global governance, the United Nations is not a world government. And it is unlikely for the international community to establish a supra-government above the governments of individual countries.
Only when it works to strengthen cooperation and coordination between sovereign states and relevant organizations, can the United Nations fulfill its mission.

Though global governance is the consensus of the international community, the development of globalization has not changed the basic realities of international politics and there are some constraints in global governance: first, the concept of globalization is rather general and abstract without a clear definition. And there are misleading interpretations which can hardly guide specific actions. Second, without a “world government”, the idea of global governance lacks the execution power. The current global governance regime has no adequate power and resources, and thus it is underperformed in international governance and coordination of actions as its execution power is limited. Therefore, global governance can only rely on effective international cooperation. Third, as sovereign states have different interests and values, it is often difficult to reach consensus on global governance. The fact that sovereign states place their national interests above anything else is an obstacle to global governance and puts it in a serious dilemma of collective action. In the current international relations, it is hard for certain countries to reach agreement and understanding as they lack mutual trust. In particular, the hegemonist international strategy pursued by the United States has directly undermined global governance in its fairness and efficiency. Fourth, non-state actors have participated in global governance on a large scale and as a result, it has added difficulties to reaching consensus on some major global issues and to the conclusion and enforcement of resolutions as different parties pursue different interests. Therefore, it is a long way to go before turning global governance from a slogan into a reality.
Under the current circumstances, global governance should be based on realities to advance the reform of the global governance regime: first, priority of global governance should be clearly set and governance on major international issues such as global security, international economic cooperation and control of communicable diseases should be strengthened. Second, cooperation and coordination among sovereign states, major countries in particular, should be enhanced. Sovereign states are the foundation of modern international relations, and without their participation and cooperation, global governance would only be an empty talk. In international relations, the basic principle of peaceful coexistence must be followed and the legitimate rights and interests as well as major concerns of sovereign states should be upheld in real earnest. In the process, it is crucial to establish a new model of state-to-state relations featuring mutual respect and win-win cooperation. Third, the role of coordination of international organizations should be boosted. International organizations are the bond of international relations. They not only uphold the international order and make decisions in international affairs, but also set international rules. Global governance is first and foremost integrated governance that the international system carries out together with sovereign states. Fourth, non-governmental organizations should be more involved in international affairs. Such organizations and the general public should widely participate in global governance to reflect the aspirations of the people. In future, the positive role of non-governmental organizations should be better displayed.

Global governance is the consensus of the international community and enjoys a broad prospect. Despite the emergence of de-globalization, slow growth of world trade, rising trade protectionism and even doubts of some people on globalization, it
does not mean that globalization will backtrack. Globalization is an objective rule based on the development of productive forces and cannot be changed by the will of mankind. Therefore, the international community should make unremitting efforts to bolster global governance and jointly push for the sound development of globalization.

**III. China’s Role in and Contribution to Global Governance**

Recent years have seen rapid economic development of China, which has become the second largest economy and the largest manufacturing and trading nation in the world. In 2016, China’s GDP reached RMB 74.41 trillion. As its aggregate national strength grows fast, China has been increasingly involved in international affairs.

China has now been deeply integrated into the international system and become an important member of major international organizations. It has taken an active part in global governance and endeavored to change from an onlooker to a participant and a leading player in international affairs.

**China has put forward the concept of common security.** In 2014, President Xi Jinping proposed the concept of common, comprehensive, cooperative and sustainable security and emphasized that efforts should be made to promote multilateral diplomacy and advance the reform of the international system and global governance.

Over the years, China has been committed to building a world of lasting peace and universal security. China stands
for establishing partnerships of dialogue and cooperation with mutual respect rather than confrontation and alliance to seek win-win outcomes. And it is in favor of improving global economic governance and strengthening cooperation in financial oversight, international taxation and anti-corruption to improve the capacity of the world economy in warding off risks.

**China has participated in the UN peacekeeping operations.** China firmly safeguards the international system with the United Nations at the core, the basic norms governing international relations based on the purposes and principles of the UN Charter as well as the authority, status and the core role of the United Nations in international affairs. China has for years shouldered the common responsibility as a member of the international community and provided various support to and cooperated with the United Nations and other international organizations. The share of peacekeeping contribution that China bears ranks the second among all the UN member states, making up for 10.2% of the total. Since 1990 when China for the first time sent its military personnel to the UN peacekeeping operations, it has in total dispatched 30,000 peacekeepers and 21 Chinese peacekeeping soldiers and policemen lost their lives during the operations. Currently, over 2,000 Chinese peacekeepers are stationed in conflict areas. China has been playing an increasingly important role in and made greater contribution to the UN peacekeeping operations.

**China’s Navy participated in escorting missions in the Gulf of Aden.** On 26 December 2008, the Chinese government sent its naval fleet to the Gulf of Aden and Somali waters for escorting missions to protect China’s vessels and personnel traveling in the area as well as the ships transporting humanitarian supplies from
the World Food Program and other international organizations. The Chinese fleet also worked hard to help ensure security of foreign vessels traveling through these waters. By far, 25 batches of fleets have been sent to the area. These fleets also held joint military exercises with naval forces of relevant countries, paid port visits and participated in counter-piracy trainings.

**China hosted the G20 Hangzhou Summit.** The *G20 Blueprint on Innovative Growth* was adopted at the Hangzhou Summit in 2016, which demonstrated the determination of G20 countries to find the fundamental path to sustained and sound growth of world economy and fully enhance the medium- and long-term growth potential of the global economy. The *G20 Strategy for Global Trade Growth* was formulated as well, which offered continued support to the multilateral trading system, reiterated the commitment to opposing protectionism and set forth the action plan for implementing the UN 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, which will deliver tangible benefits to the people of developing countries. The G20 should keep improving the international monetary and financial system, the governance structure of international financial institutions and the global network of financial security.

**China proposed the Belt and Road Initiative.** In 2013, China put forward the Belt and Road Initiative, which is a China plan of great vision designed to advance common development of China and the world. In pursuing the Belt and Road Initiative, China stands for the principle of extensive consultation, joint contribution and shared benefits. Extensive consultation focuses on strengthening the complementarity of development strategies of countries concerned to seek common development. Joint
contribution is aimed at linking closely the interests, future and responsibility of countries along the route to jointly promote the Belt and Road Initiative. Shared benefits mean that win-win outcomes should be achieved to the benefit of the countries and people along the route.

Recent years have seen impressive achievements of economic cooperation and trade between China and over 60 countries along the Belt and Road. In 2016, the import and export between China and the countries along the route reached RMB 6.3 trillion. China’s newly signed engineering contracts in these countries totaled US$126 billion and its direct investment amounted to US$14.5 billion. Chinese companies have built 56 zones of economic cooperation and trade in over 20 countries along the route, covering multiple areas. In May 2017, China hosted the Belt and Road Forum for International Cooperation in Beijing. Heads of state and government from 28 countries were invited to the forum in an effort to jointly promote the sound development of the Belt and Road Initiative.

China is committed to safeguarding world peace and advancing common development. In international relations, China has followed the principle of equality, mutual trust, inclusiveness, mutual learning and cooperation for win-win outcomes to uphold international fairness and justice. The realities have proved that China is a participant, facilitator and contributor in the international order.
“Ballast”, “propeller” and “anchor” are the key words frequently used to describe the role of China-U.S. economic and trade relations in the overall relationship of the two countries. Indeed, currently, China is the U.S.’s second-largest merchandise trading partner, its third-largest export market, and its biggest source of imports. In 2016, the trade between the two countries, totaling US$ 524.3 billion, is 209 times of that in 1979, when China and the U.S. established the diplomatic relations. Trade in services has exceeded US$110 billion in 2016, while two-way investments have amounted to over US$ 200 billion, according to China’s Commerce Ministry.

* Li Yong is senior fellow and vice chairman, China Association of International Trade.
U.S. Data: China is U.S.' largest source of surplus in service trade

In nearly 40 years of time, the bilateral economic cooperation have expanded from trading of goods in the early days of the reestablished diplomatic relations to cooperation in a wide range of areas today, such as agriculture, science and technology, energy, education, culture, tourism, environmental protection, and healthcare.

While bring great benefits to both sides, the economic and trade relationship between China and the U.S. has not always been a smooth sailing as it grows more complex and interdependent and at times, is fraught with tensions.

In the last 45 years since Nixon’s ice-breaking visit in 1972, China-U.S. bilateral relations witnessed 8 U.S. presidents, and all of them choose to stay on each other’s good side by exercising leadership and vision. No major disruptions have ever happened.

President Donald Trump has demonstrated similar vision to
the other 8 presidents in his meeting with President Xi Jinping at Mar-a-Lago resort in early April this year. At the same time, though, President Trump has been outspoken about his attitudes towards multilateral rules and institutions in general, and the China-U.S. economic and trade relations in particular. That has injected a feeling of uncertainty about how he is going to shape the contour of U.S. trade with the rest of the world, including China.

**Xi-Trump summit: setting tones for a new start**

With Donald Trump’s campaign rhetoric (including his tweets) overshadowing the China-U.S. relations, the summit meeting between President Xi and President Trump at Mar-a-Lago resort between April 6-7 turned out to have produced positive results in terms of advancing the bilateral relations in manageable direction. Although President Donald Trump has been the center of controversies in the U.S. on many domestic and international issues, his attitude, effort and vision in handling the China-U.S. bilateral ties so far deserve positive evaluation. What is also worth noting is that the U.S. State Secretary Tillerson’s visit prior to President Xi’s visit to Mar-a-Lago affirmed China’s “non-conflict, non-confrontation, mutual respect and win-win cooperation” principle for establishing new model relations between the great powers, and that was taken as a sign of goodwill before the two presidents met.

The summit distinguishes itself from the previous ones by achieving at least 6 key results that can be viewed as the new starting points and basis of future China-U.S. bilateral interactions:

1) the chemistry between the two leaders was positive;
2) the discussions between two Presidents were based on mutual respect and results-focused;

3) both sides agreed to elevate existing bilateral talks to a higher level;

4) a new high-level framework for talks was established, which includes four pillars, namely, the diplomatic and security dialogue, the comprehensive economic dialogue, the law enforcement and cyber security dialogue and the social and cultures issues dialogue;

5) the summit set a very constructive tone for the bilateral relations going forward.

6) the recognition by the U.S. of the importance of China’s Belt and Road Initiative and attendance of China’s Belt and Road Summit in May 2017.

**100-day plan: symbolization of growing rapport**

The China-U.S. Comprehensive Dialogue, one of the new pillars of high level interactions overseen by the two Presidents, had its first meeting during the summit, and one of the most significant fallouts was “the 100-dayplan”, which was proposed by the Chinese side as an expression of China’s willingness to work with the U.S. on resolving issues in bilateral economic and trade relations. The plan was seen as the most significant progress made by the two countries to begin the effort to deepen the economic and trade cooperation.
On May 12, the two sides reached an agreement addressing issues in 10 areas including agricultural trade, financial services, investment, and energy, which were called initial results of the 100-day plan.

As concrete progress is made in implementing the actions under the 100-day plan, the two sides have begun examining a one-year plan to “further solidify actions in promoting U.S. - China economic engagement and cooperation”, which will focus on trade, investment and other economic opportunities between both countries.

**One-year plan and beyond: managing differences and removing political biases**

While general spirit of 100-day plan should be continued, additional efforts will be required to manage the differences and biases that exist as a part of the political and economic realities that both countries will have to deal with going forward. In economic and trade fields, there are differences in ways how issues are identified, conceptualized, interpreted and delineated, and in the perspectives in which both sides prioritize and approach them.

On the part of U.S., the issue of trade imbalance will continue to top the list of issues that the U.S. wants to resolve. Other things on the U.S. agenda of future discussions could likely include cyber-security, excess capacity, SOEs and export subsidies, market access, IPR protection, fair trade, reciprocity, etc.. All of those are considered to be “unfair” to American businesses and industries.

China, on the other hand, desires progress on U.S.’ honoring
of Clause 15 of China’s WTO Accession Protocol regarding the use of “surrogate” to establish “fair value” for Chinese products, controls on U.S. exports of high-tech products, secretive security reviews of Chinese investments by CFIUS, BIT negotiation, China’s participation in the U.S. infrastructure projects, to name a few. Specifically, anti-dumping, countervailing measures being taken against Chinese products, the security investigations on imports from 16 countries including China and recent proliferation of national security threat into the investment area have all caused concerns.

In a broader sense, the differences between the two countries are rooted and embedded in the differences of population size, geographical location, natural endowment, history, culture, political system, economic management, social governance and structure, and level of development. As such, the world views of the two countries are different.

Politically, the two largest economies are under two different political systems. The ideological difference has given rise to biases about what China has been doing in dealing with the economic and trade relations with the U.S. and the tendency of politicizing economic and trade issues in the U.S.

In the eyes of some American, China’s success as a communist country itself undermines or poses threats to the U.S.’ global primacy and dominance, and therefore, the U.S. economic engagement with China, as they see it, has created social and economic dislocations, resulting in job losses, weakening competitiveness of U.S. industries and slowing the U.S economic growth. Factors such as China’s low labor costs, complementary
nature of the two economies, globalized supply and industry chains, level of development that has determined China’s position at the lower end of the global value chain, are not quite apprehended as the basis of economic engagement and cooperation, but construed as sources of vicious competition and factors of so-called “unfair” trade practices.

With China being demonized, the calls for tough retaliation on China’s economy seems to be part of the political correctness, and China-bashing in political campaigns are seen as a necessity to win populist favor.

The political circumstances in the U.S. have reaffirmed the Chinese concerns that the U.S. might adopt “two-faced” approach in dealing with China. While publicly supporting the idea of seeking win-win resolution of the bilateral trade issues, the U.S. lashed out “national security threats” to target at Chinese products such as steel and aluminum imports. The probe will also be “extended to other fields such as semiconductor and shipbuilding”. The probes have invoked Section 232, a portion of a Cold War-era law-Trade Expansion Act of 1962, and sparked concerns that the use of national security could be abused not just as a tool of trade protectionism, but also a geopolitical countermeasure.

The national security scrutiny has proliferated into investment area. New York Times reported on Reuters’ interviews with officials on Chinese investments in Silicon Valley, saying that “The United States appears poised to heighten scrutiny of Chinese investment in Silicon Valley to better shield sensitive technologies seen as vital to U.S. national security”. The report further disclosed that “Senator John Cornyn, the No. 2 Republican in the Senate, is
now drafting legislation that would give CFIUS far more power to block some technology investments (from China).”

The Chinese government is strongly against politically driven trade and investment barriers, and advocates that “cooperation is the only right choice for China and the U.S.”. At the same time, China will face up the elements of discord with efforts to build mutual trust based on mutual respect, expand the common ground to seek win-win solutions, manage opportunities to promote mutual success and strengthen a stable China-U.S. economic cooperation that will help boost the global economy.

In drawing up the one-year plan, both China and the U.S. will need to make efforts to build consensus on how the trade and investment issues are resolved in the best interests of both countries, and make sure that no preoccupied politically-driven agendas and protectionist assumptions are built into the process when discussing solutions.

Any attempts to go in opposite directions or forcefully impose unfair measures against Chinese products and investments on grounds of national security threats would have disruptive impact on the bilateral efforts to engage each other, and negative spillover into the world economy. China and the U.S. can work together on differences, but both cannot afford to see the differences being distorted by biases.

**Protectionism and unilateralism: Pandora’s Box**

Since the Sub-prime crisis in the U.S. in 2008, the world has been suffering from the consequences and faced with challenges
never seen before. The sluggish global economic performance has prompted some countries to change their free trade policies, triggering the rise of nationalism and parochial protectionism that makes free trade conditional and secondary. According to the WTO Report on trade-restrictive measures of G20 countries, while a total of 145 new trade-restrictions were introduced in these countries between October 2015 and May 2016, the average number of such measures applied per month since 2009 recorded its highest level (about 21) during this period. G20 economies have introduced 1,583 new trade restricting measures and removed just 387. Free trade, the principle and flag that have been upheld for decades has now been under attack and in crisis.

There have already been worrying signs that the U.S. is poised to move away from its past advocacy of free trade and the multilateral trading system. The U.S. opposition to the wording on “fighting against protectionism of any form” in the G7 and G20 joint statements provided evidence of that poise, and once again, at the APEC forum in Hanoi this May, the disagreement by the U.S. on the use of anti-protectionism language failed the forum’s effort to renew the commitment of opposing trade protectionism. The redirected focus on “fair” and “reciprocal” trade has brought “U.S. standards” to the fore of the multilateral and plurilateral platforms to justify American-standard free trade.

Bilaterally, the U.S. policymakers cry foul about the China using its unilateral standards postulating “unfair practices”, while at the same time, unfortunately, adopt trade policies that distort trade to protect domestic interests. One example is America’s continued use of surrogates on the basis so-called “non-market
economy methodology” when determining whether Chinese goods are being “dumped” into the U.S. market at “unfairly” low prices.

To be sure, the “surrogate” practice was the result of the negotiation 15 years ago, although illegal under WTO rules. However, the agreement, as stipulated in the China WTO Accession Protocol, was that it should end, no matter what, 15 years later.

The insistence that China is not a market economy and hence surrogate will continue to be used is, however, a hangover from political biases, and the mystical formula only allows U.S. officials “discretion” to impose punitive tariffs high enough to protect domestic industries. This is unfair and discriminative to Chinese imports. China sees Free trade as the foundation of economic globalization and an input of the multilateral trading system. Restrictions on free trade on the ground of fair trade could generate unfair outcomes. Fair trade must be embedded in free trade.

While blaming China for subsidizing SOEs and exports, the U.S. has never stopped its spending on subsidizing its industries, such as agriculture, oil and energy, can corporations. Five corporations, according to Washington Post, have achieved a trifecta, ranking among the 50 largest recipients of three kinds of funds: state subsidies; federal grants and tax credits; and federal loans, loan guarantees and bailout assistance.

Fairly speaking, it is hardly possible to define “fairness” of trade, and in history, the U.S. has abusively used the so-called fair trade standards to unfairly lock foreign competition out of the door. James Bovard, a Cato Institute associate policy analyst
said in his policy analysis: The "crime" of dumping results solely from applying different tests of fairness to U.S. and foreign prices. The Treasury Department, in a 1957 report on dumping, defined "fair value" for foreign prices: "the word 'fair' as used here simply means what one ordinarily conceives of as the 'fair market' value—what a willing buyer will pay a willing seller." But U.S. anti-dumping law rejects voluntary agreement as the measure of fairness of U.S. prices for imported products. The U.S. price of an imported product is "fair," not according to whether a foreign seller and American buyer voluntarily agree, but according to whether the foreign company can pass dozens of arbitrary tests imposed by the U.S. government.

In the same analysis, he cited a few examples of U.S. anti-dumping cases using self-judgments (See the box below).

**Box: U.S. trade policies in history have become a travesty of fairness**

- Commerce sometimes penalizes foreign companies for selling different products for different prices. In 1984 an Italian company was convicted of having a less-than-fair-value margin of 1.16 percent on its sales of pads for woodwind instruments. Commerce compared the price of a smaller woodwind pad sold in the United States with that of a larger woodwind pad sold in Italy. Since the smaller pad sold for less than the larger pad, the Italian company was dumping. In a brief defending its action to the Court of International Trade, the U.S. government admitted that it had not compared the sales price of identically sized pads—and then claimed that Commerce has unlimited discretion to
accept or deny comparisons of that sort.

- Commerce convicted a Brazilian company for selling its frozen concentrated orange juice for 1.96 percent less than fair price. The United States has a 40 percent tariff on orange juice, so Commerce subtracted 40 percent from the Brazilian company’s U.S. sale price before comparing it with the Brazilian price. The Brazilian government imposes a 3.5 percent export tax on orange juice, and shipping and insurance costs probably added at least another 2 or 3 percent. Thus, Brazil was selling orange juice for at least 45 percent more in the United States than in Brazil. But the Commerce Department still considered the U.S. price unfairly low.

- In early 1988 the newsletter Inside U.S. Trade reported: “The Commerce Department is trying to cajole industries into filing dumping cases against Japanese imports for products that it feels are being sold at prices that do not sufficiently reflect the recent appreciation of the Japanese yen, according to many sources including Commerce officials. Commerce has been unofficially compiling a list of products suspected of being dumped by Japanese companies.” One Commerce official declared that the agency was “trying to force Japanese concessions on contentious trade issues—such as restrictive bidding on construction projects and agricultural quotas—by ‘creating an anti-Japanese climate.’”

- In a Japanese TV case, one company had its dumping margins increased because it donated unsold television sets to charity. Commerce assessed the firm as if the television sets had been “sold” for $0 in the U.S. market—the ultimate act of unfair trade. Companies have also received higher dumping margins
Another protectionist measure that is typical of self-judgment and self-imposed-standards is the invoking of “national security” against foreign imports and investment, including Chinese ones. The intention behind is a) to take advantage of the WTO loophole of “national security exception”, which should otherwise be exercised in good faith but not abused to endanger the bases of WTO rules, and b) a unilateral action that tries to rationalize protectionism. This is not fair, and dangerous, too, as it will trigger off retaliatory responses from other countries. Between China and the U.S., the abusive use of Section 232, whether it will result in higher tariffs or restrictive measures, could well undermine the foundation of agreements that both side wish to achieve in addressing trade imbalance issues.

Another flag of “fair” trade the U.S. is waving is “reciprocity”.

ArticleXXXVI (8) of GATT 1947 established the principle of non-reciprocity, stating that "developed contracting parties do not expect reciprocity for commitments made by them in trade negotiations to reduce or remove tariffs and other barriers to trade of less-developed contracting parties." Non-reciprocity is one of the principles that constitute the pillars of the multilateral trading system as embodied in GATT and its successor WTO. Countries at different levels of development have different priorities and needs, and these must be accommodated if the multilateral trading system is to serve all its members. Unilateral enforcement of reciprocal trade does not conform to WTO rules.
China is taking notice of the “reciprocity” tendency being mulled in some developed countries in relation to their trade and investment relations with China. China is also aware of the policy options by the U.S. of reciprocal tax or tariff.

What needs to be clear is that China is still a developing country, although its aggregate size of GDP is the second largest in the world, and China’s per capita GDP is still in the lower ranking of around 80th, while having 70 million people in extreme poverty. In addition, the WTO works according to the “most-favored nation” principle, and the current status of China as a member of WTO is the result of the agreements with other members approving China of its accession, and any change of the status quo would require legitimate processes under the WTO framework, not unilateral actions.

The WTO is the legitimate organization to work out a multilateral agreement on reciprocal trade that is accepted and recognized by the all members including developing contracting countries.

**Reality check: Trade with China creates more jobs than less**

In public debates on the trade issues with China, the focus has almost exclusively been on the “staggering” size and growth of imports from China, the trade deficit the U.S. has with China and the perceived threats to American workers and manufacturers. That has fanned up anti-China sentiments in American public, and undermined the basis of trust between the two peoples.

The truth, however, has never been talked about or told to the
First, import does not directly cause job losses.

Back in 1998, in his testimony before Subcommittee on International Economic Policy and Trade, Committee on International Relations, U.S. House of Representatives on the growing U.S. trade deficit, Daniel Griswold of CATO Institute made the following statement: “No aspect of American trade is talked about more and understood less than the trade deficit. It has been cited as conclusive proof of unfair trade barriers abroad and a lack of competitiveness among U.S. industries at home. It has been blamed for destroying jobs and dragging down economic growth. None of these charges are true”. He cited savings and investments as the underlying causes of trade deficit.

Daniel Griswold’s analysis has proved true even until today. Between 2010 and 2015, for example, the number of U.S. manufacturing jobs rose by 6.8% even though U.S. imports from China increased. On June 2 this year, the U.S. Commerce Department posted a brief on trade titled: “Trade with China Continues Trend While Comprehensive Economic Dialogue Hopes to Balance Deficits”. It says: “The trade deficit widened month-to-month with China from 24.6 billion in March to 27.6 billion in April. At the same time, the Labor Department reported a 4.3% unemployment rate in May, the lowest record since 2001, with 6 million job openings unfilled.

There are a lot of research and analysis about the relationship between trade and employment. However, the two most important factors have been identified as key causes of job losses, namely,
adjustment of industrial structure and technological advances.

Second, trade creates jobs.

The U.S. International Trade Administration released a study earlier 2017, showing that U.S. exports in goods and services created 11.3 million jobs, among which China contributed 601,000 jobs in merchandise trade and 309,000 in service trade.

**U.S. Data: Jobs supported by exports**

Another research conducted by Oxford Economics commissioned by the U.S.-China Business Council reinforced the point, but further explained that the jobs supported by US exports to China could reach about 1.8 million in 2015 if the U.S. products embedded in the exports of other countries to China are factored in. When trade is combined with China’s investments in the U.S., the total jobs supported by the U.S. relations with China was 2.6 million.
Imports from China create jobs, too, as they contain “Made-in-U.S.” contents and they are created in the design, engineering, wholesale and retailing, marketing and logistics of the imported products within the U.S. As indicated by a report prepared by Trade Partnership in 2014, “Of $1.85 billion in products imported in 2009, $464 million of the value was American and 10 million U.S. jobs, or 11.2 percent of U.S. employment, were sustained by global supply chains in 2008.”

**Deficit: Statistics obfuscating the real situation**

It is imperative to recognize the fact that the two countries have developed a complex, broad-ranging and deeply intertwined economic relationship, in which one is part of another, and trade between the two countries have generated huge benefits that are shared rather than a story of one side gaining over the other, as the U.S. deficit number with China might have suggested.

The U.S. side has recorded a deficit of US$ 347 billion for 2016. The “Research Report on the China-U.S. Economic and Trade Relations” (hereinafter referred to as “the Report”), launched by The Chinese Commerce Ministry on May 25, analyzed the deficit as reported by both the Chinese Customs and the U.S. Customs, saying: “the size of the deficit has been exaggerated”, and “the difference is US$112 billion” between the China- and U.S.-reported numbers. The statistical discrepancies that exist in the two different statistical systems were recognized by both sides, and joint studies have been done on the statistical differences since 1994. The results indicated that “the deficit figures released by the US from 2008 to 2014 were over-reported by an average of 19%”.
The Report attributed the causes of statistical discrepancies to factors such as methodological differences, entrepot trade and re-export.

If China’s trade deficit with the U.S. in service trade and the amount of processing trade (exports by foreign invested enterprises in China with imported contents) were deducted, as the Report suggested, the size of deficit could well be more than halved to an estimated US$ 164.8 billion.

Processing trade, also known as intermediates trade (parts and materials imported to make products for export), is a factor of distortion. Export-oriented multinational firms source goods from multiple countries and China is often the final point of assembly. When a finished product is exported to the U.S., the total value is recorded as China’s export, while, in fact, the actual value added in China is only a small fraction.

The most cited example of iPhone assembly in China has illustrated the statistical distortion. In 2009, the export of an assembled iPhone was declared at the U.S. Customs at its full manufactured value, US$ 179, but majority of its contents, 96.4%, came from non-Chinese origins, or, in other words, was made in other countries including the U.S., while Chinese value added in the phone was only 4.6%. The total trade value the U.S. had with China, however, was accounted for at the shipping price of US$179 per unit, which is obviously not a fair calculation. To put it in perspective, China exported 11.3 million iPhones to the United States with a total export value at $2.0 billion. Considering the input from the U.S.(at $121.5 million),the U.S. trade data would put China’s trade surplus in iPhone trade with the United States
at $1.9 billion, contributing 0.8% of U.S.’ total trade deficit. But that number could fall to $73.5 million if that trade was measured according to the actual value-added that occurred in China. The iPhone example demonstrates that the rapidly changing nature of global supply chains has made it increasing difficult to interpret the trade data as they appear to be.

A Deutsche Bank analysis indicated that if foreign contents are factored in, China’s real share in the USA trade deficit will come down significantly, from nearly 50% to about 16%, which compares to 13% contributed by Japan and 11% by Germany. This analysis is done in the context of globalized supply chain, and supports the view of “made in the world” by WTO, who has a statement saying: More and more products are “Made in the World” rather than “Made in the UK” or “Made in France”.

When media are shouting out: 100-day plan is “not enough to wipe out the deficit”, the trade officials at the two sides of the table should be clear about at least two things: 1) the deficit the media talked about is not what the real situation is, and 2) there are significant American benefits and therefore, American interests, in China’s exports to the U.S..

**Globalization: driver and basis of China-U.S. cooperative interdependence**

Reflecting on the development of China-U.S. economic and trade relations, economic globalization has been primarily the driving force. The interdependence as it is today is a natural result of international division of industries as well as optimal allocation of resources against the backdrop of economic globalization.
According to the previously mentioned report by the Chinese Ministry of Commerce (again referred to as the Report here below) on China-U.S. economic and trade relations, the China-U.S. community of common interest is reflected in the benefits of the trade each of the two economies have enjoyed.

For China, the U.S. is one of China’s largest export markets, providing huge external demand for Chinese exports. According to the Report, the share of China’s merchandise exports to the U.S. has remained above 16% of China’s total trade from 2008 to 2016.

China’s exports have provided low cost products that reduce American household spending, particularly for blue collar families, and inflation as well. This is evidenced by the study by Oxford Economics and shown in the chart below.

China-produced content lowers consumer prices

![Chart showing import shares and price movements](chart.jpg)

Chinese exports also complement U.S. industries as part of the global value chain. The Oxford Economics’ research also suggested that American businesses performed well in areas where China’s exports also grew rapidly (see table below), an indication of complementarity between industries of the two countries.

Growth in US Gross Value-Added has come in areas where Chinese imports have grown

![Diagram showing growth in US Gross Value-Added](image)


The U.S. is China’s second largest service trade partner, and the total value of service trade between the two countries was US$118.13 billion in 2016, with China running a deficit of US$55.4 billion, according to the Report. This represents a 4.7% increase over the previous year, and 18% of China’s total service trade. The two countries have strong complementarities in service trade, typically, in the area of technology and culture. The technology contracts from the U.S. in 2016 amounted to US$9.64
billion, while at the same time, the U.S. sold 51 films to China, bringing home nearly US$16 billion.

The U.S. have benefited from its trade with and investments in China. The U.S. exports to China have increased 500% over the period from 2001 to 2016, while its growth export to the world in the same period was only 90%. China is America’s number one market for airplanes and soybeans, number two for automobiles, integrated circuits and cotton (see the table below for more details).

### China is a key market for American exports (2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Products</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Value (billion $)</th>
<th>% of total exports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Airplanes</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soybeans</td>
<td>33.7 million</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automobiles</td>
<td>255,000 units</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated circuits</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft parts &amp; components</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto parts &amp; components</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotton</td>
<td>260,000 tons</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Meanwhile, economic globalization has allowed companies such as Apple, to innovate, develop and engineer their products at home and expand their abilities to source some of their production in low-cost countries, such as China, all of which have enabled American firms to become a highly competitive and profitable as well as sources for high-paying jobs in the U.S.

As revealed by the Report, the revenues by American-invested enterprises in China reached an estimated total of US$517 billion in 2015, with total profit over US$36 billion.
Most of the American-funded entities are operating well in China

- General Motors sells a car every 8 seconds
- Ford sells a car every 25 seconds
- McDonald’s sells 1600 hamburgers every minute
- Starbucks opens a store everyday
- American banks, insurance companies and securities firms made an aggregate revenue of US$48 billion in 2016
- American firms providing legal, accounting and consulting services had a total revenue of over US$19 billion

China offers great potential and realistic opportunities for American companies. The interdependence between the two economies is not hear-say. An analysis by MSCI and Morgan Stanley Research shows that the U.S. listed companies with revenues of more than 10% from China account for 9.7% of the MSCI index. Bloomberg reflected the picture in an analysis that was quoted by the Economist magazine as in the chart below.

U.S. companies with highest revenues from China/greater China

Source: Bloomberg. Adapted from Economist APRIL 1ST–7TH 2017
The interdependence is also reflected in China’s holding of American treasury bonds, which stood at US$1.27 trillion by end of 2015. China’s holding of U.S. treasury bonds in its current magnitude far exceeds the merchandise trade deficit, and has contributed to the financial stability of the U.S. economy and its economic growth.

The above is just an account of some of the many benefits that both countries have attained from the bilateral economic and trade cooperation a demonstration as well of China-U.S. economic interdependence. The key message here is that China appears to be the country that has recorded the trade surplus, but the components of the U.S. deficit involves stakeholders of different countries (including the U.S.) along not just the supply chain, but also the value chain.

As many would reasonably understand, economic globalization has tied up almost every country in the world in one kind of global supply/value chain or another, provided robust momentum for the world economic growth, facilitated the flows of commodities and investments, and promoted the advancement of science and technology, human civilization and people to people exchanges around the world. It is a reality of the global economy that each country has to face and it is not a matter of choice.

Economic globalization was “Made in the America”, and the U.S. has been the biggest beneficiary of economic globalization. China, as a late comer, have also benefited from economic globalization by its comparative advantages in factors of production and active response to globalization by participating in
cooperation across industrial chain and supply chain in the world.

The economic and trade engagement between China and the U.S. has developed in the process of economic globalization, so have the disagreements and disputes. The way the two countries deal with their cooperative interdependence and resolve their issues will have global impacts, which will also shape the contour and trajectory of future globalization process.

**WTO: the core of multilateral trading system**

China’s accession to the WTO has made China’s economic convergence and integration with the rest of the world possible and enabled China to learn to comply with multilateral trading rules. China has fulfilled all its WTO obligations and commitments as required and agreed upon. At the same time, China has played a constructive role in and made contributions to the effective functioning of the WTO and its continued evolution.

In the past 15 years, and under the framework of the WTO, China and the U.S. have joined hands in the promotion of trade liberalization and facilitation, while seeking to resolve bilateral trade frictions and disputes following the WTO rules and regulations. The two countries have also worked together to respond to new challenges in global trade realm in an effort to construct a new system of rules and regulations governing the global trade.

In its over 70 years of history, the multilateral trading system as represented by the WTO and its predecessor GATT has played an irreplaceable role in pushing forward global trade liberalization
and facilitation, promoting the economic and trade growth of all member countries and territories, fighting against the shocks of economic and financial crises, and contributing to the welfare of the peoples in the world.

China firmly supports multilateral trade mechanism as a major channel to boost global economic development and resists all forms of protectionism. China believes that trade should not benefit just a small minority of people, rather, trade should bring benefits to a much larger majority.

While promoting an open, transparent, inclusive and nondiscriminatory multilateral trading regime, China envisions multilateral endeavors to make a “bigger pie” of multilateral cooperation so that it will contribute to the economic growth of all nations, putting global development on track of better equilibrium. China hopes to work with the U.S. on the improvements of the multilateral trading system.

Abandonment of WTO rules of the multilateral trading system to pursue bilateral talks would lead the world economy into a dangerous “beggar-thy-neighbor” and “zero-sum game” plight. If the rules of the multilateral regime are not strictly observed, the world trade will once again plunge into a disorderly era characterized by competition among the powerful, in which the law of the jungle will prevail, resulting in shrinking trade and investment flows, which will negatively impact the progress of world economic recovery and eventually the self-interests of those who fail to comply.
Conclusion: Bigger vision and be SMART

As the Chinese saying goes, people with petty shrewdness attend to trivial matters, while people with vision attend to governance of institutions.

For China and the U.S. to develop a new model of economic and trade relations, both countries need to have bigger visions that transcend the differences and problems that exist today.

1. Both countries should evolve with the times in building new relationship with each other, and abandon old mindset that would hamper economic and trade cooperation. This should be the right starting point for the two sides to build trust and confidence.

2. Both governments should make efforts to develop new understanding and perspectives about each other's economic and trade initiatives, and take proactive actions to promote the cooperative interdependence.

3. Both sides should realize that no-one alone can make the changes in the global trading system and unilateralism is not desirable for the world and not in our mutual interests.

4. The two sides should look at each other in long-term perspectives, pursue opportunities of cooperation rather than erecting road blocks, and view our differences in political, social and economic systems as hybrid advantages in dealing with domestic and global issues.
5. The policy-makers at both sides should realize that de-globalization is dangerous, disruptive and devastating, and strengthening and rebalancing the global economy in ways that avoid protectionism, facilitate reforms, reduce volatilities and eventually drive global growth will be good for all.

6. The U.S. and China, along with other major nations, should be united in combating global challenges, addressing issues of common concerns, and finding cooperative solutions that can best enable opportunities of growth and drive inclusive development that all in the world can benefit.

7. Revisit multilateral institutions as such that would enhance our ability to build consensus on new directions, manage sustainable interdependence in global trade and investment relations, strengthen regulatory coordination to prevent unexpected surprises, and seek reforming measures that eventually resolve long-term challenges.

In dealing with the trade problems between the two countries, both need to be SMART:

- **S**ustaining a good, stable, mutually respectful and win-win bilateral economic and trade relations to avoid disruptive outcomes and pave the way to new model of China-U.S. economic and trade relations.

- **M**anaging differences and abandoning political biases for mutual success through a trust-based platform of dialogues to seek productive and constructive solutions about future economic and trade relations.
• **Attaining concrete breakthroughs with actionable plans** a) to advance the mutual effort to narrow the gaps and seams in trade balances, with particular emphasis on removing export control restrictions on high-tech products; b) to continue the efforts to improve investment environments on both sides to facilitate U.S. investments in China and Chinese investment in the U.S., particularly the Chinese participation in the U.S. infrastructure projects, while at the same time, c) explore opportunities of cooperation under the “Belt and Road Initiative”.

• **Rebuilding the bilateral economic and trade relations** by deepening communications, understanding and trust, coordinating regulatory policies to prevent unilateral actions, making explicit commitments to trade and investment liberalization, and developing institutionalized mechanisms such as BIT and other likely trade agreements to further advance the bilateral trade and investment relations to a higher level.

• **Treating the two-way trade and investments fairly and in compliance with existing rules-based multilateral systems** to a) avoid diverging and protectionist trade policies that will obstruct normal trade and investment flows, and b) create an open, liberalized business environment that will allow the business communities in two countries to work together to contribute to mutual success.

    Being SMART could also have global implications as two responsible stakeholders in the world:

    Sustained and stable China-U.S. economic and trade relations are going to contribute to global economic growth.
Multilateral trading system should be viewed as a safeguard of the global trade flows and needs to be maintained as a central mechanism for enforcement of international trading rules and resolution of trade disputes.

Achieving improvements in existing global systems instead of “abandoning or threatening to abandon the existing systems” to build a better rules-based international environment.

Responsibilities for shared and inclusive growth in the context of globalization should be emphasized and responsible actions be encouraged.

Trade and investment should be facilitated in a liberalized manner without protectionist and unilateral actions.
The US President Donald Trump recently announced the withdrawal of the United States from the Paris Agreement on Climate Change, the latest US policy action on climate change and energy security following the Presidential Executive Order on Promoting Energy Independence and Economic Growth Trump had signed in March. It shows that the Trump administration has completely abandoned the climate and energy policies adopted by the Obama administration. The nature and impact of such a move deserve close attention.

I. The Nature of the Trump Administration’s Withdrawal from the Paris Agreement

On June 1, Trump finally decided to withdraw from the Paris Agreement after nearly half a year of calculations, which once again testifies
to his governing principle of “America first” and reinforces his policy focus on domestic economic affairs. In essence, Trump’s determination to withdraw from the Paris Agreement is utterly political posturing. It contains three interconnected meanings. First, he did so to deliver on his campaign pledge and commitment to interest groups such as coal, oil, natural gas and other conventional fossil fuel sectors. According to the statistics of the US Federal Election Committee, the five presidential candidates who had received the most contributions from coal interest groups were all Republicans. And Trump got far more donations than the others. He also wanted to get across to the voters as a politician who means what he says. Second, he did so to create and accumulate political achievements. Since taking office, President Trump has taken drastic steps to repeal Obamacare, implement tax cuts and push through a massive infrastructure plan. Unfortunately, there are either hurdles or little possibility to make breakthroughs on these attempts. At the same time, Trump’s team or family members are bogged down in the “Russia gate” scandal. The latest CBS opinion poll shows that only 36% of the respondents approved of Trump’s performance as president. Third, he did so to secure public support for the Republicans to maintain their advantage in the 2018 mid-term election and continue their control in both chambers of the Congress. Trump intends to link climate actions with the contraction of the manufacturing sector and job losses, so as to stabilize the voter base for the Republican. In June, two Republicans won the special elections in June in Georgia and South Carolina, two states that are seen as the barometer and test ground of next year’s mid-term election, thus solidifying the Republican majority in the House of Representatives.
As things stand now, the withdrawal from the *Paris Agreement* will not produce any negative impact, except for the damage to the US credibility worldwide.

First, the US does not assume mandatory responsibilities for quantified emission reduction in the *Paris Agreement*. From a legal perspective, the *Paris Agreement* is under the UNFCCC and has nominal binding force. However, it provides state parties with considerable space for policy maneuvering in practice. No substantial breakthroughs have been made on major topics where conflicting interests abound, such as emission reduction target, funding assistance and technology transfer. These issues have only been put on hold. The Intended Nationally Determined Contributions (INDCs) form the basis of the *Paris Agreement*, but have no binding force, as they are voluntary action plans submitted by state parties. Therefore, neither the *Paris Agreement* nor the INDCs submitted by the Obama administration bind the US to any compliance commitments on mandatory quantified emission target and funding assistance to LDCs.

Second, the withdrawal from the *Paris Agreement* does not mean the US pulls itself from the UNFCCC and the process of international climate change negotiations. As stated above, the *Paris Agreement* takes the form of an international multilateral treaty and is a legal extension of the UNFCCC. As customary in international law, the US is still a state party to the UNFCCC and has the right to participate in the climate negotiation process under the UN. Even Trump, when announcing the withdrawal, said that he does not rule out the possibility of renegotiating a so called “fair” climate agreement with relevant parties. In fact, even if the US starts the legal process of withdrawal right away,
it won’t be completed until November 2019. By then, Trump will soon finish his first term in office. Given its strength in science and technology, its GHG emission volume and its role in various international mechanisms, the US still has important influence on the process of international climate cooperation and related rule-making.

Lastly, the domestic climate policies and actions of the US are characterized by a “bottom-up” approach. This is determined by the US political system and ecology. The absence of federal climate policies won’t fundamentally prevent US climate actions. The states vary widely in comprehensive economic strength, industrial and energy consumption structure and resource endowment, and have different interests. They have autonomy in managing their economic affairs as well. The federal government will meet enormous resistance in pushing climate and energy policies through the congress in a “top down” manner. As such, the Obama administration bypassed the legislature and ratified the *Paris Agreement* through an executive order. It has enabled Trump to easily scrap it in the same way. At the same time, states, cities, companies and NGOs in the US have been autonomous and active in pursuing climate actions and utilizing environment-friendly technologies through a “bottom-up” approach. Almost all states and major cities and companies in the US have made their own emission reduction plans. For example, 13 states including California, Washington and Minnesota have established the United States Climate Alliance to develop a low-carbon economy and uphold the *Paris Agreement*. 9 states in the Northeast, 6 in the Midwest and 7 in the West have formed a regional alliance for emission reduction and a carbon trading market. 75 major cities including New York, Los Angeles and Chicago have adopted the
Mayors National Climate Action Agenda.

II. The Impact of Trump’s Withdrawal from the Paris Agreement Action on International Climate Cooperation

The withdrawal of the Trump administration from the Paris Agreement has brought about some impact on the international climate cooperation process with a recently identified direction. Yet, it will not set the process back or reverse it. The Paris Agreement is another major outcome of the international climate change cooperation process after the Kyoto Protocol. It draws the timeline and roadmap for the post-2020 global climate change action. It is based on the INDCs that countries have submitted in light of their national conditions. Such a “bottom-up” approach is different from the “top-down” approach of the Kyoto Protocol, where Annex I countries are assigned emission reduction targets. The US withdrawal won’t undermine the basis of the Paris Agreement at the moment. So far, it has been ratified by 149 state parties of the UNFCCC and received the widest possible support.

However, as said earlier, the United States has played a critical role in the UN climate change negotiation process. The negative impact of the adjustment of climate and energy policies by the Trump administration has yet to be assessed.

The withdrawal has undermined the political confidence of the international community about tackling climate change. The Copenhagen Conference held at the end of 2009 frustrated the world about the prospects of global cooperation against climate change. The toothless Copenhagen Agreement was tantamount to
announcing the failure of the “Kyoto Model” of global emission reduction. In the subsequent years, thanks to the relentless efforts of China, the US, the EU, India and other major economies, the international community finally reached consensus at the Durban Climate Conference in 2011 and worked closely to “develop a protocol, another legal instrument or a legal outcome under the Convention applicable to all Parties” and establish a post-2020 international emission reduction mechanism. Towards the end of 2015, the Paris Agreement was reached. A new emission reduction model was created with a legally binding international agreement as the core and the INDCs as the basis. Before the Paris Conference, 187 countries had submitted their INDCs, accounting for 97% of the global emissions and representing unprecedented participation of state parties in the climate action. The climate and energy policies of the Trump administration testify to another renunciation of climate change responsibilities by the US after the Bush Jr. administration. It deals another blow to the confidence of governments, international organizations, businesses and organizations about tackling the global challenge.

It has also added to the difficulty of implementing the Paris Agreement. The Paris Agreement entered into the implementation phase immediately after it came into force at the end of 2016. Before that, major state parties had made considerable compromises when negotiating the text of the Paris Agreement in order to maximize the consensus. The negative attitude of the Trump administration makes it more difficult to negotiate on special topics in the future and is more likely to prevent negotiations from achieving progress and results. The Trump administration has cancelled its support to the Green Climate Fund, stopped the international climate partnerships, evaded
the responsibility of developed industrialized countries to assist developing countries in adaptation and mitigation and ignored the principle of “common but differentiated responsibilities”. This will not help developing countries respect and implement the principle of respective capabilities and fulfill their emission reduction targets set in INDCs. Nor will it be conducive to achieving the long-term target in the Paris Agreement: “holding the increase in the global average temperature to well below 2°C above pre-industrial levels.”

III. Reflections on the Existing Model and Pathway of International Climate Cooperation

Trump’s withdrawal once again reveals the inherent deficiency in the agreement and the existing international climate change model, which calls for reflections. Otherwise, it will hinder the effective implementation of the Paris Agreement and the future of the international climate cooperation.

First, the inherent deficiency of the Paris Agreement should be improved and modified. The agreement was signed by representatives of state parties with full authorizations. It is open for signing by countries. State parties complete their own ratification processes and deposit the ratification instruments at the United Nations. Certain conditions are set for its entry into force. And state parties have the right to exit the agreement. In terms of procedures and content, the Paris Agreement meets the “international law-based” definition of international multilateralism. According to Article 26 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaty, all valid treaties that are binding on all states concerned shall be implemented by those states in good
will. From the perspective of legal force, the *Paris Agreement* and the Kyoto Protocol are both legal documents subordinate to the UNFCCC. In terms of content, there is no significant connectivity and continuity between the two. They represent totally different ideas and pathways on mitigation and adaptation. For the purpose of maximizing international consensus and preventing the international climate cooperation process from collapsing, the *Paris Agreement* shys away from specific differences such as supervision and compliance and places more emphasis on the moral and collective responsibilities of state parties. As there are uncertainties at the legal level, the agreement is unlikely to carry strong binding force. As the basis of the agreement, the INDCs have an even weaker legal status.

Second, the international climate cooperation model whereby multilateral negotiations are driven by bilateral cooperation needs to be improved. The fragility and failure of the model are revealed by the debates and crisis sparked by Trump’s easy withdrawal from the *Paris Agreement* as a result of government change. Trump’s new climate and energy policies almost completely reversed policies of the Obama administration, which shakes the foundation of important bilateral climate cooperation mechanism between China and the US as well as between Europe and the US. The trust and effective cooperation between China and the US on climate change was the key to the *Paris Agreement*. After the Copenhagen Conference, China and the US made compromises through dialogues and consultation mechanisms, which have enabled continuous breakthroughs in international climate negotiations. The two countries have acted as “double engines” for narrowing differences, fostering basic consensus among different parties, and safeguarding
the international climate cooperation process under the UN framework. China and the US have issued three joint statements on climate change. Based on the consensus reached at the top level, governments, businesses and non-governmental sectors of the two countries have established various dialogues and platforms on climate and energy policies, science and technology and trade. The US withdrawal poses challenges for the model of multilateral international negotiations driven by China-US cooperation and puts the government authorities and institutions of the two countries under pressure for adjustment and adaptation.

Lastly, the international community needs to have innovative approaches to discussing global issues such as climate change. To tackle climate change is a typical global challenge that calls for the participation of all countries and regions and the collaboration of governments, businesses and institutions at multiple levels so as to find solutions. However, since the UNFCCC was concluded in 1992, global climate negotiations have been a difficult process with limited progress. The Kyoto Protocol and the Paris Agreement are two landmark achievements and, at the same time, the focal point of differences. And the results have been less than satisfactory. Parties have sought to strike a balance between the shared interests of human beings and national interests and make breakthroughs. It has been difficult to implement the principle of “common but differentiated responsibilities”. To implement the Paris Agreement and continue climate cooperation calls for three interconnected factors: the right timing, the right conditions and willingness. On timing. Since the 2007 global financial crisis, the de-globalization sentiment has been rampant, causing impacts on the existing global political and economic order and impeding the implementation of the Paris Agreement. That said, the
reform of the global governance system is high on the agenda, providing the right timing for negotiators to discuss climate change in light of the reform of the global governance system. On conditions. Though the *Paris Agreement* and the INDCs are less than desirable, they can still be taken as a new starting point. Moreover, the fast development of renewable energy technologies and market provides more policy and action options for negotiators. As for willingness, joining hands to tackle climate change is the prevailing commitment of the international community. Although there will be a lack of climate policies at the federal level in the US for a long time to come, there is great enthusiasm on the part of its local governments, businesses and institutions.

**IV. Conclusion**

To put it in perspective, the withdrawal of the Trump administration from the *Paris Agreement* creates opportunities for China, the EU and India to push forward international climate cooperation. As said earlier, major negotiators must adopt an approach from the perspective of building a new global governance system, and design and steadily promote the negotiation process to take the *Paris Agreement* into the stage of negotiation.

The Paris model for international cooperation on emission reduction needs to be maintained and improved. The *Paris Agreement* and the INDCs submitted by countries have established a basic model for international climate cooperation for a fairly long time to come. The *Paris Agreement* has entered the stage of implementation and compliance. It is, in essence, a set of
principled provisions on the moral and collective responsibilities of state parties. The mechanism of compliance is weak. And there are no mandatory targets for emission reduction. According to statistics, the emissions of major economies such as China, the US and the EU have slowed down and even dropped. In fact, their pressure for emission reduction is somewhat alleviated. China made important contribution for the Paris model. As it continues to play a leading role in the absence of the US, China’s focus is not reinventing the wheel, but implementing the agreement based on its INDC and achieving its set target on schedule. This will showcase China’s image as a big responsible nation and its capability to lead the reform of the global governance system.

It is important to take China-US dialogue and cooperation on energy and climate to a new stage. The position and attitude of the US towards subsequent climate negotiations have important influence on the success of the Paris model and the building of a new mechanism. To tackle climate change is an important area for China to participate in global governance. Its constructive efforts for reaching the Paris Agreement over the past years have been acclaimed internationally. To establish a new communication and dialogue mechanism on climate change and energy cooperation with the Trump administration will be important for increasing understanding and consensus and ensuring the Paris Agreement and other achievements will not be jeopardized. Moreover, thanks to Trump’s new climate and energy policies, there have emerged abundant market opportunities and cooperation space in conventional fossil fuel, renewable energy and infrastructure. Take the oil industry for example. The US has fast increased its oil output with a robust need for exports. China’s imports of US oil can help diversify its oil import channel, improve trade
balance and solidify the basis for common interests between China and the US. China has been a world leader in renewable energy investment, production and utilization. Under Trump’s new energy policy, the market opportunities for wind, solar and biomass energy will increase, not decrease. This will lead to win-win outcomes for China and the US.
On May 25, Ambassador Wu Hailong, President of CPIFA, met H.E. Mr. Petar Stoyanov, former President of Bulgaria. The two sides exchanged views on China-Bulgaria and China-EU relations and other issues of common interest. Mr. Liang Jianquan, Vice President of CPIFA, Mr. Grigor Porozhanov, Bulgarian Ambassador to China and Mr. Vladislav Spasov, Deputy Head of Mission, were present at the meeting.
On May 16, Ambassador Wu Hailong, President of CPIFA, met with Mr. Medgyessy Péter, former Prime Minister of Hungary. The two sides exchanged views on Sino-Hungarian relations, world economy, the current European situation and other issues of common interests. Mr. Liang Jianquan, Vice President of CPIFA joined the meeting.

On May 15, Ambassador Wu Hailong, President of CPIFA, met with Mr. Wolfgang Schüssel, former Federal Chancellor of Austria. The two sides exchanged views on Sino-Austrian relations, current European situation and other issues of common interests.
On May 22, Ambassador Wu Hailong, President of CPIFA, met HRH the Duke of York at Diaoyutai State Guesthouse. The two sides exchanged views on China-UK relations, economic and trade cooperation and people-to-people exchanges between the two countries, the Belt and Road Initiative and other issues of common interests. Mr. Liang Jianquan, Vice President of CPIFA and Mme. Barbara Woodward, British Ambassador to China joined the meeting. After the meeting, Amb. Wu Hailong attended the Final
of Pitch@Palace China 1.0 at the invitation of the Duke of York and addressed the opening ceremony.

Pitch@Palace is a platform established by the Duke of York in 2014 for networking and supporting entrepreneurs to expand their businesses. On October 26, 2016, the Duke of York attended the inauguration ceremony of Pitch@Palace China. Pitch@Palace China 1.0 took place in Beijing on May 22, 2017 at Diaoyutai State Guesthouse. Three entrepreneurs from 42 candidates won the Final.

President Wu Hailong Visits the Philippines

At the invitation of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Philippines, a delegation led by Amb. Wu Hailong, President of CPIFA, visited the Philippines from April 16 to 20. The delegation consisted of Amb. Wang Chungui, Former Chinese Ambassador to the Philippines, Amb. Peng Keyu, Vice President of CPIFA, and Ms. Su Xiaohui, Deputy Director of Department
During the stay in the Philippines, the delegation signed a MoU, set up a mechanism for regular exchanges and held round table discussions on bilateral relations and regional situation with the Foreign Relations Committee.

The delegation also met with Ms. Gloria Macapagal Arroyo, former President of the Philippines, Ms. Pia S. Cayetano, Deputy Speaker of House of Representatives, Amb. Manuel A. J. Teehankee, Vice Foreign Minister, and Foundation of Ambassadors of the Philippines.
President Wu Hailong Meets with Italian Parliamentary Delegation

On June 8, Ambassador Wu Hailong, President of CPIFA, met with Italian Parliamentary Delegation, headed by Mr. Alessandro Maran, Vice-President of the Senators of the Democratic Party. The two sides exchanged views on Sino-Italian relations, current European situation and other issues of common interests.
Executive Vice President Lu Shumin Meets with the Director of Secretariat for Policy Analysis and Development Agency of Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Indonesia

On April 6, Executive Vice President Lu Shumin met with Dr. Bambang Susanto, MA, Director of Secretariat for Policy Analysis and Development Agency of Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Indonesia. The two sides exchanged views on China-Indonesia relations, the Belt and Road initiative, and cooperation between the agency and the institute.

Thai General Prem Foundation Delegation Visits China

At the invitation of the Chinese People’s Institute of Foreign Affairs (CPIFA), the Delegation of General Prem Tinsulanonda Historical Park Foundation of Thailand visited Beijing and Shanghai from June 8 to 13.
During the visit, Mr. Hang Yuanxiang, Standing Vice Chairman of China Soong Ching Ling Foundation, Mr. Peng Keyu, Vice President of CPIFA, Mr. Liu Guangyong, Deputy Director-General of Shanghai Municipal Foreign Affairs Office and Mr. Fang Guoping, vice director-general of Shanghai Charity Foundation met with the delegation respectively. In Shanghai, the delegation visited Zhujiajiao Ancient Town, Chongming Ecological Agriculture Project and Pudong New Area.

The delegation spoke highly of the friendly relations between Thailand and China, and was deeply impressed by China’s economic and social achievements. They wish to strengthen links with relevant organizations in China and push forward the development of public welfare in both countries.
Tunisian Media Delegation Visits China

At the invitation of CPIFA, Tunisian Media Delegation visited Beijing and Shanghai from May 6 to 13.

During their visit, Mr. Liu Yuhe, Vice President of CPIFA, Mr. Wan Li, Counsellor of the West Asian and North African Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Mr. Liu Guangyong, Deputy Director General of Shanghai Foreign Affairs Office of Shanghai Municipality met with the delegation respectively. In Shanghai, the delegation had seminars with experts from Institute of Middle East Studies, Shanghai International University, and journalists from “the Paper” respectively. They also visited Yangshan Deep Water Port and Chongming Ecological Agriculture Project.

The delegation spoke highly of the friendly relation between Tunisia and China, and was deeply impressed by China’s economic and social achievements. They wish to learn from China’s development experience.
Cameroon Media Delegation Visits China

At the invitation of CPIFA, a 9-person Cameroon Media Delegation visited Beijing, Hangzhou and Guangzhou from July 2 to 10, 2017. The delegation was led by Ms. Marie Claire NNANA, President of Cameroon Tribune, and consisted of persons-in-charge from CRTV, Canal 2 International, L’Action, Le Quotidien de l’Economie and other mainstream media.

During their visit in Beijing, Amb. Ou Boqian, Vice President of CPIFA, Ms. Guo Haiyan, Counselor of the Department of African Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA), Mr. Zhou Shaoping, Deputy Director of the Department of Foreign Affairs, Xinhua News Agency, met with or hosted banquets for the delegation. The delegation also visited the Phoenix International Media Center, SINOHYDRO, AVIC INTERNATIOINAL, China Communications Construction Company (CCCC) and StarTimes. During their visit in Zhejiang, Mr. Yu Yiping, Deputy Director General of the Zhejiang Provincial Foreign Affairs office hosted
banquet. The delegation also visited Zhejiang Daily Press Group and Alibaba Group, and paid a visit to the Commercial Aircraft Corporation of China (COMAC) in Shanghai by high-speed train. During their visit in Guangzhou, Mr. Luo Jun, Deputy Director General of the Foreign Affairs Office of Guangdong Provincial People’s Government hosted luncheon for the delegation.

The two sides exchanged views on China-Cameroon relations, media cooperation and China’s development.

The Twelfth China-Singapore Forum Holds in Beijing

From May 9 to 10, the Twelfth China-Singapore Forum (CSF), co-sponsored by the Chinese People’s Institute of Foreign Affairs (CPIFA) and the East Asian Institute, National University of Singapore (NUS), was held in Beijing.

The Chinese delegates include Wu Hailong, President of
CPIFA and Co-chair of the CSF, Yang Wenchang, former President of CPIFA, Zhang Jiuhuan and Zhang Xiaokang, former Chinese ambassadors to Singapore, Peng Keyu, Vice President of CPIFA, and scholars from important Chinese think tanks and academic institutions, such as Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, Peking University, China Institute of International Studies, China Institute of Contemporary International Relations, Renmin University, China Foreign Affairs University. The Singaporean delegates mainly include Prof. Tommy Koh, Chairman of Centre for International Law of NUS and Co-chair of the CSF, Abdullah Tarmugi, former Speaker of Parliament of Singapore, Lee Yi Shyan, Chairman of Business China and former Senior Minister of State for the Ministry for Trade & Industry, and scholars and business leaders, as well as chief editors of Singaporean mainstream media.

Amb. Wu Hailong, Prof. Tommy Koh, and Amb. Stanley Loh, Ambassador of Singapore to China, addressed the opening ceremony. Delegates from both countries conducted in-depth discussions on topics of “China-Singapore Relations: Advance with times”, “Five Decades of ASEAN’s Development and China-ASEAN Relations” and “Asia-Pacific Policy of the New US Administration”.

On May 10, Ruan Zongze, Executive Vice Presidents of China Institute of International Studies, Peng Zhiming, Vice Director of China Singapore (Chongqing) Demonstration Initiative on Strategic Connectivity, Ho Meng Kit, Chief Executive Officer of Singapore Business Federation, and Tan Kong Tam, Co-Director of Asia Competitiveness Institute of Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy of NUS, delivered keynote speeches and answered questions from the audience. About 80 people, including experts, scholars, university students and journalists attended the public forum.
After the forum, Vice Foreign Minister Liu Zhenmin met with the Singaporean delegation.

The China-Singapore Forum (CSF) was first co-sponsored by CPIFA and important Singaporean think tanks in 1998. By now the CSF has been successfully held for 12 times. The topics of the CSF involved different fields including politics, economy, people-to-people exchanges, culture and international and regional cooperation, etc. By promoting exchanges between experts and scholars of the two countries, the CSF has been providing more suggestions and advices to promote China-Singapore Track 2 exchanges and enhance mutual understanding and friendly cooperation between China and ASEAN countries.

**President Wu Hailong Presides over the Opening Ceremony and Plenary Session of the Second Conference of the CICA Non-governmental Forum**

On June 28, 2017, the Second Conference of the CICA Non-governmental Forum, themed on “25 years of CICA: For Asian Security and Development”, was held in Beijing.

Chen Yuan, Chairman of the Forum and Vice Chairman of the CPPCC National Committee, read the Congratulatory Message from President Xi Jinping and delivered a keynote speech on Win-win Cooperation for Asian Security and Development. Li Zhaoxing, Honorary President of CPIFA and former Chinese Foreign Minister also addressed the opening ceremony. Wu Hailong, President of CPIFA, presided over the opening ceremony and the plenary session. Li Huilai, Chinese Assistant Minister of Foreign Affairs, attended the conference.
Dr. Essam Abdel Aziz Sharaf, former Prime Minister of the Arab Republic of Egypt, Lee Hae Chan, former Prime Minister of the Republic of Korea, Jose de Venecia Jr., former Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Republic of the Philippines, Shivshankar Menon, former National Security Advisor to the Prime Minister of the Republic of India, Dr. Muwafag Al-Rubaye, former National Security Advisor of the Republic of Iraq, Dr. Alinaghi (Kamal) Kharrazi, former Foreign Minister of the Islamic Republic of Iran, Talbak Nazarovitch Nazarov, former Foreign Minister of the Republic of Tajikistan, Shakhrat Nuryshev, Kazakhstani Ambassador to China, Andrey Ivanovich Denisov, Russian Ambassador to China, Rashid Alimov, Secretary General of the Shanghai Cooperation Organization, Gong Jianwei, Executive Director of the Secretariat of CICA, Gu Ziping, Chairman of the Task Force of the Chinese Chairmanship of the CICA, Yang Jiemian, former President of the Shanghai Institutes
for International Studies, and around 300 former political leaders, diplomats, scholars, experts, media and NGO representatives were present at the conference. The conference was hosted by CPIFA, organized by the People's Government of Beijing Municipality, co-organized by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and supported by the China Public Diplomacy Association.

At the Plenary session, participants exchanged in-depth views on “Practice the Asian Security Concept, featuring common, comprehensive, cooperative, and sustainable security, to Build a Regional Security Architecture with Asian Features”, and “Jointly Build the Belt and Road”. Eight parallel round-table panels were also held, focusing respectively on the Asian security situation, the implementation of the United Nations 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, anti-terrorism cooperation, cyberspace security, addressing climate change, financial security, the role of the CICA Non-governmental Forum, and the role of the media.

Wei Wei, Vice President of CPIFA, held a press briefing after the conference.
“一带一路”建设在新起点上扬帆远航

王毅 中国外交部部长

5月14日至15日，“一带一路”国际合作高峰论坛在北京成功举行。这是新中国成立以来我国首倡主办的层级最高、规模最大的主场外交活动，是中国国际地位和影响力显著提升的重要标志。习近平主席在开幕式上发表主旨演讲，出席并主持高峰论坛圆桌峰会。29位外国国家元首、政府首脑和3位重要国际组织负责人出席圆桌峰会，多国高级官员出席开幕式和高级别会议等活动。与会代表来自五大洲130多个国家和70多个国际组织，总数约1500人，嘉宾云集，盛况空前，凸显“中国倡议、全球响应、世界共赢”的积极成效，成为“一带一路”建设国际合作进程中的里程碑。

一、高峰论坛举世瞩目、成果丰硕

当前，世界经济增长动力不足，经济全球化遭遇逆风，全球治理体系变革深入推进，国际形势中不确定性增多。在此背景下，我国以“加强国际合作，共建‘一带一路’，实现共赢发展”为主题举办高峰论坛，唱响开放包容、合作共赢的主旋律，为世界经济增长谋求动力，为经济全球化发展提振信心，为构建人类命运共同体探索路径，得到国际社会热烈响应，彰显我国在全球治理和国际合作中的引领作用。

凝聚了广泛国际共识。习主席2013年提出“一带一路”倡议以来，100多个国家和国际组织积极支持参与，使“一带一路”成为全球最受欢迎的公共产品。同时，也有一些国家对“一带一路”倡议内涵缺乏了解，少数国家对中方意图仍存疑虑。习主席在论坛上积极倡导和平合作、开放包容、互学互鉴、互利共赢的丝路精神，系统梳理“一带一路”建设4年来取得的丰硕成果，深刻阐释共商、共建、共享的“一带一路”倡议内涵，深化‘一带一路’国际合作的共识，得到广泛响应。

论坛还通过了《“一带一路”国际合作高峰论坛成果》，涵盖政策沟通、设施联通、贸易畅通、资金融通、民心相通5大类，共76大项，270多项具体成果。这些成果将为“一带一路”建设提供广阔的合作空间和巨大的合作潜力。

二、“一带一路”倡议取得的积极成效

1. 政策沟通：通过签署政府间合作文件、举办政策沟通研讨会等形式，加强沿线国家政策对接，推动“一带一路”建设进入务实合作新阶段。

2. 设施联通：推动“一带一路”基础设施互联互通，推进重大项目建设，提高互联互通水平，促进地区经济一体化。

3. 贸易畅通：加强“一带一路”贸易合作，降低贸易成本，促进贸易便利化，提高贸易效率。

4. 资金融通：推动“一带一路”金融合作，建立多边金融合作机制，提供资金支持，促进贸易和投资。

5. 心民相通：加强“一带一路”人文交流，推动民心相通，增进沿线国家人民的相互了解和友好感情。

三、“一带一路”建设的未来展望

“一带一路”建设是当今世界最具活力和潜力的国际合作平台，是构建人类命运共同体的重要实践。未来，“一带一路”建设将继续秉持共商、共建、共享的原则，深化合作，扩大开放，为促进世界和平发展作出更大贡献。
建、共享的合作理念，生动揭示“一带一路”倡议的历史源头和发展大势，取得了消疑释惑、扩大共识的显著成效。高峰论坛发表圆桌峰会联合公报，是首份关于“一带一路”建设的国际性、权威性文件，既有理念引领也有行动规划，集中反映了关于“一带一路”国际合作目标、原则和举措的国际共识。俄罗斯总统普京强调，习主席描绘的“一带一路”合作蓝图符合国际潮流，前景广阔。印度尼西亚、乌兹别克斯坦、白俄罗斯等多国领导人认为，“一带一路”倡议是长期、宏伟的历史性工程，高峰论坛具有重要现实意义和深远历史影响。联合国秘书长古特雷斯表示，“一带一路”倡议是一项充满智慧和极富远见的战略，不仅有利于实现可持续发展，也有利于实现可持续和平。习近平在开幕式上的演讲犹如火炬照亮世界。很多国家领导人在讲话中引用“要想富，先修路”、“人心齐，泰山移”等中国俗语，表达对“一带一路”的衷心认同和支持。论坛期间，我国在已与40多个国家和国际组织签署共建“一带一路”合作协议基础上，又与20多个国家和国际组织商签有关合作文件，有力拓展了“一带一路”朋友圈，形成各方合力共建“一带一路”的强声势。

明确了共同努力方向。“一带一路”建设进入全面展开的新阶段，方向指引、路径规划至关重要。习近平从顶层设计角度指出，要将“一带一路”建设成为和平之路、繁荣之路、开放之路、创新之路、文明之路，强调要构建以合作共赢为核心的新型国际关系，营造共建共享的安全格局；深入开展产业、金融、设施联通合作，实现经济大融合、发展大联动、成果大共享；打造开放型合作平台，携手构建广泛的利益共同体；坚持创新驱动发展，建设21世纪数字丝绸之路；建立多层次人文合作机制，以文明交流超越文明隔阂、文明互鉴超越文明冲突、文明共存超越文明优越。上述主张顺应时代发展潮流，契合各国发展需求，为“一带一路”国际合作长远发展指明了前进方向，得到了与会各方积极响应。论坛期间，我国同有关国家达成重要共识，明确了今后一段时期“一带一路”合作的重点领域和具体路径，把美好的愿景转化为具体的行动，把宏大的蓝图转化为清晰的路线图。

推动更多合作项目落地。在各方共同努力下，高峰论坛以政策沟通、设施联通、贸易畅通、资金融通、民心相通为主线，达成5大类、76大项、270多项合作成果，体现了“一带一路”以行动为导向、以项目为落脚点的行动力和实效性。我国同柬埔寨、土耳其、巴基斯坦等多国签署加强基础设施建设和促进交通运输合作协议，中欧班列合作、雅万高铁和匈塞铁路等重大项目取得积极进展，亚欧大陆互联互通网络逐步显现。我国同30个国家签署政府间经贸合作协议，同格鲁吉亚签署双边自贸协定，同多个国家致力于共建经贸产业园区、跨境经济合
作区，增添了全球贸易和世界经济的内在活力。同泰国、马来西亚、波兰、阿富汗、联合国教科文组织、联合国环境规划署等签署核能、水资源、电信、科技、环保、教育、文化、医疗卫生等方面合作协议，有力拓宽了“一带一路”合作领域，让有关国家人民感受到实实在在的参与感和获得感。各方赞赏中方推进“一带一路”建设不是空谈，而是取得了实实在在的成果，高度评价“一带一路”建设开创了以统筹协调、改革创新、战略对接、优势互补为特点的合作新模式，将推动各国共同走上发展富裕的新道路。

构筑了完善支撑体系。“一带一路”是着眼长远的系统工程，需要建立牢固完善的支撑体系。习主席宣布我国将于2019年举办第二届“一带一路”国际合作高峰论坛，设立高峰论坛后续联络机制，为“一带一路”建设长远发展奠定坚实基础。中方提出向丝路基金新增资金1000亿元人民币，鼓励金融机构开展人民币海外基金业务，规模预计约3000亿元人民币，国家开发银行和进出口银行分别提供2500亿元和1300亿元等值人民币专项贷款等举措，同多边开发银行建立多边开发融资合作中心，同国际货币基金组织合作建立能力建设中心，同有关各方共同制定“一带一路”建设融资指导原则，鼓舞了各方参与“一带一路”的信心和干劲。我国推动建设一批科技、环保、新闻等领域综合性服务平台，为“一带一路”建设提供了长效支持。中方上述举措赢得广泛赞赏，与会领导人表示这些举措体现了中方作为首倡国的历史担当和共建“一带一路”的决心，各国也应拿出更多实际行动，全力推进“一带一路”合作。

拓展了全球伙伴关系网络。论坛期间，习主席同所有与会外国元首和政府首脑举行双边会谈会见，有力拓展了以“一带一路”为主干的伙伴关系网络。习主席会晤俄罗斯总统普京，双方一致同意加强各领域合作，加快推进“一带一路”建设和欧亚经济联盟对接，进一步充实了中俄全面战略协作伙伴关系的内涵。习主席会见意大利等欧洲国家领导人，就支持多边主义、推进中欧四大伙伴关系达成重要共识。习主席广做周边国家领导人工作，引导其与我国增进互信、扩大合作，以共建“一带一路”为契机维护周边稳定发展的良好势头。习主席还与非洲、拉美等与发展中国家领导人亲切交流，深入探讨在“一带一路”框架下的合作机遇，推动我国同各方关系进一步发展。

二、“一带一路”建设意义重大、影响深远

“一带一路”倡议是习近平总书记外交思想的集中体现，是中国特色大国外交的伟大实践。高峰论坛集中展示了“一带一路”建设取得的丰硕成果，描绘出
“一带一路”沿线国家开展合作的宏伟愿景，彰显了“一带一路”建设对解决人类发展难题、促进世界和平与繁荣的重大意义和深远影响。

推动国际经济合作再出发。世界经济长期低迷，迫切需要挖掘潜在需求、创造新的增长点、形成新的发展引擎。“一带一路”贯穿亚欧非大陆，连接东亚经济圈和欧洲经济圈，以完善基础设施为先导，通过推进“五通”实现资源有效配置和市场深度融合，为各方搭建了一个开放高效、优势互补、联动发展的国际合作平台。“一带一路”倡议提出4年来，各方战略对接有序展开，一批重点合作项目开工建设，区域贸易和投资年均增速高于全球平均水平近一倍，形成一批早期收获成果并产生示范效应。越来越多国家看好“一带一路”蕴含的巨大机遇和广阔前景，期待共同参与、共同建设、共同受益。本次高峰论坛在已有基础上又推出一系列重大合作举措，必将推动“一带一路”国际合作向更高水平、更深层次、更广领域迈进，为促进世界经济增长和各国共同发展带来更多红利。国际货币基金组织预测，到2020年，“一带一路”沿线国家和地区货物贸易总额将达到19.6万亿美元，占全球货物贸易总额的38.9%。

在“一带一路”框架下，中国发展对沿线国家的辐射效应不断增强。2014年至2016年，中国与“一带一路”沿线国贸易总额超过3万亿美元，对“一带一路”沿线国投资累计超过500亿美元。中国企业在20多个国家建设了56个经贸合作区，为有关国家创造近11亿美元的税收和18万个就业岗位，中国与世界经济联动融合发展的势头日益强劲。

推动经济全球化再平衡。当前，“逆全球化”暗流涌动，各国面临封闭僵化还是开放合作的重要抉择。“一带一路”建设顺应人类社会相互依存的发展趋势，使各种经济要素冲破地理障碍得到更合理配置，通过提高有效供给催生新的需求，重塑世界生产、投资和消费格局，为经济全球化找到可持续的新动能。“一带一路”倡议坚持开放包容，推动解决发展失衡、治理困境、数字鸿沟、分配差距等全球性问题，为引导经济全球化向更加开放、包容、普世、平衡、共赢方向发展开辟了新路径，为构建更加公正合理的全球治理体系勾画了新愿景。

高峰论坛与会各方称赞“一带一路”建设为构建开放型世界经济、推动经济全球化、改善全球治理提供了中国方案。一些发展中国家领导人表示，“一带一路”倡议让处于经济全球化边缘的欠发达国家获得前所未有的发展机会，朝着工业化和现代化目标加快迈进。发达国家代表也认为，“一带一路”倡议不走保守、封闭、排他的“回头路”，而是提供了开放、连接、融合的新选择，是新型全球化模式的代表，是经济全球化条件下一场规模宏大的“经济地理革命”，体现了卓越的东方智慧。
推动中国国际地位再提升。“一带一路”建设是统筹国内国际两个大局、实现内外联动发展的世纪工程。高峰论坛的成功举办，是我国推进新一轮对外开放和国际合作的新起点。高峰论坛期间，国内16个省区市的代表同来自100多个国家的高官、企业家等对接交流、商洽合作，为我国地方扩大对外开放、促进经济社会发展提供了新抓手。随着我国同有关国家和国际组织合作协议的逐步落实，我国装备、技术、投资、标准“走出去”将迎来新机遇，为国内经济发展和转型升级开辟广阔空间。“一带一路”建设同京津冀协同发展、长江经济带发展等区域战略紧密衔接，将为引领我国经济发展新常态、打造东中西部联动发展新局面注入强劲动力。

高峰论坛的成功举办，也是我国在国际上发挥更大作用和影响的新起点。我国创新、协调、绿色、开放、共享的新发展理念在高峰论坛成果文件中得到充分体现，扩大了中国理念的世界影响。习主席演讲和发言中蕴含的中国特色安全观、发展观、合作观、文明观、全球治理观得到广泛响应，显著增强了我国的国际话语权。“一带一路”建设日益成为开展中国特色大国外交的着力点和实践场。通过“一带一路”国际合作，越来越多的中国理念上升为国际共识，中国方案转化为国际行动，我国在全球治理和国际事务中的引领作用不断迈上新台阶。

三、“一带一路”国际合作前景广阔、大有可为

方向既定，关键在于行动。高峰论坛吹响了“一带一路”建设全面推进的号角。我们将以此为契机，集众智、汇众力，在开放中合作，在合作中共赢，同各方携手推进“一带一路”建设，更好造福我国人民和世界各国人民。

我们将以落实高峰论坛成果为抓手，推动“一带一路”建设深入向前迈进。同各方进一步加强政策协调和发展战略对接，推动各项行动计划和合作项目落地生根。扎扎实实推进经济走廊建设，深入开展国际产能和装备制造合作，推进跨国互联互通，提高贸易投资合作水平，打造更多产业带、增长极和经济圈，塑造亚欧大陆联动发展格局，助推全球经济稳定复苏。着眼“一带一路”建设长远发展，在理论政策、经济金融、体制机制、安全保障等层面加大投入，构建全方位、多层次的支撑体系。汇集政府、企业、智库、媒体、民间等力量，形成各方齐抓共建的强大合力，推动“一带一路”建设行稳致远。

我们将以共建“一带一路”为平台，打造更加紧密的伙伴关系网络。我们将坚持对话不对抗、结伴不结盟方针，贯彻共商、共建、共享原则，积极推进同有关国家和国际组织的平等互利合作，把我国经济转型升级同各国共同发展有机结合。
合起来，为伙伴关系建设注入新的活力和内涵。依托“一带一路”建设拓展伙伴关系网络，以周边为基础，面向亚欧大陆，辐射五洲四海，打造更加紧密强劲、遍布全球的“朋友圈”。

我们将以合作共赢理念为引领，构建人类命运共同体。开放包容、合作共赢是“一带一路”建设的核心理念，也是中国特色大国外交的重要原则。我们将通过推进“一带一路”建设，把以合作共赢为核心的新型国际关系具体化、实践化，同各国一道应对全球性问题和挑战，推动国际社会共同探索全球治理新模式，引导全球治理体系向更加公正合理的方向发展，为打造人类命运共同体作出新的贡献。

“一带一路”合奏着历史和现实的壮丽交响，承载着中国人民和各国人民的共同梦想，在探索中前进，在发展中完善，在合作中成长。以高峰论坛为契机，“一带一路”这艘巨轮正蓄满和平发展的能量，扬起合作共赢的风帆，载着各参与方乘风破浪，驶向和平繁荣的美好未来。

（此文转载自《求是》杂志2017年6月刊）
当今世界，大发展、大变革、大调整潮流浩浩荡荡，国际形势变乱交织，不稳定、不确定因素明显增多。中国作为最大发展中国家、第二大经济体、联合国安理会常任理事国，坚定维护自身正当权益，积极承担应尽国际责任，日益成为国际形势的稳定锚，世界增长的发动机，和平发展的正能量，全球治理的新动力。

一、国际形势变乱纷呈

继去年发生一系列“黑天鹅”事件之后，2017年国际形势中的乱象继续发展，动荡多变一面凸显，引发各方对世界失序、治理失灵、经济失速的担忧。

治理失灵问题凸显。国际金融危机爆发以来，世界经济持续低迷负面影响发酵，不断向社会政治领域蔓延。其直接后果是，发达国家内部民粹主义、保护主义、反全球化倾向抬头。美国新政府高调奉行“美国优先”，推行强硬移民政策，酝酿启动美墨边境墙建设，计划重谈北美自由贸易协定，多边贸易体制和应对气候变化等问题上立场后退。英国正式启动脱欧谈判，欧盟峰会首次提出“多速欧洲”原则，一体化进程在挫折中艰难前行。欧洲经济危机、难民危机、恐怖袭击等诸多问题复杂交织，民众对传统政治和精英阶层的失望情绪上升，一些奉行民粹主义的边缘政党迅速膨胀，成为影响政局变化的重要力量。发达国家内部经济、社会、政治难题增多，内顾倾向加剧，对经济全球化和全球治理的引领作用降低。

安全挑战错综交织。今年以来，地缘博弈和热点问题交织联动的特点更加突出。叙利亚局势持续动荡，美借化学武器事件对
叙实施突袭，给叙利亚问题政治解决前景增添变数，域内外力量围绕叙利亚问题主导权、中东地区格局博弈升温。乌克兰局势总体稳定，但东部地区冲突不断，美欧与俄罗斯在政治解决乌克兰问题上仍然存在较大分歧，双方围绕制裁、东欧反导、波罗的海地区军事部署等问题激烈较量。朝鲜违反安理会决议多次试射导弹，美国对朝由战略忍耐转向极限施压，美韩加大军事部署和演习规模，半岛局势在美韩与朝相互刺激下持续紧张。美借机推动在韩部署“萨德”反导系统，对地区战略平衡与稳定带来严峻挑战。日本不断突破和平宪法约束，政治右倾和军事化步伐加快。恐怖主义、网络安全等非传统安全挑战依然突出，据不完全统计，今年仅一季度全球恐怖袭击事件已达728起。中东恐怖极端势力在有关各方打击下节节败退，但暴恐势力化整为零、分散求生，向亚洲、欧洲及其他地区外溢扩散，对有关地区和平稳定构成新的威胁。

世界经济乍暖还寒。当前，全球经济有所回暖，但增长基础仍不稳固。国际货币基金组织上调今年全球经济增长预期至3.5%，将发达经济体增长预期上调至2.0%，预测新兴市场和发展中经济体今年将增长4.5%。同时，世界经济依然面临诸多风险和挑战。一是美联储加息导致一些国家资本外流和金融市场动荡风险上升，许多国家推进经济结构性改革困难重重，给世界经济增长蒙上阴影。二是全球贸易增速持续低于经济增速，逆全球化倾向抬头，发达国家频繁采取保护主义措施，自贸安排碎片化趋势仍在发展，增加世界经济下行压力。三是热点问题引发地区动荡和经济制裁，增添了世界经济复苏的复杂因素。

二、中国外交的全球稳定作用凸显

面对国际形势乱局和变局，在以习近平同志为核心的党中央坚强领导下，中国高举人类命运共同体旗帜，不畏浮云遮眼，不为乱花迷眼，攻坚克难、开拓进取，勇于担当，致力于维护世界和平与稳定，致力于推动各国共同发展，致力于促进全球治理体系变革，赢得国际社会越来越多认可和赞同。

中国是全球经济中的发动机。2008年国际金融危机爆发以来，中国经济增长对世界经济增长的贡献率年均30%以上，位居世界之首。面对世界经济复苏乏力，中国“撸起袖子加油干”，积极推进供给侧结构性改革，“三去一降一补”初见成效。中国对世界经济复苏乏力、保护主义挑战的拉动，中国“撸起袖子加油干”，积极推进供给侧结构性改革，“三去一降一补”初见成效。不仅实现了今年一季度6.9%的较高速度增长，而且推动产业转型升级，经济稳中向好，并为世界经济增长作出巨大贡献。国际货币基金组织上调今年中国经济增长预期，凸显对中国引擎强劲动力的信心。

有孚挛如，富以其邻。中国秉持亲诚惠容的周边外交理念，同周边国家分享
发展红利，不断加强互利合作。中国积极同东盟国家落实中国—东盟自贸区升级版，继续推动区域全面经济伙伴关系协定（RCEP）谈判。中国携手湄公河次区域国家共同构建的澜湄合作机制发展势头迅猛，45个早期收获项目和倡议全面推进。中国同新西兰启动首轮中新自贸协定升级谈判，同澳大利亚就更有效实施自贸协定达成共识，有力推动亚太地区和平、稳定与繁荣。

“一带一路”版权是中国的，收益是世界的。中国加快推进中巴经济走廊建设、中哈（萨克斯坦）产能合作，打造“一带一路”国际合作样板工程。沙特国王、以色列总理访华期间，习近平主席等同沙特国王共同见证签署了中沙产能和投资合作大项目清单，中以两国领导人宣布建立中以创新全面伙伴关系，推进“一带一路”建设在中东方取得新突破。吉布提多哈雷多功能港口举行开港仪式，蒙巴萨—内罗毕铁路开通试运营。中国与沿线各国共同推进“一带一路”建设，坚持共商共建共享原则，释放“五通”红利，紧扣有关国家基础设施建设和融资需求，打造合作共赢、共同发展的典范。

习近平主席说，中国追求的是共同发展，我们既要让自己过得好，也要让别人过得好。中国对非“十大合作计划”取得丰硕早期收获，带动了近600亿美元的投资合作项目。中国与拉美“1+3+6”务实合作扎实推进，同阿拉伯国家“1+2+3”合作稳步落实。一笔笔投资、一条条铁路，一片片工业园区承载着共同发展的梦想，为中国和远朋近邻源源不断注入发展的动力。

中国是世界乱局中的稳定锚。大国对维护世界和平稳定负有重要责任。中国积极探索新的大国相处之道，致力于维护健康稳定的大国关系框架，推动有利于和平的力量不断发展。今年4月，习近平主席同特朗普总统举行海湖庄园会晤，双方建立良好工作关系，商定两国高层交往计划，宣布建立外交安全、全面经济、执法及网络安全、社会和人文4个高级别对话机制，就中美经济合作“百日计划”达成一致。这次会晤中美关系发展指明了方向，作出了规划，奠定了建设性基调。在国际形势动荡不定背景下形成了稳定预期和正面影响。中国高度重视发展中俄全面战略协作伙伴关系，年初以来中俄元首频繁会晤，两国高层保持密切沟通，深化了两国政治互信与战略协作。中国积极同欧洲发展和平、增长、改革、文明四大伙伴关系，坚定支持欧洲一体化进程，双方共同为多边主义和国际关系民主化发挥重要推动作用。中国致力于加强同新兴国家团结合作，积极筹备今年9月第九次金砖国家领导人厦门会晤，努力将金砖国家合作打造为具有国际影响力的南南重要合作平台。

和平始于周边，依托周边。在朝核问题上，中国始终坚持半岛无核化目标，坚持维护半岛稳定，坚持和平解决方式。中国严格执行联合国安理会朝制裁决
议,提出“双轨并行”思路和“双暂停”倡议，阻遏朝鲜示强，鼓励美方将“四不一要”的表态落到实处，为维护半岛和平稳定发挥了重要作用。中国与东盟国家一道，推动全面有效落实《南海各方行为宣言》，审议通过“南海行为准则”框架，共同打造各方都认同的海上规则，共同维护南海地区的和平稳定与航行自由。中国坚定支持阿富汗国内政治和解与和平重建。在叙利亚问题上，中国谴责使用化学武器的行为，坚持尊重和维护叙利亚主权和领土完整，坚持政治解决是唯一可行的正确途径。

中国是国际变局中的正能量。面对国际形势不稳定不确定因素增多，面对保护主义和逆全球化抬头，习近平主席在达沃斯和日内瓦发表重要演讲，明确表达支持经济全球化和多边主义的中国立场，提出推进经济全球化进程再平衡和构建人类命运共同体的中国方案，勇立世界和平发展潮头，说出绝大多数国家人民的心声，呼吁各国以富有活力的增长模式、开放共赢的合作模式、公正合理的治理模式、平衡普惠的发展模式应对世界经济困境。习近平主席重要讲话为世界经济和经济全球化发展指明了正确方向，为加强全球治理贡献了中国智慧，得到国际社会广泛好评。

独行快，众行远。中国以合作共赢的精神、开放包容的胸怀，积极为全球经济治理贡献力量。习近平主席提出“一带一路”倡议4年来，得到100多个国家和国际组织积极响应和支持，成为中国推动经济全球化再平衡的崭新实践，同时也是中国为国际社会提供的最重要公共产品。今年5月，“一带一路”国际合作高峰论坛在北京成功举行，29位外国元首和政府首脑以及来自130多个国家和70多个国际组织的超过1500多名代表出席。高峰论坛发表圆桌峰会联合公报和成果清单，公布5大类、76大项、270多项具体成果。其中，人类命运共同体、丝路精神、共建共享原则以及创新、协调、绿色、开放、共享发展理念等中国主张写入联合公报，体现了中国在全球发展和治理领域的引领作用。

三、中国特色大国外交理念为国际社会带来新思维

理念引领行动，方向决定道路。党的十八大以来，以习近平同志为核心的党中央立足中国和平发展的历史方位，把握国际格局演变的总体趋势，在保持外交大政方针稳定性连续性基础上，积极推进外交理论和实践创新，引领我们成功走出一条中国特色大国外交之路。与西方传统国际关系理念相比，中国特色大国外交理念更有中国风格、中国气派，主要有以下特点。

一是先进性。“芳林新叶催陈叶，流水前波让后波。”21世纪的今天，各国
利益深度交融，相互依存不断加深，各种挑战交织联动，人类社会日益成为你中有我、我中有你，一荣俱荣、一损俱损的地球村。习近平主席勇立时代潮头，把握历史大势，率先提出打造对话而不对抗、结伴而不结盟的伙伴关系，进而建立以合作共赢为核心的新型国际关系，在此基础上，各国共建人类命运共同体。这些新思想新理念，摒弃了结盟对抗的旧思维，超越了零和博弈的老套路，既有鲜明中国特色，又有重大世界意义，不仅是新时期中国外交的行动指南，也将对人类发展进步事业产生深远影响。

二是开拓性。 “凡益之道，与时偕行。”随着“走出去”企业及人员越来越多，中国外交维护海外正当合法权益的任务也越来越重。面对新形势新任务，中国外交为国家和人民的利益积极进取，开拓创新。我们积极构建覆盖全球的伙伴关系网络，为国内发展营造了有利外部环境和战略支撑；我们推进“一带一路”建设，开启了中国新一轮对外开放与互利合作的历史新篇；我们心系百姓，大力打造海外民生工程，为中国公民、企业在海外撑起了一把挡风避雨的大伞。

三是稳定性。 “任凭风浪起，稳坐钓鱼船。”面对动荡不安、冲突频发的地区和国际形势，中国始终坚持走和平发展道路。面对质疑现有国际秩序和国际体系的言行，中国始终主张在维护中加以改革完善。面对逆全球化和保护主义思潮抬头，中国始终高举多边主义和开放包容的旗帜。中国外交的这种稳定性和确定性，是大国应有的担当，不仅对冲了各种不确定性，也充分展示了中国的定力和自信。

今年下半年，我们将迎来党的十九大胜利召开。中国外交将在习近平总书记外交思想指引下继续开拓前行，积极为党的十九大召开营造主动有利的外部环境，推动世界和平与发展的伟大事业中作出中国贡献，留下中国印记。
中东地区秩序演化及新趋势

张卫婷 上海国际问题研究院博士后

中东传统地区秩序由域外大国引进并主导，一定程度上反映域外大国与地区国家政权的层级关系。域外大国及地区国家间的复杂竞争是驱动地区秩序演进的直接动力。后阿拉伯之春时代，地区国家恐将回归中心角色，而域外大国和非国家因素将受到抑制，新的基于民族国家的地区秩序安排正在形成。

一、现代中东地区秩序的起源

中东地区现代秩序格局和当下地区非国家行为体崛起的根源可追溯至一百年前英法瓜分奥斯曼帝国的赛克斯-皮科协定。该协定正式确认了西方对中东地区“分而治之”的垂直统治模式，不仅深刻改变了中东地缘政治版图，而且也开启了地区内政权和社会背离并分头演进的历史。

失去帝国庇护后，地区内多元文化共存的宗教宽容环境宣告结束。凯末尔土耳其作为帝国继承者走上世俗化为特点的现代化转型道路。黎凡特和海湾的阿拉伯部分被人为分割，并以国际托管名义纳入西方主导的殖民体系。传统政权精英成为西方统治代理，管理国家经济和安全参与体外循环，逐渐与社会脱节。而作为传统社会治理“双支柱”的宗教和部落则被全球殖民体系排斥在外，转而拥抱同样被边缘化但仍占据社会主体的底层民众。奥斯曼帝国瓦解后发展出的伊斯兰主义后来大致裂变为两类，一类倾向于借鉴外部先进文化制度，即政治伊斯兰及其代表穆兄会等，另一类倾向于向历史传统寻求答案，其终极表现形式即为原教旨主义和极端组织。

俄国十月革命后，域外大国间意识形态竞争传递到地区，与地
区内传统地缘矛盾结合，激活地区国家间的生存竞争。穆兄会在埃及和叙利亚等国发展较快，盖因这些国家与俄国基本情况类似，人口众多、资源不足，要扩大税基、加强武备和追求政策自主权，就不得不率先开展不同程度的民主宪政改革和工业化尝试，并诉诸外来的民族主义或社会主义作为社会动员工具，因此社会开放程度稍高。相反，原教旨主义在海湾和北非人口稀少国家更加流行，一个重要原因在于这些国家地理渗透性较差，直到石油资源大开发后才得到域外大国重视，但是巨大的石油财富和远离域外霸权竞争降低了进行紧迫的政经改革和社会动员的必要性。

二战后巴以问题和海湾地区主导权竞争成为吸引美苏冷战和地区代理人热战的长期猎场。在前者问题上，阿拉伯世界分裂为激进派和温和派两大阵营。在叙利亚和伊拉克等激进派国家，长期对外战争和内部宵禁环境下频繁发生军事政变，政权日益高度集权化，穆兄会等社会动员工具则被迫转入地下。在后者问题上，伊朗跟伊拉克发生了霸权竞赛，结果君主制的伊朗社会支持不足，发生伊斯兰革命，后来为了抵制美苏控制又对外输出革命，埋下地区社会革命的种子并引发两伊战争。两伊战争初期，沙特等海湾国家组建海合会，统一安排外交和防务，以有效应对外部两伊侵入和内部社会革命的威胁。尽管萨达姆凭借良好的社会动员能力在两伊战争末期组织起百万大军，但是也面临财政崩溃的风险，为消化危机悍然入侵科威特，引发海湾战争和伊拉克战争，最终将美国力量引入海湾，并建立起美国主导的中东地区秩序。

二、美国主导地区秩序的盛衰

海湾战争打出了美国的威望，加速了冷战的结束。美国展现了出众的空天一体战和远程投放能力，而作为伊拉克盟国，苏联为美国背书，从此在中东的威望一落千丈。携此战之威，美国与海合会及埃及等温和派国家合作建立的地区秩序有两个突出特点，一是安全主导，二是美国利益优先。也因此，美国主导的地区秩序内嵌的缺陷和矛盾，将助长地区国家政权与社会之间的背离，注定了难以持久。

美国主导的地区秩序的第一个明显缺陷在于美国利益优先放大了政权与社会的冲突性。中东地区被纳入美国全球战略，其地缘和能源价值成为美国独霸地位的支撑。沙特支持石油交易美元结算并且将美元定向用于购买美国国债以支持美国的金融霸权，以换取美国支持沙特在OPEC内的定价权以及承诺保障海合会国家政权安全。埃及等国接受美国提供的军事和经济援助，作为交换，即使巴以问题上
做出妥协，承认以色列国家生存权，不再支持地区激进派消灭以色列的主张。冷战的意外结束和福山的“历史终结论”麻痹了这些国家，使它们甘于依附美国，或者让渡经济利益或者出卖民族感情，导致政权合法性来源异化，国家经济高度对外依赖，但是另一方面随着人口的快速膨胀，社会发展缺乏足够资源支持，导致这些国家的内部社会变革压力持续累积。

美国主导的地区秩序的第二个明显缺陷在于毫不妥协地排斥了地区激进派国家，扩大了地区国家间矛盾。海湾战争后，伊朗拉夫桑贾尼政府曾向海湾国家和欧示好，但是克林顿政府依然因为伊朗海外刺杀反对派而将伊朗列为恐怖主义支持国家，提出了“西促和谈，东遏两伊”的政策，试图彻底否定伊朗在巴以问题上的影响力，并且利用伊朗威胁强化美国地区存在的合理性，维持海湾国家对美国的依赖关系。但是美国的不妥协政策却刺激伊朗上下形成拥核崛起的共识，并针对与美国潜在的军事对抗加强了不对称战术的开发，如岸基导弹技术以及封锁霍尔木兹海峡等。此外，伊朗还加大了对巴以和谈抵制派国家和组织的支持。美国的不妥协政策最终换来的结果是，巴以问题和海湾问题高度互联，因此都更趋于复杂化。美国霸权的存在孕育了反美主义，为地区激进派抵制巴以问题和平解决提供了源源不断的社会支持。而巴以问题的长期存在，反过来又从内部破坏了温和派国家的社会与政权关系，进而破坏了美国主导的地区秩序的稳定性。

“9·11”事件后，地区政权与社会间力量对比逆转，美国主导的地区秩序加速瓦解。阿富汗和伊拉克两场战争大量消耗美国实力的同时也大量产生反美主义。加上新兴国家崛起，全球地缘重心转移，地区秩序重新进入加速演化阶段。在强大的社会压力下，海合会国家不再完全以美国马首是瞻。继1995年解散刚刚引入却与保守社会价值观相违背的BBC阿语频道后，2001年沙特又以类似原因取消了美国驻沙特空军基地。当然，海合会内部也不再是铁板一块，被沙特驱赶的BBC阿语频道和美国空军都很快接到卡塔尔邀请，另组半岛电视台和乌代德美军基地。卡塔尔在海合会内率先表现出外交独立性，走出多元化外交道路，除了广泛拓展与其它大国关系外，还积极向伊朗为首的地区激进派示好，积极资助哈马斯和穆兄会等激进组织。

为根除地区恐怖主义土壤，小布什彻底重建阿富汗和伊拉克政权，同时要求中东盟国实施社会民主化改造，自上而下推广民主，扩大社会支持基础，但是结果却相当负面。其一，安于现状的政权不得不自上而下做出一些装饰性改革，分化了既得利益集团。其二，为地区内激进组织合法化和政治化铺平道路，哈马斯于次年选举中获胜，不久又相继爆发伊朗核危机和以黎冲突，激进派在地区内威
望达到顶峰。其三，伊拉克原先安全部队被解散，为基地组织渗透打开了空间，原教旨主义第一次有机会实践建国目标。为摆脱中东负资产，应对国内金融危机，奥巴马政府开始寻求从中东撤出。2009年奥巴马开罗大学演讲迎合了地区民众对长期发展停滞的不满和要求社会变革的呼声，却开出了一剂以人权名义改变政权的药方，为自下而上的社会革命开了绿灯。也许奥巴马真正指向的是伊朗，后者刚刚爆发了抵制选举不公的“绿色革命”，为了进一步煽动伊朗革命不惜为所有具有社会规模的地区革命做背书，但是首先发生政权颠覆的，却是美国的地区盟国突尼斯和埃及。

奥巴马的演讲使地区民众乐观预期美国将无条件支持社会革命。土耳其伊斯兰民主与社会经济同步发展的模式进一步强化了地区政治伊斯兰组织的革命动力。阿拉伯之春中，宗教伊斯兰组织与民粹主义相结合，利用社交媒体动员、组织大规模抗议，而极端组织则浑水摸鱼，迅速将街头抗议升级为暴力革命。卡塔尔半岛电视台的报道，将民粹混淆为民主，为阿拉伯之春社会革命整个地披上了合法化的外衣。西方国家作茧自缚，因为虚妄的政治正确原则和不确定的地缘利益企图，甚至以撤销援助为要挟，强令盟友政权不得镇压革命。国际安全机制失灵，出于安全自助或权力竞争，地区国家转而支持地区内非国家行为体向地区热点安全问题渗透和扩张，从而助长了阿拉伯之春的地区蔓延。基于以上多种原因，美国与地区盟友的安全联盟被从内部突破，社会革命轻松收割诸多地区政权。

三、后阿拉伯之春时代的地区竞争

阿拉伯之春社会革命使地区国家政权面临非传统安全挑战和新的国家生存竞赛，但是能源需求下降、政权结构性问题以及地区同质竞争等进一步限制了地区国家的改革转型空间。通过对外输出安全危机，挑动教派对立只能暂时封冻经济改革要求，不足以应对经济挑战，满足社会发展要求。

突尼斯和埃及等国在阿拉伯之春中的陷落证明了两件事。其一，封闭的温和派国家和地区社会革命更加脆弱，因为社会革命的诉求多集中在社会发展和政治参与两点，这恰好是专注传统安全的美国地区盟友长期以来所忽略的。其二，美国受限于本国财政困难以及人权价值观政治正确，既无力也不愿干涉地区社会革命，也因此，美国对盟友的政权安全保障承诺已经不再有效。由于地区内民众的高流动性传统以及地区性组织的广泛分布加上半岛电视台和社交媒体的无障碍传播，地区国家间事实上已经围绕社会治理能力形成了新的国家间竞赛，最脆弱
的国家很可能首先被社会革命淘汰出局。美国地区盟友普遍遭遇的困境是人口膨胀和信息透明导致的需求多元化对原先的单一经济和封闭社会结构形成巨大冲击，政权必须在保障执政地位的同时创造条件，推动经济发展和开放社会参与。

由于三个方面原因，地区国家推进经济转型改革将遭遇巨大困难。首先，全球能源消费需求下降。自2005年达到顶峰后，欧洲碳排放总量逐年下降，越来越多转向光伏和核电等新能源。债务危机、难民危机、暴恐袭击以及民粹崛起和英国脱欧等不仅拖累经济增长，还将挑战欧洲一体化。金融危机以来，美国通过量化宽松对外输出通胀风险，进一步抑制了全球消费。2014年美国页岩油技术获得市场化应用，美国一跃成为能源净出口国，将挤占全球能源市场份额。新兴国家经济增速下滑，依赖能源加工和出口的贸易、航运和金融等服务业规模缩减，阿联酋和埃及等国的过境管理、外劳汇款和旅游业也都要跟着受损。量化宽松带来的通货膨胀和外储损失无疑增加了民众痛苦指数，突出了改革的紧迫性。但是与此同时，政权调控经济的手段却受到了很大抑制。

其次，推进改革面临结构性障碍。沙特等资源单一经济体的主要社会危机来自少数派平权运动和青年的社会参与要求。沙特什叶派聚居带与石油资源富集地高度重合，同时王权合法性与瓦哈比教义捆绑，后者又拒绝与什叶派分权，因此什叶派问题在沙特高度敏感，很难折衷妥协。青年参与问题是另一个常态障碍。沙特约3000万人口中30岁及以下人口占比高达惊人的70%。一方面，信息流通使得青年和妇女社会要求趋于多元化。另一方面，石油产业远不能提供充分就业，而且受石油收入萎缩影响，沙特不仅要退出高福利制度，私有化公共服务部门，还准备开征收入税。埃及作为人口大国和资源贫困国的代表长期面临财政支付短缺问题的困扰。埃及8000多万总人口中30岁及以下的青年占了40%，日常居民消费开支几乎耗尽了外劳汇款、苏伊士运河通行、旅游业以及地中海天然气这几个最主要的收入款项的绝大部分。革命后，这几项主要收入都出现大幅下滑。埃及军队控制了国民经济的40%左右，70万常备军是吸引国际援助的主要标的，后者维持了政府日常支出的主要来源，加上反恐和维稳，军队产业成为事实上不可触碰的独立王国。

再次，地区同质竞争带来的消极预期。沙特是伊核协议的最坚决的抵制者。第一，伊朗解禁将冲击沙特市场份额和在OPEC中的主导地位。解禁后，伊朗石油日产量增加了约200万桶，天然气出口也获得新的突破，2016年陆续通过管道向伊拉克、叙利亚和阿曼等国供气。为了保持市场份额，沙特采取了扩产降价策略，却并没有挤出主要竞争者。美国页岩油产业将每桶成本从40美元降至20美元附
近，而伊朗在制裁期间积累了数亿桶库存油，可以不计成本抛售。相反，沙特承受了更大的经济损失，石油收入锐减过快消耗外储，动摇政权安全根基。2016年11月底，在沙特力推下，OPEC和俄罗斯达成减产协议，2017年5月减产协议又获延长，但是油价仍然在低位徘徊。低油价还连累了阿美上市计划，导致全球最大IPO遭遇尴尬的估值规模不断缩水。第二，伊朗解禁令沙特经济发展前景更加暗淡。伊朗人口众多，劳动力素质较高，资源禀赋更有利于发展工业，具有独立自主的经济体系，而且伊朗有民主选举，政权得到少数族裔和青年人群的支持。最关键的是，与沙特情况相反，经历长期严酷制裁，伊朗社会对解禁后的经济预期一片乐观。

面对全新的国家竞赛规则，地区国家依据各自的资源优势和关切重点做出不同的应对。埃及借反恐名义清理最大反对派穆兄会，同时专注招商引资，建设新开罗城和苏伊士运河等重大基建工程，以带动经济和就业。土耳其除了打击反对派外，一边高举伊斯兰旗帜呼应当民粹以稳定支持阵营，另一边通过总统制修宪强化总统集权地位。沙特国内改革困难重重，因此转而向外输出安全危机。阿拉伯之春中，沙特支持利比亚、叙利亚和伊拉克的反对派，军事镇压巴林和也门的什叶派，支持埃及塞西政变，煽动美国和以色列武力解决伊朗核危机，处死什叶派教士尼米尔煽动与伊朗的断交危机，最近还联合阿联酋等国制造了卡塔尔断交风波。这一系列举动的目的都在于挑动地区内教派冲突等传统地区安全问题，从而激活美国主导的地区集体安全的反应机制，或者促进沙特主导的逊尼派安全联盟建设，以此来预先取消地区激进派威胁，同时为国内的政改集权提供掩护。为了保住地区影响力，伊朗被迫在几乎所有地区主要热点问题尤其是叙利亚内战上跟进投入宝贵资源。

四、沙特视角的地区秩序构建

沙特对外输出安全危机导致地区教派冲突，促进了地区热点安全问题的长期化和复杂化，已经成为诸多地区安全问题的策源地。通过安全化塑造地区和经济利益纽带，沙特成功在形式上部分恢复了美国主导的地区安全秩序，但是国内社会危机的潜在风险依然存在。

沙特输出安全危机的策略形式上取得了成功，但是实际效果若何还需检验。首先，沙特输出安全危机和教派对立，促进了地区热点问题的长期化。教派对立通过相互抵消形成权力真空，使叙利亚、也门和利比亚等国的危机长期化，为极端组织等非国家行为体的渗透和壮大创造条件，而极端组织的介入又使热点问题
更加复杂化。伊斯兰国渗透伊拉克和叙利亚，利用内战弱势平衡接管了各方武装及大片国土，最终宣布建国。尽管沙特的也门的军事行动耗费巨大，成效缓慢，但是地区内诸多热点问题的持续存在使安全持续成为地区首要议题，干扰了伊朗等地区对手的经济发展计划。伊斯兰国的崛起及其外溢使沙特遭到欧美的空前孤立，同时也为2015年接连发生的美国解禁伊朗、俄罗斯军事回归中东以及什叶派反恐联盟的建立创造了条件。但是安全议题突出使得中东地区在未来油价下跌的情况下任然维持了地缘重要性，最终利用地缘政治竞争将准备撤出中东的美国重新拉回地区。2017年4月，美国借口叙利亚化武危机空袭叙空军基地，此后又在阿富汗丢下“炸弹之母”，以此高调宣示美国不会放弃对全球反恐事业的领导权。

其次，沙特以反恐名义和经济利益串联地区热点，将安全焦点从黎凡特转移到海湾。2015年12月组建的逊尼派反恐联盟是当年5月组建的阿拉伯联军和海合会的扩大版，主导者都是沙特，用兵对象都在也门。2017年4月举行的美国-阿拉伯-伊斯兰峰会是对以上逊尼派地区联盟的再次升级。俄罗斯和伊朗主导建立的什叶派反恐联盟基本上是根据战时需要结成的即时安全联盟。相较而言，沙特主导的逊尼派反恐联盟则是主要通过经济纽带联结的利益共同体，这也可以从卡塔尔断交风波中找出一点证明。对阿联酋来说，伊朗解禁意味着迪拜港转口贸易繁荣的结束，因此只得押注沙特未来的国际投资计划。对于埃及，沙特不仅是塞西政变支持者，是最大金主，也是争取美国援助的桥梁。巴林的政权安危完全仰赖沙特为首的海合会，而且旅游业支柱也需要邻国市场。对利比亚和也门来说，沙特是两国中央政府的主要支持者，而卡塔尔或伊朗则支持反对派。特朗普美国的加入同样也充满了利益交换的味道。沙特通过1100亿美元军购将美国的地区政策重新引导回克林顿时代，即遏制伊朗和解决巴以问题并举。

再者，沙特的地区秩序以遏制伊朗为意识形态，以此为基础构建广泛的利益同盟。教派对立只是沙特输出安全问题和团结地区内多数的手段，恐伊症和遏制伊朗才是沙特真正的意识形态。伊核协议谈判期间，沙特与以色列密谋联合军事打击伊朗，一起游说美国国会为伊朗解禁设置障碍。特朗普访问中东期间，沙特不仅高调展现与美国的亲密关系，更不惜在本国经济困难时期，动用1/5外储采购军备拉动美国就业。相反地，当海合会小弟卡塔尔向伊朗示好，提出合作开发两国共享天然气的建议，以及向地区什叶派武装支付巨额赎金后，沙特果断动员盟友集体与卡塔尔断交，对其实施海陆空封锁。沙特等国围剿卡塔尔和穆兄会还遏制地区内的各类激进组织，有助于地区国家融合政权与社会关系，回归现代民族国家角色。逊尼派国家专注本国事务，对巴以问题采取游离立场，而伊朗和黎巴嫩真主党则被拖在叙利亚战场，孤立无援的哈马斯委婉表达了愿意承认以色
列国家生存权的意思。

地区的热点问题也为建构新的地区安全合作机制创造了条件。目前看来，沙特的地区安全保障无疑有助于解决巴以问题。一旦解决了巴以问题这个地区根源性问题，伊朗的地区影响力将失去大半，对沙特等国的社会威胁也将大打折扣。但是以色列安全只是巴以问题的一半，在巴勒斯坦问题解决之前，地区内一切都有可能反复。历史地看，发展民族国家内涵、强化地区机制的功勤性和包容性仍将是未来中东地区秩序建构的方向。
慕尼黑安全会议“三后”议题引发全球思考

王嵎生  中国国际问题研究基金会研究中心执行主任，
中国前APEC高官和大使

“后真相、后西方、后秩序？”这是今年二月中旬举行的慕尼黑安全会议的主题（以下简称“三后”）。

《2017年慕尼黑安全报告》明确指出，西方国家已经意识到，他们的治理体系所产出的积极效果越来越少。会议主席沃尔夫冈·伊申格尔判断说，“当前国际安全环境比二战以来的任何时候都更加动荡不安。一些西方社会以及自由国际秩序最根本的基础在发生动摇。”他还开门见山地发问：“世界是不是正在步入后秩序时代？”

多少年来，慕尼黑安全会议从没提出过这样的议题，而且一开始主办方就有比较明确的表态，这不能不发人深思。西方有评论认为，这在一定程度上，反映了老牌发达国家（特别是敏感的精英阶层）的某种焦虑和反思，既关乎世界形势，又关乎国际秩序和他们所谓的“政治正确”，不无道理。

进入新世纪以来，“时代变迁量变进程正在加速发展，国际力量对比正在发生历史性的变化”；美国现在是“无可奈何花渐落，情不自禁苦争春”。关于时代变迁的“量变进程”和美国霸权的“花渐落”的判断，是比较实事求是的，因为事物总是有一个从量变到质变的过程；美国还没有衰落到“无可奈何花落去”的程度，其“霸权之花”，在一定程度上仍然“风韵犹存”。

去年一年，国际形势发生了很大变化，可谓乱云飞渡，黑天鹅起飞，呈现“乱”，“变”，“治”三大特点。原因当然是多方面的，但关键还是美国不愿面对现实，不承认“世道变了”，仍坚持要继续“领导世界100年”，舍不得放弃“世界警察”的阴魂。

“大乱”势必寻求“大变”。“变”，一向都是绝对和普遍存
在的，但去年似乎大不相同，“时代变迁”好像走到了一个“临界点”。“杜特尔特现象”和“特朗普现象”，被誉为“两只黑天鹅”起飞，并非偶然，显然预示着时代的脚步正在向着“质变”方向阔步前进。人们常说，“穷则思变”。那是因为过去发展中国家要“打翻身仗”。现在，它们大多数翻身了，一部分迅速兴起了，可以说，“富也思变”。金砖国家领导人要求建立更加公平合理的国际政治经济秩序，最具有代表性，表明美国制定规则的老一套秩序现在不灵了。“大变”，显然是有时代性，从根本上说，牵涉到时代变迁的大方向。

有鉴于此，国内外一些专家学者认为，现在继续说“量变进程”已不那么准确了，时代变迁已经发生、至少已接近发生质的变化。在这方面，美国不乏其人。他们在不同程度上都“认知”或“接近认知”时代变迁已到了一个节点。比较有代表性的人士，当数知名学者福山。想当年，苏联解体时，他兴致勃勃，写下了举世瞩目的宏文“历史的终结”，断言从此美国一统天下了，美国价值观将遍及和主导全球。但历史和社会发展是无情的，很快便嘲笑了这位“巨匠”。福山先生虽然念念不忘他所谓的美国民主自由，但作为一位严肃的学者，近些年来，他不得不承认，他当时过于乐观，误判形势；承认所谓美国民主体制的失败；承认中国等社会体制也有可取之处，值得借鉴……。现在，美国这类人士似乎越来越多，给我印象比较深的还有顶级专家兰普顿。提起此人，人们马上就会联想到他前年写的一篇文章（中美关系逼近“临界点”），好像中美“必有一战”。但他的文章最终强调，中美关系为什么会搞成这样？从根本上来说，美国必须重新思考它对“主导权”的定位。这一观点难能可贵，但只有阅读全文，大海捞针，才能发现。

如果说，“大乱”呼唤“大变”，那么“大变”也势必要求“大治”。这是社会发展规律。在战乱和动荡年代，“人心思治”显然是主旋律。人们普遍渴望能有一个安定的世界，和睦相处；普遍思考和探寻新的相处之道，憧憬着美好的未来。正是在这种情况下，“全球治理”大课题提到了议事日程。如果从2008年美国金融危机算起，差不多快十年了。应该说取得了不少成绩，但仍然任重道远。

“全球治理”是一个系统工程，需要从战略上和社会发展方向上进行“顶层设计”。

首先，对慕尼黑安全会议关于“三后”议题，需要有一个明确的认同，至少是认知。“后真相”，意味着老牌发达国家所谓的“政治正确”是个伪命题，在它旗下的所谓“价值观”，绝非“放之四海而皆准”的宝贝。“后西方”，不言自明。西方七国虽还风韵犹存，但世界大事他们已不能独断专行，而必须同以
“金砖国家”为代表的新兴经济体商量着办。“后秩序”，这里的“秩序”，如果是指联合国宪章精神及其相关秩序，那是要坚持和维护的（当然，也需要发展和必要的修改）；如果指的是被扭曲的所谓“秩序”（小布什总统就说过，“美国的权威高于联合国”），那就必须摒弃。2009年6月，金砖国家领导人首次会议发表的16点联合声明就明确支持联合国的中心地位和作用。

第二，要有一个广纳良言后形成的“药方”，战略上引导“全球治理”。在这方面，去年G20的杭州共识，主张要“同舟共济，合作共赢，共商、共建、共享”，反对贸易和投资保护主义，坚持包容和互联互通，在很大程度上反映了全球治理的客观需要。

第三，若干年前，上海合作组织达成一致，主张“尊重多样文明，谋求共同发展，互信、互利、平等、协商”。因为是“诞生”在上海，人们称之为“上海精神”。它既是中国的，也是上合组织的；它顺应时代潮流，也是“全球治理”可供参考的一剂良方。

最后，也是很重要的，就是“三后”和“全球治理”需要宝贵的公共产品和智慧。中国不争什么“领导世界”的桂冠，愿与世界各国共同探索，提出中国的方案，贡献中国的智慧。目前，明显摆着的，一是“人类命运共同体”理念，一是“一带一路”实践。

人们普遍注意到，去年菲律宾飞出了一只“黑天鹅”（杜特尔特），美国也飞出了一只“黑天鹅”（特朗普）。他们都很有个性，但并不是简单的个人，他们各自都有其代表性和标志性。美国“政治正确派”不喜欢特朗普（正在反扑，企图迫使他“停飞”或“逆飞”）；菲律宾“政治正确派”也不喜欢杜特尔特（正在千方百计阻扰他飞行）。但“全球治理”需要他们“顺飞”，“三后”也需要他们“顺飞”。希望他们都好好飞，继续向着正确方向飞。中国作为一个有担当的大国，已经在飞，顺着时代变迁诉求的方向飞；希望我们在蓝天相遇，共同飞向一个方向，为人类命运共同体谱写新的篇章。
全球化时代的全球治理

蒋振西  中国联合国协会理事

目前，“全球治理”成为国际社会的一个热门话题，得到国际社会的广泛关注。在全球化的时代背景下，探索全球治理对国际局势的影响，加大对国际经济、安全等机构的治理改革，增大发展中国家在国际事务中的地位和话语权具有十分重要的意义。

一、全球治理的基本理念

全球治理的概念是在全球化的时代背景下提出的。1992年，德国社会党国际前主席、国际发展委员会主席勃兰特倡议成立“全球治理委员会”。该委员会在1995年联合国成立50周年时发表了《我们的全球家园》的专题报告，呼吁国际社会开展广泛合作，共同应对在全世界范围出现的公共问题。

“全球治理”是一个理论概念，国际上不同学派对其有不同解读，而且不断发生变化。《我们的全球家园》对全球治理作了详细阐述，此后许多学者提出了不同见解。笔者认为：“全球治理是主权国家、国际组织、民间机构为解决全球性问题而共同采取的治理行动，包括进行谈判协商、制定国际协定、建立法制法规，实施强制性措施等多种形式。全球治理涵盖国际安全、经济发展、生态环境等多个共同领域。”“全球治理”的核心应是国际社会各方的普遍参与、普遍受益，更好利用联合国等多边机制，平等协商，实现合作共赢，共同发展。

全球治理是一个广泛的世界议程，全球治理的对象是世界性问题，涵盖政治、经济、安全等多个领域；一是全球安全治理，包括解决国家间或区域性的武装冲突、制止一些国家爆发的内战和动乱，
防止国际核武器的扩散，控制常规武器的国际贸易与非法流通；二是促进经济全球化发展，包括保护全球贸易、金融市场流通、处理经济危机等；三是保护生态环境，包括资源的合理利用与开发、保护生物多样性、应对气候变化等；四是打击国际恐怖活动比如走私、毒品交易等跨国犯罪活动；五是保护基本人权，提供人道主义救援，以及防止流行疾病的传播等。

全球治理的主体分为三个层面：第一层面是主权国家政府及行政当局。这是全球治理的基本层面，也是国际上最重要的行为主体。政府机构拥有国家治理的权力和资源，也承担着全球治理的责任和义务；第二层面是政府间国际组织，包括联合国、世界银行、世界贸易组织、国际货币基金组织等世界性综合国际组织和专门组织。同时也包括由地区国家组成的地区性组织，如欧洲联盟、非洲联盟、亚太经济合作组织。这些国际和地区组织将不同国家组成纵横交错的网络，在不同领域发挥着独特的作用与影响；第三层面是民间机构，由非国家行为体组成，包括民营企业机构、非政府组织和民众组织。根据国际组织联盟统计，目前世界上300多个国家和地区拥有67000多个国际组织，其中大多数为非政府组织，包括学术团体，研究机构、专业协会和跨国商业组织。其中“国际红十字协会”、“绿色和平组织”等最为知名。他们有的组织世界论坛，聚集世界英才，提供研究成果，为政府出谋划策。他们有的联合民众，组织规模活动，成为实行人道主义援助，保护生态环境的重要力量。非政府组织的有些活动是与政府共同组织的，比如每年在瑞士达沃斯召开的世界经济论坛，除了邀请世界顶尖经济学家等学者外，还邀请政府官员出席，大家各抒己见，共同为世界经济发展把脉问诊。

全球治理的目标是建立完善的国际机制，制定有效的国际规章，实现公平有效的治理。全球治理特别强调要采取“参与、谈判和协调”的方式，而不是诉诸武力；主张根据《联合国宪章》等国际条约与规章处理国际纠纷，规范参与者的行文。许多研究国际政治的学者认为，当前世界实际上是处于“无政府”状态，即不存在处于各国政府之上的“超级政府”。因此，全球治理的倡议者强调，全球治理的目标不是要建立“世界政府”，而是要建立一个更加民主、透明、有效的国际机制，加强国际合作，动员多种力量，对全球事务进行多元化和多层面的治理。

全球治理的积极作用。随着全球化的发展，全球治理取得了不少进展，发挥了重要作用：一是有利于全球化的发展。全球化把世界各个地区、不同国家紧密地联结在一起，是全球治理的时代背景。当前，无论是发达国家还是发展中国家，对全球治理的议程和目标表现出更多关注。二是有利于共同应对世界性问题。全球治理促进了世界经济秩序重构、推动联合国改革、气候变化、环境保护
的进程。当前，全球治理的范围不断扩大，正向网络、极地、空天、海洋等新的领域发展。这些世界性问题是任何一国，无论多么强大，都不可能单独解决，只有加强国际合作，才能共同应对。三是有利于增强国际合作。全球治理的关键是要加强国际协调与合作。主权国家是解决全球问题的基础和关键，他们通过参与国际组织、增进地区合作形成了多层次、宽领域的国际网络，为全球治理提供了广阔的平台与渠道。四是有助于建立新的国际秩序。全球治理依照公认的国际法规、国际关系准则和国际惯例妥善处理全球性问题，体现了公平与效率，维护了各国的权利，同时也维护了国际秩序。总之，全球治理是主张通过以联合国为代表的多边治理机制，动员国际社会普遍参与，通过平等协商，实现合作共赢。

二、对全球治理的思考

当前，全球治理理念得到了国际上的广泛认可，有其可行性，理由是：一是全球治理符合世界各国的根本利益，大家都从中受益；二是经过多年努力建立的现有国际体制仍在可靠运行。如世界银行、国际货币基金组成的布雷顿森林体系不断完善，世界贸易组织成绩斐然，世界卫生组织在防治流行疾病方面功不可没；三是国际条约在全球治理中发挥了重要作用。《联合国宪章》为国际关系制定了准则，保证了世界的和平与安全。《不扩散核武器条约》、《联合国气候变化条约》、《联合国海洋法公约》都已经在并继续在维护国际秩序过程中发挥重要作用。

当然，全球治理并不是要建立“世界政府”。虽然国际上有些学者主张建立“世界政府”进行全球治理，但主流派对此并不认同，而且也不现实。许多学者强调：“全球治理并不是要建立世界政府或世界联邦。”虽然联合国在全球治理中发挥着极其重要的作用，但是联合国并不是“世界政府”，国际社会也不可能成立凌驾于各国政府之上的世界“超级政府”。联合国只有加强主权国家与有关组织的合作与协调，才能完成其承担的使命。

尽管全球治理是当今国际社会的共识，然而全球化的发展并没有改变国际政治的基本现实，全球治理存在一些制约因素：一是全球治理的概念比较笼统，虚化，定义不明确，且多有歧义，很难指导具体行动；二是全球治理理念在没有“世界政府”的情况下，缺乏执行力。现有的全球治理机制没有足够的权力和资源，在国际治理、行动协调方面表现不足，其执行力是有限的。因此，全球治理只能依靠有效的国际合作；三是主权国家存在不同的利益与价值观念，常常使得全球治理难以达成共识。主权国家国家利益至上原则往往成为全球治理的障碍，
使其面临严重的“集体行动的困境”。当前，在国际关系中，由于一些国家缺乏互信，很难达成一致与谅解。特别是美国奉行的霸权主义国际战略，对公正而有效的全球治理造成了直接的损害；四是在全球治理中有非国家行为体的大量参与，出现了许多不同的利益诉求方，使得在一些重大的全球性问题上达成共识的难度增加，使得决议的达成与执行更为困难。因此，全球治理从口号变为现实是一条漫长之路。

在当前形势下，全球治理应立足于现实，推进全球治理体系的改革：一是明确全球治理的重点，加大对全球安全，国际经济合作，控制传染性疾病等重大国际问题的治理；二是加强主权国家特别是大国的合作与协调。主权国家是现代国际关系的基础，没有他们的参与和合作，全球治理只能是一句空话。在国际关系中，要坚持和平共处的基本原则，切实维护主权国家的正当权益和重要关切，其中建立相互尊重、合作共赢的新型国家关系至为关键；三是加大国际组织的协调作用。国际组织是国际关系的纽带，它们不仅是国际秩序的维护者和国际问题的决策者，同时也是国际法规的制定者。全球治理首先是由国际机制协同主权国家共同进行的综合治理。四是增加非政府组织对国际事务的参与，全球治理应有非政府组织和民众的广泛参与，体现民生诉求。今后应更多发挥非政府组织的积极作用。

全球治理是当前国际社会的共识，具有广阔的前景。尽管世界上出现了逆全球化现象，世界贸易增长缓慢、贸易保护主义抬头，甚至引起有人对全球化的质疑，但这不能表明全球化将会倒退。全球化是基于生产力发展的客观规律，并不以人们的主观意志为转移。为此，国际社会也要为此做出不懈努力，加强全球治理的力度，共同推进全球化的健康发展。

三、中国对全球治理的作用与贡献

近年来，中国经济迅猛发展，成为世界第二大经济体、第一大制造业国、第一大贸易国。2016年中国GDP总量已达74.41万亿元人民币。随着中国经济的快速发展，中国对国际事务的参与度不断提高。

目前，中国深度融入国际体系，是主要国际组织的重要成员。中国积极参与全球治理活动，在国际事务中努力实现从“旁观者”到“参与者”、“引领者”的角色转变。

中国提出共同安全观。2014年，中国国家主席习近平提出，要“倡导共同、综合、合作、可持续的安全观”，强调“要切实推进多边外交，推动国际体系和
全球治理改革。”

多年来，中国致力于建设一个持久和平的世界，建设一个普遍安全的世界。中国主张建立“对话不对抗、结伴不结盟”的伙伴关系，相互尊重、合作共赢。中国主张完善全球经济治理，加强在金融监管、国际税收、反腐败领域合作，提高世界经济抗风险能力。

**中国参与联合国维和行动**。中国坚定维护以联合国为核心的国际体系，坚定维护以联合国宪章宗旨和原则为基石的国际关系基本准则，坚定维护联合国权威和地位，坚定维护联合国在国际事务中的核心作用。多年来，中国承担国际社会的共同责任，对联合国等国际组织提供了多种支持与合作。中国是联合国维和行动的坚定支持者和积极参与者。中国承担的维和摊款比额在所有会员国中已位居第二位，占据联合国维和摊款总额的10.2%。自1990年中国派出军事人员参加联合国维和行动以来，迄今，中国共向联合国维和行动派出三万人次的维和人员，21名中国维和军人和警察献出了宝贵生命。当前，2000多名中国维和人员正在冲突地区为和平而值守。中国在联合国维持和平行动中发挥的作用日益增强，贡献日益突出。

**中国海军参加亚丁湾护航**。2008年12月26日，中国政府开始派遣海军舰艇编队赴亚丁湾、索马里海域实施护航，主要任务是保护中国航经亚丁湾、索马里海域的船舶、人员安全，保护世界粮食计划署等国际组织运送人道主义物资船舶的安全，并努力为航经该海域的外国船舶提供安全掩护。目前已派出25批护航编队参加亚丁湾索马里海域护航，护航编队还与有关国家海军进行联合军事演习，访问港口，进行反海盗训练。

**中国举办20国集团杭州峰会**。2016年中国举办的杭州峰会上通过了《二十国集团创新增长蓝图》，决心从根本上寻找世界经济持续健康增长之道，全面提升世界经济中长期增长潜力。杭州峰会制定了《二十国集团全球贸易增长战略》，继续支持多边贸易体系，重申反对保护主义承诺，第一次就落实联合国２０３０年可持续发展议程制定行动计划，这将为发展中国家人民带来实实在在的好处。二十国集团应该不断完善国际货币金融体系，优化国际金融机构治理结构完善全球金融安全网。

**中国提出“一带一路”倡议**。2013年，中国提出了“一带一路”倡议。这是促进中国与世界共同发展宏伟构想的中国方案。在“一带一路”建设中，中国主张“共商、共建、共享”的原则。其中“共商”就是要注重和有关国发展战略的对接，以求共同发展；“共建”就是紧密联系沿线国家的利益、命运和责任，共同推进“一带一路”建设；“共享”就是实现互利共赢，造福沿线各国人民。
近年来，中国与“一带一路”60多个沿线国家经贸合作取得可喜成绩。2016年中国与“一带一路”沿线国家的进出口总额为6.3万亿元人民币，在沿线国家新签对外承包工程合同为1260亿美元，对沿线国家直接投资145亿美元。中国企业已经在“一带一路”沿线20多个国家建设了56个经贸合作区，涉及多个领域。2017年5月，中国在北京举办“一带一路高峰论”，28个国家元首政府首脑应邀与会，共同促进“一带一路”的健康发展。

中国以维护世界和平、促进共同发展为己任，在国际关系中弘扬平等互信、包容互鉴、合作共赢的精神，共同维护国际公平正义。实践证明，中国是国际秩序的参与者、建设者和贡献者。
日前，美国总统特朗普宣布美国将退出关于应对气候变化的《巴黎协定》，这是继3月份特朗普签发《关于促进能源独立和经济增长的总统行政命令》（Presidential Executive Order on Promoting Energy Independence and Economic Growth）后美国在气候变化与能源安全领域的最新政策行动，标志着特朗普政府已经完全抛弃了奥巴马时期的气候与能源政策，其性质及影响值得关注。

一、特朗普政府退出《巴黎协定》行动的性质

6月1日，特朗普经近半年的反复权衡最终决定退出《巴黎协定》，再次体现了其倡导的“美国优先”的执政理念，强化了其注重国内经济事务的政策倾向。但就实质而言，特朗普执意退出《巴黎协定》的行动几乎完全是一种政治姿态，其中至少包含相互关联的三层含义，一是兑现其总统竞选承诺，对大力支持其当选的煤炭、石油、天然气等传统化石能源利益集团有所交待。据美国联邦选举委员会统计，接受煤炭利益集团捐助资金最多的前五位总统候选人均为共和党籍，而居首位的即是特朗普，且受助金额遥遥领先他人。同时，也在选民中树立其言出必果的执政形象。二是创造和累积政绩。特朗普就任以来，大刀阔斧力图推倒奥巴马健保体系、实施税改、落实大规模基础设施建设计划，但目前均遭重挫或难以突破。同时特朗普团队或家族受“通俄门”等丑闻缠身。美国哥伦比亚广播公司进行的最新民意调查显示，目前仅有36%的受访民众认可特朗普的执政表现。三是巩固共和党民意基础，争取在2018年
中期选举中共和党能够延续优势地位，继续掌控国会两院，以图长远。特朗普着意将应对气候变化与制造业萎缩、就业岗位流失等联系在一起，稳定共和党选民基本盘。6月，在被视为明年中期选举风向标和试验场的乔治亚州、南卡罗来纳州特别选举中，两位共和党候选人均获全胜，稳住了众议院多数议席。

目前来看，特朗普退出《巴黎协定》对美国利益而言除了其国际形象大为受损外，尚不会造成其他直接负面影响。

首先，美国没有在《巴黎协定》中承担强制性量化减排责任。从法律关系看，《巴黎协定》是《联合国气候变化框架公约》的子约，确实具有名义上的法律约束力，但在实践中为各缔约方保留了较大的政策转圜空间。那些矛盾集中的重大谈判议题，如减排目标、资金援助、技术转让等并未在《巴黎协定》中获得实质性突破，而是暂被搁置。作为《巴黎协定》基础的“国家自主贡献方案”（Intended Nationally Determined Contributions）是缔约方根据各自国情提交的自愿性行动计划，并不具有真正的法律约束力。所以，无论是根据《巴黎协定》还是奥巴马政府提交的“国家自主贡献方案”，美国都没有对强制性量化减排指标、资金援助不发达国家等行动作出法律意义上的履约承诺。

再者，美国退出《巴黎协定》并不意味着退出《联合国气候变化框架公约》及国际气候谈判进程。如前所述，《巴黎协定》采取了国际多边条约的形式，为《联合国气候变化框架公约》的法律延伸。依照国际法惯例，美国仍是《联合国气候变化框架公约》的缔约方，对于联合国框架下的气候谈判进程仍有权参与。即便是特朗普本人，也在宣布退出《巴黎协定》的同时表示，并不排除与有关各方重新谈判所谓“公正”气候协定的可能性。事实上，即便美国立即开始进入《巴黎协定》退出的法定程序，也需到2019年11月方可完成。届时特朗普总统第一任期也即将结束。基于美国的经济和科技实力、温室气体排放量及在各种国际机制中的地位，美国仍然对国际气候合作进程及相关规则制定保持着重要影响力。

最后，美国国内气候政策与行动的基本特点是“自下而上”。这是美国政体及政治生态的特点决定的。联邦气候政策缺失不会从根本上阻止美国气候行动。一方面，美国各州综合经济实力、产业和能源消费结构、资源禀赋差异巨大，利益取向不同，且享有广泛的管理自身经济事务的权力。联邦政府通过国会“自上而下”推动和制定全面的气候与能源政策阻力极大。因此，奥巴马政府即是以行政命令形式绕过立法机构签署并批准了《巴黎协定》。这也使得特朗普能够同样以行政命令的方式轻易脱逃。另一方面，美国各州、市、企业、非政府组织在开展气候行动应用环境友好技术等方面一直极为自主、活跃，形成“自下而上”
的局面。美国几乎各州和主要城市及企业均制定由各自的减排计划。比如，加利福尼亚州、华盛顿州、明尼苏达州等13州组成美国气候联盟（United States Climate Alliance）坚持发展低碳经济，维护《巴黎协定》。美国东北部9个州、中西部6个州、西部7个州等组成区域减排联盟和碳交易市场。美国纽约市、洛杉矶市、芝加哥市等75个主要城市组成了“全国市长联盟气候行动议程”（Mayors National Climate Action Agenda）。

二、特朗普退出《巴黎协定》行动对国际气候合作的影响

特朗普政府退出《巴黎协定》对确立前进方向不久的国际气候合作进程造成一定冲击，但不会使之倒退或逆转。《巴黎协定》是继《京都议定书》后国际社会开展气候合作进程中的重大成果，对2020年后全球应对气候变化行动的时间框架和路线图作出规划。其基础是各国根据自己国情制定并提交的“国家自主贡献方案”，这种“自下而上”的方式不同于《京都议定书》“自上而下”向“附件一国家”分配减排指标的作法。美国暂时退出并不会摧毁《巴黎协定》的基础。目前，《巴黎协定》已获149个《联合国气候变化框架公约》缔约方批准，赢得最广泛的支持。但是，如前所述，美国在联合国气候变化谈判进程中一直扮演着极为关键的角色，对特朗普政府调整气候与能源政策的负面影响还需有所评估。

一方面，动摇了国际社会应对气候变化问题的政治信心。2009年底哥本哈根气候大会令国际社会对全球合作应对气候变化前景普遍失望，不具任何法律约束力的《哥本哈根协议》相当于宣告全球减排的京都模式失灵。随后，经过中国、美国、欧盟、印度等主要经济体的反复推动下，国际社会终于在2011年德班气候大会上达成共识，为获致“议定书、另一法律文书或某种具有法律约束力的议定结果”展开协作，着手构建2020年后国际温室气体减排机制。2015年底，《巴黎协定》达成，最终形成以具有法律约束力的国际协定为核心，以各国“国家自主贡献方案”自愿行动为基础的新减排模式。巴黎大会召开前，已有187个国家提交了“国家自主贡献方案”，代表全球温室气体排放总量的97%，缔约方采取气候行动的参与度达到空前水平。特朗普政府气候能源政策是继小布什政府之后美国再次在气候变化领域放弃大国责任，对各国政府、国际组织、企业、机构等协作解决全球性问题的信心造成一定打击。

另一方面，加大了落实《巴黎协定》的难度。《巴黎协定》于2016年底生效后即进入落实阶段。此前，为凝聚最大共识，主要缔约方在磋商《巴黎协定》文本过程中作了较大妥协和让步。特朗普政府的消极态度使未来特定议题的谈判难
度增加，更可能成为阻碍谈判取得进展和成果的因素。特朗普政府取消对“绿色气候基金”给予支持，中止了国际气候合作伙伴计划，推卸发达国家援助不发达国家等适应和减缓气候变化的责任，无视“共同但有区别的责任”原则，不利于发展中国家尊重和履行“各自能力”原则，兑现其各自在“国家自主贡献方案”中提出的减排目标，更无助于实现《巴黎协定》协定中提出的远景目标，即“确保至2100年全球平均气温升高不超过工业化水平前2℃”。

三、反思当前国际气候合作的模式与路径

特朗普退出《巴黎协定》再次暴露了协定及当前国际气候合作模式的内在缺陷，有必要对其进行反思，否则影响将《巴黎协定》的有效落实及国际气候合作的前途。

首先，《巴黎协定》先天不足有待弥补和改变。《巴黎协定》由缔约方全权代表签字、开放供各国签署、缔约方各自履行国内批准程序、向联合国交存批准文书、设定并满足一定生效条件、缔约方享有退出权利等。从其缔约程序及内容看，《巴黎协定》符合“以国际法为准”国际多边条约的定义。据《维也纳条约法公约》第26条，“凡有效之条约对其各当事国有拘束力，必须由各该国善意履行”。从法律效力层次上看，《巴黎协定》与《京都议定书》同属实施《联合国气候变化框架公约》的次级法律文件。从内容上看，二者之间关联性和延续性并不显著，体现了完全不同的减缓和适应气候变化的理念和路径。为了最大限度凝聚国际社会共识，维护国际气候合作进程不致崩溃，《巴黎协定》回避了如监督、遵约机制等具体矛盾或分歧，更多地强调缔约方的道义责任、集体责任，在法律层面遗留了诸多不确定性，缺乏可操作性，难以实现所谓强法律约束力。而作为其基础构成要件的各国“国家自主贡献方案”的法律地位更为脆弱。

再者，以双边合作推动多边谈判的国际气候合作模式亟待完善。美国政府更迭，新任总统特朗普轻易退出《巴黎协定》所引发讨论与危机反衬出这一模式的脆弱与失灵。特朗普气候与能源新政几乎完全逆转了奥巴马时期的相关政策，动摇了中美、欧美等重要双边气候合作机制的基础。中美之间在气候变化议题上的互信与有效合作更是达成《巴黎协定》的关键。哥本哈根会议后，中美之间建立的各层次气候对话磋商机制折冲双方利益诉求，推动国际气候谈判不断取得突破。两国成为弥合各方分歧，凝聚基本共识，维护联合国框架下国际气候合作进程的“双引擎”。中美元首先后发布三份关于气候变化的联合声明，基于双方高层的广泛共识，两国政府、企业、民间也逐步搭建起气候与能源政策、科技、贸
易等各类对话与合作平台。美国退出《巴黎协定》后，以中美双边合作推动国际多边谈判的模式受到挑战，两国有关部门和机构均面临调整和适应的压力。

最后，国际社会讨论如气候变化等全球性问题的思路亟待创新。应对气候变化是典型的全球性问题，需要世界各国、各地区的普遍参与，政府、企业、机构等多层次协作寻求解决方案。但是，从1992年《联合国气候变化框架公约》达成至今，全球气候谈判历尽曲折，成果有限。《京都议定书》和《巴黎协定》既是两大标志性成果，但同时也成为矛盾纷争的中心，效果不彰。谈判始终在人类共同利益与国家利益之间寻求平衡与突破，所谓“共同而区别的责任”原则难以得到贯彻。落实《巴黎协定》以及继续推进气候合作需利用“天时”、“地利”、“人和”，即时机、环境与意愿，三者相互关联。从时机上看，2007年全球金融危机以来，“去全球化”浪潮涌动，对全球既有政治、经济秩序形成多次冲击，不利于落实《巴黎协定》。但是，全球治理体系变革已提上日程，为实现主体站在变革全球治理体系新高度讨论气候变化议题提供时机。从环境上看，《巴黎协定》及“国家自主贡献方案”虽不完美，但仍完全可以作为一个新起点。而且，可再生能源技术与市场发展迅速，增加了谈判主体的政策与行动选项。从意愿上看，携手应对气候变化是当前国际社会的主流意志，虽然未来一段时间美国联邦层级的气候政策阙如，但是其地方政府、企业、机构的积极性潜力很大。

四、结语

特朗普政府退出《巴黎协定》，客观上给予中国、欧盟、印度等更多推动国际气候合作的机会。如前所述，主要谈判主体有必要站在构建全球治理体系新机制的高度，设计并稳妥推进《巴黎协定》进入履约期后的谈判进程。

维护和完善国际减排合作的巴黎模式。《巴黎协定》及各国提交的“国家自主贡献方案”已经确立了未来较长时间国际气候合作的基本模式。《巴黎协定》已进入落实、履约阶段。《巴黎协定》本质上是关于履约方道义责任、集体责任的原则性规定，遵循机制弱，并未设定强制性量化减排目标。据统计，中国、美国、欧盟等主要经济体温室气体排放量增速均已放缓甚至有所下降，减排压力事实上有所减轻。中国对形成巴黎模式具有重要贡献，今后在美国缺席的情况下继续发挥主导作用的重点并非立即重新建章立制，而是依照“国家自主贡献方案”认真履约，如期实现预设目标，展现负责任大国形象和引领全球治理体系变革的能力。

推动中美气候与能源对话合作进入新阶段。美国参与后续气候谈判的立场、
态度对巴黎模式成效及新机制的构建具有重要影响力。应对气候变化是中国参与全球治理的重要问题领域，几年来为达成《巴黎协定》所作的建设性工作获国际社会普遍认可。与特朗普政府建立了新的关于气候变化与能源合作的沟通对话机制，对于双方增进了解，扩大共识，确保以《巴黎协定》为代表的成果不受损害具有重要意义。而且，在特朗普气候与能源新政下，传统化石能源、可再生能源、基础设施建设等领域均出现丰富的市场机会与合作空间。以石油行业为例，美国石油产量增长加速，出口需求旺盛。中国进口美国石油，既可拓展多元进口渠道，又有利于改善双边贸易平衡，增强两国共同利益基础。中国在可再生能源领域投资、生产、应用方面均处于领先地位。而在特朗普能源新政下，美国风能、太阳能、生物质能领域的市场机会不减反升，也有利于形成中美双赢局面。