Brazil-China towards the strategic situation in 2005 and the transformations in international security

Jorge Calvario dos Santos (*)

The human history has been characterized by a crisis succession. The generalized crisis that reaches the world in the beginning of the century is not an unusual or singular fact. The resulted transformations strongly affect the national States' political, economic, and cultural structures.

At this historical moment, the world lives one of the most difficult and suffering phases of human evolution, consequence of the hegemony of a civilization at its top, of a space culture, at the moment of its projection over the world.

The epoch that we live was named by Edgar Morin[2] as "planetary iron age". This denomination is correct as, since a while ago, we verify an westernization process of the world, where is searched to install the globalization of ideas as, generally, almost all of them come from the the same roots, from the same source of thought; a war globalization , in most of cultural reasons, but that many times attend to interests for control and irrestrict access to natural non-renewable resources; the human hope gave in place to hopelessness as the Utopia has lost itself, there no more exist fixed reference that will guide us to a future goal; the economic globalization that, standardizing the world, allows the process of cultural interference which aims the subordination of the most fragile cultures; the virtualization of a world that withdraws from the agenda the reality of facts, considering its version as the proper

---

fact; the consolidation of thought and unique conscience that would become mankind similar to what is protagonized on "Brave New World", by Aldous Huxley.

The most attentive observer verifies the effort to implementing of an universal ethic that leads all of us to cultural dimension's imprisonment, essence and factor of unity, and that characterizes each one of the nations.

At the end of 20th century, and at the beginning of 21st century, it has been formed a concentration of power and wealth never seen before. As a direct consequence, it has formed a monopoly of the most important decisions on a world context as well as a search for the monopoly of technical and scientific knowlegde.

The difference between the present crisis and the ones that came before is based on its solid character, on its universal comprising and simultaneity, on the action of desestabilization agents over the whole of the territories, showing the aggravation of the system's contradictions, among the diffuse horizontal, vertical and of many variables movings, causing perplexities and suffering.

In such circunstances, a fundamental fact is not always understood: the concentration of decisory power never seen before as a consequence of a progressing concentration of capital and monopoly of the scientific and technological knowledge, opposing to the ilusion of its democratization, whose consequence, in the theoretical field, is the ideology of the end of the ideologies. Such is the case of "The End of History", by Francis Fukuyama, establishing that neoliberalism would be a final stage of human society's development.

We all live in a system at fail stage in its own centers of command, and that intends to survive for the monopolization of decisions, based on the survival strongest one law. In another words, implementing a game whose basic rule is that everyone transfers all types of resources to few. It is because the richer and more industrialized countries assume the right to legislate about the interests and sovereignty from the other States, judging themselves as "the only form of the salvation of mankind". However, this fail may mean a final phase of qualitative transformations that reveal "The End of History" exactly to that system condemned to its own history that intends to be itself the end of history.

It is violence under the most scientific methods to reach hegemonic control of only one. This is the product of the end of industrial society, which does not have man as a main goal, but under the view of profit and efficiency maximization has complicated with the spraying of social division of work from the excessive subdivision of social classes, from the burocratic and technocratic power production, in the public sector as well in the private one. The industrial society has not eliminated the classes conflict neither between capital and work in order to attend the consolidation of centralized decisory power, in which technology is a preponderant factor.

In fact, the nature and the conflict's power have varied, dissembled in a supposed decisory power divison. Technology is considered to be the main factor, considering that capital and work have a new aspect as social opposites: unemployment and techonology, knowlegde and ignorance, poverty and concentration of wealth, with its severe consequences.

The present crisis' understanding, which place the national sovereign State in a central position, may only be reached when the cause connection between Power and Ideology; Ideology and Culture; Power and Culture; Ideology and Technique; Social Work Division and Power may be established.

Nowadays, George W. Bush continues the proposal of his father when he stretches the North American Army Force to the world, preaching the battle of Good that is said to be represented, against the Evil. In order to do that, he argues to take democracy to the countries where, according to his purposes, are not democratic.

The world, in this new order, lives in permanent instability. Every new world order ends itself, a intention to be enduring. The Westfalia Peace lasted one hundred and fifty years, the international system decided at the Viena Congress lasted one hundred years, the order characterized by the Cold War lasted fourty years. As we see, the world orders have lasted less and less despite its eternal aspirations.

In the 21st century, technology strongly prevails, but without losing the ideological component. The ideology that fights the national sovereign State; that defends the false economic competition instead of cooperation; that defends a system of political economy which

30

transfers wealth from poor nations to rich ones; where human being is not placed in the center of the process.

As the ideology of all ideologies, the process of consolidation of anglo-saxonic hegemony searches to perpetuate the strongest one's predominance under the weak one. It searches to keep the peripheral nations as commodities and raw material suppliers, benefiting the most industrialized and developed ones.

The structure that sustains the new order or the modernity is supported by a huge heap of technical and scientific knowledge, but that restricts the access, to each individual, to only what is determined by the system. Even in these work, learning and achievement conditions, the individual has the sensation of happiness. It is because, since birth, he was conditioned, being satisfaction and happiness given, as says Lorenz, by psycho-pharmacological means.

A domination structure, made possible by technics and owner of a doctrine system tends, through time, to develop its own mechanisms directed to eliminate any reaction.

In consequence, nations become vulnerable, State is despised, the actual insatisfactions of the peoples grow, become ou of control and the governments become fragile to conduct and build the countries future.

A country, in our conception, is a dialectic being, having two dimensions: space and culture. The space dimension is represented by a delimited geographical area, of political sovereignty. The culture dimension is represented by the cultural field, more or less homogeneous, and undelimited. Culture is the responsible for the national unity, and this shows its fundamental importance to sovereignty and survival of the nation.

This also shows why the culture dimension is the most important among the long-term social determinantes, although there can be or persist an indetermination as to the exact moment in which culture is determinant for the nations' evolution odr dissolution.

However, this takes us to a question that I consider essential and it´s necessary to explain, which is hidden in the transformations that are occurring in the world. It is the duality between the national or cultural identity and the modern or new order.

This duality takes all of us to a deadlock: or we modernize ourselves or we abandon what we are, or we maintain ourselves as we are, or we don´t modernize. This is a deadlock that brings serious consequences and, for that, I would like to set down some thougths.

It is about the generalized insistence on affirming that the mentioned modernity would constitute for us, Brazilians and Chinese, a paradigm, a new and promising paradigm. In my opinion, in order to understand our countries' problems, not in the way that it is said to us, as a new paradigm, but as *a* paradigm's veil. In fact, it is something that has to do with the paradigm, but not with the paradigm properly said, but with its hidding.

We all agree to go towards modernity searching the control of the scientific and technological universe that is necessary and fundamental to attending the necessities of humanity. We all agree that, if we don´t have the means provided by science and technique, we will end being dominated by the central cultures and owners of ample scientific and technical control, even more that we already are. For that, we all want to modernize. There is no one who does not want it.

Concerning the function of culture in a nation, it is necessary to break the duality sometimes political, sometimes economical, that obstruct the profound understanding of the long term historical process in which we all are closely and dramatically envolved, and that places intellectuality, which is preocupied with the future of our countries, in profound depression; the necessity of adapting the strategic knowledge to our reality, therefore, to our culture. We are discussing the countless and endless armed conflicts spreading all over the world.

Conflicts that, in Xie Wenging's words (Wenging, 2004), are "motivated by factors as national and religious contradictions, territorial disputes and for resources, struggle for power and external intervention, hegemony and political power. These factors, even though are present, reflect the mainly cultural grounds of such conflicts, and that may not be hidden any longer.

In order to have a more precise idea about this issue, it is worthy comparing a developed, central, hegemonic society, to a peripheral society. A developed central society has necessarilly these three aspects in a well articulated form. It needs to have a solid

culture. It has an economical dynamism, and these two dimensions will find a balance or a dialetic composition at political level.

When we compare this society to a peripheral society such as ours, what will we find? We will see that the economical side of a peripheral society is the one which receives more influence from the economical center. So, what happens? In the peripheral society, the economical activity acquires a bigger dynamism than the culture would allow. It is because it begins to exist a process of productive accumulation in a certain sector, quality demands to attend even the central demands. So the economical center receives a dynamism that is induced from the outside.

Somehow such sector becomes the most developed aspect of a underdeveloped country. The economic aspect is exactly the most developed. It creates a very severe problem, for, not having a cultural consistency, the society does not have a social and cultural dimension that supports that dynamism. And what happens? The culture loses this joining function of society. The culture begins to receive the separating influence of the economic side. It becomes the function of the economy. So, there is no way to make a dialetic composition at the political level because the economical overcomes the cultural. So, what happens? The politics become pure reflex of the economic interests. It places exactly in the marxist scheme of economical infrastructure and cultural superstructure. It well shows what is the condition of underdevelopment. It is a degradation because, strictly speaking, it is every peripheral society that becomes part of the central country's economy. So, this is a degradation. An underdeveloped country is not the developed one in a prior stage or smaller or things like this. It is an ontological degradation as all of its being becomes part of the economical being of the other.

Thus, we can easily understand that it is difficult to get out of this situation without a cultural reinforcement. It is from the cultural that it is possible to restore the strength of identity, the social cohesion, for counterbalance the induced economical dynamism in order to have a composition at political level, and that the political will not be only an effort of economical domination. This is more than clear, and shows exactly the reason because it is important to

hide the culture dimension from the society. In short, without culture there is no salvation (Sampaio, 1993).

Reduced only to its political and economical dimensions, man and society are inevitably mutilated in their essence and, therefore, in their producing potentials. We also believe that the emphasis that will be given here to certain logical and philosophical determinants may constitute, by itself, in the most fertile strategic, not only to understand the specific aspects and meaning of culture, but also for prior comprehension of other two social being's dimensions: the economical and the political as well as the complex scheme that articulates it.

This is important to emphasize the real value of culture as fundamental and essential factor of national unity so attacked on the present days and less noticed by all. The preservation of culture is a survival question for the nation. For that, I understand that the cultural dimension is not considered when international security questions are discussed.

Concerning the September 11th 2001's attack, in New York and Washington D.C., President George W. Bush qualified the terrorist attack against the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, not as an attack against the United States of America, but as an attack against humanity. It brought profound consequences. Bush differed that terrorist attack from many other ones occurred in different world's places, and, thus, intended to pressure other countries to participate in the "cruzade against the evil", and justify the military cruzade that followed and that motivated the initiatives for transforming international security.

The Cold War has ended, but the maniqueism continues. The world is divided between the good and the evil. Between who are and who are not terrorists. It has constructed a new cruzade. The new Holy War makes visible the four Knights of Armageddon. The innocent victims of this cruzade against terrorism, identified or not, are considered as colateral effects. Life becomes not worthy for the ones who are not born on the side of the ones who propose to end the evil.

In "The Art of War", Sun Tzu, with his milenar chinese culture, teach us that "if we know the enemy and ourselves, we

will be victorious a hundred times, but if it does not happen, our battles will be counted by our defeats". This is a fundamental tought, but perhaps less understood or interpreted as the way the world sees it, which dominates the thought in most of the countries nowadays.

When we discuss such a sensitive theme as terrorism, we must remember Sun Tzu's words, and know the culture, history, reasons that motivate, essentially, the honesty in the will of the ones who say to want, in fact, the end of terrorism, in order to become possible the end of it, which perhaps do not please not even the terrorists themselves.

On the historical point of view, we know political, "criminal", and cultural terrorism. The political one could be the State and the ideology. The "criminal" one, like this denominated for not knowing another name, reffers to what is done by bandits, ordinary criminals. The cultural one, that I consider relevant in terms of historical process, from living and relating between nations. This way, the cultural motivated terrorism is what interest us, which I understand as the main agent of international insecurity.

What has been denominated as international terrorism, for instance, to that that has been designated in a metonymic way [3] such as *Al Qaeda* has no political pretension to establish a State-Nation. It would be more appropriate to denominate it as terrorist. Terrorist of cultural conflict, even that it is given political meaning.

We know that terrorism does not limit to attacks, kidnapping, and selective or undiscriminated deaths. It also exists under the form of campaign of hate or demonization, sermons, literature, articles in the press, radios programs, cinema, and television. This type of terrorism intends to reach and conquest minds and hearts of individuals in the way to make them think and act as the promoters of this type of terror want.

Concerning this, Noam Chomsky has told us that: "terrorism, as the major part of deadly arms, is, above all, the arm of the powerful ones. When it is intended the opposite, it is

---

[1] Using the name of one thing for that of another with which it is closely associated, like cause and effect. For instance, flag and fatherland.

only because the powerful ones control equally the ideological and cultural equipment that allows its terror to appear something else, and not terror" (Chomsky, 2001).

Walter Benjamin also illustrates well this situation when he says that: "There is no document of civilization that is not also a document of cruelty. And as itself is not exempt of cruelty, it is not in the process of cultural transmission too, throught it falls in the hads of a culture in the other" (Morin, 1995).

Undeniably, we are, at the beginning of the 21st century, confortably settled in, watching the terror of war, and the war of terror, even if worried with the unexpectable (or as we know, expectable) consequences. It is all justified by the will of imposing a will. However, I understand that it is necessary to return the thought to indentify the motivation of this total insanity or to the fundaments of this crazy and irrational way of acting, even if it is because of a process that has its own logic.

The facing of cultures, and, in many cases, the cultural confrontation demands decisive actions that aims the national security protection. This begging of 21st century, characterized by speed, favours the tendency of the most fragile cultures' deterritorialization.

The lack of support to a culture's basis is like a death sentence: culture disappears without traces. The societies lose their values, the notion of solidarity, deterritorialize and split themselves. At last they can consolidate as new political unities which will constitute with their own political-geographical borders in the territory within which the confronted culture is set. It means the tendency to fragmentation and to consequent national dissolution.

The projection or imposition of a culture, as a whole, above another is only possible when there are no defense mechanisms which can keep its integrity. Therefore, primitive societies are the most vulnerable.

The cultural interference has its action manly directed to the overcoming of a people's soul above another one's, grounded on the territoriality content of cultures. The culture's territoriality tonic shows the fundamental importance of the nationality that is

attached to it. Territory is indispensable to culture and has with it a biunivocal relationship. Culture is essential to the maintenance of territorial integrity, which made possible its vigour and creativity.

We can consider the cultural interference as a strategic instrument. Considering strategy an art, cultural interference is a weapon. A silent and efficient weapon. As the relationships between nations are mainly conflituous and as the debates agenda is set by geopolitics and national interests, cultural interference is a weapon which transcends wartimes. What predominate, in fact, are the nations interests.

We know that culture is shaping the cohesion, integration, desintegration and conflict standards through the historic process. It's not difficult to verify that the world politic is being set up following cultural lines, although intending to be economical. When speaking about culture, in this aproaching, it's necessary to mention Joseph Nye, when states that there is a strong link between culture and power and that the existence of this link is unknown by almost everybody.

When, in 1987, the United Nations General Assembly adopted a resolution against terrorism, Honduras did not vote, and the United States and Israel were against the resolution. Why were they contrary to the resolution against terrorism? To Chomsky, this happened because of a paragraph of the resolution, which showed that the peoples' right to fight against colonialist regimes and military ocupations was not contemplate.

Months before dying, the President of Siria Hafez al Assad was pressioned by the ex-president Bill Clinton to join a world campaign against terrorist organizations.

Charged of financing terrorist groups in the Middle East, Al Assad demonstrated happiness with this invitation, but settled an invincible obstacle to the United States of America. He wanted an universal definition of terrorism, which would serve not only to judge the behaviour of groups, but also of States, specially Israel.

The dicotomic divisions of the world, between good and evil sides, are equal to ridiculous. The thoughts of terrorist leaders and of the western economy leaders have much in common. The

terrorist actions hit, destroy and kill, as much as the actions of the so called "invisible hand", responsible for the free competition which brings to despair, destruction and death of many.

Geopolitics alerts us that the one that rules the Heartland, or the Eurasia's heart, shall rule the world. The USA already siege the region, with the complacence of Russia, setting a new condominium of power and domination. However, this siege can make impossible the development of that region, bedide compromising the security of Russia, India and China, as I told you in our former meeting.

The economy of terror, supported by the production way proper to modernity, and the islamic terrorism are ruled, both of them, by the same logic. Therefore, the non industrialized nations watch and suffer the consequences of the economy's terror and of the terror's economy, which cause serious and unrepairable to the peripherical societies.

The single thought is nowadays being strengthened as the mode of directing, validating and universalizing of the values of the hegemonic culture, of modernity.

The countries that are not involved, directly or indirectly, to terrorism, or do not follow the proposal of submission to the anglo-saxon culture, must be alert to the terror of war and the war of terror, because they will hit those who do not want to quit being what they are, or that want to keep neutrality and preserve their culture. Therefore, it's important to remember the meaning of the *Brave New World* of Aldous Huxley and the *Eternal Peace* of Kant.

All of this become more serious when Bush declares, as Stalin did, that who is not with the United States of America is automatically against them. This is a form of coercing the different sovereign national States who compose the international community, so they join or support decisions and actions about what thay do not have any control or even interest.

It's been declared war on terror. For a long time war informations and scenes are censured. The news are controled and information constructed according to predominant interests.

It is established a process to demonize the enemy, reinforcing the maniqueism, aiming to consolidate the political

speech on the proposal to join society for not saving tears and sweat to face the conflict, even if what really happen is unknown.

The Defense Secretary of United States, Donald H. Rumsfeld, declared that the enemies are strived to deny to free people the opportunity of living how they wish. Who knows the terror of war denies his words.

This war undertaken by the United States, having England as a partner, against an undetermined enemy, leads to the danger of making them equal to the enemy they want to fight. In this kind of battle against the terrorism, the State turns into a terrorist State. Defining war in this dimension, the difference between the internal enemy and the external one no more exists.

The violence wave that devastates the countries and the major part of the world is a consequence of the generalized lack of sense to life that prevails in the minds and hearts of human beings, specially of the young ones.

For that reason, there is an urgent necessity to restore an utopic thought under the possibility of not having more sense to the individuals' lives. It is urgent to reconquest a sense for life. Therefore, we need a Utopia.

The anti-terror international war must not be a war that justifies an explicit military participation of countries that may use the terrorism theme to lead an internal and external politics of their strategic interest neither stimulate the involvement in others. It is fundamental to know the reasons that take people to the terror war as well as the real interests of who create the war to end the terror war.

If there is not a generalized opposition to the irrestrict terror of war and of the war of terror, the world will be vanished by a level of violence never seen before whose consequences will compromise humanity.

As we see, the current transformations in international security do not benefit peace. What is in question – and it is discussed – is the national culture question, the national identity. For more than ten years, the national identity (culture) is discussed at Universities and at study centers in the United States. France intends to preserve its culture. We do not worry about it. Perhaps, we do not even realize what it is neither what culture means to the unity and to the future of the nation.

The biggest transformations to be done in international security would begin with the preservation and autonomy of the national cultures. UN, through UNESCO[2], already produces

---

[2] UNESCO, through International Comission for the Study of Communication Problems, published, in 1980, a document entitled " Many Times. Only One World", in which proposes what is called the " New Order of World Information". The " World Commission's Report of Culture and Development", UNESCO's report, published in 1995, presents and proves the big evil that is attempted by the world power controlers against humanity, specially against the peripheral nations, not yet totally developed.

The report proposes many steps to aim culture. This is relevant because the existence of such a nation, the national unity and the nationality are constructed under the people's culture. We must not forget that the individual is loyal to his native land, to his country, to his nation because he, above all, is loyal to his culture, which is the culture of his nation. It is because the individual is, before anything, his own culture. For such reason, the system of control and domination intends to interfere in national culture, in order to be able to aim its goals.

Among many proposed steps is the creation of a Court intended for discussing cultural rights' violations. The Court would create a cultural code, which would be the base to define the cultural rights' violations. Some questions are important and need to be cleared. To whom interests the existence of a Court with such proposal of acting? Who would define the principals, the rules, and the legislation to be followed? The weaker countries, with meaningless national power would have enough power to set their position? How is it possible to judge any type of issue conected to national culture? Is it possible to discuss cultural question, which is the nations' essence, in a Court? How can we talk about cultural rights? Being culture the essence of each social group, of each nation, how would be possible to create an universal ethic above cultural ethics, in order to serve as a model to judge them?

The report intends to justify its attitude and its intention, with the creation of an universal ethic. This ethic must go on top of all the ethical cultures, and will have the decisory power about what qualifies, differs, characterizes the essence of social groups and nations. The individual would be strongly affected by what most characterizes him, by what constitutes his essence as he is his culture.

Terrifying, however, is the fact that the international code of behaviour is a legal instrument. It is intended for treating crimes. When the inclusion of "cultural crimes" is proposed to the "code of crimes against peace", it is created a criminal culture code, as states Carvalho (Carvalho, 1997). The tragic consequences are clear to everyone. The system of control and domination obtains, thus, "legitimacy" and receives a legal basis to exist "legaly".

40

something like that. When cultures, prisioners at the present moment, without a future, have autonomy, perhaps we will be able to have conditions to understand and diminish considerably the conflicts. Who knows, that with the appropriate relationship between strong, weak, different cultures, every country will be able to dedicate their effort to a construction of a better world, where cooperation would be the instrument to get over the necessity of living according to fear, and to the security of some that creates the insecurity of others.

Wang Chuanjing, in "International Counter-Terrorism Situation and Features", and Xin Wenging, in "The Main Characteristics of Current International Situation and My Preliminary Views", presented studies in our last meeting, in 2004, in Beijing, propose five principals to a peaceful coexistence and a new concept of security: "mutual trust, mutual benefits, equality, cooperation, and coordenation". To these, I would add nations self-determination. I understand that these five, now six principles, would be the base to construct a new and promising international environment, where all the nations would have conditions to development, security, and construction of prosperity. The most developed and the less developed would be all equal concerning rights and opportunities to construct their future in a peaceful coexisting environment. With this, fewer armed conflicts would happen. We would not have neither terror war nor the terror of war.

Bibliography

Bartholo Jr, Roberto. 1986. *Labirintos do Silêncio*. Ed. Marco Zero / COPPE-UFRJ. São Paulo.

_____. 1992. *A dor de Fausto*. Ed. Revan. Rio de Janeiro.

Canclini, Nestor Garcia. 1995. *Consumidores e cidadãos*. Editora Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro. Rio de Janeiro.

Chesterton, Gilbert Keith. 1958. *Ortodoxia*. Livraria Tavares Martins. Porto.

Chomsky, Noam. 2001. *Terrorismo, a arma dos poderosos.* Le Monde Diplomatique. Dezembro 2001.

Chuanjing, Wang. 2004. *International Counter-Terrorism Situation and Features*. CIISS. Beijing. China.

Coelho de Sampaio, Luis Sérgio. 1997. *Multiculturalismo: a insidiosa verdade do inimigo*. Rio de Janeiro.

_____. 1998. *A Grande Tarefa de Nosso Tempo: uma nova filosofia* in Revista Brasileira de Filosofia, fasc, 189. São Paulo.

_____. 1999/A. *Acerca da lógica e da cultura*. Rio de Janeiro.

_____. 1999/E. *A história da cultura segundo Toynbee, Tillich, Hegel e Marx*. Rio de Janeiro.

_____. 1999/G. *Crítica da Modernidade*. Rio de Janeiro.

_____. 1999/I. *Considerações Gerais sobre a História da Cultura*. Conferência na Universidade de Brasília do evento anúncio do Programa do Laboratório de Estudos do Futuro. Brasília.

_____. 1999/M. *Crítica da modernidade* in Filosofia da Cultura. Rio de Janeiro.
_____. 2001/1998. *Desejo, fingimento e subversão na história da cultura*. In Filosofia da Cultura – Brasil, luxo ou originalidade. Editora 34. (No prelo). Rio de Janeiro.

Cuche, Denys. 1999. *A noção de cultura nas ciências sociais*. Editora Universidade do Sagrado Coração. Bauru.

Earle, Edward Mead. 1973. *Adam Smith, Alexander Hamilton, Friederich* .

Featherstone, Mike. 1994. *Cultura Global*. Editora Companhia das Letras. São Paulo.

Freyer, Hans. 1965. *Teoria da Época Atual*. Zahar Editores. Rio de Janeiro.

Ghalioun, Burthan. 1996. *La Déstabilisation du Monde* in Défense Nationale. Avril. France.

Giannotti, José Arthur. 2001. *A ocultação do real* in jornal Folha de São Paulo, caderno Mais de 7 de agosto de 2001. São Paulo.

Geertz, Clifford. 1989. *A interpretação das culturas*. Livros técnicos e científicos editora. Rio de Janeiro.

Henry, Paul. 1937. *Le Probléme des nacionalités*. Librairie Armand Colin. Paris.

Huntington, Samuel P. 1997. *O choque de civilizações*. Ed. Objetivo. Rio de Janeiro.

Kissinger, Henry. 1984. *Diplomacy*. Ed. Simon & Chuster. New York.

KURZ, Robert. 1997. *Os Últimos Combates*. 2ª edição. Ed. Vozes. Petrópolis.

_____. 2001. *O Ímpeto suicida do capitalismo* in Folha de São Paulo. Caderno Mais. São Paulo.

Laloup, J. et Nélis J. 1955. *Culture et Civilization*. Ed. Casterman. Paris.

Latouche, Serge. 1994. *A ocidentalização do mundo*. Editora Vozes. Petrópolis.

Marcuse, Herbert. 1967. *Ideologia da Sociedade Industrial*. Zahar Editores. Rio de Janeiro.

Morin, Edgar & Kern, Anne Brigitte. 1995. *Terra-Pátria*. Editora Sulina. Porto Alegre.

Morin, Edgar. 1996. *Ciência com Consciência*. Ed. Bertrand Brasil. Rio de Janeiro.

North-South. 1980. *A Program for Survival*. 1980. The MIT Press. Cambridge. Massachusetts.

Petras, James. 1995. *Ensaios Contra a Ordem*. Ed. Scritta. São Paulo.

Santos, Jorge Calvario dos. 2000. *Dimensões da Globalização*. Centro Brasileiro de Estudos Estratégicos Editora. Rio de Janeiro.

Spengler, Oswald. 1993. *O Homem e a Técnica*. Guimarães Editores. Lisboa. Portugal.

_____. 1982. *A Decadência do Ocidente*. Ed. Universidade de Brasília. Brasília.

Sontag, Suzan. 2001. *O cálculo da dor* in jornal Folha de São Paulo, caderno Mais de 23 de julho de 2001. São Paulo.

Toynbee, Arnold J. 1953. *Um estudo da história*. Editora W. M Jackson Inc. São Paulo.

Wenqing, Xie. 2004. *The Main Characteristics of Current Situation and My Preliminary Views*. CIISS. Beijing. China

Zizek, Slavoj. 2001. *Controle do desejo, mundo virtual, capitalismo virtual* in jornal Folha de São Paulo, caderno Mais de 23 de julho de 2001. São Paulo.

高級戰略學院與中國國際戰略學會研討會本文

高級戰略學院, 里約, 2005 年 6 月 2 日

巴西中國於 2005 年戰略形勢和國際安全的改變

喬治聖多士 Jorge Calvario dos Santos, 博士

人類歷史的特點是一連串的危機. 於本世紀初的世界性危機是個異常現象, 它帶來的變化擊中各國政治,經濟,文化的結構.

此歷史性時刻, 因世界處於唯一的文化霸權尖端, 人類進展階段受到困難.

我們生活的時代是"行星鐵器時代", 按莫林(Edgar Morin) 說法. 此命名有適當的理由, 因為世界西方化過程也有一段時日, 幾乎絕大部份的理念來自同一根源, 同一想法; 因文化引起的全面戰爭, 說穿了是達到不更新天然資源的無限供應; 人類絕望了, 因為夢想泡湯, 帶領我們到理想世界的固定目標不復存在; 經濟全球化, 表面追求世界標準, 實際文化介入使弱國服從; 世界虛假了, 事實需求不討論, 以一種說法為準; 獨一思想鞏固, 人類走向哈克斯雷(Aldous Huxley)著作的"神奇新世界".

仔細觀察, 不難發展全世界唯一倫理道德正努力建立中. 每一個國家的精華和團結的基本條件: 文化, 將受到囚禁.

20 世紀末和 21 世紀初, 財富和權利集中是前所未有. 如此一來, 世界性重要決定和科學技術知識被壟斷.

現今危機跟以前的不同在其實心,廣泛,同時, 其不穩定因素介入全球地理位置. 橫豎不定的擴散行動, 使各國關係矛盾加深, 時常造成困惑和痛苦.

一個現象常沒人發覺: 前所未有的決定權集中. 資金逐漸集中和科學技術的壟斷而不民主化造成理論上思想終點, 譬如法蘭斯(Francis Fukuyama)的"歷史終點"中說新自由主義是人類社會發展的最終階段.

我們生活在一個以自我為中心的疏忽狀態, 想壟斷決定權. 基於弱肉強食理論, 弱者的天然資源無條件轉讓給強者. 因為富有的工業國家自認有權利在其它有自主權的國家立法, 自列"唯一拯救人類的方法". 此疏忽狀態代表著"歷史終點"中最後階段的轉變, 也就是歷史終結.

正是達到唯一霸權統治下的科學方式. 工業社會下的產品, 人不是主要目地. 以極限的利潤和效率為觀點, 結果是: 工作劃分普遍, 社會階層過度分界, 工家私人官僚風氣過盛. 為了鞏固中央決權, 雖有科技輔助, 工業社會中資金勞工的糾紛無法消除.

事實上, 中央決權的劃分加深糾紛的性質和力量. 主要因素有技術,資金,勞工. 另一方面有財富集中造成的失業,愚昧,貧窮.

瞭解現今危機, 應以國家為中心點, 分析以下因果關係: 權力與觀念; 觀念與文化; 權力與文化; 觀念與技術; 權力與勞動社會階層.

現今, 總統布希(George W. Bush)繼承其父親的執政, 把美國軍力擴散於全世界, 使用藉口是美國民主善良, 打擊所謂邪惡不民主的國家.

於此新規律之下, 世界長期動盪不安. 所有世界新規律, 企圖永久. 西法拉(Westfalia)和平歷時 150 年, 維也納(Viena)國際條約維持 100 年, 冷戰 40 年. 我們看出, 世界規律原意長久, 但事實越來越短.

21 世紀是科技世紀, 但不能撇開觀念成分. 此觀念指打擊國家自主權; 維護經濟競爭但不合作; 維護窮國天然資源無條件轉讓給富國; 人被擱置一旁, 理應居中.

所有觀念中的主觀念, 安格魯撒克遜族的霸權維護過程找永久性弱肉食, 把邊緣國當作工業發展國家的原料供應站.

新規律結構枝撐在巨大的科學技術知識上, 但僅限於執權系統規定那些人可擁有. 如此學習條件, 可擁有技術的人有滿足成就感. 按羅隆斯(Lorenz)說法, 這些技術人員的滿足從一出生就由經神藥物來達成.

一個經由技術和準則的統治器具, 長時期的傾向是發展一個毫無反應的機構.

如此一來, 一個民族脆弱的不堪一擊, 國家被輕視, 人民不滿有增無減, 政府無實力領導建設.

我們對國家的理解是兩尺度間論政. 一尺度是空間, 另一尺度是文化. 空間代表領土, 也就是具有執政權的地理面積. 文化由一個地區習慣為代表, 不等於執政面積, 是一個國家組成的基本單位, 所以文化是民族生存和獨立重要條件.

　　相對之下, 文化尺度於長時期社會演變脫穎而出, 雖然有時無法確定某文化對一個民族的演變或消失時間.

　　我個人認為必要澄清一個中心問題, 此問題隱藏在世界的變化中, 那是國家,文化身份雙重性, 或者說現代化,新規律.

　　這雙重性引我們到一個二叉口: 革新現代化或維持現狀. 決擇將帶來重大的影響, 我個人有以下的觀點.

　　關於普遍堅持巴西或中國現代化是典型範例. 我認為應當先明白我們各國的問題所在, 再推動現代化, 而不是依照他方認定的典型範例. 實際上相關, 但不是第三者所言, 而是靠自己努力.

　　無人不想走向現代化, 尋找科學,技術的掌握, 以應人類的需要. 大家都同意若無科技, 我們將會被科技發達的國家駕馭. 所以大家都無例外的走向現代化, 全盤掌握科技.

　　關於文化於民族的作用, 政治和經濟皆不利於一個歷史過程的全面瞭解, 憂心於我們國家未來的知識分子沮喪了; 必須改變戰略思想來適應現實文化. 我們正討論全世界無數的武裝糾紛.

　　謝文慶認為糾紛的原因有: 國家宗教矛盾, 領土爭奪, 天然資源, 權力爭奪, 外力介入和政治權或. 更進一步的說法, 糾紛的因素皆反應於文化背景.

　　為澄清我上述看法, 可以拿兩個社會做比較: 一個發達, 另一個周邊. 發達社會必有三個關連因素: 文化悠久, 經濟活力, 政治結構平穩.

　　相較之下, 一個像我們的周邊社會, 經濟受發達社會影響, 甚至指使. 如此一來, 經濟活動力量超出文化所能包容. 資金集中過程開始, 某部門增加生產, 應發達社會的品質要求. 所以經濟活力由外界來訂.

　　這部門或許會成為未發展國家最發達的平面. 經濟開發, 沒有牢固的社會文化支持, 產生不可忽略的問題. 這樣, 文化起不了統一社會的作用, 文化變成經濟產品, 文化無法與政治配合. 這樣下去, 政治成為經濟利益的縮影. 這是馬克斯思想中的超文化結構和經濟底層結構. 這就是低發展階段, 是自我降級. 因為整個社會成為強國的一部份. 低發展國家概念不是發達國家的前期, 是本體降級, 因為它完全聽從其他國家使喚.

　　簡單明瞭的說, 就是加強文化, 文化重建身分, 團結社會, 抵抗外來經濟統治, 配合政治. 精髓: 文化拯救民族.

　　如何定義文化? 人文風情? 哲學說法是社會的各體, 如何定義社會? 我個人偏好從政治經濟角度來看文化, 各體組成社會, 社會中具領導地位主政治, 各体生存帶動經濟.

　　文化的重要性由此而出, 維護文化是民族生存的問題. 我認為談國際安全問題該由文化說起.

　　關於 2001 年 9 月 11 日事件, 布希總統評世貿中心和五角大廈是攻擊全人類, 而不是只攻美國. 布希堅持此事件有別於其它世界各地發生的恐怖攻擊, 結果世界各地受壓力派兵參加所謂"打擊邪惡", 來解釋武裝行動. 國際安全轉變由此開始.

　　冷戰結束, 但糾紛繼續. 世界被分為善良與邪惡, 正義與恐怖, 新戰爭又開始. 新聖戰使我聯想到聖經新約啓示錄中的四騎士. 打擊恐怖份子的無辜受害者被命為"副作用". 對提議根除邪惡的人, 他人生命無價值.

　　有千年歷史的孫子兵法教導我們, "知彼知己, 百戰百勝". 如此簡單的道理, 當今世上幾乎沒有國家明白.

　　恐怖份子如此敏感的話題, 應想到孫子兵法: 認識文化,歷史及打擊恐怖份子的原因. 另一方面也得考慮提出根除者的誠意.

　　從歷史角度, 我們有政治恐怖, "罪犯"和文化恐怖. 政治代表國家, 罪犯觸及法律, 文化屬民族之間的糾紛. 當今世上國際不安全屬於文化恐怖份子.

　　國際恐怖份子現被認定為 Al Qaeda, 它沒有建立國家的傾向, 所以稱它為恐怖份子. 有時被誤稱為政治恐怖份子, 事實是文化恐怖份子.

　　我們明白這些恐怖份子活動範圍不限於攻擊,綁架或制造集體死亡. 他們也利用仇恨, 布道, 書籍, 印刷刊, 播音台, 電視來籠絡人心. 如此收買人心好為首領效命.

　　喬安(Noam Chomsky)說: 如大部份的致命武器, 恐怖主義是有效的武器. 從 另一方面想, 有權勢的人同樣控制足以致命的器具, 如文化,思想,武器. 差別微妙, 有權勢的恐怖不叫恐怖, 另有其它名稱.

　　便加明(Walter Benjamin)也說: 人類文明記載充滿野蠻. 兩文化之間接觸, 起衝突, 無可避免野蠻, 皆無清白者.

46

逢 21 世紀初，不可否認，大部份的人安樂的觀賞恐怖戰爭，一小部份關心戰況．此戰爭有某高壓意志引起，我們應該思考戰爭背後的真正原因，洞悉狀況，查核此過程是否有邏輯．

　　文化相對必求保護國家文化的決心．於 21 世紀初，弱文化有被侵蝕的傾向．

　　沒有文化為雄厚的底子有如死刑判決．文化消失無痕跡，社會失去價值，道德觀念失散．最後，會有新政治單位取代消失的文化，此所謂國家滅亡．

　　只有在缺乏防禦設施的情況下，某文化有可能用高壓手段制服另一個文化．所以原始社會較脆弱．

　　文化干涉從人民思想著手，通常有遼闊的領土支持．文化和領土之間有緊密的關連：文化存在需領土，領土健壯文化，文化維持領土的完整．

　　我們認為文化干涉是戰略器具，假如戰略是藝術，文化干涉是武器，一個安靜有效的武器．國家之間的來往時有糾紛，討論項目由地理政治和國家利害來訂．文化干涉可說是戰爭以外的武器．事實國家的利益居支配地位．

　　我們知道文化在歷史過程中締造團結，聯合，糾紛，滅亡等標準．雖有經濟因素，世界政治仍由文化支使．約瑟夫(Joseph Nye)提醒我們，文化和權力有扣扣住．

　　1987 年聯合國會議表決反恐怖份子條約，宏都拉斯棄權，美國和以色列反對．為什麼反對？因為條約中有一段落指出不討論人民反軍事佔領或殖民主義的戰鬥權．

　　敘利亞總統 Hafez Al Assad 臨死前數月被美國前任總統克林頓說服加入反恐怖份子世界性運動．

　　被指控提供中東恐怖集團資金，Al Assad 接受邀請，但開出個美國無法接受的條件：給恐怖主義下定義，不只審判集團行為，包括國家，暗指以色列．

　　世界分成善良與邪惡是可笑的，恐怖份子首領的思路和西方領袖相同：兩者皆武裝攻擊，摧毀，殘殺，如所謂的"隱形手"．

　　地理政治警告我們統治世界必先佔領中東．美國已駐軍該地區，蘇俄默認，統治權有雛型．如果大家無言，駐軍會破壞中東發展，危及中國,印度,蘇俄等國安全．

　　恐怖主義的經濟自給自足．伊斯蘭恐怖手段也是同邏輯，所以未工業化的周邊國家承受戰爭帶來的經濟恐慌．

　　唯一思想由此鞏固，霸權文化稱王，所有價值由中央社會為準．

　　至於那些沒被恐怖主義搬入的國家，他們不服從安格魯撒克遜種族的指使，也必需戒備，因為中立國必有強大的武力做後盾，不然構成種族生存的威脅．在此重提哈克斯雷(Aldous Huxley)著"神奇新世界"和干特(Kant)著"永久和平"．

　　當布希聲明不贊成美國武裝行動既為反對，於它國而言，情況不利，等於逼迫國際社會參加其所不願的決定，也就是把別人當做整背．

　　向恐怖宣戰，戰場消息和情況經審查，訊息由宣戰者的利益來控制．

　　美國竭力醜化敵人，加強政權發言來團結士氣．別因士兵受傷或死亡打擊而退縮，雖然民眾不明白實際戰況進展．

　　美國國防部秘書長郎斯福(Donald Rumsfeld)聲明，敵人的目標是不讓一個自由人民過他們想要的生活．拭目以待恐怖戰爭往那走．

　　對抗一個未定的敵人，以美國為主角英國為配角的戰爭與被攻擊的敵人相等．國家變成恐怖國家．這樣的戰爭，內在和外在的敵人沒差別．

　　撼席世界大部份國家的暴力風潮，是一般人民對生命意義絕望的後果，尤其是年輕一輩的心靈．

　　所以有必要重建夢想，救復生命意義．

　　國際反恐怖戰爭不是動武侵略的藉口，也不該強迫它國參加．當先瞭解原因，到底為什麼打仗，有目標，仗才能打．

　　如果沒有國際普遍討論此無盡頭的恐怖戰爭，世界將被前所未有的暴力掃蕩，結果連累全人類．

　　我們看出現今國際安全轉變無益和平，大家不討論的問題是民族文化，民族身份．法國尋找維護文化，我們不擔心，有時我們關心藝術文化的表現．可能我們未察覺文化對國家團結和未來的意義．

　　國際安全大轉變從保護民族文化開始．聯合國教育科學及文化組織(UNESCO)已著手，當各文化有自主權，或許我們可減少糾紛，有可能強,弱,不同文化之間從適當的交流，使所有國家走向努力建設美好世界，合作是克服害怕的工具．

　　2004 年北京研討會中，王川敬(音譯 Wang Chuanjing)的"國際反恐怖形勢及特徵"與謝文慶(音譯 Xie Wenqing)的"當前國際形勢的主要特點及初步看法"提議安全新觀念，和平共處五原

則:"互信, 互惠, 平等, 合作, 協調". 另可加上民族自決. 我認為此六原則是建立新國際環境的基礎, 所有國家有條件發展, 建設, 繁榮. 無論發達, 發展中, 低發達國家皆和平共處, 各擁有同樣的權利和建設的機會. 這樣, 糾紛磨擦不再發生, 恐怖戰爭不存在, 為大同世界.

參考書目共 39 項.

後言

聯合國教育科學及文化組織(UNESCO)國際信息問題研究委員會於 1980 年公怖"多次, 唯一世界", 提議世界信息新規律.

UNESCO1995 年公告"世界文化委員會報告". 該報告指出權力掌握者支配人類的惡行, 由其是周邊被壓迫的國家.

報告提議一連串文化方案. 這報告非常重要, 因為一個國家建立在人民文化. 我們不該忘記每個人愛國的原因是愛護民族文化, 因為人代表個體文化. 所以強烈統治最有效的手段是文化干涉.

在一連串方案中有一條設立文化侵犯法院條文, 由法院立文化規條以判決文化權力. 有些重要問題必需澄清. 文化法院的成立對誰有利? 誰立法? 誰定規則? 弱國有足夠的勢力說話嗎? 如何審判國家文化事件? 如何決定審判範圍? 如何斷定文化權力? 文化是民族根源. 如何建立全球性道德做為審判模範?

報告中用建立全球性道德來解釋它的行為. 此道德建立疑點重重, 如何用一道德規範所有民族文化? 各文化有它的特色, 文化中個人有個人的特徵.

唯恐國際法典管理介入. 高發留(Carvalho)警惕千萬別把"危害和平罪犯法"和"文化罪犯"搞混, 其不祥的結果可見: 統治管理系統獲得合法性, 有法律骨架支持它正宗存在.