

# Peace

**December 2010  
Serial No. 97**

**Chief Editor: Niu Qiang  
Executive Editor: Wu Kesheng  
Associate Editor: Liu Yumin**

*NOTE: The academic papers published in the PEACE quarterly are mainly the authors own observations, which do not necessarily reflect those of the Chinese People's Association for Peace and Disarmament.*

Cover photo by Lu Yan

## Contents

<b>Observance of the 2010 International Day of Peace.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Feature Articles</b>	
Transformation of Current International Security System and China's Concept on International Security System.....	6
China's Security Environment and Its Strategic Response in the Context of American Eastward-Moving Strategic Focus.....	14
International Security Situation: Main Trends for the 5-10 Years to Come.....	24
<b>International NGOs' Perceptions On Nuclear Disarmament.....</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>International Exchanges.....</b>	<b>54</b>

## Observance of the 2010 International Day of Peace

Peace Editors

On the afternoon of September 20<sup>th</sup>, 2010, the Chinese People's Association for Peace and Disarmament (CPAPD), All China Youth Federation (ACYF) and the UN System in China jointly observed the International Day of Peace at the Great Hall of People in Beijing. The theme of the event was "Chinese Youth for Peace and Development". Mme. Yan Junqi, Vice Chairperson of the Standing Committee of the National Peoples' Congress (NPC) and Vice President of the CPAPD, Mr. Lu Yongzheng, Vice Chairman of the ACYF and Ms. Renata Lock-Dessallien, UN Resident Coordinator in China addressed the ceremony. Over 1000 participants including Mr. LI Wuwei, Vice Chairperson of the National Committee of the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference and Vice President of the CPAPD, Mr. Li Jinjun, Vice Minister of the IDCPC, Mr. He Jun, CPAPD Vice President and Assistant Minister of the IDCPC, as well as representatives from various social circles and foreign diplomatic corps in Beijing were present.

Mme. Yan Junqi said in her key-note address that this year's International Day of Peace also happens on the occasion of the 10<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the United Nations Millennium Development Goals (UN MDGs) Summit. Under such a background, it is of great significance for the CPAPD, the ACYF and the UN System in China to convene this conference on "Chinese Youth for Peace and Development". Over the past decade, the international community has made great efforts for the attainment of MDGs, achieved some results, but the progress as a whole has been still slow because the regional imbalanced development and the huge gap between the North and the South, and particularly the severe impacts and shocks of international financial crisis have all made the realization of MDGs even more difficult. However, it remains the solemn commitment and unshirkable responsibility of the international community to strengthen cooperation and make concerted efforts for the attainment of MDGs within the timetable."

She also pointed out that making

peace constitutes a fundamental guarantee for realizing MDGs. The development of human society repeatedly reveals that peace and stability are fortunes, while wars and turbulences are misfortunes. Without a peaceful and stable environment, development is nothing but a pipe dream, let alone well-being of the public and national long-term tranquility and prosperity. Therefore, it is the common obligation of the international community to follow the objectives and principles of the UN Charter, to uphold a security concept based on mutual trust, mutual benefit, equality and consultation, and to cherish and create a peaceful and tranquil environment for development. We are about to enter the second decade of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, which is full of challenges and opportunities and when human being can have a lot to achieve. I sincerely expect young friends to conscientiously take up the historical task entrusted on you by the era, forge ahead with vision and perseverance, remain relentlessly inquisitive for new knowledge, realize your life objectives and achieve success through hard work and in an earnest style, and make new contributions to the building of a harmonious world of lasting peace and common prosperity.

In his message sent to the Observance, UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon emphasized that only in a peaceful environment will young people realize their full potential. For young people in China, peace is a day-to-day reality. It goes unremarked and is almost

taken for granted. But in countless countries across the world, peace remains an elusive goal. Therefore it is important to make this observance with the theme of Chinese Youth for Peace and Development. The Secretary-General applauded this initiative by the Chinese People's Association for Peace and Disarmament, All China Youth Federation and the UN System in China and their efforts to encourage young people in China to share the ideas and programs and expand the meaningful work to build peace worldwide. China and the world need more such initiatives. So, let each of us pledge to do more to bring about lasting peace. And together, we can build a world of peace and prosperity for all of us.

ACYF Vice Chairman Mr. Lu Yongzheng said in his remarks that youth cherishes peace, and safeguarding peace needs the efforts of youth. Young people are always an important driving force for peace. A peaceful environment provides not only space and conditions, opportunities and platforms for the development of youth, but also aspirations and guarantees for their future. It is just thanks to a peaceful environment that the young people today can enjoy more and better education, more rights and opportunities than the generations before them. Therefore, young friends should shoulder greater responsibilities to safeguard peace, and redouble efforts to eradicate poverty and reduce conflicts as well as attain the UN MDGs. Mr. Lu also expressed his hope as follows. Firstly,

young people in the world should strengthen solidarity and mutual trust to jointly safeguard world peace. Solidarity is a must in order to deal with various challenges and safeguard peace. This calls on young people to demonstrate greater wisdom and enthusiasm than previous generations in the process of removing misunderstanding, enhancing trust, and cementing solidarity, ultimately making new historical contributions to the course of building peace. Secondly, young people in the world should promote cooperation and common development. Despite some heartening progress already made by countries in the world in terms of realizing the UN MDGs, the full and timely achievement of MDGs throughout the world is still faced with multiple challenges. Young people should be a part of the endeavor of promoting world balanced economic development, improving development environment for developing countries, enhancing South-South cooperation and South-North cooperation, and orientating world development towards more balanced, universally beneficial and win-win progress, and in return elevate their status and realize their values. Thirdly, young people in the world should strengthen dialogues among different civilizations in order to promote the building of a harmonious world. Diversity of civilizations is a basic characteristic of human society and pluralistic cultures are the common legacy of mankind. Dialogues among civilizations represent a vital channel for

achieving mutual understanding, mutual respect and harmonious co-existence. Young people, as descendants to carry forward cultures, should not just absorb the cultural nourishment from the ethnic group they belong to and regions they reside in, but should also become a bridge connecting different civilizations and contribute to the building of a harmonious world.

UN Resident Coordinator in China Renata Lock-Dessallien pointed out in her address that conflict is not inevitable as we know from the country in which we live now. China has enjoyed peace and prosperity for so long a time, especially for the past three decades. China has been able to raise the living standard of its people, to develop infrastructures of its cities, and to a large extent, to eliminate poverty. It has achieved many of the Millennium Development Goals. Additionally, China's experience and its support to other developing countries have made a significant contribution to international efforts to meet their development goals and targets. We are at the point of history where China's impressive strength can become catalyst of positive change in peace and development elsewhere which in turn can only strengthen China further. She also warns that young people are vulnerable to the forces of extremes, and calls on the international community to give them a world of peace and tolerance, expect them to join in the work for peace and prosperity for all, and act with creativity and passion. She appeals to all

of us, young and old, rich and poor, strong and weak, governments and businesses, international community and civil society to work together in partnership, our small efforts can have a large influence on world peace and development.

At this event, Chinese young representatives from UN Peace Keeping Missions, international aid programs, Chinese diplomatic corps overseas as

well as Chinese NGOs and poverty alleviation projects at home gave presentations and speeches. They shared with the audience their own experience and understanding about peace building, with people of the world how the Chinese nation longs for, loves and cherishes peace, and makes its commitment to the building of a harmonious world to the benefit of human kind.



Youth at the observance of the International Day of Peace September 2010.

## Feature Articles

### **Transformation of Current International Security System And China's Concept on International Security System**

Lu Jing

Associate Professor of Institute of International Relations,  
Foreign Affairs Institute

The international security system is an important composition of the international system, and also its core content. The international security system refers to a system composed of special codes of practice and operational mechanisms formulated by mutual influence and interaction of actors of the international system that is for maintaining national security and international peace and security. <sup>1</sup>The international security system is relatively stable, but also has changeable elements. The international balance of power and its interaction modalities are the basic structure of the international security system, a changing international power structure will affect the stability and changes of the international system, and the international security concept is an important thinking base for maintaining a stable system since a changed concept could produce a new code of practice and

interaction modalities. In general, the international architecture is a manifestation of the international security system.

Since the end of the Cold War, the old global architecture completely collapsed while a new one is yet to take shape, and the international security system is also in major readjustments and strategic transformation and has been changing to the feature of “one superpower with multiple strong powers” and multi-polar competition from the past bipolar confrontation between the United States and the Soviet Union.

Under the new international security conditions, though the Cold War has come to an end, however, the bipolarity-concealed ethnic contradictions, tribal strife and religious conflicts crop up continuously, national secessionism has surfaced consecutively, and terrorism runs rampant across the world. So it

seems that “anarchism” of the international system has been getting more prominent. Therefore, there are some people believing that the world without the Cold War is more dangerous than the forecast world when it saw the sudden ending of the confrontation featuring nuclear weapons and ideology between the East and the West.<sup>2</sup> Generally speaking, these problems are hardly avoidable as the international security system is in transition, an inevitable process for the old system to peacefully transform into a new one, and is also the special feature that distinguishes from using military means to transform an international security system. From a macro-perspective, within the current international security system, there are developments of “one superpower with multiple strong powers” and multi-polarity, the process of interaction and exchanges among countries generated by economic globalization, and the continuous improvement of the code of practice for international relations and mechanisms for maintaining cooperation and consultation, which all are favorable to a peaceful transformation or transition of the international security system. Those who look at the transition of the international security system solely from the balance of power or polarity model find themselves in difficulties, so that the analysis and understanding should be acquired from a broader vision and perspective.

### **Causes for the Transformation of the International Security System**

At the present, a major distinction between the transformation of the current international security system and that in history is that the on-going transformation is being realized under the conditions of global tranquility on the whole, which has broken loose the circle of changing national strength, and is orientating toward a brand-new and profound international community order.<sup>3</sup> This process originates from the following three aspects:

**First, driven by deepening globalization and global interdependence.** Since the end of the Cold War, the global prominent feature is a comprehensive and in-depth development of globalization. Globalization deepens mankind interdependence and interconnection. It is true that globalization starts with economy, but has gradually extended to politics, security, diplomacy, culture, education, etc. in the wake of further development of economic globalization. Global problems and trans-national problems accompanied by globalization advancement are increasingly and gradually becoming major factors affecting the stability of the international security system, thus, showing the prominent position occupied by the global problems within the international security system. Therefore, the cooperation involving in the international security system, especially the room for



coordination and cooperation among major powers is getting bigger and more urgent. And major countries are eager to get more coordination and cooperation among themselves, so that the conception on win-win cooperation, cooperation and coordination mechanism, and global governance have been even overwhelming the competitions among major powers. Globalization requests the international security system to benefit the international community and advance its stability and security from the perspectives of institutions, conceptions, and practice, etc.

**Second, the absolutes of state sovereignty have witnessed some alternations and the will of cooperation and joint governance for maintaining international security is more prominent.** In the previous international security system, the state sovereignty and state power are the most important factors composing the international security system, and the security of state sovereignty and state power are the most important content of the international security. Since the end of the Cold War, pushed by globalization, the nature of the state sovereignty involved in international security system has not changed fundamentally, but looking at it from the in-depth and macro-historical perspective, the international security system in transition and development is at a significant phase of tortuous development from “a strong sovereign institution” to “a weaker sovereign institution” step by

step since the formation of the contemporary international system. The hardened state sovereignty has begun softening, the state sovereignty and power can be consciously restrained and alienated, and the state power has begun shifting to multi-orientations.<sup>4</sup> This has not only shaped up serious shocks to the international security concept that traditionally prioritizes power, but also provided the international security with a driving force and capability for cooperation, consultation and joint governance.

**Third, the aspirations for the transformation and improvement of the international system is ever more pressing.** As the international security system in transition, due to the emerging globalization and global problems, the aspirations and consensus of the international community to transform, build and improve the international institutions and mechanisms have been continuously strengthened, and the awareness on structuring and orderly development of the international security system continuously raised, which has pushed the international community to accelerate the reform and readjustments of the international institutions and mechanisms, attached importance to the application of international treaties, rules, norms and unopened rules, and emphasized more on orderly interaction of the international community. This can forcefully promote multilateralism to be effectively implemented, and prevent



unilateralism and power politics from undermining international security, and also push the building and reform of the international institutions and mechanism to be deepened and functions to be reinforced, and move the traditional mode and means of safeguarding international security toward strengthening “global governance” and responding to challenges of the globalization era.

### **The Characteristics of the International Security System in Transition**

Following the development of globalization, the main actors, modes, forms, even nature of the international relations have undertaken profound changes, and have enabled the factors structuring the international security system to show some new features, which can not but inevitably embody the characteristics of the international security system in transition.

**First, the international balance of power has undergone profound changes, which is favorable to build a new type of international security system.** The balance of power is the foundation and a main expression of the international security system. The power structure of the international security system is the core factors for the international security. Nowadays, the general trend of the international security system in transition is the polarization of international forces and democratization of international relations. It is true that

the United States, still in a dominant position in the current international system, has the capability to set international topics and the global political agenda, but is unable to orientate the development of the agenda in line with its wishes any more,<sup>5</sup> and this phenomenon has become more prominent since the global financial crisis in 2008. The advantageous position of Europe and Japan is more and more challenged by other international forces. Russia, after having freed itself from the difficulties, has comprehensively readjusted its domestic and foreign policies, and its strength and potentials have showcased increasingly. Newly emerging countries have demonstrated their collective rise with BRICs countries and VISTA countries having caught the global attention. In other words, the growing status of the newly emerging markets and other developing countries has become significant. The changing international balance of power does not only affect the options and readjustments of major countries relations, but is also conducive to formation of a new international security system, and to push the international security situation to develop further.

**Second, the mainstream actors show a trend of diversity and expand the functions and roles of the carrier of the international security system.** While the sovereign states are still the main actors for the international security system and the main actors have also

developed into plural and complex orientations, which have made the state sovereignty weaker, and enabled the functional roles of the main carriers of the international security system, such as international organizations, to become stronger. In addition to global organizations such as the United Nations that has been undertaking new reforms and readjustments in order to respond to the new international security situation and new challenges, the global “weak” organizations such as the “Group 77”, the “Group 20”, the “Group 8” and Global Conference on Climate and Environment, etc. have been playing an increasingly important role in safeguarding global peace. Since the end of the Cold War, the growth of regional organizations has attracted global attention and has been developing institutionally, formally and comprehensively. For example, the EU, the ASEAN, the AU, and the Shanghai Cooperation Organization, etc. have played an important part in maintaining regional security, which, to a certain extent, make up for the lack of necessary global organizations. It is particularly true that the Six-party Talks on the Korean Peninsula nuclear issue, an informal organization initiated and participated by China, has provided practical experiences for the building of the global non-proliferation regime.

**Third, the core contents of the international security have become increasingly plural and complex and the principles and concepts to**

**standardize mainstream actors’ interactive model have been continuously changing.** Since the end of the Cold War and especially upon entering 21<sup>st</sup> century, due to deepening globalization and interdependence among states, the security factors have become more plural and complex from simplicity of the past, and many non-traditional security factors have found their way into the international security and related subjects. Therefore, the interactive models of the mainstream players of the international security system have become plural, and the security structure has also increasingly become diversified and complex. While the international security system in transition, the traditional model of “power balance”, “alliance”, etc. are far from stepping down from the historical arena, however, the “soft power balance” and “strategic defense” both with defense in nature are <sup>6</sup> the mainstream reflected by the current international security system. The solution of conflicts and contradictions involved in the international security will turn more to the peaceful, cooperative, and consultative and win-win means.

**Fourth, there are certainly some differences and struggles in the course of structuring the international security system by the international community, but the consensus on shared values is being strengthened.** During the Cold War, the mainstream ideology and value of the international security system were a

bipolar-confrontation. Even during the early 1990s, the United States, priding itself upon the winner of the Cold War and the only superpower with overbearing posture ideologically, attempted to universalize its values and build a U.S.-led new world. However, the mainstream values of the international community did not completely follow the designed line by the United States and the West. The vast number of countries believes that the structuring of the international security system should have a consensus on mainstream values regarding the basics of security in order to expand the space for cooperation and consultation, but should also respect the global diversity and recognize multi-polarity. Enlightened by this idea and with the joint efforts of the international community, the UN 2005 World Summit adopted the “Outcome Document of the World Summit”. The Document includes the commitments made by the heads of State and Government to developing welfare and freedom and progress for people across the entire world, and to encouraging tolerance, respect, dialogue and cooperation among various cultures, civilizations and peoples. This consensus reached at the World Summit has both created conditions for shaping up common values to structure the international security system, and also further pushed forward the stable and peaceful international security situation.

**Fifth, the United Nations plays a significant role in the international**

**security system, but the collective security mechanism centered on the United Nations has faced new challenges.** After the end of the Cold War, the participation and function of the United Nations in areas of security such as international peace-keeping, post-war regional nation-building, non-proliferation, disaster relief, poverty reduction, human rights development and promotion have been further strengthened, and have played an important part in maintaining world peace. However, faced with the new reality of the diversified threats in present international security situation, it is how to reach a consensus among the UN member countries on the international security in a new era, how to expand the functions of the collective security mechanism to respond to new threats and upgrade the capacity of collective actions, how to effectively remove the disturbances by power politics and unilateralism, and how to strengthen the reform of UN security mechanism, etc., that are the main challenges faced by the United Nations in upgrading its functions regarding the international security system.

### **China’s Concept on the International Security System**

During a fairly long period of time since the founding of New China, confined by the then international conditions and environment and affected by the then domestic “left deviation”, China remained outside of the international system, and held an attitude

of opposition against the international system. Since the reform and opening up and especially the implementation of the socialist market economy, China has, with an active posture, acceded to the World Trade Organization, and many regional and global organizations and treaties, and has become gradually and consciously integrated with the existential international system as well as played an increasingly important role.<sup>7</sup> China has become not only a participant and supporter of the existing international system, but also a “responsible” major country of the international community and a builder of the international system following its continuous strengthening of comprehensive national strength and constant upgrading of its international standing.

Because of its short participation in the international system, its position and responsibilities are yet to be completely accepted by the international community, and its understanding and conception of the international security system are still in formation and development. This inevitably conditions that China has some serious differences with the Western major powers, but, China’s conceptions on the international security system have been becoming mature step by step through its active participation in the international security affairs.

**First, regarding the basic content of the international security system, the Chinese Government emphasizes that the sovereign state and the United**

**Nations and other relevant organizations are the major and basic actors of the international security system.** The uni-polar tendency and multi-polar trend are the basic features of the existing international security system, the mainstream value of the international security system should be structured through global diversity and dialogue of civilizations, and the development orientation of the international security system should be pushed to build a world with lasting peace, common prosperity and harmony.

**Second, China firmly safeguards world peace, and is a participant, guardian and builder for the international system.** China has not only joined almost all the important international organizations, but has also played an increasing role in these multi-lateral institutions. The Chinese Government holds that the role of the United Nations in the international affairs is irreplaceable. As the most universal, representative and authoritative intra-governmental organization, the United Nations is the best arena to practice multi-lateralism, and the effective platform to collectively respond to various threats and challenges, and should become an envoy in continuously safeguarding peace and a frontrunner to promote development.<sup>8</sup>

**Third, the Chinese Government not only attaches importance to the security issues in various areas, but**

**also comes up with a series of policies principles and measures to respond to the maintenance of security.** The Chinese Government has been consistently in favor of and actively pushing multi-lateralism for attaining regional security, vigorously advocating a consensus reached in the course of cooperation, coordination, dialogue and seeking common ground while shelving differences, and responding to global problems with multi-lateral cooperation and carrying out global governance with multi-lateral means. As the international security system is in transition, the Chinese Government holds and calls on all countries including China itself to

exert greater influence in areas of politics, economy, military, culture, etc. to gradually transform and improve the existing international system and order to enable them to develop in a more just and rational orientation. The Chinese Government reiterates on many occasions that this international security system should make the collective or even the international community and mankind interests the orientation, set a complex order but not a single order the objective, adhere to mutual cooperation and win-win coexistence, and build an international security system with peace and stability, harmonious development and common prosperity.

### Reference Notes:

1. Yang Jiemian, International System in Transition and Development of Multi-lateral Organizations – China's Response and Options, Beijing, Shishi Press, 2007, P4.
2. Erskine Childers and Brian Urquhart, Renewing the United Nations System, The International Civil Service, Development Dialogue, No. 1, 1994, p.11.
3. Yu Zhengliang, Que Tianshu, the System in Transition and China's Strategic Space, World Economics and Politics, No. 10, 2006. pp.20-31.
4. Zhao Kejin, Ni Shixiong, A Study on China's International Theory, Shanghai, Fudan University Press, 2007, pp.130-132.
5. Du Ping, International Order Entering Post-Western Era, <http://www.scuec.edu.cn/hkb>, 15<sup>th</sup> October 2008.
6. T. V. Paul, James J. Wirtz, Michel Fortmann (eds.), Balance of Power Theory and Practice in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century, Stanford University Press, 2004, pp. 1-22.
7. Qin Yaqing, the National Status, Strategic Culture and Security Interests, World Economic and Politics, No.1, 2003.
8. Yu Xintian, etc., China's Role in the International System, China Encyclopedia Press, 2008, p11.

## **China's Security Environment and Its Strategic Response in the Context of American Eastward-Moving Strategic Focus**

Professor Wang Sheng,  
Department of Political Science, Jilin University

### **The American Eastward-Moving Strategic Focus has Increasingly Surfaced since the End of the Cold War**

During the Cold War, the global strategic focus of the United States was in Europe. After the end of the Cold War between the United States and the Soviet Union in 1989, the international strategic architecture, the U.S. international standing as well as the global and the Asia-Pacific situation have undertaken profound changes, so all the major countries have accelerated readjustments on their foreign strategies. Accompanied by the disintegration of the Soviet block in Europe, the global strategic focus of the United States has been shifting toward the Asia-Pacific Region from the European continent. In terms of global strategy, the United States has abandoned the “containment strategy” followed for a long time during the Cold War, and

replaced it with “participation and expansion strategy”, and anchored on the “reinforcing security, promoting prosperity and advancing democracy” as the three core objectives of its new global strategy. From the perspective of Asia-Pacific strategy, the United States attaches great importance to the Asia-Pacific region with East Asia as the core, has comprehensively and actively participated in the Asia-Pacific affairs, tried vigorously to promote U.S. economic and political systems and values, and to expand U.S. influence in the Asia-Pacific region while making major readjustments and redeployments in line with the security strategy in the Asia-Pacific region in particular.

It seems that the United States holds that, in 20-30 years to come, the Asia-Pacific Region may become the global largest and the most important economic force, and a new strategic



centre for global politics so that the Asian region “may emerge a very powerful potential military competitor with the East Asian coastal region being the most challenging region”, which bears life-and-death importance to the future of the United States. Therefore, firstly, the United States, with 100000 stationed troops as the core in Asia-Pacific, tries to maintain its forward military presence and its military deterrence to the Asian-Pacific countries through various defense cooperation such as building military bases, conducting joint military exercises and training, etc. Secondly, the United States has continuously strengthened its bilateral military alliances developed during the Cold War, build a “Northeast Asian Security Community dominated by the United States, Japan and the ROK”, and sought the establishment of a regional multilateral security cooperation mechanism led by the United States. Thirdly, under the banner of forestalling and controlling the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and missile technology, the United States has attempted to suppress the DPRK’s nuclear program, strengthened the international non-proliferation regime and improved the international export-control mechanisms, etc., through prioritizing various treaties, conventions and verification mechanisms. Carrying out its national security strategy, the United States tries to contain China, restrain Japan, hold up Russia and bring under control the Atlantic sea-lanes in order to

prevent any one country from challenging the U.S. leadership position and keep hegemony over Asia. Upon entering the 21 century, the G.W. Bush Administration, while giving more weight to unilateralism and neo-realism in the aspect of foreign policy, also had hardened its policy on Asia-Pacific region. From 2002, the Bush Administration started readjusting its global military strategic deployments. Its specific measures for strengthening military deployments in Asia and the Western Pacific region include a large scale military infrastructure construction and advanced weaponry deployment in Guam, building up aircraft carrier’s might, expanding naval troops and deploying submarines with cruise missiles in the Western Pacific; expanding emergent navel facilities and building logistic centers for refueling and rear-support in the Pacific and Indian Oceans; and dispatching troops based in the ROK to meet the immediate needs of manpower-shortage in Iraq on the one hand. The United States, on the other hand, also took this good opportunity to reinforce its military power in the Western Pacific, with the interest of both holding up China and strengthening its presence in Asia-Pacific. Since May 2008, in order to upgrade its military soft and hard power, the United States has arranged two ocean-going task forces to patrol in the West Pacific waters, which is in conformity with its steps of the military strategic focus moving eastward. This, on the one hand, can show-case the U.S. military hard power toward the



Asia-Pacific conflicts and upgrade its capacity to deter the regional conflicts and manage crisis. On the other hand, the U.S. can upgrade its soft power by taking advantage in this context. Dr. Joseph Nye, professor of international relations of Harvard University and the promoter of “soft power”, holds that the military power belongs to hard power, but its soft power role can not be ruled out. Soft power is a capacity to achieve expected results through attraction but not coercion. Military power is hard power, but can still produce soft power. Besides, accelerating the expansion of military deployments in Southeast Asia, the United States is preparing to establish permanent liaison offices similar to the one in Singapore, the Philippines, Indonesia, Malaysia, Thailand and even Viet Nam, has periodically dispatched troops to the military bases for training in these countries in order to secure its military presence in Southeast Asia.

Since taking office, the Obama Administration has attached more importance to Asia. In his presidential campaign speeches, he emphasized, on many occasions, “the global gravitational center moving toward Asia”, so that his attention given to Asia, East Asia in particular has been fully shown after becoming the host of the White House. Back then, Secretary Hillary Clinton did not pay her first official visit to Europe or the Middle East as the Secretary of State tradition, but went straightforward to Asia, covering China, Japan and the ROK in her first overseas visit in office. While

readjusting the domestic strategy, Obama has also come up with a brand-new strategic position and consideration on the global strategy, and a new Asia strategy aiming at continuously pushing the U.S. global strategic focus eastward. During his three Asian nations’ tour of China, Japan and the ROK in November 2009, Obama’s new Asia strategy gradually showed up. What is worthwhile thinking twice is that Obama claimed to be a “U.S. first Pacific President” in his speech in Tokyo, holding that the United States should be more active in Asian affairs. As far as tactics are concerned, Obama’s conception on Asia is to keep prosperity in the eastern region while maintaining stability in the western region. This, in other words, means placing hopes on China, Japan, the ROK, Southeast Asian countries as well as Australia to create a prosperity prospect independent of Europe and the United States, which is supportive to the U.S. economic recovery, while on the Middle East, India, Pakistan, Afghanistan and even Iran to maintain their stable situation to the best of their abilities so as to enable the United States to free from the two wars (Afghanistan War and Iraqi War) step by step. In order to implement his Asia Strategy, the Obama Administration has adopted the following measures featured by “paving the way through cooperation and containment”.

**First, the Choenan incident was taken as a good opportunity**, to apply military deterrence and economic

sanctions against the DPRK and further worsen the situation in the peninsula, the aim of which is to further consolidate the traditional alliance with Japan and the ROK, and anchored its Asia security strategy and diplomatic strategy on the U.S.-Japan and the U.S.-ROK alliances. The Obama Administration is continuously committed to covering Japan and the ROK with the U.S. responsibility of providing the nuclear umbrella, to pushing forward the U.S.-Japan-ROK military integration building and missile defense deployment, to vigorously preventing Japan and the ROK from getting closer to China and Russia and the U.S. influence from further declining in Asia so as to jointly contain the continuous rise of China and Russia. The Obama Administration requests Japan and the ROK to “undertake offshore collective security responsibility, i.e. extending the responsibilities of Japan and the ROK only for national security to that for overseas” as well, and to participate in the U.S. military actions to maintain Asian security under the framework of Asia “collective security”.

**Second, strengthening dialogue and cooperation with newly emerging countries in Asia to establish a new partnership in Asia.** The policy on China is the priority of Obama’s new Asia Strategy, which is important to upgrade the China-U.S. relations to “jointly making efforts to build a positive, cooperative and comprehensive

U.S.-China relations in the 21st century” from “the constructive and cooperative relations” during the Bush Administration, and comprehensively enhancing strategic dialogue with China in areas of security, economy, climate change, etc. Russia has close geo-relations with Asia. However, the Obama Administration has come to some compromises with Russia regarding the anti-missile deployment in Europe, strengthened the U.S.-Russian consultations and cooperation on nuclear weapons reduction, and attempted to integrate both China and Russia into the U.S.-led Asia-Pacific strategic framework and global strategic framework. Indian economic development momentum in recent years has been surging high and India claims to be the largest “democratic country” in the world. The Obama Administration has strengthened cooperation in military security, politics and economy and other areas with India in an effort to establish a U.S.-Indian partnership based on the shared democratic system. ASEAN covers 10 Southeast Asian nations and is a regional organization with the highest integration in Asia. Hillary Clinton has picked up Indonesia as her first stop in her overseas visit and participated in the ARF. The United States acceded to Southeast Asian Amity and Cooperation Treaty, and reinforced relations with ASEAN and its members, thus, demonstrating the will of the United States to return to Southeast Asia. On the other hand, having established new partnerships with India and ASEAN, the United States aims at

containing and fending off a further rise of China and Russia, and holds up China growing influence in Asia by integrating this new partnerships into the bilateral alliances between the U.S. and each of Japan, the ROK and Australia.

### **China Faces a Worsening Security Environment**

In recent years, in the wake of global focus eastward shift and acceleration of returning to Asia by the United States, it is an indisputable fact that China's strategic security environment has worsened mainly in the following few aspects:

**First, advocated by the United States, China's neighboring countries in recent years have continuously upgraded their military power.** In the light of annual report by the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, out of five arms race hotspots across the world, there are two and half in Asia, with one in Southeast Asia and another in South Asia. From 2005-2009, arms imports in the Southeast Asian region doubled that of 5 years ago, among which Indonesia increased by 84%, Singapore by 146%, and Malaysia by 722%. In 2009, Indian defense budget grew by 24%, purchased a number of Russia-made submarines and went all out for army-building in many fields on a large scale; Viet Nam even spent 1/2 annual defense budget to acquire 6 Russia-made "Kilo"-class diesel-driven submarines, and Singapore and Indonesia

also competed in buying Europe-made war ships. On 1<sup>st</sup> December 2009, the ROK inaugurated the 214 class AIP submarine named after the national hero -- Ahn Jung Geun -- in Busa port for service. As an Asian major maritime country, under the conditions of existing serious challenges and escalating warships competition, Japan has shown great interest in huge ship-building, which gradually is breaking the restrictions by its peaceful Constitution.

All these countries have been building up their military power, strengthening military cooperation with countries concerned, and vigorously reinforcing their interdependence, which is claimed openly or privately in reference to China.

**Second, the United States has consecutively conducted military exercises with China's neighboring countries,** and created conditions for revitalizing the U.S.-ROK and the U.S.-Japan alliances through worsening the situation in the Korean Peninsula. In recent years, the United States in cooperation with many countries have frequently carried out military exercises in the Pacific, Northeast Asian and Southeast Asian regions, etc., especially in the waters surrounding China. On 23<sup>rd</sup> June 2010, the multilateral "Pacific-rim" military exercises led by the United States was launched high-keyed in the Hawaiian waters, and participated by over 30 warships and submarines, about 100 war fighters and 20000 troops from 14 countries. The U.S. experts revealed

that the aim of this exercise is crystal clear—fending off the newly emerging military powers such as China in Asia—despite the surprisingly large-scale. Through joint military exercises with the ROK in China’s surrounding waters, the United States has continuously intensified the situation in the Korean Peninsula, and created conditions for rebuilding the U.S.-ROK alliance and U.S.-Japan alliance. From 25<sup>th</sup> -28<sup>th</sup> July 2010, a joint military exercise coded “Invincible Spirit” by the United States and the ROK (and observed by Japan) was conducted in the Japan Sea, with the participation of 20 warships including the U.S. nuclear-powered aircraft carrier— USS George Washington, and about 200 aircrafts including the most advanced stealth fighter—F—22 from the United States and the ROK. The scale of it is so huge that it is the largest exercise in scale since 1976 and the high-tech involved in the naval and air equipments is so advanced that is also unprecedented. From 16<sup>th</sup> -26<sup>th</sup> August 2010, a joint military exercise coded “Ulji Freedom Guardia” was conducted in the Yellow Sea. In line with a plan, a joint anti-submarine exercise by the United States and the ROK in the waters west to the Korean Peninsula would be carried out, but was later postponed to 27th September to 1<sup>st</sup> October 2010 in the waters West to the ROK due to tropical hurricane coded “Agate”, and the aircraft carrier USS George Washington did not show up, but some media said that it would take part in the Yellow sea

exercises in the foreseeable future.

Recently, the United States has shown its posture to make active intervention on the Diaoyu Island disputes between China and Japan. The spokesman of the U.S. State Department reiterates at his regular news conference that the U.S. State Department rejects any position change regarding Diaoyu Islands, and that the U.S.-Japan Security Treaty is applicable to the Diaoyu Islands. On 3<sup>rd</sup> October 2010, some Japanese Media report that the defense authorities of the United States and Japan sent out signals that the U.S. Navy and the Japanese maritime defense corps will jointly carry out a large-scale exercise after the arrival of President Obama’s visit to Japan. Many leaks from both the Japanese and U.S. sides are that the focus of this joint military exercise is an assimilation on how to “get back” the Diaoyu Islands from the Chinese troops. The pillar-power of this exercise is the air striking task force with aircraft carrier USS George Washington of the Seventh Fleet at the core, significantly demonstrating to the international community the solid Japan-U.S. alliance and holding up the frequent Chinese activities in the Donghai Sea.

Through a series of military exercises with the ROK and Japan, the United States aims at propagating its military presence in Northeast Asia, which on the one hand can further consolidate the U.S.-Japan and the U.S.-ROK alliances, and on the other can contain China’s influence, prevent Japan

and the ROK from shaking off the U.S. security mechanism and developing strategic cooperation with China.

**Third ,intervening the Nanhai (the South China Sea) disputes in the Southeast Asian region,** the United States tries to multilateralize Nanahai disputes and drive a wedge into the relations between China and ASEAN countries. Proceeding from the strategic needs of containing China , the United States has strengthened its relations with the Southeast Asian countries and meant to hold up China by making use of the Nanhai issue to maintain its hegemonic position in the global system. In recent two years, the United States has accelerated its steps to “return” to the Nanhai and upgraded the cooperation level with some countries surrounding the Nanhai through arms sales, military aid, joint military exercises and cooperation in the area of non-traditional security. In July 2007, on behalf of the United States Government, U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton signed the U.S.-ASEAN Treaty of Amity and Cooperation requested for 17 years and strengthened its relations with ASEAN and its members. So, ASEAN and the United States have begun their annual summit.

Correspondingly, the U.S. relations with Viet Nam and Myanmar have seen new improvements. Meanwhile, the U.S. warships have increased activities in the Nanhai Sea, confronting China’s ships and boats and even colliding with them. The new occurrences are most worth

mentioning. That is the United States has fastened its steps to increase its military relations with Viet Nam even though the two countries had fought 14-year bloody battles during the Cold War. On 8<sup>th</sup> August 2010, aircraft carrier USS George Washington anchored in the Nanhai waters about 320 km away from Danang port, many Vietnamese government officials and military officers accompanied by the U.S. ambassador to Vietnam took a flight to tour the carrier. Beginning with 11<sup>th</sup> August, inaugurating the first joint naval exercise between the United States and Vietnam, the United States dispatched many heavy-warships including nuclear-powered aircraft carrier USS George Washington. While making the military presence, the United States has changed its position from “neutrality” into high-keyed “active intervention” on the Nanhai disputes. At the ASEAN Regional Forum on 23<sup>rd</sup> July 2010, Hillary Clinton claimed that free navigation in the Nanhai is related to the U.S. national interests. Referring to the Nansha and Xisha islands of China’s territorial waters, but disputed by Vietnam, the United States for the first time expressed its support to Vietnam, attempting to internationalized the bilateral problems forged by Viet Nam between China and Vietnam, thus, having created new challenges to China’s maritime interests in the Nanhai sea.

**Fourth, the United States has deepened military cooperation with Taiwan region and India through arms**

**sales to them.** On 29<sup>th</sup> January 2010, the Obama Administration noticed the U.S. Congress the plan to sell military equipments worth US\$ 6.4 billion in total to Taiwan and to be effective in March the same year. The United States sows discord between the Mainland and Taiwan through its arms sales to the latter. The United States has no military base in Indian Ocean, however, it uses India to exert influence on the Nanhai question through arms sales and military technology transfer to India to enable it to grow faster. On 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2010, Hong Kong Wen Wei Po reports that the Indian navy would take part in the amphibious exercise in Okinawa in the Western Pacific by the U.S. military so as to enhance the bilateral naval exchanges and cooperation. At the same time, India and the United States are discussing an arms acquisition agreement worth US\$3.5 billion, which is the largest amount of armament acquisition in the history of bilateral arms trade.

**Fifth, since 2010, the United States has obviously increased its submarine activities in the Asia-Pacific region,** both showing off its military power and demonstrating time again its anti-submarine capacity in the waters surrounding China. Out of 4 Ohio class nuclear-powered submarines with cruise missiles, there are 3 of them present in the Asia-Pacific region at the same time. On 28<sup>th</sup> June 2010, the submarine Ohio showed itself in the Subic Bay of the Philippines, the submarine Michigan

arrived in Busan port of the ROK, and the submarine Florida surfaced in Diego Garcia, Indian Ocean. Besides these three submarines, the submarine Georgia was also included among them.

The above-mentioned military deployments seem to formulate a strategic “encirclement”, which shows some mentality featured by “islands-chained” blockade during the Cold War. This U.S. strategy undoubtedly means to achieve the following objectives: A. Damaging the regional security and economic environment for China’s rise. B. Rebuilding the loosen Asia-Pacific alliance system based on the three hot problems of the Korean Peninsula, Nanhai and Taiwan. C. Obstructing the East Asian integration process. The fact that the U.S. Asian strategic focus moving east front on containing China from the west front on anti-terrorism would not only complicate the strategic environment for China’s rise, but may also trigger a major retrogression of the China-U.S. relations and further intensify the “Cold War legacy” in the East Asian region with the regional security situation worsened and the independent regional integration process gravely weakened. Therefore, the U.S. hardliner’s China policy will not only be a test to China but also to East Asia.

### **China’s Strategic Response**

Faced with deteriorating and proliferating security situation in the surrounding areas, China should be clear-minded about the situation, firmly



grasp the strategic opportunities, adhere to the strategic objectives of peaceful rise and actively respond all-dimensionally and strategically by enriching the country and the people for the national security.

**First, with clear-cut strategic objectives, the steps to peaceful rise should be accelerated.** We should firmly grasp the twenty-year period of strategic opportunities crucial to us to raise both the hard power and soft power step by step, and upgrade the international influence. Strength makes diplomacy more meaningful. Therefore, China should manage its domestic affairs still better, address well the relationship among reform, stability and development, the redistribution among all the social interest groups, and the relationship among resources, efficiency and sustainable development, etc., and should strive for sustainable, stable, fast and healthy economic growth and attain a faster peaceful rise by relying on itself. Only when the national strength is enhanced, can all the problems including the security problem be solved satisfactorily. Just as the late Chinese leader Deng Xiaoping pointed out that development is the key solution to all problems.

**Second, whether the China-U.S. relations can be handled well under the new circumstances is a major subject for safeguarding China's national security and development interests and for China's peaceful rise.** The

China-U.S. relations have developed into such a relationship that transcends the bilateral nature and covers multi-areas and is characterized by multi-layers and complex composition. It might be concrete for China to respond in the following way:

**Firstly, maintaining the stable and healthy development of the China-U.S. relations.** China should keep its attention on expanding the bilateral cooperation to seek common interests, which should become a favorable factor to stabilize the bilateral relations. Currently, the interests between China and the United States is never so closely connected, and the economic interdependence between the two countries is unprecedented. We should respond to the U.S. "diplomatic smart power" with "economic smart power" in a skillful and cautious way.

**Secondly, promoting cooperation in Shanghai Cooperation Organization.** We should further strengthen and deepen the anti-terrorist cooperation by China-Russia and the Shanghai Cooperation Organization in Afghanistan and the Central Asian region in order to combat the Eastern Turkistan terrorism and to maintain peace and stability in the region.

**Thirdly, correctly addressing hotspot issues concerning Korean Peninsula, etc.** Regarding the Korean Peninsula nuclear issue, we should



unswervingly adhere to the principle that peaceful and stable Korean Peninsula is in the strategic interests of China, and actively engage in all sides concerned to restart the Six-party Talks on an early possible date. Currently, it is true that there exist major differences on the understanding of the Korean Peninsula denuclearization between the United States and Democratic People's Republic and Korea, but it is difficult for the United States to abandon the Six-party Talks due to the political, economic, historical factors, etc. That is also a foundation for China and the United States to cooperate.

**Fourthly, keeping “smooth communication” is critical as well.** The balance of power can help keep relations stable, however, failed communications

can also lead to sharpening confrontations. Because, a misjudgment of the counterpart strategic intentions may elevate tension and finally trigger military conflicts. Both sides should prioritize their peaceful development, reduce frictions to the best of their ability and prevent a contradiction from elevating so as to achieve the win-win cooperation objective. The core issue of a stable China-U.S. relationship is related to the following: How each side strategically positions the other side or how the two countries treat each other? How can China play the role as a responsible major regional country? How should the United States accept China's rise, with open and self-confident attitude? These are key question of promoting a long-term and healthy development of the China-U.S. relations.

## **International Security Situation: Main Trends for the 5-10 Years to Come**

Liu Qiang,

Director of Institute for International Relations of Nanjing University

Grasping the changing international security situation has an important bearing on safeguarding the national security interests. It is very difficult to foresee how many uncertain factors to come in the next 5 to 10 years. Therefore, the author can only rely on his personal limited knowledge and experience and on his understanding of the international military security history and the current information available, and has come up with some analysis mainly based on qualitative analysis together with some quantitative elements. In other words, the forecast by the author is simply a subjective reading.

### **I. The Situation is Stable on the Whole and Balanced in General**

The present global architecture is composed of the United States, the superpower representing the center and Russia, EU, Japan and China, etc. representing various sub-centers. The

structure of these centers will remain basically the same in 5 to 10 years to come despite of the fact that the new powers centers such as India and Brazil are rapidly rising but will find it hard to keep balance with the aforementioned power centers. Therefore, a brand-new and stable international structure will be difficult to be built. In the course of evolution, various power centers will basically compete and cooperate, struggle and coordinate, and it is possible to see some military frictions or even local wars but there is almost no probability for them to elevate to an overall war. In the struggles between unilateralism and multilateralism, the international military security can be basically maintained with a balance and stability.

Since the end of the Second World War, the United States has become the most important power center in the world and was on an equal footing with the Soviet Union, but has emerged as the

winner over the Soviet Union without a hot war, thus, becoming the unparalleled military and economic superpower for the first time after the Roman Empire in the last 1500 years.<sup>(1)</sup> However, the financial crisis triggered by the sub-prime mortgage crisis in the end has weakened somewhat the U.S. comprehensive national strength. Hence, the United States can not but begin implementing strategic contraction to a certain degree, and has demonstrated a growing willingness for cooperation, with “balance strategy” replacing “unilateralism” and “preemptive strategy”. Whether or not this is a temporary technical readjustments due to the international situation or a new option for the national security strategy, it in no way means that the superpower position of the United States is shaking, and the U.S. military, economic and technical power are unmatched to any other global power sub-centers. Taking only the economic aggregate for example, the current U.S. economic aggregate accounts for 28% of the world, and other countries are too far behind to catch up. In the wake of the economic recession and possibly a fairly long “stagflation” as well as surging global anti-American sentiments produced by invasion and strategic expansion across the world and overall declining of the U.S. soft power in the past years, and keeping in sight of the growth rate of other countries in the world, it is difficult to imagine the super comprehensive national strength of the United States could be overtaken, not to

mention that it will be down-graded to a second-rate power in the next 5-10 year. The current U.S. “unilateral era” may come to its end, which does not indicate that the U.S. era will come to an end in 5-10 years to come, and there is no probability for any country to emerge to replace the U.S. “leadership” position in this period of time. The United States will still play an irreplaceable role in addressing global problems.

However, the growth of other global power sub-centers will show a developing trend that will catch the global attraction. In addition to the traditional strong powers, the development of the newly emerging countries represented by BRICs will catch a special attention. If these newly emerging countries could maintain the present growth rate, then, their comprehensive national strength will be significantly upgraded in the next 5-10 years, and will further narrow down the gap with the existing major global economic powers and even overtake some of them. The status and the role of these countries in the international community will be bound to become prominent and important variables for pushing global multi-polarity. Among them, it is China and India that are worth the most attention and are the biggest variables. This has almost become the consensus of international scholars. Because the rise of these two powers will produce unprecedented impacts on the world, and is even viewed by the United States as the newly emerging major global powers. China, India and other

relevant countries will change the geo-political paradigm. Their hidden shocks and influence will bring about dramatic results just like that in the last two centuries, i.e. similar to the unified Germany in the 19<sup>th</sup> century and the powerful United States in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century. <sup>(2)</sup> This may be the subjective strategic judgments of the American precarious thinking, but is more based on rational reading of future information, and at the same time is an instinct reflection of the U.S. crisis awareness.

Regarding the changing variables in the future, scholars have different readings and particularly different understanding and forecast on the global pattern for the future. For instance, even there is a universal belief that the world to be is a multi-polar one, but there are still some scholars arguing that the world to be is a non-polar one. <sup>(3)</sup> Besides, Russian scholars forecast that the former USSR Republics would anchor on Russia as the center to establish a new alliance --- Euro-Asian Union – in some years to come. This Union will use a uniform currency and set up a parliament with Putin as its leader. The Euro-Asian Union will follow the EU principles. Therefore, the world will witness three major power centers -- China, the EU1 (i.e. the existential EU) and the EU2 (i.e. Euro-Asian Union centered on Russia). The interests of the two centers will be integrated with that of India and Latin America through BRICs. The United States will still be the main player in the Middle East while Russia will gradually

retreat from there. The EU will be a major mediator for the Arab-Israeli conflicts and Shanghai Cooperation Organization responsible for Indian-Pakistan disputes, and Afghanistan problems, Iranian issues, ... so a relatively solid international system will be shaped. This is the views of Dr. Igor Panarin, Professor of Russian Institute of Foreign Relations during his interview by the Russia's Izvestia. This interview entitled Putin to be Leader of the former USSR region was carried by the Russia's Izvestia on 2<sup>nd</sup> April 2009. However, whether this forecast with the United States marginalized from the three major power centers is scientific or not is worthwhile studying and discussing indeed.

No matter what happens, due to the power balance, various power centers may often see frictions and disputes in their competitions or even military frictions or local wars triggered by undermined core interests, but there is trifling possibility for these frictions and disputes to turn into a large-scale war because the gaps among these power centers are not big enough and some of them have nuclear weapons as the strategic deterrence and share close relations in areas of economy, trade and financing accompanied by globalization. Various power centers can basically maintain the U.S.-led balance, and the overall stability of the international military security situation will not be undermined. The rise of some powers will lead to pluralism of the international

power struggles, which will push the global polarity to develop further, but it is difficult indeed to imagine that a new stable international structure can take shape in 5-10 years to come.

## **II. An Increase of Complex Factors May Trigger Growing Risks of Conflicts**

In the next 5-10 years, the international strategic situation on the whole will develop along a trajectory with overall stability and constant local conflicts, but factors affecting international military security will grow, and the international military security situation will get increasingly stern due to continuous occurrence of armed conflicts.

The political and economic effect across the world brought about by globalization have worsened the intrinsic contradictions in some countries, and will enable some problems such as backward economy, ethnic strife, religious disputes, inflated nationalism, social inequity, etc. to break out at some critical moments, and will finally lead to domestic turmoil escalation and will be followed by a deteriorated regional situation created by the exodus of refugees.

What deserves an attention most is the “three-ism” – terrorism, religious extremism and ultra-nationalism. The inertia trend formulated by the concentrated outbreak of all these problems in the 21<sup>st</sup> century can hardly disappear in 5-10 years to come. What is more is that the differences on understanding terrorism among the global

major actors will leave some loopholes to the global security strategy, and may give terrorism a chance to surge high in the end. The results of the U.S. Iraqi war and Afghanistan war are important variables. As far as the immediate situation is concerned, the final withdraw of the United States from Iraq and Afghanistan does not mean a complete winning in these two countries. On the contrary, the U.S. withdrawal will be viewed as its failure by those anti-U.S. activists, and the temporarily concealed contradictions will surely be coming back stronger and become factors to destabilize the entire region. Terrorism will still be the most fundamental security threats in the region, and terrorist organizations may acquire nuclear, chemical or/and biological weapons to launch terrorist threats. Internet terrorist attacks are very much possible and may generate significant shocks to state security and world security. And various national governances over terrorism will show different awareness and a lack of concrete measures proceeding from different angles, which may trigger conflicts even local wars among countries.

In the entire African and Asian regions, some countries may experience grave domestic chaos, conflicts or even civil wars due to political, ethnic, religious and economic problems, which will create large-scale disasters (slaughter in terms of genocide or huge exodus of refugees) and humanitarian crisis if the regional and global international institutions are unable to bring regional

problems under effective control. Not only that, the worst paradigm is that internal conflicts may produce an ineffective or failed government and leave a large area of territory and large number of population under ineffective administrative management. Hence, these areas will find the trans-national terrorists hide themselves (for example the “Al Qaeda” in Afghanistan) or criminals or drug cartels hide themselves (for example Columbia).<sup>(4)</sup> Meanwhile, these governments short of effective governance can also enable poverty, chaos and conflicts to go in a vicious cycle, which leave a relevant country and a region in de-stability and also may become important causes affecting international military security.

Contention for energy will get increasing fiercer or may lead to new military conflicts. Only if breakthrough progress is achieved over new energy development and is universally applied, otherwise the contention for fossil fuel -- mainly petroleum and natural gas -- will not disappear. Because from now to the year of 2025, the global demand for primary energy will record an annual increase of 1.6%.<sup>(5)</sup> A report on prospect of trans-millennium development by the World Federation of UN Associations indicates that by about the year of 2030, the fossil fuel will account for as high as 81% of energy demand.<sup>(6)</sup> And new discoveries and explorations will be rather limited, which, some experts are worried, will create imbalance between energy supply and

demand between years of 2015 -2020. Additionally, developing countries short of natural resources may find it very difficult to attract foreign direct investment to rebuild their infrastructure. Among the 47 poorest countries in the world, 38 countries are net petroleum importer and 25 countries rely on imported energy. Because of political instability or domestic market rigidity (or both), insufficient investment is very much possible to create energy supply problems for some countries.<sup>(7)</sup> Therefore, safe and effective supply of energy are premise for effectively preventing disputes, or energy contention can hardly be avoidable, which may not only lead to reorganization of relations between energy-supply countries and main energy-consuming countries, and but also to new contradictions and conflicts or even military conflicts among main energy-consuming countries. So, this politicalized energy problem initiated in the 19<sup>th</sup> century will ought to be the core of a new round of strategic struggles, resulting from which the more complex phenomenon of the geo-politics has already not only surfaced, but will develop in-depth, and this development will naturally affect the changes of global security situation.<sup>(8)</sup>

Water crisis may also become a new source of war. Firstly, the shortage of water can hardly be solved in short time. Salt water of Oceans accounts for 97.5% of the water resources across the world and fresh water only for the rest 2.5%, much of that small percentage is also

either frozen in the Antarctica, Greenland Islands, Himalayas or is flowing underground. The surface water in liquid form only accounts for 0.4% and the fresh water resources that can be acquired and used by mankind accounts just for 0.014% of the total water resources in the world. The Report entitled Global Environment Prospect IV by the UNEP points out that the global ecological carrying capacity has been overdrawn by 1/3 because of population explosion. The agricultural irrigation has consumed 70% of the fresh water available to mankind. It is predicted that before the year of 2025, fresh water consumed by developing countries will increase by 50% and developed countries by 18%. The Report says that the growing demand of fresh water will become a responsibility for countries short of water hard to bear. Any bad water crisis brewed from severe shortage of water will find it in the least developed countries and regions, especially the region to the South of Sub-Sahara and Southeast Asian region. Affected by the global warming, African rivers face a big threat of bad shortage of water, which will leave 1/4 of the African Continent in severe shortage of water by the end of this century. The Global Environment Prospect IV concludes that African rivers are very sensitive to the changing rainfall. In the Western part of Africa, even small drop of rainfall will reduce the river current by 80%, which can possibly trigger "water refugees" termed by some experts. On 12<sup>th</sup> March 2009, the World Water Development

Report by the UN shows that, affected by population growth, the water demand by mankind increases by 64.0 billion cubic meters annually, and about 47% of the world population will reside in areas badly short of water by the year of 2030.

<sup>(9)</sup> As the basic resources to support subsistence, coal was contended for in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, petroleum in the 20<sup>th</sup> century and water will be in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, which will become a reality. And the redistribution of water resources in the river-basins covering trans-national boundaries is very much likely to fuel contradictions and conflicts. Currently, 40% of the world population resides in 263 river-basins shared by two or more countries. <sup>(10)</sup> Some relevant information indicates that in the 60 years from 1949 to 2009, various countries concerned had signed about 200 international agreements on trans-boundary river resources usages, but there are still 37 international disputes on water resources finally resorted to military means. <sup>(11)</sup>

At the same time, the water pollution is the most serious problem of the water crisis. Currently, 20% of the world population fails to have access to the safe drinking water; there are still about 100 million people in the developed Europe who are in shortage of drinking water. A study by the World Health Organization concludes that 80% of the diseases and 50% of children death are the result of taking contaminated water. The UN Environment Program concludes that as far as the entire world is concerned, the contaminated water



resources are the worst factors for the diseases and death across the world.<sup>(12)</sup> The World Water Development Report indicates that about 2 million tons of wastes thrown into rivers, lakes, etc. daily in the world. Everyday, about 6000 children below the ages of 5 years die of dysentery due to the deteriorated water quality.<sup>(13)</sup> On 8<sup>th</sup> November 2009, Mr. Noel Brown, Chair of the Friends of the United Nations, mentioned in his remarks at the Forum on 2009 World Habitat Environment: 21 Century Water and Habitat Environment that the most urgent matter faced by the present world may be how to provide safe drinking water and healthy water resources. Whether pure water resources are available and water can be healthily treated is critical to poverty elimination and economic development. If no progress can be seen in relation to water resources and healthily water treatment, then, it is impossible to achieve primary education, diseases control, environment sustainability and poverty eradication, which are all driving factors for economic development and development sustainability. Besides, the phenomenon that several thousands death caused by water-related diseases will continue. A neglect of this problem will bring about huge costs socially, environmentally and economically.<sup>(14)</sup> In line with a forecast by the UNICEF and the WHO, by the year 2015, the least developed countries need at the least US\$13.5 billion investments annually to meet the primary services including providing drinking

water and hygiene facilities.<sup>(15)</sup> It is certainly a quite challenge to developing countries and the poorest developing countries in particular. Therefore, “fight for water” will inevitably become a large fuse to military conflicts if the contention for water especially for water in the trans-boundary rivers and lakes can not be reasonably addressed.

Besides, food crisis, environmental problems and so on have been increasingly exacerbating, and may also become an important factor leading to military security problems. In fact, these problems are loosely connected with the problem of energy supply. As alternative energy, bio-fuel manufacturing has to consume a large amount of grain, which will aggravate the inadequate supply of grain due to the drop of productivity created by global warming. This phenomenon is termed as the arch-criminal for the food crisis by some experts. Because petroleum will be in short supply so thermal power and nuclear power may become a main form of energy, and however, the emissions by the thermal power plants planned to be built in 25 year to come will be more than the total emissions for the past 250 years. The rise of the sea-level caused by global warming and a role of other environmental factors will inevitably fuel huge exodus of refugees and conflicts.<sup>(16)</sup> Therefore, the environmental issue is viewed as a “crisis amplifier”, and many conflicts have occurred in places that have failures in environmental sustainability.

It is easy to conclude from the above-mentioned study that non-traditional security threats are increasing, and the military conflicts triggered by it also continuously rise. In the end, it is the non-traditional security threats that lead to the outbreak of traditional security problems, so the human development faces the test of double threats. But, in terms of effects, the military security still occupies a more important place.

### **III . Arms Control and Non-Proliferation Will Face Brand-new Challenges**

Although social progress can help transform human understanding in respects of maintaining security and the modes of safeguarding its security in the end. However, the concept of pursuing security with strength will stay before the Jungle Law disappears from the historical arena. Therefore, the main options for global major actors to maintain their security are still to expand military power through developing armaments. The R and D, acquisition, and smuggles of armament platforms are still globally concerned problems, among which the proliferation of nuclear weapons and biological weapons is a major one perplexing the international community.

Theoretically speaking, proliferation of weapons, particularly weapons of mass destruction such as nuclear weapons does not necessarily lead to war because of the consideration for the changing balance among the costs, risks and results

following the development of weapons of mass destruction, and the alternative policy options of a war also get broadened. For vast number of Governments in the contemporary era, a choice between war and diplomacy is no longer the sole decision to take; there are many more choices such as mediation, leverage and control, etc. The reshuffle and subversion, which were successfully used on many occasions by the Nazi Germany during the period between the two world wars and later by many major powers and some small ones are still effective, and it is the same with other means such as propaganda, military maneuver, military exercises, economic coercion, etc. All these means can be used either individually or combined. Those countries that had utilized the means of subversion, economic sanctions, limited intervention-----these means do not call for mobilizing the organized military strength----- include all the major powers, and also Iran, Syria, Iraq, Libya, India, Ghana, Somalia, Indonesia, Nicaragua, and many others. <sup>(17)</sup> However, the proliferation of weapons must be a major factor brewed by military conflicts and war. Especially nuclear weapons, which, since its birth, have warned people that these weapons may wipe out mankind and its civilization because of their unprecedented destructive power. Even though the nuclear-weapon countries are rational, and nuclear-weapons are used as deterrence only but not in the battlefield, some scholars, as far back as 1946 soon after the birth of nuclear weapons, still

emphasized that there are possibilities for some countries to retaliate with nuclear weapons those nuclear-weapon states that may be the first to launch nuclear attacks following nuclear weapons possessed by two or more countries. If some countries use the manufactured or acquired nuclear weapons for immediate retaliatory purposes, then, this retaliation can possibly occur. If all these nuclear-weapon states do not honor their undertaken commitments at the same time, an unexpected consequence may be generated, and this can be hardly predicted by a potential invader.<sup>(18)</sup>

This is the heart of the matter. If more countries, especially non-state actors (for instance, a terrorist organization) have acquired nuclear-weapons, which, then will cause significant problems. What is more is that the means are rather limited and the progress is not an ideal as far as the solution of these problems is concerned. In spite of strong condemnation and sanctions by the international community, India and Pakistan still succeeded in developing nuclear-weapons and the DPR. Korea has also conducted two nuclear tests. If the nuclear proliferation can not be effectively controlled, the “nuclear winter” will probably not an alarming myth any more. And it is needless to mention that some countries’ ambitions for pursuing nuclear weapons have been not reduced. The more complexity of this problem lies in the fact that, in order to alleviate energy problem, at least 2000 nuclear power plants need to be built in

about 15 years to come across the world to meet energy demand. If there is no effective control and management, the nuclear technology and materials can be easily acquired by those states or non-state actors interested in nuclear weapons, which will become a new emerging problem of non-proliferation. Therefore, in the next 5-10 years, it is not only that the “Korean Peninsula Nuclear Issue” and the “Iran Nuclear Issue” can not be settled, but other “xxx Nuclear Issue” is very much possible to emerge.

In fact, the proliferation of conventional weapons is an important factor to trigger armed conflicts, and more accurately, to sustain armed conflicts. An armed conflict requires weapons, and weapons demand stimulates armament production, which becomes a vicious cycle and naturally leads to destabilizing situation of the international military security. Just take the year of 2003 as an example, the arms trade by the global top-100 corporations (excluding that of China) totaled US\$236.0 billion, and 38 U.S. corporations out of the global top-100 witnessed the biggest increase, up 28% in terms of U.S. dollars, but actually up 25%.<sup>(19)</sup> Let’s look at another statistics, from years of 2000-2004, the global 10 largest weapons supplying countries transferred weapons worth US\$456.35 billion to 38 largest weapons buying countries, with US\$51.3 billion to African countries, US\$69.32 billion to North American countries, and US\$335.73 billion to Asian countries and

regions. <sup>(4.5.3.9)</sup> it is evident that these regions are the most destable with most armed conflicts in the world. Therefore, if the weapons transfer and smuggling can not be brought under effective management and control, their negative impacts on the international military security can not be eradicated.

Following the increasing complexity of the international politics, global and regional organizations have been becoming important links for the international military security mechanisms, so that the United Nations will meet with unprecedented challenges in the area of maintaining international military security, but still have an important role to play.

One role of international organizations is to adopt international codes of practice, and build international mechanisms for safeguarding world security. Because, it is feasible for international organizations to map out the future mechanism blueprint through building transparent structure, commitment to legitimate struggles and promoting political awareness.<sup>(20)</sup> Among these organizations, the continuous emergence of regional organizations will help alleviate pressures born by the United Nations to maintain world peace to a certain extent. In line with the U.N. Charter, the tasks for the regional organizations include: (A) Peacefully resolve disputes, i.e. the U.N. member states, having established a regional organization, should strive for a peaceful settlement of a dispute through

the regional organization before submitting the local dispute to the UN Security Council. (B) Assist the UN Security Council in performing the mandatory actions adopted by the UN Security Council according to its authority, and the actions must be confined by the resolution authorized by the UN Security Council. But the UN Charter stipulates that, under military attacks, the UN member states can apply individually or collectively the right of self-defense under certain conditions. Besides, a regional organization must submit a full and timely report to the UN Security Council regarding its activity for safeguarding international peace and security. It is crystal clear that the UN Charter has already incorporated regional organizations into the UN system to maintain international peace and security. This enables regional organizations to shoulder both a responsibility to safeguard the international security and a duty to do so. In the meantime, because of having advantages in the region and the culture, etc. and better understanding of the situation, a regional organization can play a unique role in resolving a regional problem and particularly in pushing regional countries to resolve its regional disputes through peaceful means such as mediation, negotiations, and consultations. Just as Amb. Zhang Yansui mentioned, on 13<sup>th</sup> January 2010 at the UN Security Council Panel on Cooperation for Maintaining International Peace and Security between the United Nations and Regional & Sub-Regional

Organizations, that regional organizations have played an increasingly important part in preventing and resolving conflicts, deploying peace-keepers, promoting post-war construction, relieving humanitarian crisis, etc.<sup>(21)</sup>

The role played by the United Nations, as the biggest international organization across the world, in ensuring global security is so important that it is irreplaceable. Meeting with UN Secretary General Ban Ki-moon on 2<sup>nd</sup> July 2008 during his visit to China, President Hu Jintao pointed out that under the new circumstance in the new century, the United Nations, as the most universal, representative and authoritative governmental international organization, shoulders an incrementally important responsibility for world peace and development.<sup>(22)</sup> Because of the changing international situation, and the growing diversity and complexity of security situation as well as the intrinsic problems of the United Nations itself, the United Nations faces more and more challenges to perform these responsibilities.

Theoretically speaking though, international organizations have a unique or even an irreplaceable role in solving international security problems and especially international military security problems, but once an international organization system has had a loss of an initiative in managing international relations, and the consequences are disastrous. As the largest international organization, the United Nations similarly has its problems in solving international

issues and especially in maintaining the international military security. Questions are asked whether the collective security mechanism of the United Nations is the foundation for a new world order. The reply is: the possibility is trifling. Because the United Nations has the following major problematic aspects:

Firstly, regarding an obvious action of invasion, it is the collective security system of the United Nations that can play the best role, but, can hardly play a part in a civil war. Secondly, the collective security system can be effective only if there is no veto, however, as the United States, Russia, China, Britain and France are unable to reach an agreement, and the collective security system will be in stalemate again. What is more is that the collective security system of the United Nations architected in 1945 could not be used against the five Permanent Members of the UN Security Council, which enjoy veto right at the Security Council. Thirdly, the collective security system can only be effective as the member countries provide resources. One can hardly imagine how the collective security system can play a role if member countries with huge military facilities refuse to provide resources.<sup>(23)</sup> Besides, there is also some critique on the inflexibility of the United Nations. Mr. Alvin Toffler, a well-known social activist, argues that if the monster organization like the United Nations can not transform from the bureaucratic organization during the second wave of civilization into a more flexible

organization during the third wave, representing not only sovereign states but also non-state organizations, then, global power centers contending with each other – various organizations rejected by the United Nations – will get mobilized to establish a “semi-UN”.<sup>(24)</sup>

Nowadays, the reform of the United Nations is both necessary and urgent. However, the United Nations is not good for nothing even though it has shown its aspects incompatible with the current international community and future development. Its important role in safeguarding international security can not be replaced by any other international organization. Because, in the past 60 years, this international organization of ours has not been always in setbacks and failures. The United Nations has produced great benefits to our generation. Even though a part of this organization had suffered from grave failures, other parts have achieved significant success -- and this is indifferent with humans.<sup>(25)</sup> This means that the United Nations has not come to a point that it should be replaced by other organizations even though it calls for improvement and perfection. Just because of this, even those who are critique of the role and capacity of the United Nations in securing the international security have to admit that no matter what the defects the United Nations has, it is still the sole global organization that still serves as the center of the international diplomacy. There are some comments that if the United Nations ceases to exist someday

in the future, but nobody knows if a similar international organization can be established since there exist the diversities of culture and national interests in the present world.<sup>(26)</sup> Therefore, the collective security mechanism of the United Nations in the future is still an important means to maintain world order, and plays an important role in safeguarding international military security.

#### **IV China's New Security Concept May Become a Common Norm**

China's new security concept is a solution recommended to solve international security problems in the light of the changing international situation, and is a new strategic thinking on the international security by abandoning the Cold War mentality, developing the traditions and looking forward into the future.

The core tenet of China's new security concept is mutual trust, mutual benefit, cooperation and coordination, and its final objective is to build a harmonious world with lasting peace and common prosperity. Regarding this, President Hu Jintao, in his speech at the 64<sup>th</sup> General Assembly of the United Nations on 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2009, expounded as follows: The World today is undergoing major development, major changes and major adjustments. The trend towards peace, development and cooperation, which represent the call of our times, has grown stronger than ever. In the face of unprecedented



opportunities and challenges, the members of the international community should commit themselves to peace, development, cooperation, common progress and tolerance and continue the joint endeavor to build a harmonious world of enduring peace and common prosperity and contribute to the noble cause of peace and development of mankind. Security should be viewed in a broader perspective to safeguard world peace and stability. Security of all countries has never been as closely interconnected as it is today, and security now covers more areas than ever before. Traditional and non-traditional security threats are intertwined, involving political, military, economic, cultural and other fields. They are the common challenges that require a joint and comprehensive response. Security is not a zero-sum game, and there is no isolated or absolute security. No country can be safe and stable in the absence of world and regional peace and stability. Therefore, all the countries should embrace a new security thinking of mutual trust, mutual benefit, equality and coordination. While maintaining one's own national security, it should also respect the security concerns of other countries and advance the common security of mankind. The purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations should be adhered to and peaceful solutions to regional hotspot issues and international disputes be sought. There should be no willful use or threat of force. The United Nations should be supported in continuing to play

an important role in the field of international security, the spirit of equality, mutual benefit and cooperation be followed to preserve global economic and financial stability, and terrorism, separatism and extremism in all manifestations be opposed and international security cooperation deepened.<sup>(27)</sup> It is obvious that China's new security concept based on "win-win" and "relative" security mentality surpasses the hegemonic mentality based on a "individual winner" narrow security and "absolute" security, and is compatible with the trend of the era, and since, it, in broader sense, premises the common interests of mankind, is based on mutual trust and mutual benefit, and addresses common security problems for mankind in a posture of equality and coordinate manner.

Hence, the theoretical and practical logics make China choose and develop the new security concept. The content expansion of security within China's new security concept is also compatible with the trend of times, does not make the wording "security" lose its sense. But, on the contrary, China's new security concept, with the expanded contents of security, has already generated practical importance on the international community to take political actions, is in favor of adopting security strategies by various countries, in favor of building a new international security mechanism, in favor of opposing hegemony and power politics and in favor of structuring a harmonious world.<sup>(28)</sup> It can be forecast



that China's new security concept like the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence will be accepted by the vast number of countries across the whole world, will become a consensus on maintaining

international military security and will develop into an important code of practice for safeguarding international military security.

### Reference Notes :

- (1) Robert Shapiro , Next Round of Global Trend, translated by Liu Chunyi, Zhongxin Press, 2008 – 08:22.
- (2) National Intelligence Committee, Megatrends: the World in 2020, Translated by Xiang Lanxin, Huadong Formal University Press, 2007 – 04:3
- (3) On 27<sup>th</sup> May 2009, Russian Izvestia carried an interview by the Izvestia reporter with Nicholaruobin, director of Russia and Asia Section of the U.S. Institute on Global Security entitled *China can not Become a Leader, but Russia can Try*, Nicholaruobin believes that the current world is becoming an anarchy world, but not a multi-polar world. Because, the United States can not undertake the world leadership as a few years ago, and China is immature to step in. In the uni-polar world, chaos and regional conflicts may grow somewhat but will reduce root causes for leading to major global conflicts. The United States is still the most influential country, but its influence depends on whether the Obama Administration can transform the U.S.-dominant model into the U.S.-leadership model. Russia can become a regional country with significant performance if it can free itself form the past peculiarity. Nicholaruobin believes that the current world is becoming an anarchy world, but not a multi-polar world, website of China Engineering Technology Information, <http://www.certln.net.cn/cetin2/servlet/cetin/action/HtmlDocumentAction?sessionId=3AE4ED562999C4AED38465392121AEBD?baseid=1&docno=386256>.
- (4) The U.S. National Intelligence Committee, Megatrends: the World in 2020, translated by Xiang Lanxin, Huadong Formal University. Press, 2007-o4:3.82.
- (5) Nickel Niesotuo, J. Gre'vy, What will happen in the World in 2025, translated by Fan Weiwei, Dongfang Press, 2010-01:31.
- (6) Jerome Glen, S. J. Gordon, Prospects for 2007, translated by Wang Lian and Cao Yan, Science and Technology Documentary Press, 2008-07:36.
- (7) Nickel Niesotuo, J. Gre'vy, What will happen in the World in 2025, translated by Fan Weiwei, Dongfang Press, 2010-01:38.
- (8) Liu Qiang, International Security in 2008, Shishi Press, 2009-04:24.
- (9) World Water Day, Xinhua net, <http://news.xinhuanet.com/ziliao/2003-06/30/content-944726.htm>.
- (10) The United Nations Appeals for Sharing Water Resources, Liberation Daily, 22 March 2009.
- (11) Trans-boundary Water Resources, <http://baike.baidu.com/view/2293193.htm>.
- (12) The U.N. Report: 80% of Global Diseases is From Contaminated Drinking Water. <http://www.eedu.org.cn/news/resource/water/200711/17795.html>.
- (13) World Water Development Report, <http://www.eedu.org.cn/Article/eehotspot/freshwater/200907/37666.html>.

- (14) Wuxi Declaration of Water and Human Settlements in 21<sup>st</sup> Century. <http://www.js.xinhuanet.com/xin-wen-zhong-xin/2009-11/09/content-18173263.htm>.
- (15) Jerome Glen, S. J. Gordon, The Prospect for 2007, translated by Wang Lian and Cao Yan, Science and Technology Press, 2008-07:13.
- (16) Ibid. 2008-07:36-37.
- (17) Karina Horsti, Peace and War: Armed Conflicts and International Order between 1648-1989, translated by Wang Puqu, Beijing University Press, 2005-08:235
- (18) Bernard Brodie, The Absolute Weapons-Atomic Power and World Order, translated by Yu Yongan and Guo Ying, People's Liberation Army Press, 2005-01:158. This book is the first one on the study of nuclear war, nuclear policies, nuclear strategy, and was completed in June 1946, only 10 months after the drop of nuclear bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki.
- (19) SIPRI (Sweden), SIPRI Year Book 2005: Armaments, Disarmament and International Security, translated by China Association for Arms Control and Disarmament, Shishi Press, 2006-04:491.193.
- (20) Friedrich Kratochvil and John Ruggie, International Organizations: the State of Global Governance; Lisa Martin and Beth A. Simmons, International Institutions, translated by Huang Renwei and Cai Penghong, Century Press Group, Shanghai People's Press, 2006-03:406.
- (21). Website of the Permanent Mission of the People's Republic of China to the United Nations, <http://www.china-un.org/chn/hyyfy/t651326.htm>.
- (22) President Hu Jintao meeting with UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon, <http://politics.people.com.cn/GB/1024/7461486.html>.
- (23) Joseph Nye, Jr, Understanding International Conflicts: Theory and History, translated by Zhang Xiaoming, Century Press Group, Shanghai People's Press, 2009-07:220-221.
- (24) Alvin Toffler and Heidi Toffler, War and Anti-war, translated by Yan Lichuan, Zhongxin Press, 2007-03:188.
- (25) Paul Kennedy, The United Nations' Past and Future, translated by Qing Jie, Hainan Press, 2008-12:247-246.
- (26) Joseph Nye, Jr, Understanding International Conflicts: Theory and History, translated by Zhang Xiaoming, Century Press Group, Shanghai People's Press, 2009-07:223.
- (27) Hu Jintao, Unite as One and Work for Bright Future, Remarks at the 64<sup>th</sup> General Assembly of the United Nations, Xinhua net. <http://news.xinhuanet.com/world/2009-09/24/content-12103701.htm>.
- (28) Yang Honggang and Yu Chaoyang, On the Intrinsic Mechanism and Practical Significance of China's New Security Concept, Theoretical Monthly, 2007 (12):115.