

國際安全研究

2020年第2期目录

双月刊 总第173期

安全理论

- [3] 中美在亚太地区的安全矛盾：演变与逻辑 李 岩 达 巍
- [23] 探索中美关系新范式及全球安全治理 安 刚 王一鸣 胡 欣

安全战略

- [49] 《中导条约》与全球战略稳定论析 郭晓兵 龙 云
- [73] 俄罗斯对美国战略认知的演变及其政策效应 宋 伟 于优娟
- [91] 大国北极博弈与中国北极能源安全
——兼论“冰上丝绸之路”推进路径 罗英杰 李 飞

安全议题

- [116] 太空安全秩序构建中的体系压力与战略指向 徐能武 高杨予兮
- [135] 美国国家安全认知的新视阈：人工智能与国家安全 刘国柱 尹楠楠
- [156] 英文摘要

Abstract

3 **China-US Security Contradictions in the Asia-Pacific Region: Evolution and Logic**

LI Yan and DA Wei

[Abstract] In recent years, security contradictions between China and the United States in the Asia-Pacific region have continued to ferment and the two countries have been caught up in fully fledged confrontations in terms of security interests and concepts as well as a comprehensive and long-term vision of the regional security order, which has exerted great negative influence over the peaceful coexistence between the two countries. A huge divergence of views over the regional security order and hot issues are the main manifestation of China-US security contradictions in the Asia-Pacific region. Their security contradictions that loom larger in the Asia-Pacific region are fundamentally due to the changes in regional power configuration and the ensuing transfer of power, which gives full expression to “partial balance of power” in the context of the gap between their overall national strengths. This partial balance of power is manifested in the following three aspects: (1) the “dual structural balance” with China being a regional economic center and the US a regional security center, (2) the “balance of land power and sea power” with China being a land power and the US a sea power, and (3) the emerging balance of power between China and the US in China’s offshore areas. In this process, poor management of security contradictions and the enhanced threat perception of both sides have intensified contradictions and confrontations, accelerating the formation of a security dilemma. Along with the growth and decline of power as well as policy interactions, the security dilemma between China and the US in the Asia-Pacific region has further aggravated with a shift from a classic security dilemma to a “state-induced security dilemma”. Although the security contradictions between the two countries in the Asia-Pacific region will still be constrained by structural components, it is those factors like the future of economic interdependence, the changing technology-driven military deterrence, ideological competition, and non-traditional security cooperation that determine whether the existing security contradictions will lead to conflicts or not.

[Keywords] China-US relations, security contradictions, security dilemma in the Asia-Pacific region, evolution and logic

[Authors] LI Yan, Deputy Director and Associate Research Fellow, Institute of American Studies, China Institutes of Contemporary International Relations (Beijing, 100081); DA Wei, Professor and Assistant President, University of International Relations (Beijing, 100091).

23 **Exploring the New Paradigm of China-US Relations and Global Security Governance**

AN Gang, WANG Yiming and HU Xin

[Abstract] Since President Donald Trump took office, the US strategy towards China has been carrying a negative tone in all dimensions, shifting gradually from “engagement” to “confinement”. China and the US are witnessing a “new situation” in which strategic competition between an emerging power and a hegemon

is increasing. China-US economic and trade frictions have indicated that economic and trade cooperation, the traditional cornerstone of bilateral ties, can just play a limited role in handling the “new situation” of strategic competition. To effectively prevent the “new situation” from escalating into full-scale confrontations and conflicts, it is imperative for the two countries to explore a “new paradigm” that helps redefine their roles, handle and control their bilateral relationship. The global governance structure with global security governance as an essential part of it, provides a relatively stable institutional system for China-US strategic gaming and balance of power. By clarifying the boundaries of strategic competition, constructing a platform for dialogue and coordination, and effectively drawing support from third parties, China and the US can proactively facilitate rational competition and constructive cooperation, which will directly bring about changes to the concepts, systems and models of global security governance. Such endeavors are not only in line with the fundamental interests of both sides and the universal aspirations of the international community, but also fit in with the particular needs of the development of sound global governance. A major issue, however, stands in the way of establishing the “new paradigm”: a new “cornerstone” should be explored in view of the unstable role played by economic and trade cooperation and the insufficient cooperation over global security governance. In the future, given that strategic competition features in the China-US relations, a new “cornerstone” can be forged by achieving the balance of power between the two great powers through the establishment of a relatively stable mechanism via power gaming.

[Keywords] China-US relations, great-power competition, new paradigm, global security governance

[Authors] AN Gang, Research Fellow at the Center for International Strategy and Security of Tsinghua University and Editor of World Affairs (Beijing, 100020); WANG Yiming, Ph.D. Student at the School of International Studies, Renmin University of China (Beijing, 100872); HU Xin, Associate Professor at the Institute of Strategy and Security Studies, College of International Studies, National University of Defense Technology (Nanjing, 210039).

49 **An Analysis of the Relationship between the INF Treaty and Global Strategic Stability**

GUO Xiaobing and LONG Yun

[Abstract] The INF Treaty, an important arms control treaty reached by the United States and the Soviet Union during the Cold War, served as one of the major pillars of global strategic stability. In August 2019, the United States and Russia withdrew from the INF Treaty one after another, arousing great concerns from the international community. The misgivings are that their withdrawal from the treaty will affect global strategic stability and security situations in Europe and Asia, trigger a new round of arms race and undermine the international arms control system. China has been taken by the United States as an important excuse for its withdrawal, so the demise of the treaty is bound to exert a profound impact on China’s external security environment. This paper intends to review the creation, development and termination of the INF Treaty, analyze its evolutionary causes on the international, domestic and personal levels and concludes that changes in the international landscape have played a decisive role in making the treaty rise and fall. In the 1980s, changes in the balance of power between the Soviet Union and the United States led to the birth of the INF Treaty. In the 21st century, pressures from NATO and the proliferation of missile technology prompted Russia to launch the initiative to globalize the INF Treaty. In recent years, the relative decline of the US hegemonic position has created the environment for the US to opt out of the INF Treaty. At the same time, domestic politics and leadership changes in the United States and Russia have also exerted profound influence on the timing and mode of

the “creation, evolution and demise” of the treaty. Mikhail Gorbachev’s “new thinking” reforms and the upsurge in nuclear disarmament movement in the 1980s provided a special political and social context for the birth of the INF Treaty. The “America First” concept pursued by the Donald Trump administration has prompted the United States to withdraw from various international treaties and organizations, making the INF Treaty one of the victims. In different historical periods, the role of the INF varied in maintaining global strategic stability. In the early 1960s, it was the backbone of the central deterrence of the United States and the Soviet Union. In the 1970s and 1980s, INF became an important factor affecting extended deterrence. In the 21st century, it has become a tool for Russia to fight against the US missile defense system. At present, INF plays an increasingly important role in cross-domain deterrence. The world is now witnessing a recurrence of the INF competition among big powers, but the new round of competition will surely demonstrate many new characteristics different from those of the past.

[Keywords] INF Treaty, arms race, arms control, nuclear disarmament, the US and Russia’s withdrawal from the INF Treaty

[Authors] GUO Xiaobing, Research Fellow and Director of Center for Arms Control Studies, China Institutes of Contemporary International Relations (Beijing, 100081); LONG Yun, Associate Professor, China Foreign Affairs University (Beijing, 100037).

73 **An Analysis of the Evolution of Russia’s Strategic Perception of the US and Its Foreign Policy Impact**

SONG Wei and YU Youjuan

[Abstract] The paper reviews the three-stage evolution of Russia’s strategic perception of the US: friendship and cooperation, heightened competition and intensified confrontation. Russia’s assertive diplomatic and security policies can be observed through its hard-line strategic posture towards the US and NATO, and its pursuit of diplomatic and security objectives beyond its national strength. Although a mutual shaping relationship between the evolution of Russia’s strategic perception and its colliding interests with the United States can be seen clearly in Russia-US interactions, changes in Russia’s strategic perception are not merely determined by national interest considerations. Historical and psychological factors that shape Russia’s strategic perception play a very important role in making people understand why Russia has placed a high premium on NATO’s eastward expansion, the situation in Ukraine and its actions in Syria with a massive investment of resources. Many policies and actions adopted by the United States do not pay any attention to these historical and psychological factors, which is deemed as “insulting” or “threatening” by Russia, thus giving rise to a spiral of enmity and antagonism between the two sides. Due to Russia’s unique historical memory and great-power complex, Russia has made drastic responses to the conflicts of interests with the United States. Although these responses are not conducive to Russia’s national strength and overall national interests, they may still be justified. Now that Russia’s strategic perception of the US is beginning to take shape, it is quite difficult to “restart” the Russia-US relations in the short term. Viewed from the case study of Russia’s strategic perception of the US, strategic perception in itself has its relative independence, which is not only affected by conflicts of interests but also influenced by social and cultural factors so that a country’s foreign policies may not always follow the path of rationalism.

[Keywords] Russia-US relationship, strategic perception, foreign and security policy, assertive diplomacy

[Authors] SONG Wei, Professor, School of International Studies, Renmin

University of China (Beijing, 100872) ; YU Youjuan, Ph.D. Student, School of International Studies, Renmin University of China and Lecturer, Beijing International Studies University (Beijing, 100024) .

91 **The Great Powers' Arctic Game and China's Arctic Energy Security: Probing into the Advancement Path of the "Ice Silk Road" Framework**

LUO Yingjie and LI Fei

[Abstract] From the perspectives of "sea power theory", "no man's land" and "co-ownership", the ownership of the Arctic region, particularly the allocation of the Arctic energy resources remains unresolved. In recent years, in the context of accelerated changes in the Arctic environment, the strengthened capabilities of relevant countries in their polar activities as well as the increasingly fierce energy competition across the globe, there is a growing and pressing demand for countries to broaden and expand their energy access channels. Both the Arctic countries represented by Russia and the "non-Arctic countries" represented by China have made more and more energy rights claims and higher demands for maintaining energy security in the Arctic region. Centered on the demarcation of public and private attributes, the choices between inclusive and exclusive policies as well as the power-sharing standards, multiple rounds of contests have been comprehensively carried out in the Arctic region . At present, against the backdrop of "consistent ideas coexisting with conflicting objectives" relevant countries find it more difficult to work together in the Arctic region, especially in the field of energy development. As for China, advocate of the construction of the "Ice Silk Road", it should proactively engage with those countries with the most influence in the Arctic region by sharing ideas, coordinating agendas and promoting cooperation in order to play an actively role in Arctic affairs, better safeguard its energy security, avoid strategic losses caused by vicious competition and lay a solid foundation for raising China's voice in the Arctic energy development.

[Keywords] Arctic governance, great powers' game, the "Ice Silk Road", energy security

[Authors] LUO Yingjie, Professor of International Politics Department, University of International Relations (Beijing, 100091); LI Fei, M. A. Student of International Relations, University of International Relations (Beijing, 100091).

116 **System Pressure and Strategic Direction in the Construction of Space Security Order**

XU Nengwu and GAO Yangyuxi

[Abstract] In the current international system with one superpower and several major powers, the US efforts to reinforce its space deterrence capacity has not only posed clear-cut threats to its adversaries but also fueled a new arms race and security dilemma in space. Changes in the international system caused by the US pursuit of space hegemony, in turn, are reshaping the current space security relations and prompting other countries to make complex responses and anti-deterrence measures under the systemic pressure. Apart from the systemic security pressure, choices about space security strategies by various countries are also affected by such intervening variables as efficacy of space power, awareness of space laws, strategic coordination, interactions among nations, political processes. These variables not only affect nations' perceptions of space security, but also lead to the

efficiency-competitive socialization when nations are making decisions about space security within a certain period of time. However, with the continuous extension and development of international social process, efficacy of space power and the heightened awareness of space laws will make the security decision-making process of relevant countries more prudent and normative. The strategic communication and policy coordination in the tortuous advancement of globalization will transform space security interactions between countries from being conflicting to cooperative. On the premise that all countries maintain their strategic prudence, the diversification of space power will help build a new space security order featuring inclusiveness, reciprocity and harmony. The concept of common interests upheld by space globalization will promote the construction of a community with a shared future for mankind.

[Keywords] space security order, system pressure, security dilemma, strategic choices, a community with a shared future for mankind

[Authors] XU Nengwu, Professor and Ph.D. Supervisor, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, National University of Defense Technology (Changsha, 410072); GAO Yangyuxi, Lecturer, National Security College, National Defense University (Beijing, 100091).

135 **A New Perspective on the US National Security Perception: Artificial Intelligence and National Security**

LIU Guozhu and YIN Nannan

[Abstract] As a subversive and revolutionary technology, artificial intelligence (AI) will fundamentally change the development process of the international community. The United States has been acutely and accurately aware of this trend and thus has incorporated artificial intelligence into national security. The impact of artificial intelligence on US national security mainly lies in three aspects: Firstly, AI is a core variable that will influence and shape the future of US national security in that it can enhance the US position in the international power distribution, bridge and remedy the division and disorder within the American society and promote the leap-forward development of the US military power. Secondly, it is of vital importance to ensure US national security in the future by effectively overcoming the negative effects of AI. Artificial intelligence might cause a series of social and moral challenges and its inherent flaws might increase the cost of risk in making war-related decisions as well as the frequency and intensity of armed conflicts. Finally, the United States emphasizes that the rapid development of China's AI technology will pose a serious threat to the US future national security. It is inevitable that China and the United States will face increasingly fierce competition in the field of artificial intelligence due to the fact that the United States believes China is trying to challenge its leadership in the high-tech industry. In order to deal with the US policy of containing China in the AI field, China should have a clear roadmap for the research, development and application of AI, regulate the Sino-US relations through institutionalized efforts and avoid the outbreak of a tech cold war.

[Keywords] security awareness, artificial intelligence, national security, strategic choice

[Authors] LIU Guozhu, Professor and Ph.D. Supervisor, Institute of World History and Center for American Studies, Zhejiang University; YIN Nannan, Ph.D. Student, Institute of World History and Center for American Studies, Zhejiang University (Hangzhou, 310028).

(本期英文编辑: 张国帅 高静)