

INTERVIEW: Professor Li Xing

On the China-Russia Feb. 4 Joint Statement: A Declaration of a New Era

This is an edited transcript of an interview conducted February 22, 2022 by Michelle Rasmussen of the Schiller Institute in Denmark, with Li Xing, PhD. Dr. Li is Professor of Development and International Relations in the Department of Politics and Society, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, at the Aalborg University in Denmark. Dr. Li also gave the Schiller Institute an [interview](#) January 26, 2022, titled “Cooperate with China—It Is Not the Enemy.”



Aalborg University

Professor Li Xing

China take the lead, and lay out a set of principles and a shared worldview. This is my first general summary.

Second, unlike the U.S./NATO alliance, the China-Russia relationship is described by the joint document as a “close comprehensive strategic partnership.” In Putin’s early words, he said, “The China-Russia relationship is a relationship that probably cannot be compared with anything in the world.” The relationship is not “aimed against any other countries.” It is “superior to the political and military alliances of the Cold War era,” referring to the U.S.-NATO alliance. It also echoes Xi Jinping’s recent statement, that “the relationship even exceeds an alliance in its closeness and effectiveness.” The document tries to demonstrate that the China-Russia relationship is a good example of interstate relationships.

Michelle Rasmussen: Presidents Xi Jinping and Vladimir Putin held a summit meeting on the sidelines of the Beijing Olympics and issued a statement on Feb. 4 called “Joint Statement of the Russian Federation and the People’s Republic of China on the International Relations Entering a New Era and the Global Sustainable Development.” Schiller Institute founder and international President Helga Zepp-LaRouche said that this signals a new era in international relations.

Before we go into details, Dr. Li, can you please give us your assessment of the overall importance of the summit and statement, including what it means for relations between China and Russia, and China-Russian relations with the rest of the world. And at the end of the interview, we will also discuss what it means in the current, very tense situation between Russia and NATO.

Prof. Li Xing: Thank you Michelle for your invitation. It’s my pleasure to be invited again by the Schiller Institute.

First of all, let me emphasize that it is a landmark document. Why? Because the document emphasizes what I call a “new era,” declaring a shift in the world order, to a multipolar world order, in which the U.S. and the West are not the only rule-makers, and Russia and

China take the lead, and lay out a set of principles and a shared worldview. This is my first general summary.

Joint Statement: Introduction

Rasmussen: You have characterized the introduction to the statement as “a conceptual understanding and analysis of global changes and transformations taking place in the current era.” It especially refers to the transformation from a unipolar to a multipolar world. Can you please explain how the statement addresses this, and what it means?

Prof. Li: In the beginning of this statement, it puts forward both countries’ conceptual understanding of the world order, which is characterized as—

multipolarity, economic globalization, the advent of information society, cultural diversity, transformation of the global governance architecture and world order; there is increasing interrelation

and interdependence between the States; a trend has emerged towards *redistribution of power in the world*. [emphasis added by Prof. Li]

Redistribution of power in the world: this is what the beginning part emphasizes.

Second, this part also clearly sets up a series of analyses, arguments, and discourses to demonstrate both countries' understanding, and to emphasize the fact that the world order has entered a new era. Again, "new era" are the key words for this document.

Lastly, in this beginning part of the joint statement, it shows both Russia and China's grand worldview that pave the foundation for the two countries' broad consensus on almost all issues of the world, which we will deal with one by one later on.

Joint Statement: Part 1

Rasmussen: Part 1 is about the question of democracy, and it starts by saying:

The sides [China and Russia] share the understanding that democracy is a universal human value, rather than a privilege of a limited number of States, and that its promotion and protection is a common responsibility of the entire world community.

But the charge is that China and Russia are not democratic, but rather autocratic. This is one of the leading accusations by those in the West who are trying to maintain a unipolar world. They portray the world as a battle between the democrats and the autocrats. How does the document respond to this, and treat the idea of democracy?

Prof. Li: Actually, this document utilizes a large amount of space to discuss this point.

First, the joint statement points out that "democracy"—including human rights—"is a universal human value, rather than a privilege of a limited number of States." So here it implies that the concept of democracy must not be defined by the West alone. The West

cannot singlehandedly define which country is autocratic and which country is democratic.

Second, the joint document emphasizes that their standpoint is that there is no universal one-form document, or human rights standard. Different countries have different cultures, histories, different social-political systems in a multipolar world. We have to respect the way each country chooses their own social-political system, and also the tradition of other states.

Third, it signals a strong critique of the West, and in this part, there are a lot of criticisms toward the West: That the West has a tendency to weaponize the issue of




kremlin.ru

In Beijing on Feb. 4, 2022, Presidents Vladimir Putin of Russia and Xi Jinping of China signed an historic Joint Statement, signalling a new era in international relations, Beijing, Feb. 4, 2022.

democracy and human rights, and very often uses it as a tool to interfere in other countries' internal affairs. It is completely wrong for the U.S. and the West to impose their own "democratic standards" on other countries, and to monopolize the right to assess the level of compliance with democratic criteria, and to draw a dividing line on the basis of ideology, including by establishing exclusive blocs and lines of convenience. It is very bad, according to these two countries, that the West tends to use democracy and human rights to interfere into other countries' internal affairs, and China really suffers a lot from this point.

Rasmussen: How would you say democracy works in China?

Development Corridors of China's Belt and Road Initiative



BRIX

Prof. Li: I would argue that if we use Western standards to define democracy, then definitely, China is not a democracy. In the Western version of democracy, China does not have a multi-party system; China does not have elections. But the point is: How does the West respond to the fact that according to major Western sources, survey data sources, throughout many years, that the Chinese people's confidence in their government is the highest in the whole world? And that the Chinese Communist Party and the Chinese state receive the highest approval from the Chinese population according to those data? And that China has also reached very high, rapid economic development, under the so-called "non-democratic government"? How can the West explain these issues? Many democratic countries suffer from economic backwardness and underdevelopment.

So, as to the form of governance in China, I think it is the Chinese people, themselves, who should make the judgment.

Joint Statement: Part 2

Rasmussen: Let's move on to Part 2, which is about coordinating economic development initiatives, including harmonizing the Chinese Belt and Road Initiative, and also the Russian Eurasian Economic Union (EAEU), even more, and taking initiatives to create economic development, where they emphasize the role

of scientific research in generating economic growth, something that Lyndon LaRouche and our movement have had as a priority concept. And also increasing healthcare and pandemic response in poor countries. What do you see as the significance of this call for increasing economic development cooperation?

Prof. Li: I also read this part of the document very carefully. This part shows a clear difference in approach between the West and the U.S. on the one side, and China-Russia on the other side. While the West emphasizes, or holds the flag of democracy and human rights, China-Russia actually emphasize that peace, development and cooperation lies at the core of the modern international system. So, according to the understanding of Russia and China, development is the key driver in ensuring the prosperity of other nations. Even though democracy and human rights are important, development must be the core. It implies that good development will lead a country in the direction of democracy, but not defined solely by the West's concept of democracy.

Second, following this line of understanding, China's Belt and Road Initiative and Russia's Eurasian Economic Union are good examples of interregional cooperation. They actually use the Belt and Road, and also Russia's Eurasia Economic Union, as good examples. One interesting point I want to emphasize is that



CC/Brücke-Osteuropa

Huawei Technologies and other Chinese high-tech companies have been subject to severe sanctions by the U.S.

both countries emphasize scientific and technological development, and “open, equal, and fair conditions.” I think here, there is a kind of implicit criticism toward the United States, which has been conducting sanctions against Chinese tech companies—for example, Huawei, or other high-tech companies.

Finally, I’ll remark here that both countries show their commitment to the Paris Agreement of 2015 and to combat COVID-19, and these two issues are the most vital issues for the international community today. So, it is a core for every country to emphasize these two vital issues: climate change and the Paris Agreement on the one side, and COVID-19 on the other side.

Rasmussen: I can add that Helga Zepp-LaRouche has initiated a proposal which she calls Operation Ibn Sina, which deals with the terrible humanitarian catastrophe in Afghanistan, leading off with creating a modern health system in every country. If we could get much more international cooperation for building a modern health system, having the economic development which gives the basis for the population to have the immunology to resist disease, this would be a very important field for economic development, which means life and death at this moment.

Prof. Li: I fully agree with Helga’s understanding and call.

Joint Statement: Part 3

Rasmussen: As to Part 3, this is about the increasingly dangerous international security situation, with a sharp critique of Western attitudes and actions. The statement reads:

No State can or should ensure its own security separately from the security of the rest of the world and at the expense of the security of other States.

And here, China addresses Russia’s concerns and criticizes NATO’s expansion eastward after the Fall of the Berlin Wall. And Russia addresses China’s concerns by reaffirming the One-China principle and concerns about building different regional alliances against China—the Quad (Australia-India-Japan-U.S. Quadrilateral Security Dialogue) and AUKUS (Australia-UK-U.S. security pact). It also praises the recent P5 (Permanent Five member nations of the UN Security Council: China, France, Russia, UK, and U.S.) statement against nuclear war.

Can you say more about China’s and Russia’s concerns? Do you think this is a call for a new international security architecture?

Prof. Li: Yes. If you read the document carefully, the part on international security architecture, or their understanding of international security, occupied quite a large space. So, it is a very important part for China and Russia.

In this part, the statement is actually bluntly clear about their mutual support for each other’s national security concerns. For Russia, it is connected with the Ukraine crisis. The document does not mention Ukraine specifically, but it is connected. For China, it is the Taiwan issue, definitely. So, they show their mutual support for each other.

On Russia’s concern for its national security, both countries oppose “further enlargement of NATO,” and “respect the sovereignty, security and interests of other countries.” It clearly pronounced, that there will be no peace if states “seek to obtain, directly or indirectly, unilateral military advantages to the detriment of the security of others.” The document claims that the NATO plan to enlarge its membership to encircle Russia will mean security for the Western side, but it is a danger for Russia. It is a national security concern.

On the Taiwan issue, Russia reconfirms that Taiwan is part of China—the One-China policy—and it is against any form of Taiwan independence.

Third, the joint statement also openly criticizes the formation of closed blocs, [such] as what you mentioned about the Quad. The document does not men-

tion the Quad, but it does mention AUKUS. The document shows that both countries oppose U.S.-led military camps, or security camps in the Asia-Pacific region, definitely implying the Quad and AUKUS, and it points out the negative impact of the United States Indo-Pacific strategy.

Finally, the two countries call for a new international security architecture, with an “equitable, open, and inclusive security system ... that is not directed against third countries and that promotes peace, stability, and prosperity.” So, this part is very important for China and Russia, to challenge the traditional international security architecture, and call for a new international security architecture, which I will touch on a bit later.

Joint Statement: Part 4

Rasmussen: Many political spokesmen in the West have criticized Russia and China for not adhering to the “rules-based order” and here, in Part 4, China and Russia write that they—

strongly advocate the international system with the central coordinating role of the United Nations in international affairs, defend the world order based on international law, including the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, advance multipolarity and promote the democratization of international relations, together create an even more prospering, stable, and just world, jointly build international relations of a new type.

And it continues:

The Russian side notes the significance of [Xi Jinping’s] concept of constructing a ‘community of common destiny for mankind’....

Can you say more about the significance of this section, about global governance and the difference between the question of the “rules-based order” and an order based on international law, as laid out by the United Nations Charter?

Prof. Li: Yes. This part is extremely interesting, because it touches upon the mental clashes between China-Russia on the one side, and the U.S. and West on the other side, about the “rules-based order.” As you mentioned, China, in particular, has been accused a lot by the U.S. of not following the “rules-based order.”

If you remember the dialogue between a Chinese delegation and a U.S. delegation in Alaska in December two years ago—we still remember the clash—the Chinese claimed that the U.S. rules-based order does not represent the global rules-based order. Rather, China emphasized, the United Nations should play the central coordination role in international affairs. But the United States does not really like the UN-based structure,



DoS/Ron Przsuscha

Secretary of State Antony J. Blinken and National Security Advisor Jake Sullivan meet with Foreign Minister Wang Yi and Yang Jiechi, CCP Director of the Office of the Central Commission for Foreign Affairs, in Anchorage, Alaska, on March 18, 2021.

which is based on one-country/one-vote. If we trace UN voting, we could easily find that the United States very often suffers setbacks when it comes to UN voting on many issues. That’s why China emphasizes the United Nations rules-based order, whereas United States prefers a U.S. rules-based order.

This joint statement calls for advancing multipolarity and promoting democratization of international relations. In my interpretation, democratization of international relations implies that the power structure embedded in the Bretton Woods system, which was created by the United States after the Second World War, does not really reflect the new era, as I pointed out earlier. China and Russia think reforms are needed to reflect the new era. This definitely, again, from my interpretation, refers to international financial institutions

like the World Bank, and the IMF, where Chinese voting power is proportionally weaker than it should be, according to its economic size.

The joint statement also mentions China's foreign policy, as you mentioned in your question, a "community of common destiny for mankind," which was raised by President Xi Jinping. In this nexus, China's Belt and Road Initiative is a good example, seen from China's point of view—a good example of community of common destiny for mankind, in which the Belt and Road intends to promote, through worldwide infrastructure investment, the formation of a new global economic order, through creating a community of shared interest, and a community of shared responsibilities.

Unfortunately, the West does not really like either the notion of a "community of common destiny for mankind," nor the Belt and Road Initiative, because they are interpreted as the Chinese agenda is to transform global governance and the rules-based order.

However, I really think that the West should rethink their opposition, and face the fact that a Belt and Road Memorandum of Understanding has been signed by 148 countries and by 32 international organizations. So, according to my judgment, the Belt and Road, and also the community for common destiny for mankind, have already become indispensable parts of global governance and global order.

Peace Through Economic Development

Rasmussen: Yes, this is also to underscore what you said before, about how important economic development is for the wellbeing of the countries. And here you have China, which was the first country to eliminate poverty in their country, over the last 40 years, and is offering this as a model for other countries to get economic development. The slogan of the Schiller Institute is "Peace through Economic Development,"—

Prof. Li: Exactly!

Rasmussen: The way that you can get countries that have perceived each other as enemies to rise to a new level, to seek common interest, is through arranging economic development programs, not only for a single country, but for a whole region, which encourages them to work together.

You spoke before about the Chinese criticism of the Bretton Woods institutions. The Schiller Institute and

Lyndon LaRouche have been saying that the initial idea of the Bretton Woods institutions as proposed by President Franklin Roosevelt was to generate economic development in the poorer countries. But After FDR's death, his intention degenerated into, for example, the World Bank and International Monetary Fund imposing austerity conditions on countries as a precondition for loans, and where nothing was done to actually increase the productivity of the countries, in the way that the Belt and Road is actually doing, with infrastructure development, creating the basis for the countries to become prosperous.

What we're saying is that a total change in the international financial institutions is absolutely necessary now, at a point of financial speculation blowing out and hyperinflation. We need a new economic architecture, you could say, based on the physical development of the countries.

Prof. Li: I fully agree with your remarks and comments.

A New Level in China-Relations

Rasmussen: Another important statement in Part 4, is that China-Russia relations have reached a new level, as you said at the beginning, "a new era":

The sides [China and Russia] call for the establishment of a new kind of relationship between world powers on the basis of mutual respect, peaceful coexistence and mutually beneficial cooperation. They reaffirm that the new inter-State relations between Russia and China are superior to political and military alliances of the Cold War era. Friendship between the two States has no limits, there are no "forbidden" areas of cooperation, strengthening of bilateral strategic cooperation is neither aimed against third countries nor affected by the changing international environment and circumstantial changes in third countries.

This is a plea to end the geopolitical blocs, where the two countries also call for strengthening multilateral fora, like the Shanghai Cooperation Organization, the BRICS.

Li Xing, what will this much-strengthened alliance mean for China and Russia, and also for the rest of the

world? Should we in the West be worried, or is this a plea for a new type of international relations? What are the implications for shaping the new world order? What is your conclusion from the joint statement?

Prof. Li: I think one of the purposes of the joint statement is to demonstrate the good example of the China-Russia relationship, characterized as mutual respect, peaceful coexistence, and mutually beneficial cooperation. It is not targeted at any other country. It is not like the U.S.-led coalitions which are Cold War minded, according to Russia's and China's understandings.

And if we look at the BRICS, and if you look at the Shanghai Cooperation Organization, they are not purely juridical and geopolitical organizations or alliances. They are open and non-binding.

After I read the document several times, I reached the conclusion that the unipolar world order is over. The West and the United States might have a hard time accepting it.

The joint statement shows a strong unity between Russia and China. My question is, "Where is the West's unity after the Cold War, when the unipolar world order is over? How strong is the trans-Atlantic relationship today?" I don't know the answers: I'm asking the questions to the West, the U.S. The West must rethink its Cold War strategy of reviving unity through creating enemies. I think this is a completely wrong strategy, in a multipolar world order, where countries are much more interdependent. So, it is necessary for the U.S. to rethink its own version of the rules-based order, in which the U.S. is the rule-maker and others are rule-followers. This does not work in a new era anymore. That is my conclusion after reading the joint statement.

The Destructive Effect of Sanctions

Rasmussen: Now, as to the current situation, today is Feb. 22. Yesterday, Russia recognized the two break-away republics in Ukraine as independent republics, which is now going to lead to very heavy sanctions by the West. Putin's point was that these sanctions would have come anyway, but in any case, without going into the details of the Ukraine-Russia-U.S./NATO crisis, the fact is that Russia will most probably be faced with enormously hard sanctions.

In our previous interview, I asked you if Russia were thrown out of the SWIFT financial network system, how would China react? Now, it's not only a

question of the SWIFT system, but also of other major financial penalties. In light of the joint statement, how do you see China reacting to the new sanctions against Russia, which will most probably come?

Prof. Li: Let me put it in this way: Sanctions are never one-sided punishments. Both sides will suffer. It's like President Trump's trade war. Trump thought the trade war would hurt China. It did hurt China, but it had a backlash, a backfire to the U.S. economy. And today, if you look at the U.S. economy, the inflation actually is, one way or another, connected with the trade war, as well. It was one of the outcomes.

Sanctions against Russia will also cause mutual suffering. European dependence on Russia's oil and gas, is about 30-35%; some countries more, some less. If Russia is thrown out of the SWIFT system, Russia cannot have international trade, then Europe cannot pay Russia as well, then the oil or gas pipelines will be blocked, which is in the interest of the United States, but not in the interest of Europe. This is the first point.

Second, China and Russia have already agreed that they are not going to use dollars for their bilateral trade. So that doesn't really matter, seen from the Russian and Chinese perspective, and in light of the spirit of this joint statement. So definitely China will continue to do business with Russia, and if the U.S. says that any country doing business with Russia will be sanctioned as well, then the U.S. is creating an even larger, a bigger enemy. China is a different story, because Russia's economy, Russia's economic-financial status, is relatively limited, compared with China. China is the second largest economy in the world.

By the way, China is the largest trading nation in the world. Last year, the China-EU trade reached more than \$850 billion! That's a lot! And look at the China-U.S. trade [at \$657 billion]. If you punish China, in what way? I cannot imagine it. Take China out of the SWIFT system as well? No, you can't do that! Then the whole world is blocked! Then no trade, no economic development at all.

Such sanctions would have grave consequences. I cannot predict the future. Until now, I haven't read any concrete reaction from the Chinese government, but I guess, following the spirit of this document, which was signed three weeks ago, China is definitely going to act. China will also act in accordance with the spirit of solidarity between both countries.

Great Power Relations

Rasmussen: Our analysts were saying that it may be the case that China would buy more oil and gas and other products from Russia. Yesterday, February 21, is the 50th anniversary of President Richard Nixon's trip to China, [February 21 to 28, 1972], the opening up of relations, and the United States' commitment to the One-China policy. At that time, many people were saying that then National Security Advisor Henry Kissinger's strategy was to open up the relations to China, as a way of isolating Russia, of putting Russia aside. But the fact is that these sanctions and this type of policy over the recent period, has done more to bring Russia and China together, as signified by this document. What is your reaction to that? But also, the prospects of getting out of this?

Lyndon LaRouche, for many years, called for a "Four Power" agreement among China, India, Russia, and the United States. How can we break through? Looking at the world as Russia and China on one side, and the U.S. and Europe on the other side, how can we get a cooperation among those great powers for the necessity of dealing with these other very serious crises the world is facing?

Prof. Li: Extremely interesting that you mentioned Nixon's trip, of playing the "China card," during the Cold War, in the beginning of the 1970s. You are completely right that the U.S. has historically enjoyed a very favorable position, in which the U.S. has been able to keep relatively stable relations with China, relatively stable relations with Soviet Union, at that time—but making the Soviet Union and China fight each other all the time. And especially after the Cold War, the U.S. still had this favorable position—relatively stable relations with both countries, but China and Russia still had difficult relations with each other.

But today, the situation is reversed. It's totally shocking that the U.S. is fighting both world powers simultaneously. Before he died, former U.S. National Security Advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski wrote clearly, that the worst situation for the United States, for the West is when Iran, Russia, and China become a bloc, become an alliance, with China as the economic driver,



NARA/Byron E. Schumaker

U.S. National Security Advisor Henry Kissinger schemed that opening up relations with China would isolate Russia. Here, President Richard Nixon and First Lady Pat Nixon at the Great Wall, Feb. 24, 1972.

the economic power. I was very surprised that his words are becoming true today!

The only way we can come to the second part of your question, about how we can manage major power relations, is in line with the spirit of the Schiller Institute [conference](#) that took place last week and its call for establishing a [new international security architecture](#). There is no other way. The Western dominance, the U.S. singlehanded dominance, the unipolar world is over. We need what Helga Zepp-LaRouche proposed, to establish a new international security architecture. We don't know exactly what will be the form of this architecture, but that needs discussion from both sides! Unless the international community forms a kind of great, new international security architecture, conflict will continue.

Rasmussen: And then, as we spoke earlier, it goes hand in hand with the increasing economic cooperation and the determination of the great powers to really do something for the economic development of the poor parts of the world.

Prof. Li: Yes, definitely. I agree with you. Thank you.

Rasmussen: Is there anything else you would like to add?

‘The Most Comprehensive Political Document’

Prof. Li: I am very amazed by this joint statement, because I have come across many joint statements by two countries, or by multiple countries. But this one is the most comprehensive political document I have ever come across. It covers *every* aspect of the world order, international relations, governance, security, values, norms, technology, climate change, health—you name it. It is an extremely comprehensive document, which shows what Russia and China envision as a just world order.

I would argue that this document implies a kind of new world order which Russia and China are going to, not only propose, but also push forward.

Unfortunately, this document has been demonized by many Western media—I have read many media talking about—to me it’s a kind of Cold War syndrome,

because those media describe the document as creating a “bipolar world,” they say bipolar world, with the Russia and China/autocracies on the one side, and the U.S. and the West/democracies on the other side. To me, it’s a dividing line, when they allege that this document divides the world into two camps again. To me, that is a typical Cold War syndrome.


I come back to my last point, which is that we need a new international security architecture, as the Schiller Institute also proposed during the conference last week. Otherwise, there will be no peace and development. Thank you.

Rasmussen: Thank you so much, Li Xing. This has been a very important discussion.

Prof. Li: Thank you very much.

The Schiller Institute

has just released the second issue of its new quarterly journal dedicated to the creation of a classical culture. The 95-page issue, described below, is yours as a monthly contributing member. Memberships start at \$5/month. Give more if you can. This beautiful journal, written for audiences from 12 to 102, is a map to winning a beautiful future. Failure is not an option.



In this special issue, we take on the question of “What is an Aesthetical Education?” This is an incredibly important and challenging question, but one that must be taken up. We want to examine different people and nations who have either attempted or successfully created this type of educational system.

We have a very wonderful composition for you to work through. Here are a few highlights:

Preview the fall issue [here](#)

Restore Classical Education to the Secondary Classroom

by Lyndon LaRouche

The Cult of Ugliness, Or Beauty As A Necessary

Condition of Mankind

by Helga Zepp-LaRouche

Foundation for the Future

by Leni Rubenstein

The Current Transformation of Education in China: Shaping a More Beautiful Mind

by Richard A. Black

A Taste of the Sublime Comes from the Most Unexpected of Places

An Interview with Heartbeat Opera’s Ethan Heard

Subscribe [here](#)!

Have fun! *Anastasia Battle*, Editor-in-Chief, *Leonore*