

建设亚太地区安全架构：挑战、理念和行动

（题记：本发言为上海国际问题研究院学术委员会主任杨洁勉在亚信非政府论坛第二次会议全体会议上的主题发言，原发言为英文，作者本人翻译为中文。）

2017年6月28日



维护和推进亚太地区安全是亚信会议的重要目标之一。近年来，亚太地区的发展日益引人注目，成为全球最具发展活力和潜力的地区。随着国际关系格局的深刻调整，本地区格局也在发生重要深刻变化。当前，亚太地区形势总体稳定向好，和平与发展的势头依然强劲，是当前全球格局中的稳定板块。同时，本地区仍面临诸多不稳定、不确定因素。

一、三大地区安全挑战

在所有的地区安全挑战中，以下三大类别尤为突出。第一，亚太地区依然存在传统安全威胁。有些热点问题甚至引起世界的关注，诸如朝核问题和在南亚和西亚的战争问题等。第二，非传统安全威胁。在亚太地区，源于国际恐怖主义和极端主义的安全威胁有增无已。此外，本地区还存在海盗、有组织犯罪和毒品问题。同这些问题的广度和深度相比，当前地区的共同努力的力度和效应显得远远

不够。第三，缺乏整个区域性的安全机制。在这方面，亚太地区甚至无法与非洲相比，非洲联盟已经建立了全非支持的安全机制。

二、安全观的分歧

当前的亚太安全观源于历史的影响和现实的态势。首先，不同的安全实践导致各自相异的安全观。例如，亚太地区是当今世界上唯一残存冷战的地区。时至今日，本地区仍为各种竞争和对立的思想观念所困扰。尽管亚信上海峰会已经同意了共同、全面、合作和可持续安全观以应对地区面临的挑战，但其真正成为整个地区的指南还任重道远。而且，亚太地区在如何建立和运作本地区的安全架构问题仍旧莫衷一是。在设计亚太地区安全架构上的一些有限和初步的努力也是逡巡不前。实践探索不足和理念差异导致了第三个问题，不同的行为体各行其是，阻碍了整个地区性的安全架构建设。

三、共商共建未来

为了人类命运共同体的理想，我们需要共商、共建和共享。因此，建设未来的地区安全架构是个不断继承和创新的发展过程。

首先，我们应当恰如其分地评价现有的各类安全架构。主要有三类。一是美国主导的盟国体系。二是东盟推进的东盟地区论坛。三是上合组织。现在看来，尚无法看到上述三类及其他的机制能够整合一体。然而，应当鼓励它们进行建设性互动，促进其相互磋商和协调。

其次，我们应当充分发挥诸如亚信会议和香山论坛等论坛性质机制的作用。论坛本身没有强制的执行力，但它们关于当前问题的讨论和对未来趋势的分析定能促进致力于安全架构建设的各方努力。亚太地区已向世界证明了其经济发展，也将以其决心和智慧在安全问题上证明自己。

再次，我们在设计未来各类安全架构时需要想象力和创新精神。我们要充分考虑现存和将来的各种条件。我们还不能为“就安全论安全”的传统思想所束缚。上合组织的安全、经济和文化三大支柱相互作用。东盟地区论坛也主张在更广泛

的范围内进行磋商和协商。因此，最好从更加全面的角度上去讨论亚太安全架构问题。

第四，亚太地区在谋划未来各类安全架构时应当作出更多的实际努力。各国政府对此负有责任。但是，政府间的讨论复杂而微妙。而非政府组织和智库在此却大有可为。它们可以提出各种建议并进行深入讨论，作出与政府的平行努力。值得期待的是，非政府组织和智库在今后的圆桌会议上将能提出更多的建议。

最后，同样重要的是，我们应当更加重视宣传推介工作。在信息化时代，我们要尽最大的努力和最广泛地向政府和民众宣传自己的观点和建议。我们要提升自己的话语权，并以此促进在亚太和其他地区建设各类新型的安全架构。

The Building of Asia-Pacific Security Architectures:

Challenges, Concepts and Actions

(note: This is the transcript of Prof. Yang Jiemian's keynote speech at the Second Conference of the CICA Non-Governmental Forum)

June 28, 2017

One of the main goals of the Conference on Interaction and Confidence-Building Measures in Asia (CICA) is to preserve and enhance the security of Asia-Pacific region. In recent years, the development of the Asia-Pacific region has increasingly caught people's attention. It has become the most dynamic region with the strongest potential in the world. With the profound adjustment of the pattern of international relations, this regional situation is also undergoing profound changes. Currently, the situation in the Asia-Pacific region is stable on the whole, with a strong momentum for peace and development. However, this region still faces multiple destabilizing and uncertain factors.

I. Three Sets of Regional Security Challenges

Among the regional security challenges, three sets stand out prominently. The first set is that the Asia-Pacific region is still confronting with traditional security threats. Some hotspots have even caught the world's attention, such as the North

Korean nuclear issue and wars in South and West Asia. The second set is related to non-traditional security threats. The Asia-Pacific region sees increasing security threats originated from international terrorism and extremism. In addition, this region also suffers from pirates, organized crimes and drug problem. Compared with the enormity of the problems, the current regional coordinated efforts are far from sufficient and efficient. The third set is the absence of pan-regional security mechanisms. In this respect the Asia-Pacific region even cannot be comparable with Africa where the security arm of the African Union is a mechanism based on continent-wide support.

II. Different Security Concepts

The past and present security status gave birth to the contemporary security concepts in the Asia-Pacific region. First of all, the different security practices have resulted in widespread divergence in security concepts. For instance, the Asia-Pacific region is the only region where the Cold War still lingers on. Up to date, this region is troubled by competing and conflicting thoughts and concepts. Although the CICA Shanghai summit agreed on the new concepts of security that stresses common, comprehensive, cooperative and sustainable security to tackle with the security challenges facing the region, yet it is still a long way to make these new concepts as true guiding ones all over the Asia-Pacific region. Moreover, this region does not have a consensus on how to build and run the regional security architectures. The limited and preliminary attempts to design the regional security architecture see little progress. Lack of practical exploitation and conceptual convergence results in the third question: different actors proceed in their own ways, thus blocking the building of region-wide security architectures.

III. Joint Strive for the Future

To strive for the community of mankind's shared future, we need joint

consulting, building and sharing. Therefore, the building of the regional future security architectures is an ongoing process of continuity and creativity.

First of all, we should give a proper position to the existent architectures. These are mainly of three categories. One is the U.S.-led alliance. Two is the ASEAN-driven ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF). Three is the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO). So far there is no possibility for the three and others to merge into one. However, they should be encouraged to have constructive interaction among them so as to have more joint consultation and coordination.

Secondly, we should give a fuller play to the forum-type mechanisms, such as CICA and Xiangshan Forum. Forums do not possess enforcing power. However, their discussion of the present problems and their vision of the future trends will definitely enlighten the relevant parties on their way of security architecture building. This region has already proved itself in the economic field and should have sufficient determination and wisdom in the security as well.

Thirdly, imagination and creativity are in great need when we are designing the future security architectures. We must take the present and future conditions into consideration. We must question the conventional wisdom such as exclusively security ones. The SCO has three pillars of security, economic and cultural ones that work in integration. The ARF is also supported by wider range of consultation and coordination. Therefore it would be better to have an overall umbrella for the regional future security architectures.

Fourthly, the Asia Pacific region should make real efforts in designing the future security architectures. The governments have the responsibilities to do so. However, the inter-governmental discussions and drafting are not only complicated but also intricate. Here the NGOs and think tanks could play a big role. They can put forward various proposals and encourage in-depth debates. All these are the paralleled efforts to the governmental ones. Hopefully, the NGOs and think tanks could present more detailed proposals at our future Roundtables.

Last but not least, we should pay greater attention to our publicity work. At the information age, we should try our best to present our views and proposals to the

governments and people as widely as possible. We need to have more rights of discourse power and make them conducive to the building of new security architecture in the Asia-Pacific region and beyond.