



TRILATERAL COOPERATION IN THE 21ST CENTURY

中美欧21世纪 三边合作

First Summary Report of
the Trialogue21 Initiative

三边对话会倡议的
首份总结报告

TRILATERAL
COOPERATION IN
THE 21ST CENTURY

中美欧21世纪
三边合作

First Summary Report of
the Trialogue21 Initiative

三边对话会倡议的
首份总结报告

NOVEMBER 2009

2009年11月

Piin-Fen Kok

郭品芬

Translators:

译者:

Yang Yi, Guo Binhong, Zhou Chang,
Pang Shanshan, Xie Hui

杨易、郭宾鸿、周昶、
庞珊珊、谢卉



EASTWEST INSTITUTE

Forging Collective Action for a Safer and Better World

www.ewi.info



Trialogue21



The EastWest Institute is an international, non-partisan, not-for-profit policy organization focused solely on confronting critical challenges that endanger peace. EWI was established in 1980 as a catalyst to build trust, develop leadership, and promote collaboration for positive change. The institute has offices in New York, Brussels, and Moscow.

The China Institute of International Studies (CIIS), founded in 1956, is the think tank of China's Ministry of Foreign Affairs. It conducts research and analysis focusing primarily on medium to long-term policy issues of strategic importance, particularly those concerning international politics and the world economy. It also makes comments and policy recommendations on major world events and hot-spot issues.

For more information about the EastWest Institute the China Institute of International Studies or this paper, please contact:

The EastWest Institute
11 East 26th Street, 20th Floor
New York, NY 10010
U.S.A.
212.824.4100
communications@ewi.info

China Institute of International Studies
#3 Toutiao, Taijichang
Beijing 100005, P.R.China
Tel: 86-10-85119549
Fax:86-10-65123744

Copyright © 2009 by the EastWest Institute.

Cover photo: Cover photos: José Manuel Barroso, President of the European Commission (left, UN Photo by Mark Garten); Hu Jintao, President of the People's Republic of China (center, UN Photo by Marco Castro); Barack Obama, President of the United States of America (right, UN photo by Marco Castro)

Printed in China.

中国国际问题研究所创设于1956年，是中华人民共和国外交部直属专业研究机构，主要对当前国际政治和世界经济等领域的重大问题进行中长期战略研究，亦对国际事务中重要的现实和热点问题做出及时分析，提出意见和建议，以供决策参考。

东西方研究所是一家国际性、非党派、非营利性政策研究机构，主要研究应对重大和平问题的对策。该所成立于1980年，致力于构建互信、提升领导能力、积极促进合作。该所在纽约、布鲁塞尔和莫斯科均设有办事机构。

如您想进一步了解中国国际问题研究所、东西方研究所或者这篇文章的情况，请用以下方式与我们取得联系：

中国国际问题研究所
中国北京东城区台基厂头条三号
邮编：100005
电话：86-10-85119549
传真：86-10-65123744

东西方研究所
11 East 26th Street, 20th Floor
New York, NY 10010
U.S.A.
212.824.4100
communications@ewi.info

版权 东西方研究所，2009年

封面照片：欧洲委员会主席巴罗佐（左，联合国照片，马克·高尔腾摄）、中国国家主席胡锦涛（中，联合国照片，马可·卡斯特罗摄）、美国总统奥巴马（右，联合国照片，马可·卡斯特罗摄）

北京 印刷

Contents

Foreword	1
Executive Summary	2
Introduction	5
Strategic Issues	5
China-U.S.-Europe Relations	5
Maintaining Global Peace and Security	7
Economic Issues	9
Energy Security Cooperation	9
Rethinking Globalization	11
The Global Financial Crisis	12
Next Steps	13
前言	19
内容提要	20
引言	21
战略问题	21
中美欧关系	21
维护全球和平与安全	23
经济问题	24
能源安全及合作	24
全球化再思考	26
全球金融危机	26
后续计划	27

FOREWORD

China's economic, political, and military growth has altered the global balance of power. This growth has engendered mixed feelings in Europe and America: Some view China's rising influence as an opportunity for engagement and partnership; others see it as worrisome competition or a potential threat. There has been considerable confusion in the West about China's strategic intentions in various fields including defense, trade, energy and environmental policy. At the same time, the United States and the European Union are confronted with the necessity to rethink their own previously dominant roles in international affairs. China faces its own challenges managing relations with the United States, Europe and the international community while seeking to ensure stability and sustainable development within its own borders.

Many have described the U.S.-China relationship as the most important bilateral relationship of the 21st century- and it is. It is time that one of the most important trilateral relationships - one that includes Europe - be recognized and understood as well. It is essential to build relationships and mutual understanding between the three powers, but a regularized and serious Track 2 policy- and confidence-building exercise is needed.

It was for these reasons that the EastWest Institute (EWI) and the China Institute of International Studies (CIIS) developed the "Dialogue21" initiative in 2006. Dialogue21 provides an opportunity for focused Track 2 trilateral discussions and debate among leaders from government, business, academia and civil society that seeks to build trust and foster new modes of cooperation that will benefit the global community as a whole. EWI and CIIS's links to those who decide on and influence policies in the U.S., Europe and China have put us in a good position to make a difference.

The first cycle of this initiative helped leaders from China, the U.S. and Europe better understand each other's views on several issues detailed in this report, including China's development, counterterrorism, military cooperation, energy security, management of the effects of globalization, and responses to the global financial crisis. The next cycle, due to begin in Brussels in November 2009, will build on this common understanding and develop concrete measures the three parties can take to ensure the stability of global energy supplies, manage the effects of climate change, work towards regional security in Africa, and address a number of pressing security concerns. Admittedly, there are areas and issues we continue to see from different perspectives. But globalization means interdependence; China, the United States and Europe ignore that at their peril.

We are grateful for the efforts of the EWI and CIIS staff who have contributed to the success of the first three Dialogue21 meetings. From EWI, we thank Toni Mickiewicz, Benjamin Sturtewagen and Stephen Tankel who prepared the first meeting; Piin-Fen Kok for her role in organizing the second and third meetings; and Michele Miranda, Allison Doenges and Sarah Terry for providing logistical and administrative support. CIIS staffers Yang Yi, Guo Binhong and Li Minjie have also proven integral to the process. Also invaluable are our generous donors, especially Kathryn Davis, H.E. Gilbert Chagoury, Thor Bjorgolfsson and the Marshall Bennett Estate Trust, without whom the Dialogue21 process would not be possible.

John Edwin Mroz
President and CEO,
EastWest Institute

Ambassador Ma Zhengang
President, China Institute of
International Studies
Member of the Board of Directors,
EastWest Institute

Ambassador Ortwin Hennig
Former Vice President and
Head of the Conflict Prevention
Program, EastWest Institute

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

From 2006 to 2008, the EastWest Institute (EWI) and the China Institute of International Studies (CIIS) co-organized the first three annual discussions of the Trialogue21 initiative – an off-the-record process involving public and private sector leaders from China, the United States and Europe. The meetings, which were held in Berlin (December 2006), Beijing (November 2007), and Washington, D.C. (December 2008), served as an annual review of relations among the three powers and addressed a wide range of common domestic and foreign policy concerns.

This report summarizes the key outcomes of the discussions during the three meetings. Despite the divergent strategic perceptions and priorities of China, the United States, and Europe, one general conclusion was that all three sides have a significant role to play in addressing a broad range of common challenges, including weapons of mass destruction, terrorism, violent extremism, and energy and environmental security. At the same time, while the United States and the European Union expect and want China to play an increasingly important role in tackling global problems, they are also worried about its growing influence. All three sides need to be honest about their expectations and perceptions of one another in order to address this “engagement paradox” and cooperate more effectively.

Specific recommendations were also developed for how the three powers can work together and with the international community in the following areas:

- *Peace and security cooperation:* This includes police and military cooperation to counter terrorism and violent extremism along with greater attention to longer-term security concerns such as the environment, the global economy, and the management of conflicts over natural resources.
- *Security of African resources:* All three parties have an interest in Africa’s natural resources. Opportunities for cooperation include infrastructure development and economic reconstruction, coordination of Official Development Assistance (ODA) policies, and Chinese engagement in visible public-private partnerships to counter perceptions of its role in Africa.
- *Energy security cooperation:* Appropriate international or bilateral mechanisms are needed for greater policy coordination among energy-producer, -consumer and -transit countries, and for ad hoc emergency responses to energy market fluctuations. Stronger public-private partnerships and tax incentives are needed encourage clean energy technologies.
- *Managing the effects of globalization:* A China-U.S.-EU trilateral strategic economic dialogue was suggested to help build trust and manage backlash against globalization. Since countries and regions now have to deal with similar issues such as social safety nets, port and airport security, environmental sustainability, and cross-border trade, governments and other stakeholders should coordinate and develop best practices for managing these challenges. Shared surveys on local perceptions toward globalization and its effects would facilitate more effective policy coordination to manage those effects.
- *Responding to the global financial crisis:* Financial sector reform should address financial rules and procedures in addition to institutions. Sustainable economic development measures over the immediate and medium terms can address a broad range of areas, including credit flow, the international tax regime, and assistance to less developed regions. The role of bilateral preferential trade agreements should be reassessed to ensure that the multilateral free trade system is not compromised. Especially during a financial crisis, private philanthropy can complement official development efforts.

Besides providing these policy recommendations, Trialogue21 evolved into an early warning mechanism for probable future scenarios and common challenges. Moving forward, the key is how China, the United States and Europe can coordinate responses to address such potential developments in a timely manner.

Equally significantly, the discussions served to address, clarify and even change perceptions and misperceptions among the participating regions on several fronts. For example, China’s international energy activities and its strategic intentions were extensively discussed, with the Chinese participants taking pains to explain China’s “peaceful development” and the challenges it still faces. While the Chinese sought greater understanding from their Western counterparts about their culture, history, and concerns over territorial integrity, the American and European participants pointed to the need for China to reconcile its different identities as a fast developing country in economic terms and an emerging power in political and military terms.

Meanwhile, the European participants sought to explain the difficulties of the EU in forming a single foreign or

security policy due to the overriding national interests of its member states. And participants were interested in the future direction of American foreign policy, including the U.S. response to an increasingly multipolar world, the way forward in areas such as Iraq, and the new policy priorities under the Obama administration and its management of the financial crisis.

Over time, there was a gradual but discernible shift in the language and mentality of the participants in the discussions – from the “us versus them” approach to a focus on how all three sides could collectively address the myriad common challenges they face. There was a recognition of the value of the China-U.S.-Europe trilateral relationship in coordinating responses to transnational challenges such as regional security concerns, proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, climate change, and the global financial crisis – all of which require multilateral cooperation.

A note of caution was also sounded about keeping expectations in check: Misperceptions among the three parties will persevere. It is therefore important to maintain the will and appropriate mechanisms for continued trust-building and dialogue. Participants also agreed that it was important to systematically incorporate aspects of the Trialogue²¹ discussions in their dialogues with other partners, and to convey the messages from these discussions to policymakers and public opinion leaders.

Introduction

In 2006, the EastWest Institute (EWI) and the China Institute of International Studies (CIIS) launched Trialogue21 – a high-level, off-the-record dialogue process among government and non-government leaders from China, the United States and Europe. Created in response to the shifting global realities of the 21st century, this endeavor seeks to use quiet dialogue to clarify perceptions, build trust and identify areas of cooperation among today's most important global actors. Annual Trialogue21 meetings rotate among cities in the three participating regions and are attended by representatives from government, academia, business, the media and civil society. The Chinese, American and European delegations were led by CIIS President, Ambassador Ma Zhengang; EWI President and CEO John Edwin Mroz; and EWI Vice President and Head of the Conflict Prevention Program, Ambassador Ortwin Hennig. Participants have included current and former representatives of the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Directorate General for External Relations at the European Commission, the European Council Secretariat, national European governments, the U.S. government, major think tanks and universities, companies, foundations, civic organizations, and media organizations. All meetings are conducted under the Chatham House Rule.

The agendas for the first three annual meetings were as follows:

- 2006 (Berlin): Perceptions and key strategic fault-line issues; energy and global resource cooperation; combating violent extremism and maintaining global security.
- 2007 (Beijing): Energy security; rethinking globalization; security in the Persian Gulf and Horn of Africa; China's development and its relations with the United States and the EU.
- 2008 (Washington, DC): China-U.S.-Europe relations – continuity and change; what can be collectively done to strengthen international peace and security; China's opportunities and challenges – 30 years of opening up and reform; special session on “moving forward with global efforts to develop the world economy.”

The Trialogue21 discussions have not occurred in a vacuum. Much of what was addressed has links to other EWI and CIIS initiatives, including their joint China-U.S. High-Level Security Dialogue, and EWI's global efforts on weapons of mass destruction and the stabilization of Afghanistan.

Rather than provide a chronological account of the

proceedings over the three meetings, this report summarizes the discussions and recommendations under two general categories: strategic issues and economic issues. This categorization allows for reflections on the continuity in themes over the three years.

Strategic Issues

China-U.S.-Europe Relations

Key Policy Recommendations

- Despite divergent strategic perceptions and priorities between China, Europe and the United States, joint action is needed to effectively address common concerns such as the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, terrorism, violent extremism, cyber terrorism, massive refugee movements, food security, and energy and environmental security.
- Participate in honest discussions about mutual expectations and perceptions in order to address the “engagement paradox” with regard to China: while the United States and the EU ask China to be an active global player and to take on more responsibility, they are also increasingly nervous about China's growing influence.
- Shift the China-EU relationship from a primarily commercial focus to a strategic one by defining a roadmap for China-EU relations and undertaking a series of reciprocal steps to manage their relationship.

Perceptions and Key Strategic Fault Lines

The Trialogue21 process started with a frank discussion about Chinese, American and European perceptions of strategic issues and how these perceptions affect each region's priorities and approaches. It was easy to agree on the common threats that all parties face but more difficult to agree on common tactics to address these issues. Much of this discord stems from the fact that each of the three entities views these threats with varying degrees of urgency. For example, a recurring theme was China's need for stable political and economic relationships abroad, especially with regard to energy security, in order to allow its continued peaceful development. Some U.S. and European participants also sought clarification of the Chinese concept of a harmonious world based on common security. They wanted to know how the Chinese balance their respect for the sovereignty of other countries with their obligation to uphold internationally recognized human rights, which

some states clearly violate.

Another observation was that while China, the United States and Europe all claim to subscribe to similar values such as democracy, human rights and freedom, they perceive and define these values differently, and consequently do not agree on how best to promote them.

Early in the Trialogue²¹ process, Europe was perceived as relying too much on soft power, in part because it lacked the military capacity of the United States. The United States was perceived as focusing too much on hard power, and China was described as too “obscure” about its intentions. Other underlying assumptions about how each side views the others were put on the table. For example, an American participant observed that his countrymen assume Europeans can be trusted because they are “Western,” making it difficult to revise thinking about traditional alliances and global interdependence. Many outside the United States incorrectly assume that American perceptions are influenced entirely by their media, when, in fact, public opinion is influenced in its worldview by a broad array of factors. And while the West perceives China’s fixation on internal stability to be based on concern over the future of Chinese Communist Party rule, the Chinese believe that internal stability is inextricably linked to national unity. It is that link between internal stability and national unity, contended a Chinese participant, which makes China so concerned about the Taiwan issue.

Ultimately, participants agreed that it is premature to expect the three sides to share a common vision and unrealistic to believe the three will reach accord on every issue. But by focusing on areas where needs and visions overlap, and by building trust through additional meetings and continued interaction, the three entities may identify new areas of common interest. The increasing number of concerns shared by the three actors demands cooperation and a new, post-partisan thinking on all sides. Because of this confluence of interests, participants agreed, all three powers must develop a framework for continued dialogue at all levels that is based on trust, confidence and an acceptance of cultural differences, instead of on political ideology or Cold War thinking. Participants also noted that the onset of the global financial crisis in 2008 has made the China-U.S.-Europe relationship less ideological for the simple reason that all three powers recognize the need to work together to resolve the crisis.

Trilateral Relations

From the outset, Trialogue²¹ participants agreed on two major assumptions: First, the world is likely to be truly multipolar in 20 years. Second, the U.S. will almost certainly continue as an intellectual, economic,

and military leader. But both China and Europe are increasingly looking outward, with China rising and Europe evolving. While some Americans still believe in a unipolar world, there is no doubt that global issues such as climate change must be addressed through multilateral cooperation. And China is certainly needed for this new international system. Mutual understanding and stronger relationships are essential, but a serious dialogue among the three powers has not taken place.

The China-U.S.-Europe trilateral relationship was deemed mutually beneficial, politically necessary and strategically significant. Still, there is considerable confusion in the West about China’s strategic intentions in various fields, including defense, trade, energy, and the environment. Thus, we have an “engagement paradox” on the part of the United States and the EU: Both ask Beijing to be an active global player that takes on more responsibility, yet they are also increasingly worried about China’s growing influence. This paradox needs to be addressed if China is expected to play a larger global role.

Several Chinese participants took pains to emphasize China’s “peaceful development” and interest in cooperation, not competition, with its international partners. They noted that China’s continued economic growth is vital to the United States and Europe, and to China’s internal stability. In fact, it was argued, China had neither the ambition nor the capacity to dominate the world stage, and the future might not lead to a “China century” but to an “Asian century” centered around the development of China, India and other Asian countries. Chinese participants urged the United States and Europe to better understand the developmental challenges that their country still faces after 30 years of economic reform and liberalization, China’s history and culture, and its concerns over its territorial integrity and sovereignty in areas such as Tibet and Xinjiang. One Chinese participant commented that, despite enhanced international cooperation, China still does not feel the United States and the EU understand those issues. The continued controversy over the role of the Dalai Lama is just one example of this.

As American and European participants emphasized, China needs to reconcile its competing identities: as a developing country in economic terms; a permanent member of the United Nations Security Council; and a growing power with substantial military capabilities and a space program. China also needs to realize that the American and European governments must take into account public opinion at home, which means they need China’s help selling their case about the importance of nurturing strong ties with China. Some participants suggested that China should develop a stronger presence in the global media, or develop a global media network,

in order to express Chinese views and improve understanding of China's international relations. However, others suggested that this could not happen until credible investigative journalism exists in China.

Bilateral Relations

The discussions highlighted the differences between the China-U.S. and China-EU relationships. An often-repeated point was that the EU is not a single political or economic actor but a diverse body of 27 member states with distinct national interests. This diversity has obvious implications for the EU's ability to formulate coherent foreign and security policies. As a result, the China-U.S. relationship was described as bilateral and the China-EU relationship as multilateral, since China maintains individual bilateral relationships with EU member states.

It was noted that China-U.S. relations have remained steady within a narrow range over the past three decades, and the dual policy of engagement and mutual hedging (strategic development of alliances in Asia and other regions) is expected to continue for the next few decades. One participant wondered how the United States would respond if it were challenged simultaneously by Chinese hard and soft power in the future, or if China, India, Brazil and other emerging powers collectively challenge the rules of international dominance. Following Barack Obama's election, the bet was that his administration was likely to maintain a tougher stance on issues such as Sudan, Myanmar, trade and human rights, with trade protectionism remaining a big concern for China (and Europe). Nevertheless, there was a general sense that the new administration has inherited a stable and positive U.S. relationship and still perceives China as a strategic player in the international system. Furthermore, neither country can break their economic interdependence.

Other participants pondered the possibility that China might not be an immediate foreign policy priority for a new U.S. administration that is inheriting two wars and an economic crisis. There was also some discussion of the possibility that the more than 60 existing bilateral dialogues with China might be streamlined and reduced.

Meanwhile, China-EU relations have developed from a trade-based relationship to one based on political dialogue. A European participant commented that Europe does not perceive China to be a military threat. However, in December 2008, the souring of China-EU relations in the wake of China's postponement of the China-EU summit and controversy over the Tibet issue caused concern among some Trialogue21 participants, although most felt that the relationship remains fundamentally

strong despite the differences. It was noted then that Europe and China lack the kind of strategic relationship that exists between the United States and China: While the United States plays a major role in China's "core" issues such as the Taiwan issue, Europe does not. It was suggested that the EU and China lay out a roadmap and take a series of reciprocal steps to manage their relationship at a strategic level.

China has also served as a test case for management of differences between the United States and the EU. A prime example was the EU's 2005 debate on whether to lift its arms embargo on China. As one participant observed, that was the first time the United States had an interest in EU actions in the Asia-Pacific. At the same time, it was a wake-up call for the EU when this episode clearly highlighted both the trans-Atlantic and Pacific dimensions of the United States.

Some participants cautioned against taking the trans-Atlantic partnership for granted, since it is unclear whether the problems between the EU and the United States in recent years were caused only by the Bush administration's policies or by more fundamental shifts in either region. Nevertheless, EU-U.S. relations were expected to remain strong under the Obama administration. One participant predicted that the new U.S. administration will request cooperation from European partners on issues such as Afghanistan, which will put pressure on parliaments, publics and governments in Europe. He added that if the Obama administration continues to show that it is willing to address the issues of climate change, international law and the problems at Guantanamo Bay, these will be positive signals for trans-Atlantic relations and will lessen the possible negative impact of those requests.

Maintaining Global Peace and Security

Key Policy Recommendations

On combating violent extremism:

- Explore collaborative research to broaden and arrive at common definitions of terrorism and violent extremism.
- Strengthen police and military cooperation, both to build trust and to address issues related to protection against terrorism and violent extremism.

On addressing security challenges:

- Work with Russia to undertake a common threat

analysis in the Middle East and coordinate foreign policy responses, for example on the nuclear situation in Iran.¹

- Strengthen cooperation on arms control and nuclear nonproliferation. For example, consider engaging in EWI-brokered discussions on eliminating intermediate-range nuclear forces.²
- Collaborate on reconstruction efforts in Iraq after U.S. withdrawal.
- Engage in international efforts to secure and stabilize Afghanistan, which requires greater participation from non-NATO countries.
- Begin policy dialogue and cooperation on longer-term security concerns, such as energy and environmental security; global economic challenges, including trade and currency issues; and the management of conflicts over water, lumber and other natural resources.

On cooperation in Africa:

- Focus on positive cooperation on infrastructure development and economic reconstruction in Africa, and coordinate Official Development Assistance (ODA) policies on the continent.
- Encourage Chinese engagement in very visible international public-private partnerships to counter perceptions of its activities and intentions in Africa.

Combating Violent Extremism

The first Trialogue21 meeting addressed the problem of violent extremist groups targeting the core infrastructure upon which the global economy is built. Participants agreed that the three regions need to find a way to bring business into cooperation with governments on the issue of terrorism. In addition to collaboration on counterterrorism, each of the entities is faced with the problem of preventing the continued rise of violent extremism. A number of participants offered observations on the issues associated with violent extremism:

- The lack of education, employment opportunities, and the failure of governments in the Middle East

1 In May 2009, EWI published Iran's Nuclear and Missile Potential: A Joint Threat Assessment by U.S. and Russian Technical Experts, a report that has been shared with the international community to generate dialogue on appropriate responses.

2 In April 2008, EWI organized and the Icelandic government hosted a meeting in Reykjavik to discuss Russia's proposal to globalize the Intermediate Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty, initially forged between Washington and Moscow in 1987.

have all greatly contributed to this phenomenon, since people look for other ways to "matter" when they are left with a sense of irrelevance.

- The root causes of violent extremism are likely to be humiliation, alienation, despair, and fear.
- No religion advocates violence and extremists exist across almost all faiths, and overall, extremists from different faiths have more in common with one another than they do with members of their own religion.
- Religion is often misrepresented to sanction violence, which is undertaken in response to problems that are actually inherently political in nature. For this reason, more, not less, religious education is needed to ensure that young people are not susceptible to brainwashing by extremist religious leaders.

All participants agreed that a solution to the problems of the Middle East was vital to combat much of the violent extremism in the world today and to ensure overall global security. A Chinese participant noted that despite the high international expectations for a Chinese role in the Middle East, there were clear limitations, especially when it comes to the question of what leverage the Chinese may have over concerned parties. Hostility between the United States and Iran was also an obstacle, and any Chinese attempts to help broker peace in the Middle East might be viewed with suspicion by the United States.

Security in the Middle East

One prominent concern discussed at length was the threat posed by Iran's nuclear and missile potential. Participants explored whether sanctions and military confrontation are viable alternatives to negotiations and engagement, which the Chinese advocate. They discussed the extent to which the experience of the six-party talks on North Korea could be applied to Iran, and whether Iran should have the right to develop nuclear power for peaceful uses. Certain participants commented that various levels of scenario planning are needed with regard to the nuclear situation in Iran, including planning for the possibility that Iran might actually develop a nuclear bomb. Iran's existing missile program exacerbates that threat. There was concern that a nuclear-armed Iran will have a ripple effect across the Middle East, as the major Sunni countries in the region (such as Saudi Arabia) will not be content to leave Iran as the only nuclear power in the region. Both Russia and China have stated that they do not wish to see a nuclear-armed Iran.

Some participants argued that the international community, led by the United States, has set double standards in allowing the development of nuclear weapons in countries like India, Pakistan and Israel. To convince Middle Eastern countries not to go nuclear, they said, the major nuclear powers need to set an example by taking their obligations under Article 6 of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty seriously.

On Iraq, some participants commented that a key challenge lies in assessing the potential consequences of a total withdrawal of U.S. troops on internal (Iraqi), regional, and global stability. Other challenging tasks include resolving ethnic conflict and the promotion of balanced sharing of oil resources and political power.

Elsewhere in the Middle East, participants pointed to the need to address the internal situation in Saudi Arabia and to pay more attention to the Sunni-Shiite divide. Some participants commented that the United States and the EU need to do more to promote the peace process between Israel and Palestine, which will help address the problems with Iran and Iraq. There was a general sense that the U.S. strategy of democratization in the Middle East has been a failure, but the question then is: What is the alternative?

Additional security concerns discussed included radical Islam, terrorism, energy security, and cross-border issues. The United States and Europe are now facing the challenges of radical Islam and terrorism on their own soil. For example, the July 2005 bombings in London were carried out by Muslims born and raised in the United Kingdom. One can also not discount the possibility of another attack on the United States similar to the attacks of September 11, 2001. On the energy security front, there were concerns that rising oil prices could lead to a recession in other parts of the world. Cross-border security challenges include illegal immigration, trafficking of arms and drugs, and the potential flow of refugees resulting from instability in some parts of the Middle East.

Security of African Resources

Turning to Africa, some participants commented that the United States and EU are losing support on the continent with their policies of linking aid to institution-building and human rights. China, on the other hand, is gaining more emotional support among Africans with its “no-strings attached” policies of aid and a focus on very visible infrastructure-building projects. Some Chinese participants expressed the frustration that China is being misunderstood on human rights issues.

Other Security Challenges

In addition to regional concerns, participants also pointed to the need for cooperation among China, Europe and the United States in transforming the global strategic landscape and a security environment with new challenges that transcend national borders. Modern warfare has blurred the lines between civilian and military combatants, and extended the parameters of the battlefield to include outer space and cyberspace. In addition, targets now are no longer just military installations but also civilian infrastructure, such as banking systems, which could have devastating implications for a broad range of people.

Economic Issues

Energy Security Cooperation

Key Policy Recommendations

- Establish appropriate mechanisms for greater policy coordination among energy producer, consumer and transit countries, for interested parties to negotiate and accommodate their mutual energy interests, and for ad hoc emergency responses to unforeseen events affecting energy markets. Such mechanisms could take the form of an international energy institution performing such roles, or bilateral channels.
- Strengthen public-private partnerships on a global scale and introduce tax incentives to encourage clean energy technologies.
- Strengthen cooperation between the United States and China in the area of clean coal technology.

Rethinking the Framework for Energy Cooperation

Energy and resource security was a recurring theme in the first and second Trialogue²¹ meetings. It was noted that in the international oil market, the emergence of new consumer countries such as China and India and the increased importance of suppliers such as Russia and African countries have sparked talk about a changing balance of power. The following developments are anticipated:

- India could overtake China’s rate of development in the next 10-15 years.

- Russia can produce more oil than Saudi Arabia, and it is likely to become a bigger energy supplier for Europe and China, both of which are becoming more dependent on Russia. More pipelines stretching from Russia to China are likely in the future.
- Turkey and the Black Sea will increasingly become energy bridges, and this will increase Turkey's influence.
- By 2025 China's energy needs will increasingly rely on international markets. This will take colossal investments and possibly joint ventures.

As one participant pointed out, foreign policies are largely driven by energy needs. There was a common recognition that China, Europe and the United States have shared interests in stable prices, reliable sources, and transport security for energy resources. Participants agreed that a new framework is needed for international cooperation on energy security, and that there should be greater policy coordination among energy producer, consumer and transit countries. However, views differed as to what form this new framework should take. A European participant argued for an international mechanism dealing specifically with energy, which would encourage all interested parties to negotiate and accommodate their mutual energy interests. However, a Chinese participant disagreed, suggesting that bilateral action on the issue would be more effective. The goal should be to create an emergency response group to deal on an ad-hoc basis with repercussions from unforeseen events.

There was a general consensus that the dialogue on energy security should focus on how to constructively address the issues rather than engaging in political rhetoric. Participants agreed that competition for international oil reserves is not a zero-sum game: Competition to invest in upstream resources increases the total global supply pool, and competition over time tends to increase efficiency in the market, although there may be short-term inefficiencies. Some participants called for further discussion of collective ways to manage demand in an era of rapid globalization.

Chinese Overseas Energy Activities and Intentions

Ninety percent of China's energy supply is currently met by domestic energy sources. Seventy percent of its domestic consumption needs are met by coal. The transport economy is heavily dependent on oil-based fuels, but it only accounts for about 12% of total energy demand – far less than in the West. Citing these fig-

ures, an American participant commented that China has a choice in determining its policy of dependence on overseas energy resources. A Chinese participant noted that China's energy imports are not merely for Chinese consumption, but also for the manufacture of goods such as cars that will be consumed by the United States and Europe.

Much of the discussion focused on perceptions and clarification of China's international energy activities and intentions. It was generally accepted by the American and European participants that China is hardly alone in supporting so-called energy-rich "rogue regimes". Certain key allies of the United States and Europe are doing likewise but have not been singled out for criticism the same way China has. It was suggested that a more effective way for the West to engage China and other countries on this issue is to be more consistent in its approach to all parties.

A Chinese participant explained that the Chinese government's foreign policy is based on the principle of equal rights for all countries. China follows a policy of non-interference and thus finds it acceptable to engage with any sovereign nation. Aside from natural resources, Africa for the moment does not have much else to export to China; its natural resources remain the single most desirable product and thus key to most African economies. It was argued that China has a need and a right to secure its energy sources, and that it should not be criticized for dealing with certain African states or with Iran, which it invited to a Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO) summit in Beijing (something for which Europe criticized China). In this participant's view, Iran is a regional player, and it should not be criticized for promoting the safe use of nuclear energy.

Some participants familiar with the Chinese energy industry also stressed that Chinese energy companies are driven primarily by profit motives and competitive pressures in their desire to acquire energy resources, and that overseas energy investment decisions are generally initiated by Chinese companies rather than the government. They explained that motives for Chinese international energy investments are complex. They include efforts to increase a firm's autonomy and independence relative to regulators at home in China (international investments are not subject to the same scrutiny and regulation as domestic investments, and revenues are controlled by the company, not by a ministry in Beijing). Chinese energy firms also often need to tap foreign sources of energy in order to stay competitive at home. Finally, while there is a closer consultative relationship between Chinese energy companies and the Chinese government than there is between international oil companies and Western governments, this connection does not mean that a ministry in Beijing "directs" Chinese companies

to invest somewhere.

Chinese companies' interest in equity oil was attributed largely to a perception that upstream investments carry higher profit margins than midstream and downstream investments (this perception is also common among international oil companies). Also, like international companies, Chinese companies find that their share prices increase when their reserves of oil and gas increase, since stock markets reward companies for increasing their reserves.

The discussions about Chinese overseas energy activities prompted one Chinese participant to ask: 1) what is the difference between the behavior of Chinese oil companies and that of oil companies from other parts of the world? And 2) what is the rest of the world really concerned about with regard to China's overseas energy investments?

The European participants pointed out that there is no single European energy strategy. Many EU states still view energy as a national sovereignty issue, and opinion is divided on nuclear energy. They recommended that China's engagement with Europe on energy issues include dialogue with individual national governments in addition to the European Commission. Certain U.S. participants commented that U.S. energy policy is itself fragmented. An observation was made that the United States could gain both economic and security benefits from reducing its dependence on oil.

Renewable and Clean Energy Technologies

The question of oil dependence led to another area that needs greater cooperation between China, the United States and Europe: How to jointly develop, deploy and transfer environmental technologies? The United States and Australia are the only industrial states that have not ratified the Kyoto Protocol. As is widely known, gasoline prices cannot be increased in the United States because this would be political suicide for whoever supported it. Thus, it is crucial for the United States to develop new ways of producing fuel and energy, with the understanding that the private sector could drive this process and reap the profits from such innovations. That said, such a change would need to be driven by a top-down approach, since global warming is itself a product of market failure. While Europe is often viewed as favoring multilateral binding agreements rather than new technologies, one European participant commented that the best bet for defeating the problem of oil monopolies might be new technology. There was a realization, however, that investment in renewable technologies remains a challenge, primarily because the difficulty in overcoming the "first mover" advantage of established fossil fuel industries

means that renewable energy is still far more expensive and harder to fund than fossil fuels.

China's government is developing hydropower resources, especially in Southwest China, which has substantial water resources. At this time, there is a great deal of potential in this technology – two thirds of hydropower resources in China remain untapped. China has also enacted a law on renewable energy and is looking toward wind and solar power as priorities in this area. This is good news, but challenges remain in moving toward renewable energy. For example, as of 2007, renewables accounted for less than 1% of primary energy supply in China, while in 2006 alone China added 100 GW of new coal fired power plants – more than the entire installed capacity of the United Kingdom. It was suggested that clean coal technology be an area of further cooperation between China and the United States.³

Other possible sources of clean energy were also discussed. Nuclear energy poses problems, namely the potential military ambitions of some countries that develop it (e.g. Iran) and the question of safe disposal of nuclear waste and old power plants. Another option was geothermal energy: Iceland has achieved full security of supply, and India is exploring it as a viable option.

Some participants advocated public-private partnerships on a global scale, as well as tax incentives to encourage clean technologies. One U.S. participant said that he would like to challenge the next U.S. president to give the country a "leadership statement" along the lines of John F. Kennedy's 1961 statement that "We will put a man on the moon." For example: "X% of our energy will be from renewable resources."

Rethinking Globalization

Key Policy Recommendations

- Consider establishing a China-U.S.-EU trilateral strategic economic dialogue to help build trust and manage backlash against globalization. (China now has such dialogues separately with the United States and EU.)
- Learn from both the good and bad aspects of each other's globalization experience. What has worked for one country may not necessarily work for another. All sides need to be very candid about what has worked and what has not.

³ In August 2008, EWI and CIIS co-published, in English and Chinese, the policy publication *Clean Coal: U.S.-China Cooperation in Energy Security*, authored by David Wendt of the Jackson Hole Center for Global Affairs.

- Coordinate and develop, on a global scale, best practices on common issues affecting various parts of the world, such as social security, training of officials at ports and airports, management of a sustainable environment, and managing the shared risks and benefits of cross-border investing.
- Conduct shared surveys among citizens across China, the United States and the EU to obtain a more realistic understanding of local views of globalization and its impact, which would facilitate more effective policy coordination to manage this impact.
- Globalize high school curricula to inculcate international perspectives in youth.
- Promote joint international studies and research between think tanks on the effects of globalization.

Economic Relations

Several Chinese participants expressed concern about protectionist tendencies in the developed world, especially in the United States and Europe, in response to emerging economies such as China and India that have benefited from globalization. They reassured their U.S. and European counterparts that China's development will not threaten the way of life of others and should not be feared or demonized, noting that the report of the 17th Congress of the Chinese Communist Party in 2007 has committed China to a strategy of "peaceful development" and "mutual win-win cooperation."

Recognizing the increasing number of trade disputes that China is facing with the United States and the EU, certain Chinese participants commented that these disputes are a natural phenomenon that should not disrupt relations between countries. They pointed to the fact that the World Trade Organization (WTO) dispute settlement mechanism has been used most often to resolve disputes between the United States and the EU without affecting U.S.-EU relations overall.

China's economic policies and their effect on investment and trade relations were also discussed. Some participants expressed hope that more could be done to liberalize foreign direct investment in China, which would lower the cost to investors, and they welcomed China's prudence in managing the appreciation of the renminbi (RMB). One Chinese participant was of the view that after having internationalized its financial markets, businesses and talent, China should internationalize the RMB next.

American and European participants acknowledged the great strides made by China in the past three decades of its development. These include improvements in intellectual property rights protection, respect for indi-

vidual property rights, and urban planning innovations led by Chinese cities. Yet questions were raised as to how China would reconcile the apparent contradiction between a fast-developing economy and a static political system, and how the economic implications of an aging population would affect China's economic and financial relations with major partners.

Roles and Responses to Globalization

Turning to the phenomenon of globalization itself, all sides agreed that there is merit in further analyzing the legitimate elements of opposing sides to globalization. Some European participants noted that there is no single European view of globalization, although the EU is the most extreme form of globalization in that it has created a truly unified market for its member states. It was noted that globalization is increasingly driven by the growth of global cities, not just national economies. In addition, national aspirations play an important role in the age of globalization. These two observations led some participants to comment that despite the increasing importance of cities in the world economy, it is unclear whether their citizens view the residents of other global cities as competitors or as consumers who are dealing with shared problems in an age of globalization.

Participants saw the need for governments to rethink their roles in globalization. For example, what structural adjustments need to be made to the system of international public goods and international public law? What international public goods can a country or region provide? Governments were urged to differentiate between "necessities" and "luxuries" in allocating scarce resources, and to maintain the sustainability of globalization by implementing measures such as the reduction of carbon emissions. Also emphasized was the importance of rejuvenating dialogue and cooperation between the United States, Europe and China on managing the effects of globalization.

The Global Financial Crisis

Key Policy Recommendations

- Promote financial sector reform that includes measures to improve not only the international financial system and institutional monetary systems, but also international rules and procedures.
- Afford developing countries greater say in global economic affairs. The World Bank should help developing countries adapt to economic globaliza-

tion and achieve the UN Millennium Development Goals.

- The International Monetary Fund (IMF) should set up a monitoring and early-warning system for international financial markets and play a greater role in upholding international financial stability.
- Pursue sustainable economic development through a mix of immediate and medium-term measures. The former might include: make credit available to promote the flow of goods and share some of the stimulus packages with developing countries while managing domestic benefits; ensure the sustainability of food, water, and energy supplies; and pay greater attention to developmental needs in less developed regions such as Africa.
- Rethink the role of bilateral preferential trade agreements and whether they aid or hinder the multilateral free trade system.
- Harness the growth of private philanthropy, including the increasing volume of aid payments through social networking sites and mobile phones, as a means of complementing official development assistance. This would help ensure that the Millennium Development Goals can be achieved despite the financial crisis.

Development of the World Economy

The onset of the global financial crisis in 2008 prompted Trialogue21 participants to review the role of the three participating actors in managing the effects of the crisis. In December 2008, the Trialogue21 initiative, in co-sponsorship with the World Bank, organized a special discussion session, “Moving Ahead with Global Efforts to Develop the World Economy.” The focus of this session was Chinese President Hu Jintao’s four-point proposal on sustainable global economic development that he presented to the Major Economies Meeting on Energy Security and Climate Change at the July 2008 G-8 summit in Japan. His proposal advocated a sustainable world economic system, an inclusive and orderly international financial system, a fair and equitable international trade regime, and a fair and effective global development system – themes he echoed

at the G-20 financial summits in November 2008 and April 2009. An international panel of speakers from business, academia and think tanks made a number of specific recommendations, as listed above, in response to the proposal.

The proposal and recommendations were generally well received by participants at the session. The financial crisis had led to a common understanding that China, the United States and Europe need to work with the G-20 to redefine the international financial architecture, and to ensure that the global economy develops in a more sustainable manner.

China’s Response to the Financial Crisis

China’s response to the global financial crisis was also a topic of great interest. There was a general recognition that the ongoing financial crisis is an opportunity for China to re-orient its economic growth model from one driven by exports to one driven by domestic consumption. However, some participants observed that the question remains whether China can transition its economy in a sufficiently timely manner during a period of deep crisis.

Next Steps

The first cycle of the Trialogue21 process has highlighted several opportunities for enhanced cooperation among China, Europe and the United States on a variety of global and regional challenges. Some of these issues, such as climate security and regional developments in Africa, will be explored in greater detail during subsequent Trialogue21 cycles. At the same time, effective cooperation requires mutual trust and understanding, which is still sorely lacking in many cases. EWI and CIIS will continue to facilitate trust-building and in-depth policy discussions through discreet channels such as private seminars and a password-protected web forum, while promoting ideas for trilateral policy cooperation in the public domain through joint publications and op-eds.

EWI BOARD OF DIRECTORS



EASTWEST INSTITUTE

Forging Collective Action for a Safer and Better World

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMEN

Francis Finlay (U.K.)

EWI Co-Chairman

Chairman, Clay Finlay LLC

Armen Sarkissian (Armenia)

EWI Vice-Chairman

Eurasia House International
Former Prime Minister of Armenia

OFFICERS

John Edwin Mroz (U.S.)

President and CEO
EastWest Institute

Mark Maletz (U.S.)

Senior Fellow, Harvard
Business School
Chair of the Executive
Committee

R. William Ide III (U.S.)

Partner
McKenna Long &
Aldridge LLP
Counsel and Secretary

Leo Schenker (U.S.)

Senior Executive
Vice President
Central National-
Gottesman, Inc.
Treasurer

MEMBERS

Martti Ahtisaari (Finland)

Former President of Finland

Jerald T. Baldrige (U.S.)

Chairman
Republic Energy Inc.

Thor Bjorgolfsson (Iceland)

Chairman
Novator

Peter Castenfelt (U.K.)

Chairman
Archipelago Enterprises, Ltd.

**Maria Livanos Cattai
(Switzerland)**

Former Secretary-General
International Chamber of Commerce

Mark Chandler (U.S.)

Chairman and CEO
Biophysical

Joel Cowan (U.S.)

President
Habersham & Cowan

Rohit Desai (U.S.)

President
Desai Capital

Addison Fischer (U.S.)

Chairman and Co-Founder
Planet Heritage Foundation

Stephen B. Heintz (U.S.)

President
Rockefeller Brothers Fund

Emil Hubinak (Slovak Republic)

Chairman and CEO
Logomotion

Wolfgang Ischinger (Germany)

Global Head of Governmental Affairs
Allianz SE

Haifa Al Kaylani (U.K.)

Founder and Chairman
Arab International Women's Forum

Donald Kendall, Jr. (U.S.)

CEO
High Country Passage L.P.

Sigrid RVC Kendall (U.S.)

Managing Partner
Kendall-Verwaltungs-GmbH

James A. Lash (U.S.)

Chairman
Manchester Principal LLC

Christine Loh (China)

CEO
Civic Exchange, Hong Kong

Ma Zhengang (China)

President
China Institute of International Studies

Michael Maples (U.S.)

Former Executive Vice President
Microsoft Corporation

Thomas J. Meredith (U.S.)

Co-Founder and Principal
Meritage Capital, L.P.

Francis Najafi (U.S.)

Chief Executive Officer
Pivotal Group

Frank Neuman (U.S.)

President
AM-TAK International

Yousef Al Otaiba (U.A.E.)

Ambassador
Embassy of the United Arab
Emirates in Washington D.C.

Ross Perot, Jr. (U.S.)

Chairman
Perot Systems Corporation

Louise Richardson (U.S.)

Principal
University of St Andrews

John R. Robinson (U.S.)

Co-Founder
Natural Resources Defense Council

George F. Russell, Jr. (U.S.)

Chairman Emeritus
Russell Investment Group
and Russell 20-20

Ramzi H. Sanbar (U.K.)

Chairman
Sanbar Development Corporation, S.A.

Ikram ul-Majeed Sehgal (Pakistan)

Chairman
Security & Management Services Ltd.

Kanwal Sibal (India)

Former Foreign Secretary of India

Henry J. Smith (U.S.)

Chief Executive Officer
Bud Smith Organization, Inc.

Hilton Smith, Jr. (U.S.)

President and CEO
East Bay Co., Ltd.

Henrik Torgersen (Norway)

Senior Vice President
Advisor to CEO
Telenor

William Ury (U.S.)

Director
Global Negotiation Project
at Harvard Law School

Pierre Vimont (France)

Ambassador
Embassy of the Republic of
France in the United States

Charles F. Wald

Former Deputy Commander
U.S. European Command

Bengt Westergren (Sweden)

Senior Vice President
AIG Companies
Corporate & Government Affairs
Europe & C.I.S.

Igor Yurgens (Russia)

Chairman
Institute for Contemporary
Development

Zhang Deguang (China)

President
China Foundation for
International Studies

NON-BOARD COMMITTEE MEMBERS**Marshall Bennett (U.S.)**

President
Marshall Bennett Enterprises

John A. Roberts, Jr. (U.S.)

President and CEO
Chilmark Enterprises L.L.C.

J. Dickson Rogers (U.S.)

President
Dickson Partners, L.L.C.

George Sheer (U.S.)

President (retired)
Salamander USA & Canada
Founder & CEO
International Consulting
Group, USA

CHAIRMEN EMERITI**Berthold Beitz (Germany)**

President
Alfried Krupp von Bohlen und
Halbach-Stiftung

Hans-Dietrich Genscher (Germany)

Former Vice Chancellor
and Minister of Foreign Affairs

Whitney MacMillan (U.S.)

Former Chairman & CEO
Cargill, Inc.

Ivan T. Berend (Hungary)

Professor
University of California at Los Angeles

Donald M. Kendall (U.S.)

Former Chairman & CEO
PepsiCo., Inc.

Ira D. Wallach* (U.S.)

EWI Co-Founder
Central National-Gottesman, Inc.
EWI Co-Founder

DIRECTORS EMERITI

Jan Krzysztof Bielecki (Poland)

Chief Executive Officer
Bank Polska Kasa Opieki S.A.
Former Prime Minister of Poland

Emil Constantinescu (Romania)

Institute for Regional Cooperation
and Conflict Prevention (INCOR)
Former President of Romania

William D. Dearstyne (U.S.)

Former Company Group Chairman
Johnson & Johnson

John W. Kluge (U.S.)

Chairman of the Board
Metromedia International Group

Maria-Pia Kothbauer (Liechtenstein)

Ambassador
Embassy of Liechtenstein to
Austria, the OSCE and the
United Nations in Vienna

William E. Murray*(U.S.)

John J. Roberts (U.S.)
Senior Advisor
American International Group (AIG)

Daniel Rose (U.S.)

Chairman
Rose Associates, Inc.

Mitchell I. Sonkin (U.S.)

Managing Director
MBIA Insurance Corporation

Thorvald Stoltenberg (Norway)

President
Norwegian Red Cross

Liener Temerlin (U.S.)

Chairman
Temerlin Consulting

John C. Whitehead (U.S.)

Former Co-Chairman of
Goldman Sachs
Former U.S. Deputy Secretary of State

* Deceased

前言

中国经济、政治和军事的发展改变了全球力量的平衡，引发了欧洲和美国的复杂心态。一些人将中国不断增长的影响力视为进行接触和建立伙伴关系的机遇，另一些人则将其视为令人担忧的竞争或潜在威胁。一直以来，西方对中国在国防、贸易、能源和环境政策等诸多领域的战略意图抱有极大的疑虑。同时，美国和欧盟有必要重新思考他们原来在国际事务中享有的主导地位。中国也面临确保国内稳定和可持续发展的同时，处理好与美、欧和国际社会关系的挑战。

很多人认为中美关系是21世纪最重要的双边关系，确实如此。但我们现在也要认识并理解，中美欧关系是最重要的三边关系之一。三方发展关系，促进相互了解非常重要，而定期进行认真的二轨交流和建立互信的尝试也是需要的。

基于上述考虑，中国国际问题研究所和东西方研究所于2006年共同发起了中美欧21世纪三边对话会倡议。对话会为三方政府、商业、学术和民间各界领军人物提供了进行深入探讨的二轨平台，他们寻求增进三方互信，促进建立造福全球的新型合作模式。我们两家研究所各自与中、美、欧决策者和影响决策人士之间的关系，使我们的对话会大有所为。

本份报告涉及中国发展、反恐、军事合作、能源安全、全球化效应管理、应对国际金融危机等问题，第一轮对话会使中美欧三方的精英更好地理解对方在这些问题上的观点。下一轮对话会从2009年11月的布鲁塞尔会议开始，将在原有共识的基础上，制定出可付诸实践的实实在在的措施，确保全球能源供应的稳定、妥善应对气候变化带来的后果、维护非洲地区安全，并涉及其他一系列紧迫的安全问题。必须承认，我们将在一些领域和问题上继续存在意见分歧。但是全球化意味着相互依赖，中美欧任何一方忽略此点，均将自食其果。

中国国际问题研究所和东西方研究所工作人员辛勤努力工作，确保了第一轮三边对话会取得成功，第一轮三方对话会才取得成功，我们特向他们表示感谢。我们感谢东西方研究所的托尼·米基瓦兹、本杰明·斯图尔特维根和史蒂夫·特尼克，他们准备了第一次会议。感谢郭品芬女士，她组织了第二和第三次会议。感谢米歇尔·米兰达、艾莉森·道恩治和萨拉·特里为会议提供了行政后勤保障。会议的成功也与中国国际问题研究所的杨易、郭缤鸿、李敏捷的努力分不开。同时，慷慨的捐赠人为会议的举办做出了宝贵的贡献，特别是凯瑟琳·戴维斯、吉尔伯特·查高利阁下，托儿·鲍尔格夫森和马歇尔·贝内特财产信托公司，没有他们的帮助，就没有对话会。

马振岗 大使
中国国际问题研究所所长
东西方研究所董事会董事

睦融霜
东西方研究所总裁兼首席执行官

奥特温·赫尼格大使
前东西方研究所副总裁、东西方
研究所预防冲突项目总监

内容提要

2006至2008年，中国国际问题研究所（CIIS）和东西方研究所（EWI）联合举办了第一轮关于中美欧21世纪三边对话会的三次年度讨论会，该会是中美欧政府和非政府高层领导人的非正式对话。三次会议分别在柏林（2006年12月），北京（2007年11月）和华盛顿（2008年12月）召开，旨在对中美欧三方关系进行年度回顾，并就各自国内和外交政策的共同关切进行广泛的讨论。

本份报告总结了三次会议讨论的主要成果。尽管中美欧在战略观点和战略重点上存在分歧，但与会者一致认为，在解决包括大规模杀伤性武器、恐怖主义、暴力极端主义及能源环境安全等共同挑战上，中美欧三方都需要发挥重要作用。同时，美国和欧盟期望中国在全球性问题的解决中扮演越来越重要的角色，也担心中国与日俱增的影响力。三方都需要对各自的期望和看法坦诚相待，以解决这种“参与悖论”，进行更有效的合作。

同时，报告也就以下几个方面三方之间和与国际社会之间如何进行合作提出具体建议：

- 和平与安全合作：包括警察与军队合作，共同打击恐怖主义及暴力极端主义，更多关注诸如环境、全球经济及关于自然资源的冲突管理等长远安全问题。
- 非洲资源的安全：三方对非洲自然资源都有兴趣。合作机会包括基础设施发展和经济重建，协调官方发展援助（ODA）机构的政策，以及中国参与公开的公私伙伴关系，以此反驳外界对中国在非洲角色的不良看法。
- 能源安全合作：需要适当的全球和双边机制在能源生产国、消费国及中转国间进行更好的政策协调，对能源市场的波动做出专门的紧急应对。需要更强的公私伙伴关系和税收优惠来鼓励清洁能源技术。
- 应对全球化的影响：中美欧三边战略经济对话的提出是为帮助建立信任并解决对全球化的抵制。既然当前不同国家和地区都必须处理诸如社会安全网，港口和机场安全，环境可持续性及其跨境贸易等类似问题，政府和其他利益攸关者应该相互配合，找出应对这些挑战的最佳做法。针对当地对于全球化及其影响的看法进行共同的调查，催生更加有效的协调政策以处理全球化影响。
- 应对全球金融危机：除金融部门机构本身改革外，还应包括金融规则和程序问题。可持续的经济发展措施在近期和中期涉及信贷流动、国际税收制度以及对欠发达地区援助等广阔领域。双边优惠贸易协定的作用应重新评估，以确保多边自由贸易体系不受到损害。特别是在金融危机中，私人慈善机构可作为对官方发展的补充。

除了提供以上的政策建议外，三边对话会还发展成为一种预警机制，预判未来可能出现的情况及共同挑战。对话会继续向前发展的关键在于中美欧如何及时协调处理潜在的问题。

同样重要的是，讨论会研讨、澄清甚至改变了参与地区在一些方面的观点和误解。例如，有关中国在国际上的能源活动和战略意图被广泛讨论，中方与会者竭力解释中国的和平发展政策以及仍面临的挑战。当中方从西方同行身上寻求在中国文化、历史和领土完整关切方面的更多理解时，美欧方代表则认为，作为一个在经济上快速发展的国家和在政治军事上的新兴力量，中国需要协调好自己的不同身份。

与此同时，欧洲代表试图解释欧盟难以形成统一的外交或安全政策是由于成员国各自的国家利益高于一切。与会者对美国外交政策的未来走向，包括美国对日趋多极化的世界的反应、在伊拉克等地区的下一步行动、奥巴马政府新的优先政策以及如何处理金融危机等问题也十分感兴趣。

随着时间推移，与会者在讨论中的语言和心态逐渐产生了一种清晰的改变，从“我们与他们”的方式转到三方如何一起解决面临的无数共同挑战。中美欧三边关系在协调应对跨国挑战方面的价值得到了认可。这些挑战包括地区安全关切、大规模杀伤性武器扩散、气候变化及全球金融危机等等，都离不开多边合作。

还需要注意的是我们应保持正常的预期：三方间的一些误解还将会存在。因此重要的是保持继续建立信任和对话的意愿及适当的机制。与会者还一致认为，系统地将三边对话会成果应用于与其他合作伙伴的对话中，并将相关资讯转达给政策制定者和公共舆论引导者也很重要。

引言

2006年，中国国际问题研究所和东西方研究所发起了中美欧21世纪三边对话会倡议——一个中美欧政府和非政府领导人之间的高层非正式对话进程。对话会的发起是基于21世纪全球的变化，旨在寻求通过对话澄清观点，建立信任并在当前全球重要国家中确定合作领域。一年一度的三边对话会轮流在三方的城市召开，与会者来自政府部门、学术机构、商界、媒体及民间团体。中美欧三方代表团团长分别是中国国际问题研究所所长马振岗大使，东西方研究所总裁兼首席执行官陆融霜（John Edwin Mroz）先生和东西方研究所副所长及预防冲突项目总监奥特温·赫尼格（Ortwin Hennig）大使。与会者包括来自中国外交部、欧洲委员会对外关系总局、欧洲议会秘书处、欧洲各国政府、美国政府、主要智库及大学、公司、基金会、民间组织及媒体机构的现任及前任代表。所有会议遵循“查塔姆宫规则”。

前三次年会的议程如下：

- 2006（柏林）：各自观点及主要战略断层性问题；能源和全球资源合作；打击暴力极端主义和维护全球安全。
- 2007（北京）：能源安全；对全球化的再度思考；波斯湾和非洲之角的安全；中国的发展及其与美国、欧盟的关系
- 2008（华盛顿）：中美欧关系一变与不变；加强合作巩固国际和平与安全；中国的机遇与挑战——改革开放30年；“全球合作推动世界经济的发展”特别会议。

三边对话会的讨论并非在真空中进行。讨论涉及的大部分内容同中国国际问题研究所和东西方研究所的其他倡议相联，包括双方合办的中美高级别安全对话会，东西方研究所在全球范围就大规模杀伤性武器和阿富汗稳定问题的努力等。

有别于提供一份按时间顺序记录的会议流程，本份报告按照战略问题 and 经济问题两大类别总结有关会议的讨论和建议。这种分类可以更好地反映出三年来对有关议题讨论的连续性。

战略问题

中美欧关系

主要政策建议

- 尽管中美欧在战略观点和战略重点上存在分歧，但在有效解决诸如大规模杀伤性武器扩散、恐怖主义、暴力极端主义、网络恐怖主义、大规模难民流动、粮食安全及能源环境安全等共同关切上需要联合行动。
- 参与关于相互期望和理解的坦诚讨论，以解决关于中国的“参与悖论”：尽管美国和欧盟要求中国积极参与全球性事务并承担更多责任，他们也日益担心中国与日俱增的影响力。
- 通过制定中欧关系路线图及采取一系列互惠步骤，使中欧关系焦点从以商业为主转移到战略层面上来。

各自观点及主要战略断层性问题

三边对话会进程从坦率讨论中美欧对战略问题的看法及这些观点如何影响各地区的战略重点和政策开始。三方认同所面对的共同威胁，但很难就解决威胁应采取的普遍策略达成一致。这种不一致主要源于各方对威胁紧迫性程度的不同认识。例如，一个反复出现的主题就是中国需要稳定的对外政治经济关系，特别在能源安全方面，以保证自己持续和平发展。一些美国和欧洲与会者也试图弄清中国提出的建立在共同安全的基础上的和谐世界理念。他们想知道中国如何在尊重他国主权的同时，履行其维护国际公认人权的义务，因为有些国家明显侵犯了人权。

另一种观点是尽管中美欧都宣赞同诸如民主、人权和自由等相似的价值观，他们对这些价值观的理解和定义是不同的，因而对如何更好提升这些价值观有不同意见。

在三边对话会进程的早期，欧洲被认为太过依赖软实力，其部分原因是它缺乏美国一样的军事能力。美国被认为太强调硬实力，而中国则被认为动机太模糊。其他关于各方如何看待他方的基本假设也摆上桌面讨论。例如，一位美国与会者表示美国人认定欧洲人是值得信任的，因为他们都是“西方”，所以改变这种传统盟友和在全球相互依存关系的想法是困难的。美国以外的很多国家错误地认为美国人的观点完全是受媒体的影响，实际上公众舆论受各种各样因素的影响。西方认为，中国着力于国内稳定是基于对中国共产党未来统治的担忧。中国人则认为，内部稳定与国家统一有着密不可分的联系。一位中国与会者表示，正是内部稳定与国家统一的

联系，让中国如此关注台湾问题。

最终，与会者一致认为，期望三方观点相同还为时尚早，就所有问题达成共识也不现实。但将注意力集中在有共同需求和想法的地方，通过更多会议和继续互动来建立信任，三方可以开辟新的共同利益带。面对越来越多的共同关切，三方需要新的思维。正因为这种利益的汇合，与会者认为，三方必须建立一个在所有层面上的长期对话框架，以信任、信心和接受文化差异为基础，而不以政治意识形态和冷战思维为基本。与会者还指出，2008年发生的全球金融危机使中美欧关系少了意识形态的影响，原因很简单，因为三方都意识到需要合作来解决危机。

三边关系

从三边对话会开始，与会者就同意两个主要假设：

其一，20年后世界很可能成为真正多极世界。其二，基本可以肯定，美国将保持科技、经济和军事上的领先优势。但伴随中国的崛起和欧洲的发展，中欧将越来越关注本区域外的事务。一些美国人仍然相信单极世界，但毫无疑问，类似气候变化等全球性问题必须通过多边合作才能解决。新的世界体系当然需要中国。三方的相互理解和更牢固的关系必不可少，但他们间的严肃对话还未开始。

中美欧三边关系被视为互惠互利，既有政治需要又有战略意义。但西方对中国在包括防务、贸易、能源和环境在内的战略意图仍感到相当困惑。因此，在美欧身上存在“参与悖论”：双方都要求中国在全球充当一个承担更多责任的积极角色，但又越来越担心中国日益增长的影响力。如果期望中国在全球扮演更重要角色，就需要解决这个悖论。

数位中国与与会者强调中国的“和平发展”，中国愿意与国际伙伴合作而非竞争。他们指出，中国持续的经济增长对美国 and 欧洲，对中国国内的稳定至关重要。实际上，有争论说，中国既没有野心也没有能力主宰世界舞台，未来并不会走向一个“中国世纪”，而是一个“亚洲世纪”，以中国、印度和其他亚洲国家的发展为中心。中国与与会者敦促美国和欧洲更好理解中国在改革开放30年后仍面临的发展挑战、中国的历史和文化以及在诸如西藏、新疆自治区的领土和主权完整的关切。一位中方与会者表示，尽管增强了国际合作，中国依然没感觉到美国 and 欧洲的理解。对达赖喇嘛身份持续不断的争议只是其中的一个例子。

美国和欧洲与会者则强调，中国需要协调好自身多种相冲突的身份：经济意义上的发展中国家；联合国安理会常任理事国；具有庞大军事能力和太空计划的新兴力量。中国也需要意识到美国 and 欧洲各国政府必须考虑本国的公众舆论，这意味着他们需要中国帮忙向公众解释同中国维系紧密联系的重要性。一些与会者建议中国应该在全球性媒体上有更高的曝光率，或者发展一个全球媒体网络，以表达中国的观点并提高对中国对外关系

的认识。另外一些与会者建议，为提高外界对中国的理解，中国应建立可信的调查性新闻行业。

双边关系

讨论强调了中美关系和中美关系的不同。一个经常重复的观点是欧盟不是一个单独的政治或经济体，而是由27个成员国构成的具有明显国家利益的一个多样化机构。这种多样化明显影响欧盟制定连贯的外交和安全政策的能力。结果是，中美关系被描述为双边关系，中国和欧盟关系则被认为是多边，因为中国同欧盟成员国保持着独立的双边关系。

有人指出，过去30年，中美关系在狭小范围内一直保持稳定、接触和相互回避（在亚洲和其他地区的盟友的战略发展）的双重政策预计会延续到未来几十年。一位与会者设想，如果美国在未来遭到中国软硬实力的同时挑战，或是中国、印度、巴西及其他新兴国家联合挑战国际主宰的法则，美国将会如何应对。奥巴马当选后，预计他的政府很可能在苏丹、缅甸、贸易和人权问题上保持强硬立场，同时贸易保护主义继续成为中国（和欧洲）重点关注的问题。无论如何，一般认为，新政府继承了稳定积极的美国对外关系，仍将中国看做是国际体系中的战略玩家。而且，任何一国都无法摆脱经济上的相互依存。

其他一些与会者想到的可能性是，继承了两场战争和经济危机的美国新政府可能不会将中国作为外交政策的优先考虑。此外，与会者对现存的60多个中美双边对话将被合并和消减的可能性也进行了讨论。

同时，中欧关系已经从以贸易为基础发展到以政治对话为基础。一位欧洲与会者表示，欧洲没有将中国视为军事威胁。但是，在2008年12月，由于中国推迟了中欧峰会和对西藏问题的争议，中欧关系恶化，引起了部分三边对话会代表的担忧，虽然大多数代表依然认为，尽管存在分歧，双方关系从根本上还是牢固的。有人提出，中欧间缺乏像中美之间的战略关系：美国在诸如台湾问题等中国核心问题上发挥主要作用，欧洲却不能。有人建议让中国和欧盟制定一份路线图，并采取一系列互惠步骤，使他们能在战略层面上处理双方关系。

在如何处理美国 and 欧盟之间分歧上，中国也可作为一个测试的例子。一个最好的例子就是2005年欧盟关于解除对中国禁运武器的讨论。正如一位与会者所指出的，那是美国首次对欧盟在亚太地区的政策表示兴趣。同时，这一事件也唤醒了欧盟，因为它清楚凸现出美国的跨大西洋和跨太平洋属性。

部分与会者对跨大西洋伙伴关系的理所当然性表示谨慎，因为目前仍不清楚近年美国 and 欧盟之间的问题是仅由布什政府的政策所致或是源于双方更多的根本性转变。无论如何，奥巴马政府下的中欧关系有望继续保持稳固。一位与会者预测新政府将在阿富汗等问题上要求欧洲同伴的合作，这将给欧洲国家的议会、公众和政府带来压力。他补充道，如果奥巴马政府继续表示愿意

妥善处理气候变化、国际法和关塔那摩湾等问题，对于美欧关系来说，这将是积极的信号，并会减轻美国向欧洲提出其他要求所带来的负面影响。

维护全球和平与安全

主要政策建议

打击暴力极端主义：

- 开展合作研究扩大恐怖主义和暴力极端主义的定义，并达成一致。
- 加强警察和军队合作以建立信任，解决针对恐怖主义和暴力极端主义的安全保护问题。

应对安全挑战：

- 同俄罗斯合作，分析中东地区双方的共同威胁并协调外交政策反应，比如在伊朗核问题上¹。
- 加强在武器控制和核不扩散上的合作。例如，考虑参与由东西方研究所组织的关于消除中程核力量的讨论。
- 美国撤军后在伊拉克重建问题上的合作。
- 同国际社会一起致力于阿富汗的安全和稳定，这需要更多非北约国家的参与。
- 在长期的安全关切上开始政策对话和合作，比如能源环境安全；全球经济挑战，包括贸易和汇率问题；以及处理争夺水、木材等自然资源的冲突。

在非洲的合作：

- 关注在基础设施发展和经济重建上的积极合作，协调非洲大陆上的官方发展援助（ODA）机构的政策。
- 鼓励中国参与公开的国际公私伙伴关系，以此反驳外界对中国在非洲活动和意图的不实看法。

¹ 2008年4月，东西方研究所在雷克雅未克组织了一次会议。会议由冰岛政府主办，讨论了俄罗斯关于将中导条约（INF）全球化的提议，该条约最初由美俄于1987年制定。

打击暴力极端主义

首次三边对话会将暴力极端主义问题的解决与全球经济的核心建设联系在一起。与会者一致认为，在恐怖主义问题上，三方需要寻找一种方式让企业保持与政府的合作。除了在反恐问题上的合作，各方都面临防止暴力极端主义持续上升的问题。不少与会者就暴力极端主义涉及的问题提出看法：

- 中东地区教育和就业机会的缺乏，以及政府的失败大大催生了这种现状，当感觉自己无足轻重时，人们便寻找让自己“被在意”的方式。
- 暴力极端主义的根源很可能来源于屈辱、疏远、绝望和害怕。
- 没有哪种宗教提倡暴力，极端主义者存在于几乎所有信仰中。总体上，不同信仰的极端主义者之间比他们同一宗教的教友更有共同之处。
- 宗教常常被误认为用以制裁暴力，这点在处理那些真正的天生具有政治性的问题时被采用。正因如此，或多或少，宗教教育需要确保年轻人不易被极端主义宗教领袖洗脑。

所有与会者一致认为，中东问题的解决对打击当前大部分暴力极端主义和确保全球整体安全至关重要。一位中方与会者提出，尽管国际上对中国在中东问题上所起作用有着很高的期望，但这其中也有明显的局限性，特别是中国究竟对有关当事方有何影响力。美国和伊朗间的敌对也是一个障碍，中国在中东地区任何促成和平的努力，都被美国打上了问号。

中东地区安全

伊朗在核和导弹方面的潜力所带来的威胁是一个被详细讨论的突出问题。与会者探讨制裁和军事对抗是否可以替代中国所倡导的谈判和接触，六方会谈的经验在多大程度上可以用于伊朗问题，以及伊朗是否有权发展可和平利用的核能。一些与会者指出，在伊朗核问题上需要制定不同层面的远景规划，包括针对伊朗可能真会制造出原子弹的计划。伊朗当前的导弹计划加剧了这种威胁。有这样一种担心，拥有核武器的伊朗将在中东地区产生涟漪效应，因为主要伊斯兰国家（如沙特）将对伊朗成为地区唯一核武器拥有国感到不满。中国和俄罗斯都声明他们不希望看到伊朗拥有核武器。

一些与会者争论说，在美国主导下，国际社会设立双重标准，允许印度、巴基斯坦和以色列等国家发展核武器。要说服中东国家不发展核力量，主要的核大国应树立榜样，严格履行在防核扩散条约第6条中规定的义务。

在伊拉克问题上，一些与会者认为主要的挑战

来自于美国从伊拉克完全撤军后。与会者对伊拉克国内、地区和全球稳定可能导致的后果进行了评估。其他挑战则包括解决种族冲突和促进石油资源和政治权力的平等分享。

在中东其他地区问题上，与会者指出需要处理沙特内部局势并更多关注逊尼派和什叶派的分裂。一些与会者表示美国和欧盟需在促进巴以和平进程上投入更多力量，这将有助于解决两伊问题。与会者普遍认为美国在中东推行民主的战略是失败的，但问题是还有什么其他办法吗？

另一些讨论的安全问题包括激进伊斯兰、恐怖主义、能源安全和跨境问题。美国和欧洲面临着本土的激进伊斯兰和恐怖主义的挑战。例如，2005年7月伦敦爆炸案的罪魁祸首就是生长于英国的穆斯林。没有人会排除美国遭受另外一次9.11式恐怖袭击的可能性。在能源安全问题上，有人担心不断上升的油价可能会导致世界其他地方出现经济衰退。跨境安全问题包括非法移民、武器和毒品走私以及因中东部分地区的不稳定而可能产生的难民潮。

非洲资源安全

关于非洲问题，有人表示由于美国和欧盟将其对非援助政策与当地制度建立及人权挂钩，美欧正在失去非洲大陆的支持。另一方面，中国由于其不带任何附加条件的援助政策以及注重可见的基础设施建设项目，正越来越赢得非洲人民在情感上的支持。一些中方与会者对中国在人权问题上被误解表示失望。

其他安全挑战

除了地区问题，与会者也指出中美欧需要合作以改变全球战略格局，改变存在诸多超越国界新挑战的安全环境。现代战争已经模糊了平民和军队战斗的区别，并将战场延伸到外太空和网络。另外，打击的目标也不仅是军事设施，还包括银行系统在内的民用基础设施，其破坏性的影响可能波及广大民众。

经济问题

能源安全及合作

主要政策建议

- 建立适当机制，在能源开发者、消费者和能源中转国之间更好地进行政策协调，利益攸关方协调其各自在能源方面的利益，并对于影响能源市场的不可预见性事件做出专门的应急处理。此机制可以让某种国际能源机构来实施，也可通过双边渠道实施。
- 加强公私机构全球性合作，引进税收激励方案，促进清洁能源技术的发展。
- 加强中国与美国在清洁煤技术方面的合作。

重新思考能源合作框架

能源和资源安全在第一和第二次中美欧三边对话会中是一个反复强调的主题。显然在国际原油市场，针对不断变化的能源局势，新出现的消费大国如中国、印度和供油国如俄罗斯和非洲国家已经展开了对话。以下几点备受关注：

- 印度的发展速度将在未来10-15年赶超中国。
- 俄罗斯可以生产出比沙特阿拉伯更多的石油。俄未来可能更多地供给欧洲和中国石油，而中欧也会更依赖俄罗斯。中俄两国在未来可能会铺建更多的石油管道。
- 土耳其和黑海两地将逐渐发展成为能源桥梁，这也将扩大土耳其的影响力。
- 到2025年，中国的能源需求将更多依赖进口。这将导致更多的外资或合资企业的建立。

一位与会者指出，很大程度上，能源需求决定对外政策。中美欧在能源价格稳定、供能资源可靠和能源运输安全方面可谓利益与共。与会者都认为必须制定一个新的框架来规划国际能源安全合作，在政策方面也需要做出更大的努力来协调能源开发者、消费者和中转者的关系。但在新框架需要以何种形式出现这个问题上，与会者意见出现了分歧。一位来自欧洲的与会者坚持，有必要建立一个主要针对能源问题的机构，这样所有的利益方才能通过协商来协调各自在能源方面的利益。但是，一位中方与会者持不同意见。他认为在能源方面双边的行动会更有实效。总之，目标应该是创建一个危机应对组织来专门处理不可预见事件给能源方面带来的影响。

对话会有一些赢得普遍共识，即在关于能源安全方面的讨论应该集中在如何建设性地解决问题而非说些政治上的浮文巧语。与会者都认为，国际石油储备方面的竞争不应该是零和博弈。开发投资上游资源的竞争无疑会增加国际石油总储量，而竞争不断势必增强市场效率，尽管有时候也会导致短期低效。有些与会者呼吁就协调合作处理全球化发展带来的能源需求进行更深入的讨论。

中国在海外能源市场的活动和发展意向

中国90%的能源供给来自国内能源市场，其中煤处于主导地位，占能源消耗总量的70%。尽管中国交通业的发展在很大程度上取决于以石油为主的燃料，但是石油的消耗只占总能源需求量的12%，远远低于西方国家水平。根据这项统计数字，一位美国与会者在分析中国能源政策问题时指出，中国对于海外能源市场的需求是具有选择性的。同时，有位中方与会者表示，中国的能源进口不仅仅用于满足国内需求，同时用于生产出口产品，如销往美欧的汽车。

大量的讨论集中于中国在国际能源市场上的活动和发展意向。欧美学者认为，中国并非唯一支持所谓能源丰富“无赖政权”的国家。美国和欧洲国家的一些关键盟友和中国有着同样的所作所为，但不像中国这样被单独列出来加以批评。对于中国在国际能源问题上的态度，西方世界或许应当采取与其他国家一样的、更加一视同仁的、更有效率的方式对待。

一位中方与会者指出，中国的外交政策是建立在所有国家享有平等权利的基础之上的。中国恪守不干涉别国内政的外交方针，并以此为基础与其他主权国家交往。非洲国家目前对于中国的出口业务以自然资源为主，并成为非洲经济发展的关键支柱。中国有必要也有权力保护其能源资源。中国在同非洲国家、伊朗等进行国际能源合作的问题上不应该受到国际社会的批评（中国邀请伊朗作为上海合作组织观察员曾受到西方社会指责）。从参与者的角度来看，伊朗是地区利益攸关方，伊朗因为谋求安全利用核能的行为不应当受到指责。

一些对中国能源产业颇为熟悉的与会人员认为，中国的能源公司出于利益驱动和竞争所带来的压力，在海外能源投资的决策环节上，很大程度由能源企业自己决定，而不是中国政府来决定。他们认为中国能源投资的初衷是复杂的，也包含在处理好企业独立自主地位与政府监管力度方面所做的努力（国际投资并不像国内投资那样走同样的审议程序，遵守同样的规章，收入归于公司，而非政府）。中国的能源公司为了在国内保证竞争优势同样需要密切关注国外能源动向。最后，比起西方能源企业和西方政府的关系来说，中国能源企业和中国政府之间存在一个更加密切的咨询伙伴关系，但这种联系并不意味着中国政府会直接左右企业海外投资去向。

人们普遍认为，上游投资收益要高于中游投资和下游投资（这也是国际石油公司的共识），这点认识是中国

公司热衷于投资石油股权的原因所在。同样，像一些全球性企业，中国公司的股票价值增加是随着公司获得的石油、天然气资源的增加而增加，因为股票市场上的收益离不开公司资源储备的增加。

关于中国在海外能源市场的活动的讨论引发了一位中方代表提出如下问题：中国的石油公司与外国的石油公司在运作上有何不同？其他国家对于中国海外能源投资的真正关注点是什么？

欧洲与会者指出，欧洲不存在统一的能源战略，许多欧洲国家仍然视能源问题为国家主权问题，对核能源的态度不尽相同。他们建议中国与欧洲加强能源接触时，除与欧盟打交道，还要与欧洲国家进行双边对话。美国与会者表示，美国的能源政策并不连续。还有人认为，美国若是能减少对石油的依赖，可以在经济和安全利益上获得双赢。

可再生和清洁能源技术

出于对石油资源的依赖，中国、美国以及欧洲国家在另一领域有着巨大的合作空间：如何共同开发、发展和转让环保技术？美国和澳大利亚是唯一两个没有在《京都议定书》上签字的工业国家。众所周知，美国汽油价格不涨价的原因是因为那样无疑会使提倡者在政治上自毁前程。因而，关键之举是美国政府应开发新能源，并且私营企业还可以掌握新技术并从中赢利。可以说，全球气候变暖是市场失灵的产物，所以开发利用新能源的变革应是自上而下进行。一位欧洲与会者曾感言打破石油垄断或许最好的出路在于研发新技术。不过，欧洲通常被认为是偏向于通过多方签署的合作协议来应对能源和气候问题，而非新技术。与会者有这样一个共识，可再生技术领域的投资仍然充满挑战，这需要克服化石燃料企业长期发展所具有的先发优势。也就是说可再生能源的建设成本巨大，远无法与化石燃料的成本相比。

中国政府正在逐步发展水电资源，尤其是在西南部的水利条件优越地区。同时，这一领域的发展潜力依然巨大，中国三分之二的水电资源尚待开发。中国出台关于可再生能源的法律法规，并明确风电和太阳能资源的优先发展地位。这些都是好消息，但是发展所要面临的挑战不容忽视。比如，可再生能源在2007年所占的全国主要能源供给量还不到百分之一。但在2006年，中国新增增加了装机容量达100万千瓦的火力发电厂，这远大于英国现有水平。清洁煤技术将有可能成为中国同美国在未来的合作项目。

同时被讨论的还有其他可行性清洁能源。这其中，核能是存在问题的，比如伊朗等国家出于军事发展的目的发展核能，而且安全处理核废料和旧电厂也是问题。另外一种选择是地热能源：冰岛已成功实现安全供应，印度也在进行可行性探索。

为鼓励发展清洁能源技术，一些与会者提倡企业以公私合营形式在全球市场拓展，政府在税额政策上予以放宽。对于清洁能源的发展，一位美国与会者认为，他希望下一届美国总统可以给国家一次“领袖的表态”，像

约翰·肯尼迪在1961年做出“我们将把人类送上月球”的表态那样实际，比如：“我们国家百分之多少的能源将来自于可再生能源”。

全球化再思考

主要政策建议

- 考虑建立中国、美国和欧盟三边战略经济对话，以建立信任和应对反全球化冲击（中国目前已经分别同美国和欧盟建立起了类似的对话）。
- 认真吸取各自国家全球化的经验和教训。对一国有益的做法对于其他国家并不是必然适用的。所有各方对这些经验和教训都必须采取非常坦率的态度。
- 在全球层面上，应就影响世界多个领域的共同议题，开展协调与沟通，并拟出最优方案，这些领域包括：社会保障、培训海港和空空的官员、对可持续发展环境的管理、跨国投资的共同风险和收益管理。
- 以全球化及其影响为主题在中国、美国和欧盟的公民中做联合调查，获得对这一问题更现实的认识，这将有助于各方开展更有效的政策协调，以处理全球化带来的影响。
- 实现高中课程的国际化，让青年人更多了解国际化观念。
- 三方智库应就全球化及其影响等问题加强合作与研究。

经济关系

一些中国与会者表达了对发达国家，尤其是美国和欧洲涌起的贸易保护主义潮流的担忧。这股潮流针对中国和印度这样从全球化中获益的新兴经济体。他们强调，中国的发展不会影响其他国家的生活方式，发达国家无须惧怕，也不应妖魔化中国。中国共产党在第17次代表大会报告中已经承诺要坚持和平发展和合作共赢的战略道路。

某些中国与会者承认，中国与欧洲和美国的贸易争端正与日增多。但他们认为这些争端是正常现象，不应影响到双边关系。他们指出，世界贸易组织的争端解决机制被最经常用于解决美欧间的贸易争端，但这些争端并没有影响到美欧的整体关系。

三边会议也讨论了中国在经济政策及其对投资和贸易关系的影响。一些与会者希望中国进一步放宽外国对华直接投资，这样就可以减少投资方的费用，他们赞赏中国在人民币升值上所持的谨慎态度。一名中国与会者认

为，中国在金融市场、商务和人才国际化之后，下一步应将人民币国际化。

美国和欧洲与会者认为，中国在过去30年中取得了巨大进步。这些进步包括：知识产权保护、对人权的尊重、由中国城市主导的都市规划创新。但是中国的发展也存在一些问题，包括如何解决快速增长的经济与不变的政治体制的矛盾以及人口老龄化对经济的影响。这些有可能影响中国与其主要伙伴国的经济和金融关系。

如何认识和应对全球化

对于全球化本身，各方一致认为有必要进一步研究分析全球化反对派的合理观点。一些欧洲与会者指出，尽管欧盟是全球化的最高级形式，它创造了成员国间真正的统一市场，但在欧洲并没有一个关于全球化一致的观点。有人指出，全球化越来越多地受到国际城市不断壮大的驱动，而不仅是国家经济体。另外，国家的意愿在全球化时代也起了巨大的作用。一些与会者对上述两种看法不完全赞同，他们认为，尽管城市在世界经济中的重要性不断增加，但还不清楚国际化城市的居民将那些与他们一样共同面对全球化时代问题的其他城市居民视为竞争者还是消费者。

一些与会者说，政府应该在全球化时代重新界定其地位和作用。比如，国际公共产品和国际公法体系应做怎样的结构性调整？一个国家或地区能够提供什么样的国际公共产品？敦促各国政府在分配稀缺资源时应区分奢侈品和必需品，为实现全球化的可持续性必须消减温室气体排放。会议还强调了中美欧之间就管理全球化影响方面重新恢复对话的重要性。

全球金融危机

主要政策建议

- 加快金融领域改革，不仅要采取措施完善国际金融体系和货币制度体系，还应完善国际规则和程序。
- 提高发展中国家在国际经济事务中的发言权。世界银行应帮助发展中国家应对经济全球化并实现联合国千年发展目标。
- 国际货币基金组织应为国际金融市场建立监测和早期预警体系，并在维护国际金融稳定方面发挥更大的作用。
- 采取短期和中期相结合的办法实现经济的持续增长。短期措施包括：提供信贷促进货物流通，在维护本国利益的同时与发展中国家分享经济刺激计划；确保食物、水和能源的持续供应；加大对不发

达地区（如非洲）发展需求的关注力度。

- 重新思考双边互惠贸易协定对多边自由贸易体制是起促进作用还是阻碍作用。
- 利用私人慈善事业的发展，包括通过社交网站和手机不断增加的慈善捐款，以此作为官方发展援助的补充。这样可以确保联合国千年发展目标在金融危机的形势下仍然能够实现。

世界经济的发展

2008年金融危机的爆发，促使中美欧三边对话会重新审视中美欧三方在解决经济危机中的作用。2008年12月，由中美欧三边对话会与世界银行共同举办了特别讨论会，会议的主题是“全球合作推动世界经济的发展”。这次会议的关注点是胡锦涛主席提出的关于全球经济持续发展的四点主张，这四点主张是胡锦涛主席在2008年7月出席G8峰会关于能源安全与气候变化问题的讨论时提出的。四点主张的具体内容是：建立起可持续发展的世界经济体系、包容有序的国际金融体系、公正合理的国际贸易机制、公平有效的全球发展体系。胡锦涛主席在2008年12月以及2009年4月的G20金融峰会上再次重申了这四点主张。之后，来自全球商界、学术界和智库的专家组成员们纷纷就上述主张的具体实施建言，作为对这四点主张的回应。

这些主张和建议受到了特别讨论会与会者的普遍欢

迎。中国、美国和欧洲应共同努力，重新界定国际金融架构，并确保全球经济实现更持续的发展，这在这次金融危机中已经成为了人们的共识。

中国如何应对金融危机

中国如何应对金融危机也是大家比较关注的一个议题。大家普遍认为，这次金融危机为中国经济发展实现由出口拉动型到内需拉动型的转型提供了难得的机遇。一些与会者认为，中国是否能够在此次严重危机中实现及时充分的转型是个挑战。

后续计划

第一轮三边对话会突出了中美欧三方在一系列全球和地区挑战上加强合作的机遇。今后，三边对话会将更深入地讨论诸如气候安全和非洲地区发展等议题。同时，三方的有效合作需要共同理解和信任，这一点在许多方面还很欠缺。中国国际问题研究所和东西方研究所将继续通过非正式研讨会、互联网加密论坛等渠道进行深入的政策讨论，以实现建立信任的目标。双方还将通过公开出版物和论坛来交流观点和看法，为中美欧三方政策合作献计献策。

理事会



EASTWEST INSTITUTE
Forging Collective Action for a Safer and Better World

理事会主席

弗朗西斯·芬利 (英国)
东西方研究所主席
Clay Finlay公司

阿门·萨金森 (亚美尼亚)
东西方研究所副主席
Eurasia House International
亚美尼亚前首相

管理人员

约翰·埃德温·姆罗兹 (美国)
东西方研究所总裁
兼首席执行官

马克·马莱茨 (美国)
东西方研究所执行委员会主席
哈佛商学院高级研究员

R·威廉·艾德三世 (美国)
东西方研究所法律顾问兼秘书
麦肯朗律师事务所合伙人

利奥·申克 (美国)
东西方研究所财政
Central National-
Gottesman Inc.公司
高级副总裁

理事会成员

马蒂·阿赫蒂萨里 (芬兰)
2008年诺贝尔和平奖得主
芬兰前首相

马克·钱德勒 (美国)
Biophysical公司主席兼CEO

埃米尔·霍比纳克 (斯洛伐克)
Logomotion公司主席兼CEO

杰拉尔德·T·鲍德里奇 (美国)
共和能源公司主席

乔尔·考恩 (美国)
Habersham & Cowan公司总裁

沃尔夫冈·伊申格尔 (德国)
慕尼黑安全会议主席
Allianz SE公司政务主管

托儿·鲍尔格夫森 (冰岛)
Novator公司主席

罗希特·德赛 (美国)
Desai Capital公司总裁

海法·阿尔·卡伊拉尼 (英国)
阿拉伯国际妇女论坛创办人兼CEO

彼得·卡斯滕费尔特 (英国)
Archipelago Enterprises Ltd.公司董事长

艾迪生·费舍尔 (美国)
Planet Heritage Foundation
公司主席兼共同创办人

小唐纳德·肯德尔 (美国)
High Country Passage L.P.公司CEO

玛利亚·利瓦诺斯·卡托依 (瑞士)
国际商会前秘书长

斯蒂芬·B·海因茨 (美国)
洛克菲勒兄弟基金会总裁

西格丽·RVC·肯德尔 (美国)
Kendall-Verwaltungs-
GmbH公司执行伙伴

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| 詹姆斯· A·拉希 (美国)
Manchester Principal LLC
公司公司董事长 | 小罗斯· 佩罗特 (美国)
Perot Systems Corporation
公司董事长 | 亨利· J·史密斯 (美国)
Bud Smith Organization Inc.公司CEO |
| 陆恭惠(中国)
香港思汇政策研究所CEO | 路易斯·理查森 (美国)
圣安德鲁斯大学负责人 | 小希尔顿·史密斯 (美国)
East Bay Co. Ltd.公司总裁兼CEO |
| 马振岗 (中国)
中国国际问题研究所所长 | 约翰·R·鲁滨逊(美国)
自然资源保护委员会副创办人 | 亨利·托格森 (挪威)
Telenor ASA公司执行副总裁(退休) |
| 迈克尔·梅普尔斯 (美国)
微软公司前执行副总裁 | 小乔治· F· 拉塞尔(美国)
Russell 投资集团与Russell
20-20公司名誉主席 | 威廉· 乌拉圭 (美国)
哈佛法学院国际谈判项目主管 |
| 托马斯· J·梅雷迪恩 (美国)
Meritage Capital, L.P.
公司负责人和创办人 | 拉姆兹·H·桑巴尔 (英国)
Sanbar Development
Corporation,S.A公司
集团主席 | 皮埃尔· 维芒 (法国)
法国驻美国大使 |
| 弗朗西斯·纳杰菲 (美国)
Pivotal Group公司CEO | 伊克拉·ul-马吉德·西哈尔
(巴基斯坦)
Security & Management
Services Ltd.公司
主席 | 查尔斯·F·沃德 (美国)
美国欧洲司令部 前副司令 |
| 弗兰克· 纽曼 (美国)
AM-TAK International公司总裁 | 坎瓦尔·西巴尔(印度)
印度前外交秘书 | 班戈特·韦斯特格林 (瑞典)
美国国际集团 (AIG)欧洲及独联
体企业与政府事务部高级副总裁 |
| 尤瑟夫·阿尔·欧太巴 (阿
拉伯联合酋长国)
阿拉伯联合酋长国驻美国大使 | | 伊戈· 尔尤尔 (俄罗斯)
现代发展研究所主席 |
| | | 张德广 (中国)
中国国际问题研究基金会会长 |

非董事会成员

- | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| 马歇尔·贝内特 (美国)
Marshall Bennett
Enterprises公司总裁 | 小约翰· A·罗伯特(美
国)Chilmark Enterprises
L.L.C公司总裁兼
CEO | J·迪克森罗杰斯 (美国)
Dickson Partners,
L.L.C.公司总裁 | 乔治·希尔(美国)
Salamander USA & Canada
公司总裁 (退休)
美国国际咨询集团
创办人及CEO |
|---|---|--|--|

名誉主席

- | | | |
|---|--------------------------------|---|
| 贝特霍尔德·拜茨 (德国)
Alfried Krupp von Bohlen und
Halbach-Stiftung公司总裁 | 汉斯·迪特里希·根舍 (德国)
德国前副总理和外长 | 惠特尼·麦克米伦 (美国)
美国嘉吉集团前总裁兼CEO |
| 伊万·T·贝伦德 (匈牙利)
洛杉矶加利福尼亚大学教授 | 唐纳德· M·肯德尔 (美国)
百事公司前总裁兼CEO | 艾拉·D·瓦拉赫* (美国)
Central National-Gottesman,
Inc.公司前主席
东西方研究所创办人 |

名誉理事

詹·克日什托夫·别莱茨基 (波兰)
Bank Polska Kasa Opieki S.A.公司CEO
波兰前首相

埃米尔·康斯坦丁内斯库 (罗马尼亚)
罗马尼亚地区合作与冲突预防研究所
罗马尼亚前总统

威廉·D·迪尔斯泰因(美国)
美国强生公司前集团主席

约翰·W·克鲁格 (美国)
Metromedia International
Group公司董事会主席

玛利亚·皮娅·科斯鲍尔(列支敦士登)
列支敦士登驻奥地利、欧洲安全
与合作委员会、联合国大使

威廉·E·莫里 (美国)
The Samuel Freeman Trust主席

约翰·J·罗伯茨 (美国)
美国国际集团 (AIG)高级顾问

丹尼尔·罗斯 (美国)
Rose Associates, Inc.公司主席

米切尔·I·桑肯 (美国)
MBIA 保险公司执行董事长

托瓦尔·斯托尔腾贝格 (挪威)
挪威红十字会会长

利纳·特莫林 (美国)
Temerlin Consulting公司主席

约翰·C·怀特黑德 (美国)
Goldman Sachs公司前副主
席 美国前副国务卿



Trialogue21 is a high-level, off-the-record process among government and non-government leaders from China, the United States and Europe. Created in response to the shifting global realities of the 21st century, this endeavor seeks to use quiet dialogue to clarify perceptions, build trust and identify areas of cooperation among today's most important global actors. Annual Trialogue21 meetings rotate among cities in the three participating regions and are attended by representatives from government, academia, business, the media and civil society.

中美欧21世纪三边对话会倡议是一个中美欧政府和非政府领导人之间的高层非正式对话进程。对话会的发起是基于21世纪全球的变化，旨在寻求通过对话澄清观点，建立信任并在当前全球重要国家中确定合作领域。一年一次的三边对话会轮流在三方的城市召开，与会者来自政府部门、学术机构、商界、媒体及民间团体。

EWI Brussels Center

Rue de la loi, 85
Brussels 1040
Belgium
32-2-743-4610

EWI Moscow Center

Sadovaya-Kudrinskaya st.
8-10-12, Building 1
Moscow 123001
Russia, 7-495-691-0449

EWI New York Center

700 Broadway
New York, NY 10003
U.S.A.
1-212-824-4100