

Second Forum Chine-Europa

Discours et interventions du samedi 6 octobre 2007

Deuxième partie de l'après-midi

*Texte intégral*

Sont intervenus :

- **Henri Claude de Bettignies**
- **Ljiljana Zurovac**
- **Elie Faroult**
- **Nicolas Bach**
- **Hugh Frazer**
- **Jorge Braga de Macedo**
- **Zhong Binglin**

### **Henri-Claude de BETTIGNIES**

Good evening. If you don't mind we will get started. I would like some of the speakers who are not here to join us.

My name is Henri-Claude de Bettignies, I am Professor at the China Europe International Business School in Shanghai, and I am also a Professor at INSEAD, and I'm currently building up a centre in China called the Euro-China Centre for Leadership and Responsibility. I was entrusted by Pierre to chair this session, so maybe you would like to introduce yourselves and then we will proceed.

### **Zhong BINGLIN**

Hello everyone, I am Zhong Binglin from Beijing Normal University of China.

### **Henri-Claude de BETTIGNIES**

Thank you. In the session we will first present and then have a lively debate. The major challenge in Europe as seen by Europeans is the question raised by the Chinese members of our workshops. In many workshops – as was said several times this morning – we had a very open discussion as there was not too much “langue de bois”. Some of the subjects we discussed were a little bit sensitive, and I think we should be very grateful to all participants who have been more willing to express themselves rather freely. In the workshop that we had where we were looking at the challenge of Europe, I have picked up a few points which came in and out of the different discussions. We were all concerned about how we are going to achieve this University with diversity, or how do we manage diversity in Europe at a time when we realize we need to do so but we realize that with 27 it is a challenge.

A second issue was the issue of governance: what kind of governance do we give ourselves and how groping for solutions could inspire others and maybe have others give us views on how we could be more effective in managing the governance; governance at the European level and also at the World level, what kind of governance do we need, and Europeans seem to be concerned about what kind of governance we need to have if we want to avoid a unipolar world and if we want to build a multi-polar world.

A third issue which came up in a number of workshops was the issue of CSR, social responsibility, sustainable development; how to manage sustainable development; what the implications are of this at the national governance level; at the European level; and what kind of implications does it have at the corporation level.

The next one was the issue of the difficulty we have of creating a common view of what is a common good; we talked about public good, we talked about common good, we talked about the whole civil society in Europe, all the NGO's. How do we develop a sense of going beyond the public good to the common good? Are there any dominant proposals today to define and try to implement a common view on what a common good for Europe and the planet is.

Because of the nature of the whole forum, we then had to talk about values. Values came into a number of questions, on a more philosophical basis are values universal,

are European values shared by all the different parts of Europe. I think at some point we concluded that values serve a discipline purpose, that the reason why corporations need values is because they need a way to discipline their people. That led us to discuss in one of the workshops in particular, the different types of modern society and to explore with our Chinese friends what type of society is evolving and progressively coming out in China.

You can see that although we were talking about Europe, we often made reference to China, and we had a number of questions from our Chinese friends which will be reported a little later this evening.

First, we will have a more detailed presentation and then we will have a number of questions including the question proposed by our Chinese friends. Let me first invite Ljiljana Zurovac to give us her presentation.

### **Ljiljana ZUROVAC**

It is funny actually, it can only happen in such a nice event, someone who comes from Bosnia Herzegovina as I do, a country which is far away from the European Union presents European points and awareness of Europe's diversity. This is from the social and professional groups who have worked together over the last two days: the main points are awareness of Europe's diversity, public and institutional actions are seen as possible and positive. Pro-active management of technological, economical and social constraints, awareness of the constraints faced by Europe, and Europeans view ethics and values as pillars of governance.

What does this mean? All the workshops agree on the following: Europe as a project is stuck at a cross-roads but they seem polarized on what to do, where to go. Scientifics, academics, civil service managers and service men believe in a pro-active management of constraints. However, the workshop composed by young people, companies and journalists feel very constrained because they do not believe that European projects are capable of immobilizing social energies. To take one sentence from the company workshop, Europe is living in the shadow of its future while China is looking at a bright future. It is very interesting to hear that Europe is aware that it has mastered a new model of development, less materialistic, segmented and consuming of natural resources. It has a number of tools to do so at its disposal such as liquid assets that would serve as long-term investments, or the Internet that could lead to re-thinking of the economy. This line of thought also touches on better ways of socially controlling both development and the use of science and technology.

Europeans are very aware of their diversity: geographical, legal, institutional, religious etc. This is a specificity that draws the attention of the Chinese, and they are very interested in understanding how Europe has managed to live in its motto "Unity through Diversity". Maybe it will be very interesting to hear in our discussion how Europe manages that. But also a series of changes causes the first European model to be called into question. They include social changes such as population and family breakdown, cultural changes with the various crises affecting not so much individuals as trust in institutions, and the economy which reduces the ability to take action in the long term. They also include the industrial models, negative impact on agriculture and functional models negative impact on human activities. Because of that, it was said that Europe is very aware of the problems that they are facing today. Europe is aware that it must turn to a new model of development, and also Europe's

relationships with the rest of the world are changing. This is very interesting for our Chinese friends. In response to the inter-dependence of problems, the idea of world governance is wide-spread; Europe is conscious of its full involvement in globalization and is convinced of the risks of non-regulated world markets. Here the European Union is also a fresh international player that images award systems based on relations between regional players. In principle, the European Union has gone from a relationship based on superiority to one of equality with other regions of the world including China.

Nevertheless, the example of its relationship with China suggests that a truly symmetrical relationship is still far from being shared and it's also something which can be interesting for discussion and questions and answers. Let's present what our workshops suggested and concluded. Thank you.

### **Elie FAROULT**

Je voudrais tout d'abord souligner l'intérêt et l'importance que tous les participants de l'atelier dont j'ai fait part ont pris au cours des deux jours, l'importance de cet atelier pour une meilleure compréhension des problématiques aussi bien européennes que chinoises. Je dois dire qu'en ce qui concerne les problématiques européennes, le débat a été extrêmement riche et extrêmement contrasté, c'est-à-dire que nous avons pris conscience dans ce débat de l'importance de la diversité pour l'Europe, et de l'importance et de la richesse de cette diversité pour clarifier les choses. Souvent, nous avons été confrontés au fait que pour arriver à traduire de manière correcte certaines des notions ou des idées que nous avons, il fallait d'abord un long débat entre nous pour arriver à un consensus qui nous permette de trouver le mot permettant de réunir les choses. Cela a d'ailleurs amené l'un de nos collègues chinois à insister sur le fait que l'un des résultats de cet atelier, c'est qu'au fond nous sommes d'accord non seulement entre nous, mais aussi avec nos partenaires chinois, sur des idées, mais dès que nous changeons un peu la formulation des choses, cela devient comme si c'était un peu contradictoire alors que cela ne l'était pas fondamentalement. La première notion qui nous est apparue est cette idée d'une communauté de vues.

Une deuxième notion était très importante : bien entendu, nous avons derrière nous et avec nous tout le poids de l'histoire, du passé de nos sociétés si diverses qui ont été si conflictuelles pendant longtemps, des conflits que nous avons souvent dépassés, mais ce qui est encore peut-être plus important, c'est ce qu'il y a devant nous. Il est important de nous mettre d'accord sur une certaine vision de notre avenir commun. De ce point de vue, notre avenir commun est confronté à un certain nombre de défis globaux que nous avons tous en tête (le changement climatique, les problèmes d'énergie, les problèmes de société, les problèmes d'inégalité ou de disparités sociales dans les différents pays).

Un point qui a été important dans cet atelier « Gestion des choix technologiques et scientifiques » était de rappeler que même si nous parlions essentiellement de la relation entre la Chine et l'Europe au cours de ces deux jours, nous ne pouvions pas faire l'économie de repositionner cela dans un environnement international fondamental pour arriver à des solutions qui ne soient pas simplement des solutions stratégiques, mais des solutions pour le bien de l'ensemble de la planète et de l'humanité. Cette question nous a amenés à mettre au cœur des propositions auxquelles nous avons abouti l'idée que, dans les propositions de coopération entre

la Chine et l'Europe, il fallait aussi penser aux pays tiers, à l'Afrique, à l'Amérique latine, et qu'il fallait penser les problèmes dans cette perspective-là.

La deuxième chose qui nous a paru assez essentielle, c'est que toutes nos sociétés (que ce soit les sociétés européennes ou la société chinoise) sont confrontées à une notion essentielle d'acceptabilité par la société des mouvements en jeu et des solutions à y apporter. Cette notion d'acceptabilité par la société renvoie à deux types de choses : d'une part, à des modes de fonctionnement sociaux, de la société, qui permettent à chacun de se retrouver dans le discours tenu ; d'autre part, à des représentations que les individus se font et que les groupes sociaux se font de ce qui est en face d'eux, comme risques, difficultés et problèmes, et ceci renvoie à des problèmes d'éducation. On ne peut pas faire l'économie, quand nous traitons de problèmes de coopération à venir, de bien prendre en compte cette dimension d'éducation, de formation, à tous les niveaux, de l'école primaire jusqu'à l'université.

La troisième notion importante était de dire qu'il y a un vrai problème au niveau de la conscience des gens sur les enjeux mondiaux. Aujourd'hui, trop souvent nos sociétés (et ce n'est pas une attaque à l'égard des médias et de la presse) ..., nos systèmes de communication ne mettent pas suffisamment l'accent sur l'ensemble des éléments qui sont de véritables enjeux, non seulement pour chacun des individus d'une société donnée en Europe ou en Chine, mais sur des enjeux humanitaires et planétaires. Cette notion d'information, de dissémination, de sensibilisation à ces questions fondamentales est apparue comme une question essentielle.

Enfin, il a été dit aussi qu'il y a une dimension culturelle très importante. C'est un point qui a déjà été souligné dans les présentations antérieures – et surtout par nos amis chinois –, mais qui a été aussi très fort dans l'atelier dans lequel nous étions. Par exemple, nous nous sommes rendu compte que même si nous parlons de disciplines scientifiques qui sont supposées être universelles, on n'apprend pas les mêmes mathématiques en France, en Allemagne ou en Chine, et c'est un élément très important. Les lois sont peut-être les mêmes, les théories sont peut-être communes, mais la manière même de faire vivre ces connaissances scientifiques dans la réalité, de leur donner une dimension concrète à travers les technologies et les innovations, c'est quelque chose de très spécifique à chacune de nos sociétés et que, malheureusement, nous ignorons souvent. Cela a d'ailleurs amené dans les propositions à faire une large place à l'idée de coopération, des échanges entre chercheurs, créer certains types de recherche entre la Chine et l'Europe qui permettent de développer cette compréhension des modes culturels qui traversent les choses qui nous paraissent les plus et les mieux établies dans nos sociétés, comme le domaine des sciences et des technologies. Ces quelques points sont ceux qui ont été assez marquants dans notre atelier. Bien entendu, nous nous sommes très longuement appesantis sur la notion d'innovation, parce que c'est très lié à la science et à la technologie. Cette notion d'innovation nous a permis de nous rendre compte que la dimension et la vision pragmatique chinoise est peut-être une des choses que nous aurions intérêt à apprendre le mieux dans nos sociétés européennes, où peut-être nous continuons de vivre sur un paradigme qui fait qu'il faut d'abord penser sciences pour penser ensuite technologies alors que, parfois, c'est le processus inverse qui enrichit la science. C'est à partir d'une découverte ou d'une innovation scientifique que l'on peut s'interroger de manière plus intelligente et plus intéressante sur des domaines scientifiques.

En quelques mots, voici ce que je voulais dire et rappeler. Pour terminer, ce qui a été omniprésent pendant tout le long des deux jours, c'est comment la diversité peut être un élément de renforcement et de force plutôt qu'être un élément de division. Merci.

### **Nicolas BACH**

Hello, I belong to the group of people who were surprised by talking here so right now I am trying to say something intelligent, and I hope it will work out. I was part of the workshop on participation and it was very interesting in this context of participation. On the first day we had to figure out what each of the parties meant by talking about participation, like the European view on participation, of citizens participation especially, is completely different to the ones we experienced from the Chinese side. But after the first day I think for both sides it was quite clear what we were talking about. The first day was about understanding and the second day was more dedicated to show what might be problems that we can solve together.

FIM are talking about Europe, I just want to show you the possible European challenges, what we have in Europe is a bit of a crisis of the representative democracy right now. We are experiencing on many different levels that the citizens are not any more properly connected to the political decision-making process, that is frustrating. You find that this phenomena on different levels, not only national but especially on the European level, but also on the local level. For example if you take a look at the communal elections in Germany; in some areas less than 40% of the citizens were coming to the communal elections.

So what might be one tool to face this problem; we think that citizen's participation could be one tool to manage it. I was lucky to be part of a European participation process called "The European Citizens Participation" and in the last year in all 27 member states the citizens were asked what Europe they would like to have. What should a future European look like? It was very good to see that it is possible to discuss, not with experts but also with citizens important topics such as immigration, social security and the environment. The outcomes were drafted in a report that is available online; if anyone is interested they can ask me.

What I want to say is citizens' participation even works on the European level so it could work on the other levels too. When I was talking yesterday evening to one of the Chinese colleagues, I suddenly heard that they are testing right now participatory budgeting, and it was really surprising to me because I didn't know (up to now I thought I was quite well informed about participatory rules), I think that if we are coming to discuss things like citizens' participation for example, there is the opportunity, not only that the Chinese side can learn something from our experiences, but also on the other side, that Europe or European nations can learn something from the experiences of China. Thank you.

### **Hugh FRAZER**

Thank you and good afternoon. I was in the workshop on "wealth and poverty: the search for a social model". Since 2000 the European Union has had the goal of making a decisive impact on the eradication of poverty by 2010. We still have a long way to go on that but during the period since 2000 we have been very actively engaging in an exchange of learning between member states of the European Union on this issue. I have been very involved in that process, but what I found from the

last two days of the workshop was that I should have also had a broader horizon. I found it enormously stimulating and exciting, and indeed helpful to hear some of the experiences of our Chinese colleagues. While we recognize in our workshops that there were great differences in stages of development in cultural beliefs and approaches, in political arrangements, it was really quite striking how many issues and concerns we shared in common when we started talking about wealth and poverty.

I just want to highlight six points: the first one I want to emphasize it that there seems to be a very strong and shared concern that unbalanced development leads in all our societies to wide-spread disparities; disparities of incomes, disparities in terms of access to services, disparities in terms of opportunities to participate in society. These disparities are a real obstacle to building in the terminology used by our Chinese colleagues: “a harmonious society” or the European concepts were “a socially cohesive society without poverty and social exclusion”.

The second point is quite linked to that because we seem to share the same concern about how in our economies we can maintain competitiveness and growth, but adopt our economic and social models so that they better promote social inclusion and a harmonious society. I think we all recognize that economic growth on its own is not sufficient to eliminate poverty. Then, linked to that and looking at the recent European experience, we looked at the process started by the European Union in 2000 in Lisbon which aimed at trying to ensure integration between economic employment, environmental and social goals so that they would be mutually reinforcing.

To date, the experience has been that they haven't been particularly reinforcing but that the economic goal has been given priority and dominance. We have a result of that not achieved a decisive impact on poverty. We must face the challenge still ahead of us of trying to find a better balance between those different aspects of development.

The next issue that surprised me slightly in the workshop, but I think is actually very important and an area for further exploration, that is the role that cultural values and moral standards in societies play in the development of inclusive policies. We had a lot of discussion about what people meant by harmonious society, what in Europe we meant by social cohesion and social inclusion. But I think we generally accepted on all sides that we need to foster and sustain those values throughout society if we are to have the ability to develop the policies that will tackle poverty. That means countering values that put too much value on individual responsibility and the marketisation of welfare.

An area that I think has very practical and significant opportunities for learning is that we shared on all sides a belief, that developing a selective social security system and good quality public services in areas like health and education are vital in preventing poverty. We have on all sides the challenge of either adapting our new systems to new situations or developing new systems where they are not yet adequately developed.

My final point that I wanted to highlight: it was an area we shared across everybody in the group, we see as very important if you are concerned with issues with poverty

and social exclusion, that you need to mobilize all actors in society at all levels in society. You need to mobilize government agencies, you need to mobilize businesses, you need to mobilize workers and farmers, non-governmental organizations, academics, but also people experiencing poverty if you are to make progress in policies to tackle poverty. Again, we can learn from each other on how to do that better.

There were many other areas of common concern, issues like migration, about better access to adequately paid employment, about assuring gender equality being a key element in anti-poverty strategies, those and many other areas for future potential. So I felt in our workshop on issues of poverty and wealth, we took a first step, let's hope we can build on it in the future. Thank you.

### **Jorge BRAGE DE MACEDO**

Hello, I was at the financial institutions workshop, now this may seem a little bit arcane but it has to do with all of us because of course financial freedom, the ability to exchange one currency for another is an essential element of human freedom. The discussion was very lively and I will only address a few points.

The main one was to do with mutual knowledge, this has been mentioned a number of times, I don't think we can mention it enough times however, because this mutual knowledge is not really going back and looking at what you know but discovering something about the other and how together we can know something about the world. As you know very well, financial globalization is the one that is most felt, perhaps after media globalization, so we really have to confront each other, not just with the problems of European economic and monetary union and the problems of the Chinese single market and its own monetary system, it is of course a very special monetary system still in transition, but also how to confront ourselves with the international financial architecture. Something in which the Europeans and the Chinese and other great countries have not had nearly as much influence as they probably should. So again, what we were trying to do is have innovative thinking about how we could look in a similar way at the problems of international financial architecture; how could we have common perspectives on the global agenda? There's a French author who said that loving is not looking at each other like I am looking at you, but looking in the same direction. This is what we did, we were really discussing how we could look in the same direction, how could we find the interaction between globalization on one side and governance on the other, to be a positive and a mutually reinforcing one, rather than a negative one where poor governance, corruption leads to protection which in turn reinforces bad governance. In this regard, the conclusion I think came across very clearly: there is no geographical or historical determinism. The right policies conducted at the appropriate level, maybe national, maybe super-national, maybe cities, maybe sub-national, and China is an excellent example of this and so is Europe, this is what counts: to sustain growth and development. There is no determinism, development has hope. What can Europe then offer in this regard? Precisely the idea that it is through appropriate policies conducted together that we have managed to create a single currency. It is the strengths of our mutual surveillance framework that has allowed countries with such different histories, recent histories of inflation, of budgetary disciplines such as my own Portugal, Germany, to be together in the single currency.



There is a lesson here for China and there is a lesson here for the rest of the world: mutual surveillance, multi-lateral surveillance is no easy task. Even in Europe, countries that because they are big, thought they didn't have to accept the rules of the stability pact, and it was through public opinion, through financial markets that in the end they understood that they couldn't fool around. This is a lesson for countries outside the Euro zone as well, and for China I dare say, and for the other countries that are now the emerging markets: Brazil, Russia, India and China, we discussed the relations between China and India a lot. China is the world factory, India is the world back-office, do they get along? How do they entertain the comparison of policies which we do on a routine basis in Europe and in the OECD; we discussed at some length the convertibility issue there.

Don't forget that financial markets have a very long memory, there are academic articles on all the bankruptcies since 1500, and we know how many times the Crown and the various governments have failed to meet their obligations. And so financial markets have a lot of memories and so they are very fond of history.

I want to conclude with history that will also bring me to say one or two words about myself. History is something that is very often done in a very colloquial manner. I think this needs to be underlined, it is only last year that the two founding members of the European Union (France and Germany) managed to have a common textbook for the recent period since the Second World War, last year. It is very recent again that the Chinese and Japanese managed to at least set up a commission to do that in a few years. All history under globalization should be looked at, not as a goulash (nothing against Czech food) but allowing the differentiability, the specificity of each country's history, for example, through the history of bankruptcies, to come out.

This is a major undertaking and my proposal would be (I think I am in the spirit of this workshop) to actually do that, do that through this forum, do that with all the contributions of civil society. I'm afraid I won't be here tomorrow, I run an institute of tropical research which is thinking about the Portuguese-speaking world: Brazil, several African countries, I am as interested in Africa as China is these days, and it turns out that we have to celebrate the second hundredth anniversary of the departure of our King John 6<sup>th</sup> to Brazil. Since this is on Monday, because of the connections and so on, I can't be here. But I do want to tell you in closing that this was a very emotional moment for me, I made new friends, I saw old ones, and on the whole I think I come across more European perhaps even more Global. Thank you.

### **Henri-Claude de BETTIGNIES**

Thank you for this last remark. I propose we move directly to the questions raised by our Chinese colleagues, and we have the discussion after the questions raised by the Chinese colleagues. We have the whole afternoon of presentations. I will give the floor to my Co-Chairman.

### **Zhong BINGLIN**

Ok, hello everyone.

*Intervention en chinois (1\_3/11.10 à 12.06)*

### **Un intervenant**

*Intervention en chinois (1\_3/12.10 à 14.00) - (2\_1/0 à 6.56)*

**Un intervenant**

*Intervention en chinois (2\_1/7.00 à 13.15)*

**Un intervenant**

Thank you very much. Now I would like to ask Professor (1\_1/13.18 - inaudible) from Hong-Kong University of Science and Technology to give some comments please.

**Une intervenante**

*Intervention en chinois (2\_1/13.35 à 14.59 et 2\_2/0 à 7.30)*

**Un intervenant**

Thank you very much Professor. Considering there is no time for discussion I would like to ask my colleague to give a brief conclusion please.

**Un intervenant**

Thank you. In the interest of time I understand we will not have the debate that we were expecting to have but we can have it maybe tonight and continue the discussion then.

There are four points which I have picked up in the debate this afternoon. The first point is that to manage our differences and to manage our commonalities we emphasise both the importance of difference commonalities as a virtue of the dialogue that cannot be replaced. We must dialogue but it may be difficult because we don't use the same concept, and we must dialogue. The second is that we need imagination, we have identified a number of issues, we sometimes have the same issues. I think to solve those issues over a long period of time, we used a lot of imagination, and maybe we need to cultivate how to develop imagination. The third one is the importance of a vision: the importance of a vision is because of the necessity to overcome some of the differences that we have today in assessing the present. We may try to see the different vision that we have can help us to communicate more effectively. I think that vision should also be relying upon what has been said to what the latter part of this afternoon, the importance of respect, respecting others. I think that is a first step towards effective communication. If we have differences and commonalities, but if we have respect we can probably imagine a solution which will help us to cope together because we have no choice. That is certainly the only agreement we have, or at least the basic agreement we have. We are all linked together and whatever happens to one will affect the other very significantly. Thank you very much.

**Un intervenant**

Thank you. For me I have only two points.

*Intervention en chinois (2\_2/9.50 à 11.36)*

Thank you.